

NEWS & NOTES

ABOUT WOMEN PUBLIC OFFICIALS

SUMMER 1988

Vol. 6 No. 2

CONTENTS

News from CAWP

Project Update: "Impact of Women in Public Office"	1
Hispana Leaders Come to CAWP for Training	2
Workshop Summary from CAWP's Forum for Women State Legislators: "Reproductive Hazards in the Workplace"	3
Letter to the Editor.	6

Features

Women Candidates in 1988

Candidates' Summary	7
Preliminary List of Congressional and Statewide Candidates.	8
Women of Color Compete for Congressional Seats.	10

Women in the Democratic and Republican Parties

Women at the Conventions: A Growing Presence.	12
"Firsts" for Women at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions . .	19
Percentage of Women Delegates to the Conventions -- 1900-1988.	21

Lists of Organizations Available from CAWP

Organizations of Women Officeholders	22
Organizations of Administrative Women in Government.	22
Women's PACs	23

S.I.S. Packet Enclosures

Complete set of CAWP fact sheets, including new fact sheet, "Women of Color in Elective Office;" CAWP publications list; Forum for Women State Legislators cassette order form; reprints of articles from The Journal of State Government issue, "Women as State Policymakers;" Women's Vote Project 1988.

Note: CAWP is willing to consider including additional enclosures in S.I.S. mailings; call for more information.



Issued by:

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901 ** (201) 828-2210

Edited by:
Lucy Baruch

© COPYRIGHT 1988

PROJECT UPDATE: THE IMPACT OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE

by

Debra L. Dodson, Program Administrator, CAWP

The Center for the American Woman and Politics' (CAWP) research project to examine "The Impact of Women in Public Office" is now well under way. Funded by a grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation, the project focuses on the impact of women on policy, processes and institutions. It is composed of two parts: an in-house study of women and men in the state legislatures and a grants program. Findings will be presented at a public program in 1990.

"The Center has long studied women's recruitment into elective and appointive office at all levels of government," notes Ruth Mandel, director of CAWP and co-principal investigator. "Our earlier studies of women officeholders gave tantalizing hints that women officeholders were having a distinctive impact on all types of policies. The Revson Foundation's support offers us an opportunity to examine women's impact in depth, providing definitive evidence on whether or not women's presence changes the policies, processes and institutions."

The first phase in CAWP's survey of some 1200 state legislators began in late May and will soon be completed. In addition, CAWP has just awarded eleven grants to scholars to conduct research about the impact of women appointees and elected officeholders at the local, state and national levels looking at all three branches of government -- executive, legislative and judicial.

The recipients of the grants awarded to date are:

Susan Abrams Beck (Fordham University) -- "The Impact of Women in Public Office: Council Members in Bergen County, New Jersey."

Janet K. Boles (Marquette University) -- "The Impact of Women's Policy Networks on the Redesign of Urban Services."

Susan Clarke and Barbara Fox (University of Colorado, Boulder) -- "Gender, Public Policy, and the Legislative Process: Men and Women Legislators in Colorado."

Catherine Havens and Lynne Healy (University of Connecticut) "The Impact of Women in Public Office: A Study of Women Appointees to Leadership Positions in Public Agencies in Connecticut."

Elaine Martin (Eastern Michigan University) "Women Judges Study".

Nancy E. McGlen and Meredith Reid Sarkees (Niagara University). "Women in Foreign Policy Formulation."

Sue Tolleson Rinehart (Texas Tech University) "Gender and Leadership Style Among American Mayors"

Janann Sherman (Rutgers University) "The Impact of Gender Identification: The Career of Margaret Chase Smith."

Helene Silverberg (Princeton University), "Political Institutions, Congresswomen and Women's Issues: Explaining National Policy Outputs for Women."

Jeanie Stanley (University of Texas at Tyler) and Diane Blair (University of Arkansas). "Gender Differences in the Perception, Development, Uses and Impact of Power in State Legislatures."

Susan Welch and Sue Thomas (University of Nebraska, Lincoln) "The Policy Impact of Increasing Numbers of Women in State Legislatures."

* * * * *

HISPANA LEADERS COME TO CAWP FOR TRAINING

by

Katherine E. Kleeman, Senior Program Associate, CAWP

Nineteen dynamic Hispanic women from around the nation visited the Center for the American Woman and Politics this spring for a four day intensive program on women in leadership. The trainees were the pilot class for the Coors National Hispana Leadership Initiative, selected from more than 300 applicants in recognition of their potential to move into national-level leadership roles.

The trainees were drawn from the corporate world, academe, government, non-profit organizations and community service agencies. They boast impressive academic and professional credentials and a long list of honors for their community involvement. In order to graduate from the program, each must participate in five training sessions (at CAWP, the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, the Center for Creative Leadership in North Carolina, and in Los Angeles and Denver), serve as a mentor to a young Hispanic woman, and complete an individual project in one of the following areas: training and self development, mentorship, data collection and analysis on Hispanic women nationally, or policy making.

Included in CAWP's program were:

- o **Hispanas and Political Leadership**
Polly Baca, Vice Chair, Democratic National Committee
- o **History of Women's Movement(s) in the United States**
Jo Freeman, Author, The Politics of Women's Liberation
- o **Critical Issues for American Women**
Ethel Klein, Associate Professor of Political Science, Columbia University
- o **Women's Economic Status and Prospects**
Heidi Hartmann, Director of Women's Studies, Rutgers University
- o **Leadership and Personal Image**
Nancy Thompson, President, Image Awareness

- o **Women, Power and Leadership**
Charlotte Bunch, feminist activist and theorist; Blanche, Edith and Irving Laurie/NJ Chair in Women's Studies, Douglass College, Rutgers University
- o **Women and American Politics**
Kathy Kleeman, Susan Carroll, Debbie Walsh
Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)
- o **Building Coalitions**
Joanne Howes, Partner, Bass & Howes; Executive Director, Women's Vote Project
- o **Influencing Public Policy**
Kathy Kleeman, Moderator, Senior Program Associate, CAWP; Nanette Falkenberg, President, Joint Foundation Support; Catherine Willis, NJ/NY Director, Human SERVE; Belle Ahlring, Case Worker, Office of Representative Bernard Dwyer.
- o **Case Study: Hispanic Women's Resource Centers Legislation**
Gloria Bonilla Santiago, Chairperson, Hispanic Women's Task Force of New Jersey; and Ivette Del Rio, Co-Chairperson, Hispanic Women's Task Force of New Jersey

The pilot program was rewarding for both CAWP and the trainees. CAWP is looking forward to future cooperative efforts.

* * * * *

REPRODUCTIVE HAZARDS IN THE WORKPLACE

by

Debbie Walsh, Director, Program for Women State Legislators, CAWP

The following is a summary of "Reproductive Hazards in the Workplace," one of 45 public policy workshops held at the 1987 CAWP Forum for Women State Legislators. Moderated by Nadine Taub, director of the Women's Rights Litigation Clinic at Rutgers University Law School, the workshop was made possible by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Panelists included: Joan Bertin, Associate Director of the Women's Rights Project of the American Civil Liberties Union; Dr. Linda Rudolph, Chief of the Occupational Health Surveillance and Evaluation Program at the California Department of Health Services; and State Representative Lynn Taborsak of Connecticut.

Reproductive hazards in the workplace are a critical problem and the issue is further complicated by a lack of information and research. According to Dr. Linda Rudolph:

- o There are three million live births in the US each year.
- o 1.25 million of these three million babies are born to women who are working outside the home.

- o Every year, 300,000 women are pregnant while working in jobs that could expose them to known reproductive toxins.
- o 150,000 children in the U.S. are born with serious birth defects each year.

Testing chemicals for their toxicity is costly, and funding for studies on occupational reproductive hazards is difficult to obtain. Rudolph noted that recommendations have been made to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to develop a generic reproductive hazards policy. OSHA's response has been that they "...regulate on the basis of science, not opinion." Of the 60,000 chemicals in commercial and industrial use, OSHA has standards for only three based in part on reproductive hazards.

With little or no funding for research, scientifically based information will not be forthcoming. Without that information it is difficult to promote any kind of meaningful protection for workers. The lack of scientific evidence about likely hazards also makes it difficult to win workers compensation and liability suits.

To address the problem of reproductive hazards in the workplace some employers have instituted "fetal protection policies," or what Rudolph and Joan Bertin refer to as "exclusionary placement policies." These policies remove women workers from areas with exposure to known or possible reproductive hazards. Bertin and Rudolph argued that there are serious problems with exclusionary placement policies, which are often based on erroneous assumptions:

- o The policies ignore more health protective alternatives. Cleaning up the workplace and making it safe for all workers is far preferable to removing certain workers.
- o The policies assume that all women between the ages of 15 and 45 are pregnant.
- o The policies ignore the health effects of the same chemicals on male workers and assume that only women are at risk, even though the chemicals tend to affect both female and male reproductive systems. One study of 26 industrial chemicals for which the industry had policies banning women's exposure showed evidence that 21 of them had effects on the genetic material or reproductive systems of men. When DCBP (a pesticide) was found to cause sterility in approximately 50% of the men who had been exposed to it for more than one year, the chemical -- not the worker -- was banned.
- o The policies assume that a pregnant woman's employment can be sacrificed with little or no cost to her, her fetus, or her family. But by removing the woman from the workplace, one potential hazard is replaced with a host of known hazards such as lack of medical care, no access to pre-natal care, and inadequate nutrition.

Bertin described the case of a chemical plant in West Virginia to illustrate the complexity of the issue and the problems inherent in some employers' solutions. The chemical plant provided the only jobs in the region with union wages for unskilled labor. Until 1974, no women were employed in production work

at this plant. By 1978, due to pressure from the federal government, 25 women were employed.

In 1978, the company developed a new medical policy to protect fetuses from exposure to hazardous chemicals if women workers were to become pregnant. The policy excluded all women from most jobs in the plant and meant that the women with the lowest seniority were at risk of losing their jobs; it virtually excluded women from all union scale employment in the plant. The women were told the policy was supported by the federal government and that other chemical plants in the area would adopt similar policies in the next year.

The policy applied to all women between 15 and 50 years of age, regardless of marital status, sexual orientation, or childbearing intentions. The only women not affected were those who submitted medical verification of their sterility; medical verification of a spouse's vasectomy would not suffice. The women were told by the company doctor that they should not submit to tubal ligations in order to secure their jobs; they were also told the procedure was "band-aid surgery" and that the company insurance policy was likely to cover the costs.

The scope of the employment policy was later narrowed substantially, but by then five women had had tubal ligations to protect their jobs. One year later those same women's jobs were eliminated for what the plant called "business reasons."

This case study illustrates the problems with exclusionary placement policies which, according to Bertin, "ignore the risk to men and rationalize forcing women to choose between their fertility and their jobs, instead of making the workplace safe."

The panelists all agreed that the solution to reproductive hazards in the workplace lies in a comprehensive policy which protects all workers from workplace injury and toxic substances. In addition, the reproductive health of men and women must be protected based on sound and complete scientific evidence; therefore, adequate funding for research must be provided. In the meantime, at the very least, it was suggested that employers provide for transfer of workers to safer jobs with retention of wages and benefits, not termination of employment.

An audio tape of this workshop can be ordered from InfoMedix with the enclosed form (request tape PT307-28AB). For more information about reproductive hazards in the workplace, panelists can be contacted directly:

Nadine Taub, Director
Women's Rights Litigation Clinic
Rutgers Law School
15 Washington Street, Room 337
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Dr. Linda Rudolph, MD, Chief
Occupational Health Program
Department of Health Services
2151 Berkeley Way, Room 504
Berkeley, California 94704

Joan Bertin
Women's Rights Project
American Civil Liberties Union
132 West 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036

Representative Lynn Taborsak
P.O. Box 309
Danbury, Connecticut 06813

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

In response to "At the Helm: Women Running the Presidential Campaigns" (News & Notes, Winter 1988, Vol. 6, No. 1), CAWP received the following from Elisabeth Perry, Associate Professor of History at Vanderbilt University:

...in the 1920s there was a forerunner of the women staffers in presidential campaigns. My grandmother, Belle Moskowitz, masterminded Al Smith's nomination in 1928, and afterwards was the only woman on the Executive Committee of the Democratic National Committee for his race. As head of the Publicity Department for the campaign, she was a major policy maker and considered by most to be Smith's "true" campaign manager.

[Perry] has tried to restore Moskowitz to historical memory in [her] recent book: Belle Moskowitz, Feminine Politics and the Exercise of Power in the Age of Alfred Smith (Oxford University Press)....

CANDIDATES' SUMMARY

compiled by
Lucy Baruch, Research Associate, CAWP

CAWP is tracking women candidates running for Congress, statewide elective executive offices, and state legislatures through the 1988 election season as part of its National Information Bank on Women in Public Office. Preliminary information about congressional and statewide candidates is listed below; however, because filing deadlines have not yet passed in many of the 25 states with primaries still to come, it is too soon to tell how many women will run and how many women will be on the ballot in November.

The fall issue of News & Notes will include an update on congressional and statewide races, as well as information about women running in state legislative races.

Women Congressional Candidates (Major Party)

As of June 17, there are 74 (44D, 30R) women congressional candidates in the running. Of these, 32 (18D, 14R) have won their primaries and 42 (26D, 16R) are running in the 25 states which have not yet held primaries.

Women Congressional Candidates In the Running as of June 17, 1988

U.S. Congress - 74			
30 Republicans		Democrats 44	
11	Incumbent	12	
17	Challenger*	23	
2	Open Seat	9	

U.S. Senate - 6				U.S. House - 68			
3 Republicans		Democrats 3**		27 Republicans		Democrats 41	
0	Incumbent	0		11	Incumbent	12	
2	Challenger	2		15	Challenger*	21	
1	Open Seat	1		1	Open Seat	8	

*challenger = the incumbent is also running; in all but one primary race, the incumbent is not in the candidate's party.

**Includes Polly Mann of Minnesota who plans to run in the general election whether or not she receives the DFL nomination.

Women Candidates for Statewide Elective Executive Offices

Thus far 22 (14D, 7R, 1 nonpartisan) women in 12 states have been identified as running for statewide elective executive offices. The 22 candidates include: 2 for governor, 4 for lieutenant governor, 2 for secretary of state, 3 for treasurer, 2 for auditor, 4 for superintendent of public instruction, 1 for corporation commissioner, 1 for public service commissioner, 1 for commissioner of insurance, 1 for commissioner of agriculture, and 1 for tax commissioner.

PRELIMINARY LIST OF WOMEN CANDIDATES
In the Running as of June 17, 1988

State	Office	District	Candidate	Seat*	Primary**
FL	US Sen.		Patricia Franks (D)	O	
HI	US Sen.		Maria Hustace (R)	C	
MI	US Sen.		Susan Engeleiter (R)	O	
MN	US Sen.		Polly Mann (DFL)	C	
TN	US Sen.		Alice Algood (R)	C	
WY	US Sen.		Lynn Simons (D)	C	
AL	US Rep.	02	Janie Baker Clark (D)	C	W
AZ	US Rep.	05	Judy Blecher (D)	C	
CA	US Rep.	05	Nancy Pelosi (D)	I	W
CA	US Rep.	06	Barbara Boxer (D)	I	W
CA	US Rep.	07	Jean Last (R)	C	W
CA	US Rep.	12	Anna Eshoo (D)	O	W
CA	US Rep.	14	Patricia Malberg (D)	C	W
CA	US Rep.	15	Carol Harner (R)	C	W
CA	US Rep.	20	Lita Reid (D)	C	W
CA	US Rep.	40	Lida Lenney (D)	O	W
CO	US Rep.	01	Patricia Schroeder (D)	I	
CO	US Rep.	01	Joy Wood (R)	C	
CO	US Rep.	02	Mary Estill Buchanan (R)	C	
CO	US Rep.	06	Martha Ezzard (D)	C	
CT	US Rep.	01	Barbara B. Kennelly (D)	I	
CT	US Rep.	06	Nancy L. Johnson (R)	I	
FL	US Rep.	14	Dorothy Wilkens (D)	O	
HI	US Rep.	01	Mary Bitterman (D)	C	
HI	US Rep.	01	Patricia Saiki (R)	I	
ID	US Rep.	02	Jeanne Givens (D)	C	W
IL	US Rep.	07	Cardiss Collins (D)	I	W
IL	US Rep.	13	Evelyn Craig (D)	C	W
IL	US Rep.	16	Lynn M. Martin (R)	I	W
IN	US Rep.	04	Jill Long (D)	C	W
IN	US Rep.	05	Patricia Williams (R)	C	W
KS	US Rep.	03	Jan Meyers (R)	I	
LA	US Rep.	02	Corinne Boggs (D)	I	
LA	US Rep.	08	Faye Williams (D)	C	
MD	US Rep.	02	Helen D. Bentley (R)	I	W
MD	US Rep.	06	Beverly B. Byron (D)	I	W
MD	US Rep.	08	Constance A. Morella (R)	I	W
ME	US Rep.	02	Olympia Snowe (R)	I	W
MI	US Rep.	02	Lana Pollack (D)	C	
MI	US Rep.	11	Marsha Gould (D)	C	
MI	US Rep.	13	Barbara Rose Collins (D)	C	
MI	US Rep.	13	Marlene Kler (D)	C	
MO	US Rep.	03	Barbara Vires (D)	C	
MO	US Rep.	05	Mary Ellen Lobb (R)	C	
NE	US Rep.	03	Virginia Smith (R)	I	W
NH	US Rep.	02	Betty Tamposi (R)	O	
NH	US Rep.	02	Barbara Underwood (D)	O	
NJ	US Rep.	04	Betty Holland (D)	C	W
NJ	US Rep.	05	Marge Roukema (R)	I	W
NM	US Rep.	03	Cecilia M. Salazar (R)	C	W
NV	US Rep.	01	Lucille Lusk (R)	C	
NV	US Rep.	02	Barbara Vucanovich (R)	I	
NY	US Rep.	20	Nita Lowey (D)	C	

State	Office	District	Candidate	Seat*	Primary**
NY	US Rep.	22	Eleanor Burlington (D)	C	
NY	US Rep.	27	Rosemary Pooler (D)	O	
NY	US Rep.	30	Louise M. Slaughter (D)	I	
OH	US Rep.	09	Marcy Kaptur (D)	I	W
OH	US Rep.	11	Margaret Mueller (R)	C	W
OH	US Rep.	14	Loretta Lang (R)	C	W
OH	US Rep.	20	Mary Rose Oakar (D)	I	W
RI	US Rep.	02	Ruth Morgenthau (D)	C	
RI	US Rep.	02	Claudine Schneider (R)	I	
SC	US Rep.	48	Elizabeth J. Patterson (D)	I	W
TN	US Rep.	03	Marilyn Lloyd (D)	I	
TX	US Rep.	07	Diane Richards (D)	C	W
TX	US Rep.	26	Joann Reys (D)	C	W
VA	US Rep.	05	Linda Arey (R)	C	W
VT	US Rep.	A-Lg	Dolores Sandoval (D)	O	
WA	US Rep.	03	Jolene Unsoeld (D)	O	
WA	US Rep.	07	Ruthe Ridder (D)	O	
WI	US Rep.	02	Ann Haney (R)	C	
WI	US Rep.	05	Helen Barnhill (R)	C	
WI	US Rep.	05	Janette Marsh (R)	C	
WV	US Rep.	04	Marianne Brewster (R)	C	W
MO	Governor		Betty Hearnns (D)	C	
VT	Governor		Madeleine Kunin (D)	I	
MT	Lt. Gov.		Barbara Skelton (D)	O	W
ND	Lt. Gov.		Donna Nalewaja (R)		W
RI	Lt. Gov.		Elizabeth Morancy (D)		
WA	Lt. Gov.		Nita Rinehart (D)	O	
OR	Sec. St.		Barbara Roberts (D)	I	
RI	Sec. St.		Kathleen Connell (D)	I	
NC	St. Treas.		Nancy Lake Coward (R)	C	W
PA	St. Treas.		Catherine Baker Knoll (D)	O	W
RI	St. Treas.		Marlene McKerna (D)		
MT	Auditor		Andrea Bennett (R)	I	W
PA	Auditor		Barbara Hafer (R)	C	W
IN	Sup Pub In		Mary Peterson (D)		W
MT	Sup Pub In		Barbara Foster (R)	O	W
MT	Sup Pub In		Nancy Keenan (D)	O	W
WA	Sup Pub In		Judith Billings (NP)		
ND	Comm Agric		Sarah Vogel (D)	O	W
ND	Comm Insur		Margaret Bushee (R)	C	W
ND	Tax Comm.		M.K. Heidi Heitkamp (D)	O	W
NM	Corp Comm.		Jannie McDaniel (R)		W
GA	Pub.Ser.Co		Cathey Steinberg (D)	O	

*Seat: I = incumbent; C = challenger (the incumbent is also running; in all but one race, the incumbent is not in the candidate's party); O = open seat.

**Primary: W = won primary or ran unopposed; blank = primary not yet held.

Sources: CAWP, Women's Campaign Fund, and Women Executives in State Government figures. In several states the filing deadline for candidates has not yet passed; hence information may be incomplete and/or may change.

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS • THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS
WOOD LAWN • NEILSON CAMPUS • NEW BRUNSWICK • NEW JERSEY 08901 • 201/828 2210

For immediate release
May 20, 1988

CONTACT: Ruth Mandel
Lucy Baruch
(201) 828-2210

WOMEN OF COLOR COMPETE FOR CONGRESSIONAL SEATS

New Brunswick, NJ -- As this year's congressional races shape up, a growing number of women of color are among the contenders, according to the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP). At least ten women of color are vying for major party nominations for the U.S. House of Representatives; they include **five Black women, two Hispanas, two Asian-Pacific Americans and one Native American.**

"At the Center for the American Woman and Politics, we have watched the number of women officeholders edge upward over the past seventeen years," remarked Ruth B. Mandel, CAWP's director. "Along with that growth has come increasing diversity. The women of color moving into public office symbolize important changes in the leadership we are choosing for our future, a future which promises to be enriched by new faces, different voices and fresh perspectives."

Among the candidates for the 101st Congress are the two incumbent women of color, Reps. **Cardiss Collins (D-IL)** and **Patricia Saiki (R-HI)**. First elected in 1973, Collins is the only Black woman in the Congress today. Saiki was elected in 1986, becoming the first Republican woman of color in the Congress and the second Asian-Pacific woman ever to gain a Congressional seat.

No Hispanic woman has ever served in Congress, but at least two Hispanic women are seeking nominations for House seats this year. **Patricia Madrid (D)**, who was the first woman elected to a state district court judgeship in New Mexico, is running in the primary for the open seat in that state's first congressional district. **Cecilia M. Salazar (R)** is seeking the nomination in New Mexico's third congressional district to oppose incumbent **Bill Richardson (D)**.

Former Colorado State Senator **Polly Baca**, now vice-chair of the Democratic National Committee, became the first Hispanic woman ever to win a major party nomination for a congressional seat when she ran in Colorado in 1980. In 1986, **Linda Chavez (R)** of Maryland, a former White House aide, became the first Hispanic woman to win a major party nomination for the U.S. Senate.

Three Black women (in addition to the incumbent Collins) are confirmed congressional candidates, and a fourth is considered likely to run. **Faye Williams (D)**, an attorney, is seeking a rematch of her 1986 race against incumbent **Clyde Holloway (R)** in Louisiana's eighth congressional district. **Dolores Sandoval (D)**, a Vermont educator, is one of several contenders for that state's open at-large House seat. In Wisconsin, businesswoman **Helen Barnhill (R)** is a candidate for the open fifth congressional district seat. Former Wisconsin Secretary of State **Vel Phillips** is also expected to run for the Democratic nomination for that seat. If both Barnhill and Phillips win their primaries, the stage will be set for a first-ever congressional race with Black women holding both major party nominations.

A total of five Black women have served in Congress, all since 1968 when Shirley Chisholm (D-NY) won her seat. The others were Yvonne Brathwaite Burke (D-CA), Barbara Jordan (D-TX), Katie Hall (D-IN), and Representative Collins.

Lily Chen (D), former mayor of Monterey Park, CA, is pursuing her party's nomination in the 30th congressional district in a primary race which includes incumbent Representative Matthew Martinez (D). If Chen wins, she will be the third Asian-Pacific American woman in Congress; Patsy Takemoto Mink (D-HI) was the first, elected in 1964.

State Representative Jeanne Givens (D), a Native American woman, is a candidate in Idaho's first district. If she wins her party's nomination, she will face incumbent Rep. Larry Craig (R) in the general election. No Native American woman has ever served in Congress.

"In the history of the United States, 124 women have served in Congress. Seven have been women of color, all of them members of the House of Representatives," noted Lucy Baruch, the CAWP research associate who compiled the information.

Below the congressional level, the numbers of women of color in elective office remain small. Only two women of color hold statewide elective executive office -- California's Secretary of State, March Fong Eu (D) and New Mexico's Secretary of State, Rebecca Vigil-Giron (D). Of the 1175 women state legislators who make up 15.8% of all state lawmakers, 127 are women of color. Twenty-nine are senators and 98 are representatives; 120 are Democrats and 7 are Republicans.

A newly-issued CAWP fact sheet, "Women of Color in Elective Office," provides additional information about the status of women of color in offices at the local, state and federal levels.

The Center is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Data about women candidates are compiled as part of the Center's National Information Bank on Women in Public Office.

- end -

Update on May 20 Press Release Women of Color Compete for Congressional Seats

As of June 17, the status of the ten women of color identified in CAWP's May 20 release, is as follows:

3 won primaries

U.S. Rep. Cardiss Collins (D-IL)
Cecilia Salazar (R-NM)
State Rep. Jeanne Givens (D-ID)

2 lost primaries

Lily Chen (D-CA)
Patricia Madrid (D-NM)

4 primaries have not yet been held

Helen Barnhill (R-WI)
U.S. Rep. Patricia Saiki (R-HI)
Dolores Sandoval (D-VT)
Faye Williams (D-LA)

1 did not declare
her candidacy

Vel Phillips (D-WI)

Another candidate who lost her March primary and was not included in the May 20 release is Debora McNair (D-MS); McNair, who is black, was running for an open seat in the 4th district.

WOMEN AT THE CONVENTIONS: A GROWING PRESENCE

by

Debra L. Dodson, Assistant Research Professor, CAWP

Introduction

The news media and the public pay more attention to political parties during the presidential nominating season than at almost any other time. Each nominating season brings with it the quadrennial intra-party debates over who will have power in the party, whose interests will be voiced, who will voice those interests, and who will control the party. One such recurrent controversy in recent years has centered around the parties' relationships with female voters and party members. While women have improved their status within the parties, they still have not achieved equality with their male counterparts. Nowhere is this dualism of women's relationship to the parties more evident than at the Republican and the Democratic parties' national conventions.

An Overview of Historical Progress

The first women attended the Democratic and Republican national conventions as delegates in 1900 (NWPC, 1980a; NWPC, 1980b). The entry of women as delegates at the national conventions was only the first of many firsts. In recent decades we have seen women's names placed in nomination for the presidency, a woman selected as a vice-presidential candidate, women chair conventions, women chairing the national parties, and women serving as keynote speakers at the conventions. Furthermore in 1984, for the first time in our nation's history, about half of the delegates to both party's conventions were women -- quite a change from the conventions of the early 1900's and even from conventions a generation earlier. [see pages 19-20 for "'Firsts' for Women at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions" and page 21 for "Percentage of Women Delegates to the National Conventions -- 1900-1988"]

Women's progress toward equal representation at the conventions, however, has been sporadic, marked by a couple of leaps and intermediate plateaus. The gains for women occurred primarily following women's suffrage and the party reforms of the early 1970's. Yet women's status within the parties remains tenuous as the question of equal representation of men and women has not been firmly decided. In the Republican party, which has guidelines suggesting (but not requiring) equal representation, women's representation at the conventions is heavily influenced by the presidential candidates' and party leaders' views on the importance of women being present at the convention. In the Democratic party, the rules requiring equal representation are continually threatened by debates over the merits of quotas and by the growing influence of "superdelegates."

Without the societal changes brought about by the women's movements of the 1920's and of the 1970's and 1980's, it is doubtful that women could have increased their influence and presence in the parties. However, societal change is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition to ensure that a male-dominated institution, such as a political party, opens its doors to women and grants them real power as well as formal authority.

Women's greatest advances have occurred when women have worked together as a group to demand change and when the parties have feared that disregarding women's

concerns will cost them votes. Parties do not change because they are benevolent; they change because they want to remain attractive to the electorate and as such must reflect societal changes. The importance of these factors is illustrated well by changes in the parties during the 1920's and more recently since the 1970's.

Women's Representation in the 1920's

In response to the women's suffrage amendment, the parties granted women equal representation on the Democratic National Committee (1920) and on the Republican National Committee (1924) (Breckenridge, 1933; NWPC, 1980a). Yet these early national committeewomen did not exercise as much power as their male counterparts; they often found themselves in auxiliary roles, serving subject to the approval of the committeeman (See Breckenridge, 1933; Fisher and Whitehead, 1944). Nevertheless, equal representation of women and men on the committee was remarkable in that it did give women a discernible presence on one of the highest bodies of the party.

Another notable manifestation of women's influence in these early post-suffrage conventions was the platform. In 1920, the League of Women Voters was successful in getting the Democratic Party to accept twelve of its fifteen proposals in the platform. The planks were aimed at improving the lot of women and of children in American society and at cleaning up government (NWPC, 1980a).

After women did not turn out to vote in the record numbers many had hoped or feared, and after party leaders concluded that women were not voting as a unified block (NWPC, 1980a), the number of women on party councils and at the conventions plateaued. Women's presence at the conventions did not increase significantly again until the reform movement of the early 1970's. Fourteen percent of the delegates to the 1924 Democratic national convention were women, compared to 13% in 1968. Eleven percent of the delegates to the 1924 Republican convention were women, compared with the 17% in 1968. In both parties, the proportion of women at the 1928 conventions was lower than in 1924, but it fluctuated over the forty years thereafter with no sharp gains for women.

Although women were making slow and steady progress between the 1920's and the 1970's (NWPC, 1980a; NWPC, 1980b) general and pronounced widespread gains for women as a group were lacking. This leveling of progress at the national conventions mirrored much of what was going on in the parties outside the national conventions (see Breckenridge, 1933; Fisher and Whitehead, 1944; Gruberg, 1968; and Witcover, 1974).

The Reforms of the 1970's and Women's Representation

Women continued to be a very small proportion of the delegates until the parties instituted reforms in the 1970's. Without these reforms, which opened up the Democratic party and, to a lesser extent, the Republican party, it would have been far more difficult for women to translate the progress they were making in society in general into gains in the parties. The importance of the reforms for ensuring women's representation at the convention is indisputable. The proportion of women at the 1972 Republican convention was almost twice that at the 1968 Republican convention (30% in 1972 versus 17% in 1968); the proportion of women at the 1972 Democratic convention was three times what it had been in 1968 (40% in 1972 versus 13% in 1968).

Democratic Party Reforms

The Democratic party's McGovern-Fraser Commission instituted eighteen "guidelines" (which were essentially rules) which the state parties had to follow in order for their delegations' members to be seated at the 1972 national convention. One guideline called on state parties to ensure that the proportion of women delegates in their delegations reflected their share of the population. This guideline's passage, in its strong form, was due in large part to the efforts of the nascent National Women's Political Caucus (Shafer, 1983).

The Caucus was particularly successful in influencing the Democratic party because it had many reform-minded Democratic women as members and because party reform and the women's movement were occurring simultaneously. In addition, Arvonne Fraser, one of the charter members and leaders of the Caucus, was able to arrange meetings between members of the Caucus and Representative Donald Fraser (chair of the Commission and her husband) in which the importance of equal representation of women and men at the conventions was discussed (Shafer, 1983). Although equal representation was not strictly enforced at the 1972 convention (Apple, 1972), forty percent of the delegates at the convention were women, due in large measure to the Caucus efforts.

After the 1972 convention, party regulars, many of whom never fully embraced the reforms, realized the reforms had brought a new breed of activists into the convention -- activists whom many party regulars viewed as a threat. Not surprisingly, the rancorous convention and electoral defeat in November brought demands from party regulars that the reforms be revised. This included demands that the quotas for women (as well as the young and minorities) be lifted for the 1976 convention. The opposition to the reforms was led by powerful forces in the party; subsequently a new commission was established to evaluate the reforms and to make recommendations for change (Crotty, 1977).

Had it not been for the political savvy of this new commission's chair, then-Baltimore City Councilwoman Barbara Mikulski (who had been promoted from vice-chair to chair when the commission's chair Leonard Woodcock decided to step down), the advances made by women might have been lost. Although quotas were abolished by the Mikulski commission, the states were urged to use affirmative action steps voluntarily to ensure equal representation of women and men in the delegations; 34% of the delegates to the 1976 convention were women. Considering that many of the Mikulski Commission members were party regulars who would have liked to abolish the reforms, this was a victory for women (Crotty, 1977).

Despite the temporary setback, quotas were still on the agenda of Democratic women, who succeeded in reviving them in 1980. Jimmy Carter moved to support quotas for women in order to avoid a show-down with feminists at what promised to be a hotly contested convention (Peterson and Broder, 1978; NWPC, 1980a).

Many Democratic women (although not all) view the party's inclusion of "superdelegates" since the 1984 convention as a threat to equal representation at the conventions. The superdelegates are elected office holders (primarily from the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House) and party officials chosen to represent the party leaders at the convention. Because national officeholders are disproportionately men, the effect is that men are disproportionately the unbound (not required to be pledged to a specific candidate) delegates and women are the bound district and at-large delegates. Superdelegates may become less of an issue in future elections as a result of recently announced plans to decrease the

proportion of superdelegates to the 1992 Democratic National Convention. (This pledge was apparently made in response to Jesse Jackson's complaints about party procedure, not in response to concerns raised by women.)

Many of the reforms in the Democratic party which have benefited women are codified in party rules. Although rules are more difficult to change than suggested guidelines, they can be deceptive. Democratic women must remain vigilant since, as a result of new reform commissions (which now seem to occur every four years), rules can be changed. The tentative nature of the gains made by women was evident this year when Democratic women battled the chair of the Democratic National Committee, Paul Kirk, for inclusion in the platform of important planks such as support for the Equal Rights Amendment, affirmation of a woman's right to choose abortion, and anti-discrimination language.

Reforms and Change in the Republican Party

While the Democratic party's McGovern-Fraser commission was at work, the Republicans were making some changes of their own. The Delegates and Organization Committee (DO), chaired by national committeewoman Rosemary Ginn, developed an analogous set of reform suggestions for the state parties and their delegations to the 1972 national convention (NWPC, 1980b; Crotty, 1977). Among other things, the DO committee encouraged state parties to take steps to increase the proportion of women in their delegations, but unlike the Democratic party's reforms at that time, compliance was optional. There was no penalty for state parties who failed to follow the guidelines. Although some have suggested that the Republican reforms were generally quite meaningless (see Crotty, 1983), the proportion of women who attended the 1972 convention increased from 17% in 1968 to 30% in 1972.

The headway Republican feminists made was certainly due in part to savvy lobbying efforts, as they carefully worked behind the scenes to ensure progress on issues of concern to Republican women (NWPC, 1980b). Advances for Republican women were also likely aided by the implicit pressure the Democratic reforms placed on the Republican party to show they were the party of the open door (Crotty, 1977; Crotty, 1983).

It was only through considerable hard work that Republican women were successful in retaining their numerical strength at the conventions throughout the 1970's and the 1980's. In 1984, the proportion of women delegates was higher than ever -- 44%. In addition to the efforts made by Republican women, some attribute this change to pressure on state parties from President Reagan to work toward an equal sex division in order to improve the party's standing among women as a response to the gender gap. For Republicans, equal representation of men and women at the convention is unfortunately dependent on the extent to which the power-holders choose to encourage the states to select women as delegates.

Delegates Perceptions of Women in the Parties

While women have increased their presence within the parties over the past century, the historical record suggests that much remains to be done, even at the conventions where much of the change has occurred. These inferences are

validated by responses that delegates to the past four conventions (1972, 1976, 1980, and 1984) gave when asked about their own political experiences.¹

A strong majority of Democratic women delegates and sizable minorities of Republican women delegates to each of the four conventions think affirmative action is an important reason for their selection as national convention delegates.

TABLE 1: Proportion of Women Viewing Affirmative Action as an Important Reason for Their Selection as Delegates by Convention Attended²

CONVENTION	DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
1972	71%	37%
1976	55%	26%
1980	72%	24%
1984	68%	41%

This table suggests that the guidelines or rules encouraging or ensuring affirmative action are crucial for women merely holding positions within the parties. Hence, women within both parties must keep the pressure on their party leaders to provide equal representation for men and for women.

The importance of keeping the pressure on is also highlighted by the fact that within even the most recent cohort of delegates, there are substantial proportions of men who believe men are better suited emotionally for politics. Republicans are more negative than Democrats about women's suitability for the political world, while within parties, women have greater faith in their own qualifications than men.

TABLE 2: Proportion of Men and Women Attending Conventions Who Agree That Men Are Better Suited Emotionally for Politics³

CONVENTION	DEMOCRATS		REPUBLICANS	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
1972	47%	19%	74%	43%
1984	19%	4%	42%	21%

These patterns of responses show that while women's status within the parties has improved between 1972 and 1984, women must jump many hurdles in political life about which men need not worry.

Perhaps the most serious indictment of the parties is that women still perceive men as trying to keep women out of leadership roles in the party.

¹ Data are from the University of Michigan's Center for Political Studies' 1972, 1980 and 1984 Delegate studies.

² Data from Jennings, 1987, page 50.

³ Data from Jennings, 1987, page 57. 1972 delegates as they responded in 1972; 1984 delegates as they responded in 1985.

TABLE 3: Proportion of Women Attending Conventions Who Agree That Most Men Try to Keep Women Out of Leadership Positions⁴

CONVENTION	DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
1972	79%	53%
1984	71%	44%

The slight decline in the percentage agreeing with the statement reflects some improvement in women's status within the parties between 1972 and 1984; nevertheless, the perception of discrimination has remained fairly high.

Conclusion

Women have made great strides in attempting to achieve equity within the parties. However, as the 1988 national conventions approach, it is equally clear that not only do women face the same barriers as men, they must also leap additional hurdles in order to achieve their political goals.

When institutions of representation, such as political parties, are less open to women than to men, it raises fundamental questions about the quality of democracy in America. When those same institutions enjoy a privileged status due to laws that favor the major parties over minor parties and independent candidates, the ramifications are even more severe. If women and men have different approaches to policy and process in the parties, as may be the case, the importance of equal representation is even more critical to ensuring a democratic process. Even if women and men advocate the same policies, it is still an injustice that women, merely by virtue of the fact they are women, are excluded from this critical part of the political process. Women in both parties must remain vigilant in their efforts to ensure equal representation and seek greater positions of political power in order to advance an agenda which addresses the concerns of women. The historical record shows, and the attitudes of the delegates to recent conventions suggest, that the parties will not turn over power to women unless and until it is necessary.

REFERENCES

- Apple, R. W. "New Delegate Rules Falling Short of Goal," New York Times, March 27, 1972, page 24.
- Breckenridge, Sophonisba P. Women in the Twentieth Century. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933.
- Crotty, William J. Political Reform and the American Experiment. New York: Thomas Crowell, 1977.
- Crotty, William J. Party Reform. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Fisher, Marguerite J. and Betty Whitehead. "Women and the National Party Organization," American Political Science Review. (1944) 38:895-903.

⁴ Based on CAWP's analysis of University of Michigan's Center for Political Studies' Delegate Study data. 1972 delegates as they responded in 1972; 1984 delegates as they responded in 1985.

- Gruberg, Martin. Women in American Politics. Oshkosh: Academia Press, 1968.
- Jennings, M. Kent. "Women in Party Politics." Unpublished manuscript, 1987.
- National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC), Democratic Women are Wonderful.
Washington, D. C.: National Women's Political Caucus, 1980a.
- National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC), Republican Women are Wonderful.
Washington, D. C.: National Women's Political Caucus, 1980b.
- Peterson, Bill and David S. Broder. "Democrats Move to Give Women Convention Seats," *The Washington Post*, December, 8, 1978, page A2.
- Shafer, Byron. Quiet Revolution. New York: Russell Sage, 1983.
- Witcover, Jules. "Within Political Parties Women Fight for Recognition," *The Washington Post*, June 16, 1974.

"FIRSTS" FOR WOMEN AT THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

- 1876 First woman to address a convention -- Sarah Spencer (R). [4]
- 1892 First women alternates to a convention -- Therese Jenkins (R) and Cora Carleton (R). [4]
- 1900 First woman delegate to Republican convention -- Frances Warren. [4]
First woman delegate to Democratic convention -- Elizabeth Cohen. [3]
First woman to second the nomination of a presidential candidate -- Elizabeth Cohen (D). [1]
- 1916 Women first appointed to Democratic convention committees. [3]
Both conventions adopt women's suffrage planks, although the planks are not strongly worded. [1]
- 1920 First women appointed to Republican convention committees. [1]
Democratic party adopts rule to give women and men equal representation on the Democratic National Committee. [3]
- 1924 Republican convention adopts rule to give women and men equal representation on the Republican National Committee (women had been admitted as "associate" members with equal representation in 1923). [1,4]
First woman to chair Credentials' Committee -- Lena Springs (D). [3]
First woman from a major party to be nominated for Vice-President -- Lena Springs (D). [3]
First Black woman delegate -- Louise M. Fairweather (R). [4]
First woman vice-chair of a convention -- May Kennedy (D). [3]
First woman chair of Committee on Permanent Organization -- Elizabeth Price Martin (R). [4]
- 1928 First Republican woman to chair the Credentials Committee -- Mabel Walker Willebrandt. [4]
- 1932 First Republican woman named to Resolutions Committee -- Dr. Martha Rober de Romeo of Puerto Rico. [4]
First Democratic woman named to Resolutions Committee -- Jean S. Whittemore of Puerto Rico. [1]
- 1936 First convention with an equal number of women and men serving as vice chairs (Democratic). [3]
Women and men given equal representation on a Platform Committee (Democratic). [3]
- 1940 Republican party first endorses ERA. [4]
First woman to nominate a presidential candidate -- Gladys Pyle (R). [4]
- 1944 Women selected for the first time as co-chairs of all major party committees (Democrats). [2]
First woman chosen as permanent secretary of the convention -- Dorothy Vrandenberg Bush (D). [2]
First time women and men given equal representation on the Platform and Resolutions Committee in the Republican party. [2]
Democratic party platform supports ERA for the first time. [3]
- 1948 First woman secretary of the Republican convention -- Mrs. Dudley Hay. [4]

- 1951 First woman asked to chair a national party -- India Edwards (D) (she declined). [3]
- 1956 First Black woman member of the Democratic National Committee -- Gladys Ford Duncan. [3]
- 1960 First woman executive director of a national convention -- Josephine Good (R). [4]
Rule established that women and men should have equal representation on all national convention committees (Republican). [4]
- 1964 First woman in a major party to have her name placed in nomination for the presidency -- Margaret Chase Smith (R). [4]
- 1972 First woman keynote speaker at a convention -- Anne Armstrong (R). [4]
McGovern-Fraser Commission guidelines require equal representation of women and men in delegations to the Democratic convention. [3]
Delegates and Organization Committee guidelines recommend (but do not require) equal representation of women and men in delegations to the Republican convention. [4]
First Black woman to co-chair a convention -- Yvonne Brathwaite Burke (D). [4]
First Black woman in a major party to have her name placed in nomination for the presidency -- Shirley Chisholm (D). [3]
First woman to gather a substantial number of convention votes for the vice-presidential nomination -- Frances Farenthold (D). [3]
First woman to chair a national party -- Jean Westwood (D). [3]
- 1974 First woman chair of the Republican party -- Mary Louise Smith [4]
- 1976 First woman chair of a national convention -- Rep. Corinne (Lindy) Boggs (D). [4]
First Black woman to deliver a keynote address at a national convention -- Barbara Jordan (D). [3]
- 1980 Democratic party rules require quotas ensuring 50% of the delegates at the convention are women. [4]
First woman to be the temporary chair of the Republican convention -- Nancy Kassebaum. [4]
- 1984 First woman vice-presidential candidate placed on the ballot -- Geraldine Ferraro (D).

REFERENCES

- [1] Breckenridge, Sophonisba P. Women in the Twentieth Century. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933.
- [2] Fisher, Marguerite J. and Betty Whitehead. "Women and the National Party Organization," American Political Science Review. (1944) 38:895-903.
- [3] National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC), Democratic Women are Wonderful. Washington, D. C.: National Women's Political Caucus, 1980a.
- [4] National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC), Republican Women are Wonderful. Washington, D. C.: National Women's Political Caucus, 1980b.

PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS -- 1900-1988

<u>Convention</u>	<u>Democrats*</u>	<u>Republicans</u>
1900	**	***
1904	**	***
1908	**	***
1912	**	***
1916	1%	***
1920	6%	3%
1924	14%	11%
1928	10%	6%
1932	12%	8%
1936	15%	6%
1940	11%	8%
1944	11%	10%
1948	12%	10%
1952	12%	11%
1956	12%	16%
1960	11%	15%
1964	14%	18%
1968	13%	17%
1972	40%	30%
1976	34%	31%
1980	49%	29%
1984	50%	44%
1988	49%	N.A.

*Percentages do not necessarily reflect the proportion of convention votes held by women delegates; many Democratic delegates have held fractional votes.

**Less than 1%. Actual numbers: 1900, 1; 1904, 0; 1908, 2; 1912, 2.

***Less than 1%. Actual numbers: 1900, 1; 1904, 1; 1908, 2; 1912, 2; 1916, 5.

Sources include: David, Goldman, and Bain, The Politics of National Party Conventions (1960); Davis, National Conventions in an Age of Party Reform (1983); Lynn "Women and Politics: The Real Majority" (1984); National Women's Political Caucus, Democratic Women are Wonderful (1980); National Women's Political Caucus, Republican Women are Wonderful (1980); Breckenridge, Women in the Twentieth Century (1933); Congressional Quarterly (various issues); Fisher and Whitehead, "Women and the National Party Organization" (1944); and official proceedings of the Democratic conventions.

© COPYRIGHT 1988. Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)

LISTS OF ORGANIZATIONS AVAILABLE FROM CAWP

Beginning with this issue of News & Notes, the lists of organizations of women officeholders which have appeared in each issue will now be published once a year in the winter issue (January/February). Contact CAWP if you would like copies of any of the available lists of organizations (not individuals).

In addition to the 18,000 elected women in CAWP's **National Information Bank on Women in Public Office**, the following lists, which include the name of the organization, contact person, address, and phone number (if available), are available from CAWP:

National Organizations of Women Officeholders

Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues (CCWI)
Women Executives in State Government (WESG)
National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), Women's Network
National Order of Women Legislators (NOWLs)
National Organization of Black Elected Legislators/Women (NOBEL)
National Association of Counties (NACo), Women Officials in NACo
National League of Cities (NLC), Women in Municipal Government (WIMG)
National Association of Women Judges (NAWJ)

Statewide Organizations of Elected Women

States: CA, IL, MD, MN, NV, NJ, NY, OR, PA, SC, TX, WA

Statewide Organizations of Women Legislators

States: AK, CA, CT, IL, IA, KS, MD, MA, NY, NC, VA

Statewide Organizations of Women in Municipal Offices

States: IA, MA, MI, MN, WA

Organizations of Administrative Women in Government

National
American Planning Association, Planning and Women Division
American Public Works Association, Women in Public Works
American Society for Public Administration, Section for Women in Public Admin.
American Society for Training and Development
Federally Employed Women

States: CA (5), MI

Women's PACs

Since the 1988 election season is well underway, with local primaries having already been held in 25 states, we have included a list of women's PACs in case you wish to make a contribution to one of them.

WOMEN'S PACS

Committee of 21

Contact: Sandra Duncan
1716 No. Clairborne Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70116
504/943-6622

Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Barbara Romey
c/o AMB
1631 Pontius Avenue
Suite 113
Los Angeles, CA 90025

East Bay Women's Political Action Committee

Contact: Kare Anderson
c/o Taylor Associates
958 Alma Place
Oakland, CA 94610

Marin County Women's PAC

Contact: M. Lee Hunt
Hunt & Oliver
1000 4th Street, Suite 475
San Rafael, CA 94901
415/457-5700

Economic Security PAC

Contact: PO Box 33245
Washington, DC 20033-0245

Michigan Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: 8100 East Jefferson
Suite 115D
Detroit, MI 48214
313/823-1830

Eleanor Roosevelt Fund

Contact: Nancy Kirschner
Democratic National Committee
430 South Capitol Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003
202/863-8173

Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Barbara Stuhler
877 Jefferson Avenue, #E
St. Paul, MN 55401-2801
612/293-1298

Emily's List

Contact: Ellen Malcolm
Suite 412
2000 P Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/887-5697

National Political Congress of Black Women

Contact: Assemblywoman Maxine Waters
7900 South Central Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90001
213/582-7371

GOP Women's Political Action League

Contact: Maureen Reagan
1012 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

National Organization for Women

Contact: Molly Yard
1401 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005-2102
202/347-2279

Hawaii Women's Political Action League

Contact: Ann Fisher
1526 Wilhelmina Rise
Honolulu, HI 96816

National Women's Political Caucus

Contact: Irene Natividad
1275 K Street, NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20004
202/898-1100

Hollywood Women's Political Committee

Contact: Marlene Saritzky
335 N. Maple Drive
Suite 135
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
213/285-2312

The Network for Women's Elections

Contact: Harriett Woods
PO Box 3245
St. Louis, MO 63130

Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Helen Seager
508 Roslyn Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15232
412/682-1271

Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Kate Karpilow
President
PO Box 162212
Sacramento, CA 95816
916/446-6733

The Sullivan PAC (for Women Democrats)

Contact: Stephanie Cartwright
18600 Sheffield Road
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Jane Danowitz
Executive Director
815 15th Street, NW
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20005
202/638-3900

**Women's Congressional Council--
Democratic Congressional Campaign
Committee**

Contact: 430 South Capitol Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003
202/863-1500

Women's Investment Network (WIN PAC)

Contact: Jewel Lansing
PO Box 585
Salem, OR 97308
503/246-6022
503/378-1853

Women's Issue Network PAC

Contact: Elaine Bursic
739 Broadview Terrace
Hartford, CT 06106

**Women's Political Action Committee
of New Jersey**

Contact: Pat Connolly
PO Box 170
Edison, NJ 08818
201/638-6784

Women's Political Committee

Contact: 11355 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Women's Political Fund

Contact: Franza Newsom
PO Box 421811
San Francisco, CA 94142
415/924-9704
415/861-5168

WOMEN and POLITICS

Center for the American Woman and Politics Subscriber Information Service (S.I.S.)

for

FACTS AND FIGURES

about women in
Congress
Statewide Elective Offices
State Legislatures
Legislative Leadership
County Governing Boards
Municipal Offices
Women of Color in Elective Office
State Cabinet Appointees
Gender Gap
Sex Differences in Voter Turnout

LISTS AND INFORMATION

about
Women's PACs
Organizations of Women Officeholders

FEATURE ARTICLES

about women in politics

. . . and more . . .

How to Subscribe:

A one year S.I.S. subscription costs \$20. S.I.S. subscribers receive three packets a year, each of which includes: CAWP's newsletter, News & Notes; About Women Public Officials; fact sheets; reports; reprints of articles; and other timely information. S.I.S. mailings are sent in the winter, summer, and fall.



Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)

Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
201-828-2210

Name, Title _____

Organization/Company (if applicable) _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

_____ Please enroll me in S.I.S.; enclosed is \$20 for a one-year subscription.
All subscriptions must be prepaid; please make checks payable to CAWP.

_____ Please send me more information about CAWP.

_____ Enclosed is a _____ tax deductible contribution to CAWP.