

BRINGING MORE WOMEN INTO PUBLIC OFFICE

POLITICAL

WOMEN

TELL WHAT

IT TAKES

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY  
**RUTGERS**

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS

---

*Political  
Women  
Tell What  
It Takes*

---

# *Political Women Tell What It Takes*

*Report Written by*  
KATHY A. STANWICK

This report is part of CAWP's series entitled "Bringing More Women Into Public Office," a project conducted under a grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation.



---

## Introduction

---

In 1981, the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) began studying routes to political office, comparing the paths taken by women and men into elective and appointive positions. In a project supported by a grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation, CAWP surveyed and talked with public leaders around the country in order to identify channels and effective strategies for increasing the numbers of women officeholders. The project, entitled "Bringing More Women Into Public Office," used two methods of inquiry—surveys and group consultations. First, surveys were conducted of women and men holding high-level federal and state appointive offices and of women and men serving in municipal, county, and state elective offices. Second, CAWP held six group consultations with public leaders around the country.

The six consultations had an identical goal: to discuss and develop recommendations for increasing the numbers of women in public life. While the goal of each session was identical, the focus of each meeting and the types of women who participated were different.

The first consultation, held in New Jersey in 1981, brought together about twenty women—elected officials, political strategists, leaders of major women's organizations, and women who were holding or had held cabinet positions in the state. Participants discussed strategies for ensuring that women would be appointed to key posts in state government following the 1981 gubernatorial election. At that meeting, the New Jersey Bipartisan Coalition for Women's Appointments was formed, with the goal of identifying and promoting women for appointments.\*

A second group consultation, held in Washington, D.C. in early 1982, brought together a small group of women appointed to high-level federal positions in the Reagan Administration. At the session, these women candidly described their political backgrounds and experiences and talked about how they received their appointments.

A third session, held in Minnesota in August 1982, brought together women elected and appointed officials, women candidates, heads of women's organizations, political party leaders, women representing colleges and universities, and women from corporations and foundations. Discussion focused on the factors which facilitate or hinder women's entry into public offices, with a major emphasis on the role played by political parties. The forty women who participated in the meeting spent several

\* A separate monograph, "Getting Women Appointed: New Jersey's Bipartisan Coalition," describes how this coalition was established and developed. It is available from CAWP as part of the series, *Bringing More Women Into Public Office*.

hours defining and developing strategies for encouraging Minnesota women's political participation and enhancing their effectiveness in public life.

Two meetings held in California—one in Sacramento attended by about thirty women and one in Los Angeles with about forty-five women—brought together political party officials, political activists, officeholders, and successful and unsuccessful candidates. Participants talked about the role of political parties in recruiting and supporting women candidates and the various ways women had directly or indirectly influenced more women to enter public life.

The sixth consultation, held at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, brought together representatives from political action committees across the country which have an explicit goal of giving financial support solely or primarily to women candidates.\*

*Political Women Tell What It Takes* draws on ideas from all of these meetings, but relies most heavily on the sessions in Minnesota and California. The report focuses on routes to elective office, although occasional references are made to appointive officeholding.

The report is divided into three parts. Part one includes a discussion of two of the four basic ingredients necessary for bringing women and men into public office—political parties and money. Part two focuses on two ingredients essential for bringing more women into public office—organizations (particularly women's organizations), and individual women leaders. Part three concludes the report.

Following the report is a list of participants at each of the six consultations conducted by CAWP.

\* The report of this meeting, entitled "Women's PACs," is available from CAWP as part of the series, *Bringing More Women Into Public Office*.

---

## *Political Women Tell What It Takes*

---

**P**olitical women around the country cite four key ingredients necessary for increasing the numbers of women holding public office. Two support mechanisms—political parties and money—are needed by any woman or man who decides to launch a political career. Two other resources—organizations (especially women’s organizations) and individual women leaders committed to increasing women’s representation in public life—are special to women.

Each of these ingredients is a basic element in any formula for growth in the numbers of female public leaders. What we learned from the political women at our consultations is that the relative importance of the traditional factors—political parties and money—can differ from state-to-state, community-to-community, office-to-office. What we also learned is that if women’s political participation is to continue expanding, the two new ingredients—women’s organizations and individual women leaders—are necessary in large quantities.

Finally, we learned that in order to increase *significantly* the number of women holding public office, what is required is more of everything: more assistance from political parties, more money, more encouragement and support from women’s organizations, and more occasions for women currently holding elective and appointive offices to meet and talk with women not now active in public life.

---

## An Old Formula

### Political Parties

---

**T**he importance of party activity differs by state and by level of office. In states such as Minnesota, the parties play important roles in almost all municipal, county, state, and federal elections. Thus, partisan activity is important for any woman interested in running, no matter for what level of office. As Minnesota's Ruby Hunt advised, "I think that women who are interested in running for public office should really be involved with their political parties at the grassroots level."

By contrast, in other states, like California, all (or almost all) municipal elections are nonpartisan by law. While partisan activity is not at all important to candidates seeking municipal offices, some special problems arise for those who want to move up the political ladder. "How do you make the transition from nonpartisan to partisan?" asked Republican Sandy Smoley. "The party structure doesn't provide a way to make that transition, especially for women," she added.

In almost every state, political parties make few efforts to identify and groom women candidates. "Women will run in spite of the party, not because of the party," stated Sally Howard, Republican member of the Minneapolis Board of Aldermen. Her sentiment was echoed by Democratic and Republican women at CAWP's Minnesota and Sacramento consultations.\*

*Women will run in spite of the party, not because of the party.*

Sally Howard

Women who run for office receive little direct assistance from their political parties. Even those who run for open seats against vulnerable incumbents receive little assistance. One Democrat in the Minnesota consultation said, "the party seems to encourage women where we have less chance of winning." In California, Jane Baker, mayor of San Mateo, interpreted the campaign experiences described by her Republican colleagues:

All four of you ran and were encouraged to run in a district that was predominantly Democratic. I think you will find that when there is a chance of winning, when there is a registration in your favor, and when they don't need a desperation candidate, they will always find a man to run.

Despite the fact that the parties in some areas of the country are weak and that in all areas of the country they are not as supportive of women candidates as they should be, parties are an important factor with which

\* At CAWP's Minnesota and Sacramento consultations, the morning sessions were divided into Republican and Democratic discussion groups. Discussion focused on the ways parties nurtured or discouraged women seeking elective or appointive offices. In Minnesota, the Democratic discussion was facilitated by Arvonne Fraser; the Republican discussion by Charlee Hoyt. In Sacramento, the Republican discussion was facilitated by Sandra Smoley; the Democratic discussion by Sunne Wright McPeak.



women who are seeking public office must deal. According to Minnesota Democrat Arvonne Fraser:

Even though the parties are weak, and even though one needs a base outside the party [to run for office], you can't neglect the party. They are going to be a force. . . .

In California, Placer County Supervisor Theresa Cook believed that women must "get tough" with the parties, and not let themselves be used. She suggested:

Let's quit being every party's sacrificial lamb . . . If that race isn't possible . . . walk away from it. Let's quit knocking ourselves out. The cost is too dear.

Indeed, although working within political party structures can be difficult, it also can be beneficial. As Supervisor Sunne Wright McPeak from Contra Costa County, California said at CAWP's Sacramento session:

I have become more and more active within the party as a way of trying to better understand how that party structure can ultimately accomplish not only the goals that I think the party should be pursuing, but also the election of women.

For those women who plan to seek higher offices, particularly statewide offices or state legislative or congressional seats, working within political parties is an absolute necessity. In California, Assemblywoman Gloria Molina stressed the importance of knowing the party power brokers so that if a seat opened up through the retirement of an incumbent or through redistricting, women could get to the brokers early. "We can't wait until things start moving and shifting," she argued.

At the present time, Democratic women feel more positive about working within their party than do Republican women. According to Minnesota's Ann O'Loughlin, "In 1980 you couldn't be a feminist and a Republican." And a California Republican feminist declared, "This is a time when our feminist philosophies are coming smack-dab face-to-face with our political philosophies."

Yet feminist Republicans are not planning to abandon their party. As one long-active Minnesota Republican stated:

The party is still the best basis for good government in a democracy . . . a few radicals have led the party astray.

Republican party activist and co-founder of the Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund, Kathleen Ridder added, "I'm mad about the way things are in the Republican Party; that's why I'm staying and fighting."

At both the state and federal levels, political party leaders rarely include women on lists of possible candidates for gubernatorial or presidential appointments. Women must put themselves forward in order to receive appointments, not wait for party leaders to call them.

At CAWP's Washington, D.C. session with women appointees in the Reagan Administration, participants believed that their contacts within the Republican party had played a critical role in bringing them to the attention of those who were making the appointments. Yet all agreed that the first step one must take in pursuing an appointment is to ask for it. From their points of view, not enough women actively seek appointments.

In the states, too, women must step forward and indicate their interest in receiving appointments. As one Minnesota woman put it:

[To get an appointment] you've got to be aggressive. You can work your head off for somebody [in a campaign] and then they turn around and they start looking for appointees and you aren't on the list.

How can political parties be prodded to be more responsive both to women candidates and to women who could potentially become appointees?\* One major way is for women to continue organizing within their parties—to insist on tangible trade-offs for their support of men or for their support of the party.

*Sometimes we must go beyond party lines to push for women. It's our responsibility.*

Gayle Kincannon

Working within their political parties women can encourage party leaders to groom female candidates and stick by them. They can work toward challenging the notion that their party should support candidates based solely on incumbency. They can move women into county and state central committees and have them work themselves onto financial subcommittees. One participant at CAWP's sessions suggested that the funds in each party should be divided into a fifty-fifty split for female candidates.

Women organizing within their parties and across party lines is also a good way to ensure that women receive appointments. In Minnesota, Pat Jensen stressed the importance of working "to elect a governor who is committed to appointing women." One Minnesota participant described the kind of commitment governors must make:

Women have different credentials than men. Women's backgrounds and experiences give them the qualifications necessary for holding appointive public office, but women don't necessarily move in the "old boys networks." A governor must have a commitment to look affirmatively for women.

An affirmative commitment means giving women credit for "quasi-legal" or "quasi-governmental" activities like work in the League of Women Voters, the civil rights movement, and other community activities. But she

\* There are many complicated questions about the roles political parties can play in electoral politics—questions about which party activities are important or required; about how, when, and where parties help in campaigns and in the appointments process; about their relative power and impact in the 1980s. These kinds of questions, while important and interesting, were outside the scope of discussions at CAWP's consultations for this project.

added, "women have to keep pushing to make party leaders and the governor want to take that step."

## Money

Activities within the political parties, although important, are not enough to ensure anyone's election. A major consideration for any candidate who runs for public office, especially at higher levels, is money. The ever-increasing costs of campaigns coupled with lack of financial support for women's candidacies will prevent women from throwing their hats into the ring. Although the costs of waging campaigns differ by state, level of office sought, and the size of the district in which the candidate is running, an overwhelming majority of political women who attended CAWP's consultations believed that any woman thinking about a *career* in politics would have to deal very seriously with financial considerations.

California's Ann Rudin, councilmember from Sacramento, described the dilemma that many women face as they begin to make a transition from community activist to political leader:

We've been issue-oriented . . . involved with issues. That's not what wins elections. It's the power that comes from being able to raise money, spend money, support other candidates with money.

In some municipal races in small communities, the cost of running for office is minimal. For example, in Rolling Hills, California, Gordana Swanson spent under \$500 for her local council race. In other cases, the stakes are increased greatly when a woman decides to run for a higher level office.

An example of the rising costs of waging a winning campaign is the case of Simi Valley Assemblywoman Cathie Wright. In 1972, when she first ran for a seat on her municipal council, she spent \$900 and lost by 129 votes. In her 1974 race for the same seat, she spent \$1,200 and lost by 100 votes. In 1976 she spent \$1,400 and lost by twenty-five votes. In 1978, she spent \$8,000 and won a seat on the council. When she ran for the California Assembly two years later, she spent \$220,000. Her most recent race for the Assembly, waged a few weeks before CAWP's November 1982 meeting, cost \$250,000 and left her \$100,000 in debt. Wright suggested that any woman who wanted to move up a rung on the electoral ladder must consider the costs of doing so.

Although women, particularly incumbents, are finding it somewhat easier to raise money now than they did a few years ago, it still remains more difficult for women than men. Former Santa Monica Mayor Ruth Yanatta Goldway observed:

No matter how well women learn to raise money, if women continue to represent the same types of issues they do now, they will never have access to the same money as men. Women will have to use the grassroots fund raising approach.

Grassroots fund raising has its advantages. Although money in the form of large contributions may be the key to being elected in expensive races, in races that require less money, soliciting small amounts from many donors ultimately may be more useful. Rosario Anaya, president of the San Francisco Board of Education, remarked, "In my experience I have raised more money from small donors, and it is important because it gives you a continuing base of workers."

In expensive races, large contributions, usually from political action committees (PACs), can provide the winning edge of victory. Most PACs are less responsive to requests for money from women candidates. In California, Mayor of Newport Beach Jacqueline Heather, who also serves on the board of a PAC, suggested that this pattern of giving would be unlikely to change unless more women serve on PAC boards. She hoped that her experiences would be repeated in many other places:

I infiltrated one of the largest political action committees in California. As a member of its executive committee, I got important primary support for a woman assembly candidate, and raised the men's level of consciousness for continuing support.

*No matter how well women learn to raise money, if women continue to represent the same types of issues they do now, they will never have access to the same money as men.*

Ruth Yanatta Goldway

The process of raising money can be particularly frustrating for a woman candidate. Raising large sums from a few PACs and large contributors means less time spent on fund raising and more time spent on campaigning. For women, who often rely on grassroots fund raising, time which should be spent on campaigning often is spent at ten dollar per person cocktail parties.

California's Maggie Erickson, Ventura County Supervisor, faced this frustration when she was forced to raise \$38,000 to win her seat. While she struggled to organize her fund-raising plan, her opponent raised large sums from a few PACs and big donors. Erickson described her initial frustration with trying to raise PAC money: "When I could get to see the PACs, I frequently received support, but in most cases I couldn't even get to see the PACs."

Given today's burgeoning campaign costs, PAC contributions and individual donations are important for any candidate's campaign. The women who attended CAWP's meetings are political realists, so in the short term they recognize the importance of "learning to play the game by the rules" when it comes to fund raising for campaigns. However, they also are interested in changing the rules of the game. Reform of current campaign finance regulations and laws and public financing of campaigns were suggested by the women who attended CAWP's consultations as two possible ways to "change the rules of the game" to counter the difficulties women candidates face as a result of the current escalation of campaign costs. Specific suggestions included campaign expenditure ceilings and limitations on an individual's personal contribution to his or her own campaign.

Reforming campaign finance regulations in ways that might assist women and other candidates who are not well-connected to traditional

sources of campaign money is not likely to succeed in the short-term as a strategy for handling this problem. *Major* campaign finance reform, although often a topic of discussion and debate among those presently holding elective office, is unlikely to be implemented in the next few years. This is especially true because current laws tend to favor the very incumbents (most of whom are men) who would have to initiate and pass the legislation.

In an exciting development on the women's political scene, women are beginning to raise the money necessary to wage successful campaigns from an important new source—each other. Both individual women and women's PACs are contributing enough money to make a difference in some women's campaigns.

As individuals, women officeholders give money to other women candidates and encourage women and men to do so as well. One woman in California gave \$2,000 to each of three women legislative candidates. Los Angeles Councilwoman Joy Picus shared her fund raising contacts with Gloria Molina. Picus frequently lends her name to fund raising appeals by other women candidates.

Gloria Molina raised about \$175,000 in her 1982 race for the California Assembly. About 75 % came from individual women, women's networks, and women's PACs. Her initial \$5,000 contribution came from fellow-Assemblywoman Maxine Waters. Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes noted, "Democratic women in the Assembly contributed to Molina's campaign because they wanted her as a colleague."

In Texas, Democrat Ann Richards raised \$1.2 million in her 1982 campaign for state treasurer. Jane Hickie, Richards' campaign manager, credited women for donating about half of that total. "Ann's large contributors, not necessarily large lenders, were almost exclusively women," reported Hickie. Some of the support for Richards took the form of in-kind contributions from women not charging for their professional services; some of the large donations came from both Democratic and Republican women.

The phenomenon of women officeholders contributing financial support to other women candidates has become a given, according to women at CAWP's sessions. Many women in office have established guidelines for giving to other women, even when it involves crossing party lines. Teresa Hughes described an "unwritten code of ethics" which says, "Don't give money against a woman who is an incumbent." Hughes continued:

I did not give any money against any incumbent women candidates of the opposing party. And I think if we have that kind of understanding among women, we can go a heck of a long way and we still don't do anything to get us into the bad graces of our own political party.

Money is now being raised from women for women through women's PACs. In 1981, New Orleans' Committee of 21 raised \$15,000 for women candidates. In 1982, the Michigan and Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Funds distributed nearly \$12,000 each and the Minnesota Women's

*It is our responsibility to change the ways that money for campaigns is raised and distributed.*

Eva Garcia

Campaign Fund contributed \$20,000. In California in 1982, the East Bay Women's PAC gave \$9,000 to women candidates, the Women's Political Fund contributed nearly \$4,000, the Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund gave \$9,000, and the Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund was formed. And in 1982 the only national PAC which contributes money solely to women candidates, the Women's Campaign Fund, distributed \$270,000 in cash and in-kind contributions.\*

\* More specific information about these PACs can be found in "Women's PACs," one report in CAWP's series, *Bringing More Women Into Public Office*.

---

## *The New Ingredients*

---

**P**arty support and money are necessary but not sufficient for ensuring the election and appointment of women. Women candidates and women seeking appointments must come with a bloc of support from someplace else.

From coast to coast, in CAWP's consultations with women public officials and women activists a common response emerged to the question, "What will it take to bring more women into public office?" Regardless of her age, race, political party affiliation, level of office, community location, or profession, each woman participating in the CAWP sessions believed that she, as a woman, bore a special burden to encourage other women to consider participating actively in politics and that she, as a member of women's networks and organizations, should use every possible occasion to educate women about the importance of political participation.

Around the country, political women are working as individuals, and they are organizing coalitions, PACs, loosely structured networks, and formally organized groups in order to:

- encourage more women to enter public life
- apply pressure to political parties and male leaders on behalf of women
- support women already holding public office
- enhance the status of women holding public office, and advance them to leadership positions.

Many of these are nascent efforts, planting seeds for future growth. Others, like associations of elected women, have been functioning for about a decade. All begin with a few women personally committed to increasing the numbers, visibility, and clout of women in public life.

Perhaps it is because women sense that their roles within the political parties are somewhat tenuous and know that their access to money is so limited that they have begun to develop special constituencies and bases of support. Women do have additional and different bases of support than men when they run for office. Among the political women who attended the CAWP consultations, an overwhelming majority indicated that their activities in both women's organizations and community groups prompted them to seek elective office. These groups and organizations provide an important bloc of support for women candidates.

### **Community Groups**

Issue-oriented, community-based groups frequently provide a springboard from which women run for public office. Groups organized around the issue of education are particularly important.

Women traditionally have been involved with the educational system—as teachers, as mothers, as members of a PTA. Groups and organizations related to schools and education frequently are places where women learn about issues of concern to their communities, hold their first public leadership positions and develop networks of support which assist them in seeking other public leadership positions.

A number of the women who participated in CAWP's sessions had been active in school-related groups such as the PTA. Joy Picus, councilwoman from Los Angeles, explained that her work with the PTA, the Girl and Boy Scouts, and similar groups provided her with a community base from which she conducted a grassroots campaign. Eva Garcia, who for nine years was a member of the Sacramento school board and now serves as a member of the State Board of Education, got involved in politics through her work in the PTA as well.

Gwen Moore, California assemblywoman from Los Angeles, got her start through a different type of education-related group. Involved in a county-wide group in Los Angeles called the Coalition for Better Education, Moore was tapped as a candidate when the group recruited and ran a slate of candidates for the Los Angeles Board of Education and the Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees. After Moore had won a seat on the L.A. Community College Board of Trustees, her constituency from the coalition—a coalition comprised of minorities, women's, labor, and education groups—along with a group of poverty program activists with whom she had worked, joined together to encourage and support her race for the Assembly.

Issues or community concerns often motivate women to become active in groups and organizations which later support their political candidacies. In addition to education-related groups, other issue-based groups include:

- community groups concerned with issues of desegregation, especially important for women who entered politics in the 1960s
- environmental groups
- consumer groups
- church groups
- groups organized around an issue of special concern in a community, such as rent control or environmental hazards.

Frequently, women take the initiative to “organize the unorganized” for their campaigns. These alternative bases of support, whether comprised entirely of women or including men as well, are especially important to minority women.

Aleta Cannon, the first black woman ever to serve on the Oakland City Council, had been active for years in groups concerned with improving public education in Oakland, such as the Parent Boosters at the high school. In addition, as a single parent she found that many people in a similar situation were concerned about the quality of their children's



education. By serving as a spokeswoman for the concerns of parents from those groups, she mobilized the support of single parents. Cannon then went a step further. As a way of keeping single parents informed and consolidating her own base of support, she computerized the list of names and addresses of her backers. She found that people were willing to lend their support when they felt, "she's one of us."

Rosario Anaya also organized the unorganized. When she ran for president of the San Francisco Board of Education, she enlisted the support of school children and mothers for her candidacy. Like Cannon, Anaya reported that her efforts had given people who previously felt removed from the political process a chance to have a stake in the system.

### **Women's Organizations and Networks**

Women's organizations play a critical role in educating women about the political process and stimulating them to run for office. CAWP's 1981 survey of women elected officials found that of those women who were encouraged to run for office by an organization, a significant proportion received encouragement from a women's organization.\* At CAWP's consultations, most women reported they had been motivated to seek a public office by their activities in a women's organization or had been encouraged to run by members of a women's group to which they belonged. Whether long-established national women's organizations (e.g., League of Women Voters, Business and Professional Women, or American Association of University Women) or the newer feminist organizations (e.g., the Women's Political Caucus or the National Organization for Women), women's organizations clearly have been important training grounds for today's political women and will continue to be for political women of tomorrow.

The League of Women Voters (LWV) has been the most important training ground for women in public life today. The League was mentioned most frequently both by women who responded to CAWP's survey and by women who attended CAWP's consultations as a source of encouragement and support for their decisions to run for public office. Dona Foster, councilwoman from El Cajon, California, said, "The League of Women Voters provided me with training on how to analyze policy issues and the public exposure that was invaluable when I ran for the council." Barbara Shipnuck, Monterey County Supervisor and president of the California Elected Women's Association for Education and Research, talked about the importance of the League in her political career:

The League does provide excellent training on issues. In addition, the colleagues you develop in the League become volunteers and precinct

\* For a further discussion of these data see: "Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's," a report in CAWP's series, *Bringing More Women Into Public Office*.

walkers in your campaign. After they get involved in your campaign, they are encouraged to become active politically.

Los Angeles Councilwoman Joy Picus and Mayor of Huntington Beach Ruth Finley mentioned the critical role both the LWV and the American Association of University Women (AAUW) played in their early careers in politics. Picus recounted:

The League of Women Voters gave me a knowledge of government and an understanding of the situation and players in city hall. A five-day conference conducted by the AAUW gave me the techniques to run.

*The struggle for ratification of the ERA politicized women's groups which had traditionally been non-political.*

Nina Rothchild

According to women leaders, traditional women's organizations have a responsibility to educate their members about the importance of women's political activity and, more specifically, to encourage their members to seek elective and appointive offices. The consensus at CAWP's sessions was that, indeed, these organizations are becoming more politically-oriented. According to Gloria Griffin, the chair of Minnesota's Women's Consortium:

We are beginning to politicize the leaders of women's organizations. Our group includes executive officers from about forty-five groups. They understand the need for politicization. They want to do it, and they are doing it.

Minnesota's Nina Rothchild explained the increased politicization this way: "The struggle for ratification of the ERA politicized women's groups which had traditionally been non-political." Many women at CAWP's sessions indicated that the defeat of the ERA was due in large part to the fact that women were not represented in large enough numbers in state legislatures to ensure the amendment's passage.\* Because many women's organizations ranked the passage of ERA one of their priority issues, its defeat helped underscore the direct link between women's power and women's actual representation in elective office. In part as a result of the ERA struggle, several women's groups have undertaken major new drives to get more women elected and appointed to public office. Making the connection between the ERA and women's numbers in positions of power and influence, one participant mused, "Just think, if we had spent all that time and energy getting women elected and women appointed, we would be ahead of the game."

Women candidates and appointees will continue to emerge from the ranks of women's national membership organizations; however, in the future, other groups will be important as well. For example, one officeholder observed, "Women candidates, like men, will come through

\* CAWP's 1981 survey of elected women found that the Equal Rights Amendment would probably be part of the Constitution today if women had held half the seats in state legislatures around the country. According to data collected in the survey, more than three-fourths of women legislators (77%) supported ERA, while only about half of their male counterparts (49%) did so.

professional networks." Indeed many women at our sessions noted the importance of "different recruitment and support networks" for newer entrants into public life. Perhaps some of the best examples of these new routes to office were found at CAWP's sessions.

One newcomer to elective office, Marlene Johnson, in her bid for Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota, listed among her strongest supporters the Minnesota Association of Women Business Owners. Johnson, a former president of the National Association of Women Business Owners, described how this support was mobilized:

I was involved in an effort over a five-year period to really politicize women business owners. . . . They all had bottom line responsibility, and they all had some money . . . and we had a small business organization, the White House Conference on Small Business in the Carter Administration, to use as a tool for politicizing them within their area, within their industry. And as a model I think it has a lot of advantages. Everybody can think in terms of their self interest as a *group*.

She continued by pointing out that professional associations, clerical workers, homemakers, and welfare women are organizing around issues of common concern, and that it is necessary to find ways to politicize them.

For black and Hispanic women, other women's groups and networks are important as well. In some cases, minority women called upon their own special women's networks. When Gloria Molina made her bid for the California Assembly, she elicited support from elected and professional women in the L.A. area, Hispanic women from around the country, and a small network of Chicana feminists in her community. The first Hispanic woman to be elected to the California General Assembly, Molina credits her network of Chicana supporters as being especially critical to her decision to run for office. This network, organized twelve years earlier, had been active in Los Angeles' Hispanic community and lists the establishment of day care centers among its achievements. Both Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes and Marguerite Archie, Vice President of Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees, got much of their initial support from a black women's sorority to which they belonged. Not considered by most to be a political launching pad, the sorority was used to advantage by Hughes and Archie.

Majority women, too, sometimes found alternative bases of support. When Republican Beverly Homan ran for the California Assembly, she established a babysitting pool for her campaign workers, most of whom were professional women on leave from their jobs to raise children. That pool continues today and promises to be a source of support in any of Homan's future races. In southern California, Madge Schaefer and Jacqueline Heather reported "organizing unorganized women"—in their case, physicians' wives—for their campaigns.

### Feminist Organizations

"In what ways do groups such as the Women's Political Caucus (WPC) and the National Organization for Women (NOW) encourage and support women running for elective offices and seeking appointive offices?" This question began an animated debate among women who attended CAWP's sessions. The debate found women at our sessions positioned at various points along a spectrum of response.

At the one end of the spectrum were those who felt that the encouragement and assistance they had received from feminist organizations constituted an important base of support. Marguerite Archie, for example, credits WPC and NOW for "developing my political organizing skills."

At the other end of the spectrum were those who felt that feminist organizations did not place enough emphasis on getting women elected and appointed to public office. Among the women on this end were some Republican feminists who felt "abandoned" by feminist organizations. They expressed the belief that feminist groups were supporting "Democrats first and Republicans never," regardless of whether the Republicans were feminists and the Democrats were men. One Republican participant stated the issue this way:

I truly don't care if women's groups are for Democrats. But I want them to raise money in that name. I do not want them to come out and say we are for *women* candidates and then give every penny I contribute to only Democrats—women and men.

Most women fell somewhere in the middle of this spectrum, agreeing that feminist organizations are playing an important role in bringing women into politics, but hoping that the groups would develop more "political sophistication."

A small, but increasing proportion of women report the backing of feminist organizations, whether in the form of endorsements or money when they run for office, or in other forms when they seek appointments. In the early 1980s, the Women's Political Caucus was mentioned more frequently than NOW as a feminist organization supportive of women seeking office.

The National Women's Political Caucus has been effective in encouraging women to run for office and influencing the appointments process at both federal and state levels. At the federal level, in 1976 the NWPC spearheaded the Coalition for Women's Appointments, which was formed to identify and promote women for high-level appointments in President Jimmy Carter's administration.\* The coalition, still committed to having women appointed, has been operating with a handicap since the 1980 election of President Ronald Reagan. Without a Reagan campaign

\* For a more detailed description of the work of the Coalition for Women's Appointments, see: "Women Appointed to the Carter Administration: A Comparison with Men," one report in CAWP's series, *Bringing More Women Into Public Office*.

commitment to appointing women and without a receptive White House and cabinet after the election, it was difficult for the coalition to lobby for women's appointments.\*

At the state level, too, the WPC has been successful in influencing the appointments process. According to Kathleen Ridder, in 1978 the Minnesota WPC served as a catalyst in an effort to identify and promote women for political appointment in then-Governor Quie's administration. The WPC provided the impetus and leadership for this effort, with other groups and organizations concerned with women's appointments playing a less active role. Pat Jensen at that time worked for Governor Quie interviewing people for appointments to boards and commissions. She recalled:

As far as I was concerned, the Women's Political Caucus was the only women's group which was active in seeking appointments. Other women's organizations were almost invisible.

The Women's Political Caucus also has been active in recruiting and supporting women candidates. In California, Ventura County Supervisor Susan Lacey, Assemblywomen Gwen Moore and Teresa Hughes, Monterey County Supervisor Barbara Shipnuck, and others felt that receiving support from the WPC was very helpful to their campaigns. A very active WPC chapter in Santa Clara County, California was part of a coalition in the late 1970s which helped to elect majorities of women to the San Jose City Council and the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors.

The National Organization for Women also is beginning to emerge as an important support group for political women. In 1982, in Florida, NOW worked hard to defeat anti-ERA candidates and incumbents by identifying pro-ERA women to run for the state legislature. NOW pumped money and volunteers into these races for an exciting result—a record number of women holding seats in the legislature.

Electing more women is, for the first time, high on the list of NOW's priorities. With a highly-politicized corps of volunteers to assist women candidates and a large war chest to provide financial assistance, NOW is moving heavily into electoral politics.

Support from feminist groups, although valued by most women at our sessions, often was considered to be difficult to gain for a relatively small financial benefit. Obtaining support from these organizations can present two problems. First, gaining their endorsement may require a large commitment of candidate or staff time and energy. Second, having positions on controversial issues aired in public can be a liability for a candidate or officeholder. In order to get any organization's endorsement or support, women were willing to respond to questions and be judged on their answers. However, as campaign manager Jane Hickie said, if it

\* It should be noted that during his 1980 campaign, President Reagan did make a commitment to appoint a woman to the Supreme Court, a commitment which he kept with the 1981 appointment of Sandra Day O'Connor.

took hours of campaign staff time to fill out a questionnaire from each of fifty chapters of an organization, she wasn't sure it was worth the endorsement, particularly if the accompanying financial support was minimal. Hickie, who helped her candidate raise over a million dollars, explained:

We had this fabulous endorsement by NOW and a hundred dollar contribution to go with it. Then we started getting questionnaires from all of their local chapters, which indicated to me that they were far more interested in their own *internal* bureaucracy than they were getting candidates supportive of their issues elected.

A handful of women at CAWP's sessions felt that feminist groups were far from having the political savvy necessary to develop criteria for awarding endorsements and support that would really make a difference in bringing large numbers of women into public life. "If it weren't for women, I would never have won political office. However, with feminist groups it's a different story," declared one disgruntled participant.

Over the past ten years, feminist groups have become more and more politically sophisticated. Some of this political acumen is brought back to feminist organizations by members who also hold elective offices. Many elected women feel a responsibility to return to the feminist groups which supported their candidacies and educate them about what California's Susan Lacey called "the second stage of a group's political development"—learning to compromise. One participant offered this suggestion:

It is now time for feminist groups to develop politically-sophisticated strategies. In order to deal with issues, we women have to be there in public office. In order to get there, you have to help us.

If significantly large numbers of women are going to be elected to office, feminist organizations must make electing *women* an important criterion when making endorsements, providing volunteers, and contributing money. "Do we want a woman, or do we want THE PERFECT WOMAN?" asked one participant at CAWP's sessions. "Bring the less-than-perfect into the fold and she may eventually become one of us," she continued. Most political women believe we will need to trade "perfection" for parity in representation.

Political women are not asking feminist groups to support a woman without evaluating and judging her stands on issues. Rather, they are suggesting that the groups expand considerably the range of "acceptable" positions on issues and the number of issues on which they make an evaluation. Andrea Washburn from the Berkeley, California city council asked:

Are we going to continue to let ourselves, as women, get divided over issues or are we going to try to find those women candidates whom we can all support? If we expect a standard of consistency from women that

we don't expect from men we are never going to make the case, in the strongest way, that women have to be supported.

There must be a bottom line when it comes to supporting women. According to Sacramento County Supervisor Sandy Smoley, the bottom line is clear:

I'd rather have a woman who *is* a woman and feels like a woman than a man who says he thinks like a woman.

Smoley went on to describe how she and others had become much more "feminist" while serving in office. This "feminist socialization" can come from a variety of experiences once a woman is in office. Smoley is convinced that most women ultimately will be more likely than their male colleagues to bring issues of importance to women to the public arena and to alter the debate on those issues already in the public arena. As she put it:

In order to think like a woman, you've got to be a woman. And I'd rather put my money on a woman. Because when the chips are down, her thought processes are different. She approaches problem solving differently. She *is* different.

Most women at our consultations support the goals of the feminist movement; almost all hope that feminist organizations will become more involved in the electoral process. Time and time again, women at CAWP's consultations expressed their desire to count more women among their ranks, and hoped that women's organizations in general, and feminist organizations in particular, would make electing women to office—women of all types—a primary goal.

### Individuals' Efforts

Bringing more women into public office is a responsibility that most political women take very seriously. One participant at CAWP's Minnesota consultation described her commitment:

I think it is important to remember that we have to light up the corner where we are . . . in order to be effective, you have to figure out what you can do personally, and I know what I can do personally—give speeches, and constantly bring up the fact that everyone in that room is almost always going to have to give speeches to women's groups. . . .

Madge Schaefer, Thousand Oaks Councilwoman, put it in terms fitting for her Los Angeles base, "We have to be talent scouts to find other women and get them involved."

Just by virtue of "being there" as leaders (whether elected officials or appointed officeholders), women also pave the way for more women to enter politics. Although the significance of role models in encouraging women to become politically active is difficult to measure, many political

*We have to be talent scouts to find other women and get them involved.*

Madge Schaefer

women at CAWP's meetings thought that merely by being in public office they stimulated other women to consider careers in politics.

Presence does make a difference. A woman serving on the U.S. Supreme Court enables women around the country to realize the Supreme Court justices can be female. Women serving in the U.S. Congress enable women around the country to see that the nation's highest legislative body can include women. "My being elected the first woman mayor of my city with 360,000 population has proven to other women that minority women can reach high office and be effective leaders," said Eunice Sato proudly. Formerly mayor of Long Beach, California, Sato currently serves on the city council.

However, few women public officials are content with simply being role models. The vast majority of women at our sessions actively encourage other women to enter the public arena. They make individual efforts to bring other women into public office in a variety of ways. They discuss what it's like to serve in public office; they speak with enthusiasm about their own experiences as candidates and officeholders; they constantly encourage women to run for office. They do this in one-on-one situations and with groups of women. They have recruited candidates for local office, served as campaign managers for other women, volunteered in other women's campaigns, loaned materials, strategies, and organizers to other women candidates, and contributed money to women candidates.

Women's organizations are often a place to which women officeholders direct their attempts at political inspiration and recruitment. They attend meetings of women's organizations in order to keep the members informed about issues and to urge the groups to look for women to run for office. One woman regularly contacts women's organizations, entreating them "to put up women for appointed and elected offices." Recognizing that one phone call or visit is not enough, she follows up her initial effort by "calling again and again and again."

*As elected women we have a responsibility for bringing more women in.*

Gloria Molina

Elected women also bring other women into politics by appointing them. Over and over again, women have taken the responsibility that comes with holding elective office—the power of appointment—to place women on advisory boards and commissions. "I have been responsible for three women appointees to the Planning Commission and two women to the Personnel Board," claimed one southern California councilwoman. Another woman appointed ten women to important commissions and helped prepare them to move legislation. Besides being a training ground for future women candidates, appointive officeholding helps to acquaint men in politics with the different perspectives women bring to public policy-making.

Political women frequently use their political organizing skills to encourage women's political participation. Women officeholders often catalyze a group around a political issue and then use that group in an advisory capacity. From among the members of such an *ad hoc* group, they identify potential appointees and future candidates. One elected woman set up an informal committee in her community to identify and



recommend women for appointive offices. The recommendations were delivered to elected officials—both women and men.

Sometimes not doing something has been an effective means of enlarging the pool of women officeholders. Some elected women have chosen to remain neutral—often over the objections of their own party's leaders—in races where a woman of the opposing party, incumbent or nonincumbent, is running against a member of their own party. While many people would argue with the wisdom of their decision, some political women have given up what could have been an excellent political opportunity to run for a higher office when it would have meant running against another woman.

---

## Conclusion

---

**T**he projects and activities aimed at expanding women's political participation have been important . . . as a beginning. But they have had a relatively minor impact on making a major difference in women's political status overall—across the country and across all levels of office. What will it take to increase women's political power dramatically over the next decade? Political women who attended CAWP's sessions shared their insights about what they thought would be required to make sweeping changes in women's political status over the next several years.

Many of the recommendations and strategies for bringing more women into public life focus on building programs and coalitions which join together individual political women and women's networks, organizations, and institutions. It is important to extend the efforts elected and appointed women and women's organizations already are making to enlarge the pool of politically active women.

Giving support to women once they become public officials is vital in order for these women to continue encouraging other women to enter political life. One way to do this is by supporting associations of elected women and other programs which bring together women elected and appointed officials. Sessions which enable political women to meet together informally to exchange thoughts and ideas on a wide range of topics are invaluable.

Providing financial and staff support for associations of women public officials is one strategy for strengthening the existing small community of political women and helping prepare them to move into positions of political leadership and up the political ladder. These associations all share the goals of encouraging other women to enter political life and encouraging their own members to seek higher office, but they do not have the time and resources necessary to design and implement programs which can systematically address these goals. Yet, even without the ways and means to achieve some of their goals, the associations play a critical role for individual women members. For example, in a recent letter to the Center for the American Woman and Politics, newly-elected California Assemblywoman Lucy Killea wrote:

I have found CEWAER [the California Elected Women's Association for Education and Research] to be an invaluable source of support for me; in fact one of the reasons I chose to run for the state legislature is because of the dynamic women I met at the state level through CEWAER.

Meetings which bring political women together informally, such as those conducted by CAWP as part of this project, are also useful. "I love

to come to meetings such as this," said one woman in California. "It re-charges my batteries." Indeed, a woman in office, who often is the only woman on her governing board or one of a few in a state legislative chamber, wants the opportunity to meet with other women in office to exchange legislative strategies and share survival skills.

Political women are an important resource to tap when programs are planned for bringing additional women into public life. At CAWP's consultations, minds were working actively—one person's comments sparking another person's suggestions. Political women who live in the same city or area meet infrequently. Associations of elected women and other in-state networks provide a forum for women to get together, but seldom, if ever, do they provide an opportunity for brainstorming sessions among women public officials about how to bring more women into public life. Involved in the day-to-day operations of government or their organizations, women leaders welcome invitations to sessions where they can discuss how more women can share the responsibilities of public policymaking.

Ideas emerging from such meetings often turn into action. For example, Minnesota women hope to achieve the objective of getting more women elected and appointed—in part, by increasing the political awareness of women's groups. They will begin this effort with the help of the College of St. Catherine, which has offered to assist in establishing a speakers' bureau. Through the bureau, women leaders will speak with other women about the opportunities political life offers, and urge women who seem ready to run to move forward.

It is important for political women to have platforms from which they can speak about bringing more women into public life. Many political women want more opportunities to speak to more and different audiences, and they want others to join them on the speaking circuit. Suggestions made by women at the CAWP consultations included: giving talks at colleges, universities, high schools, and elementary schools; offering information to high school girls so they can *plan ahead* for careers in politics; speaking to junior and senior high school girls in preparation for a campaign to interest them in becoming campaign workers.

Developing educational programs to increase girls' and women's political awareness ranks high on the list of strategies aimed at building women's numbers and clout in politics. Participants at CAWP's sessions hope that elementary schools, high schools, and colleges will develop programs specifically aimed at female students, encouraging their political participation. One existing program—the Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN)—addresses this need specifically and directly. PLEN links CAWP and the National Women's Education Fund in a consortium with ten women's colleges to create public leadership programs for women. The programs address both students and community women in academic and extracurricular settings, presenting information, skills, and role models. Similar efforts could be initiated in many other educational

*We are talking about encouraging women to step out into positions of public leadership, helping them get there, and making them more effective when they are there.*

Diana Murphy

contexts, certainly for primary and secondary school students and girls' organizations.

Coalitions of women—women public officials and other women leaders and activists—working together have the potential for making the biggest impact on women's numbers in political offices, especially if they have the staff and financial support necessary to continue their work over a sustained period of time. If they do not have this support, good intentions and strong convictions will prove ineffective. In 1981 and 1982, women in New Jersey, California, and Minnesota decided to work toward getting women appointed in the new gubernatorial administrations in their states. These women were committed to bringing more women into public life through the appointive process; but they had little time to devote to recruiting women for offices. Without the proper resources, important and worthwhile goals and ideas cannot be translated into effective programs.

When CAWP held its August 1982 consultation in Minnesota, both Republicans and Democrats were preparing for September's gubernatorial primary and November's general election. Prior to the CAWP meeting, women within each party (active members of the DFL and GOP feminist caucuses) had spent some time discussing among themselves how best to promote women's appointments after the election, but the discussion had not crossed party lines. Early in CAWP's afternoon session, Arvonne Fraser asked:

Is there a list of appointive positions on the state level? Whoever wins for governor, do we have a list of who they've got to appoint, and then do we have a committee that can act as a coalition for appointments?

Gloria Griffin, chair of the Minnesota Women's Consortium, replied, "Yes, we do have the seeds of a coalition, but I must say it is very informal and it probably should be formalized." After some discussion among participants, Fraser continued, "I guess my point is that we ought to be getting ready now—both parties—so that whoever is elected, we are there the next morning with our pack of resumes."

There was no question that in 1982 in California and in Minnesota, as had been the case in New Jersey a year earlier, political women were anxious to ensure that women would receive a fair share of appointments in a new gubernatorial administration. However, it was quite clear that the women at our sessions were stretched very thin. None had the time to develop the resources necessary for organizing a coordinated statewide effort to identify women for appointment, to meet informally with the women who were political insiders for information and guidance, and to ensure that the strategy devised for having women appointed would be implemented. Yet all felt that a systematic approach to identifying and promoting women for appointments was a key ingredient for bringing more women into high-level state appointive offices.

Groups or coalitions organized to seek out and find support for women willing to be political representatives may be the most significant strategy

we can pursue in the decade ahead for bringing more women into public life. No state or organization in the country has had the resources or mechanisms to provide continued support to people and projects working to make a difference in women's political status.

Much more must be done to improve women's political status. Political parties must develop plans of action for integrating women into the hierarchy of party leadership, for identifying and supporting women to run for office and for encouraging women's appointments at local, state, and federal levels.

More money must be available to women candidates, particularly those women running for congressional, statewide, and state legislative seats. Individual women must contribute money to women candidates, and women's PACs must raise and distribute larger amounts of money. Traditional networks of financial support for candidates—professional groups, business, labor unions—must be convinced of the value of supporting women's candidacies.

Individual political women must help other women to understand the significance and challenge of public officeholding. More opportunities must be created for political women to be seen, to speak, and to be heard. As still only 10% of all officeholders, political women remain few and far between—thus, almost invisible unless there are special efforts to spotlight them.

Last, women's organizations, women's colleges and other women's communities must make concerted efforts to interest women in political careers. They must urge women to participate directly in politics—in appointive or elective offices at all levels of government.

Women's numbers in public life will continue to inch ahead slowly *unless* people who care about the representation of women in politics join together to make major commitments to changing women's political status. Political women believe firmly that for the goals and recommendations discussed at CAWP's sessions to become strategies and programs, many interested "communities" must join together in the effort—elected and appointed women, political party officials, leaders of women's organizations, educational institutions, foundations, corporations, and others concerned with women's political participation. Only if working coalitions are developed to identify, inform, recruit, train, and support those women who are interested in politics and willing to serve in office can we expect to achieve the goal of bringing *many* more women into public leadership in the foreseeable future.

---

## Participants

---

### New Jersey

October 16, 1981

Catherine Arnone

*Public Information Officer, New Jersey Department of Transportation*

Nancy Becker

*President, Nancy H. Becker Associates, Trenton, NJ*

Kathryn A. Brock

*Chair, Democratic Women's Task Force, New Jersey Women's Political Caucus*

Leanna Brown

*New Jersey Assemblywoman*

Jane Burgio

*New Jersey Assemblywoman (1981)*

*Secretary of State, 1982-*

Anne P. Canby

*Acting Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Transportation*

Pat Cherry

*Chair, Republican Women's Task Force, New Jersey Women's Political Caucus*

Barbara A. Curran

*Member, Board of Public Utilities, State of New Jersey*

Barbara Geiger-Parker

*Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Katherine E. Kleeman

*Program Director, Public Leadership Education Network, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Ann Klein

*Former Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Human Services*

Ruth B. Mandel

*Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Carmella Pavlick

*Freeholder, Bergen County*

*President, New Jersey Association for Elected Women Officials (1981)*

Patricia Sheehan

*Manager, Federal Relations, Johnson & Johnson  
Former Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs*

Amy Rosen

*Assistant Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Transportation*

Kathy A. Stanwick

*Assistant Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Eileen Thornton

*Chair, New Jersey Women's Political Caucus*

Betty Wilson

*Executive Director, Center for Non-Profit Corporations  
Former Deputy Commissioner, New Jersey Department of  
Environmental Protection*

### **Reagan Appointees**

**March 24, 1982**

Annelise Anderson

*Associate Director for Economics and Government, Office of  
Management and Budget*

Pamela N. Bailey

*Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Department of Health and  
Human Services*

Wendy Borchardt

*Special Assistant to the President for Public Liaison*

Susan J. Carroll

*Senior Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and  
Politics*

Janet Colson

*Deputy Director, President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control*

Barbara Geiger-Parker

*Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Dorcas R. Hardy

*Assistant Secretary for Human Development, Department of Health  
and Human Services*

Virginia Knauer

*Special Assistant to the President*

Ruth B. Mandel

*Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Kathy A. Stanwick

*Assistant Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

**Minnesota**  
**August 17, 1982**

- Rosemary Ahmann  
*Candidate, Minnesota State Legislature*
- Diane Ahrens  
*Ramsey County Commissioner*
- Ruth G. Armstrong  
*Education Chair, League of Women Voters of Minnesota*
- Gladys Brooks  
*Member, Minneapolis Metropolitan Council*
- Maureen Bye  
*Councilmember, Duluth*
- Susan J. Carroll  
*Senior Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Arvonne Fraser  
*Senior Fellow, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs*
- Barbara Geiger-Parker  
*Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Gloria Griffin  
*Chair, Minnesota Women's Consortium*
- Meredith Hart  
*Chairperson, Minnesota Women's Political Caucus*
- Judy Healey  
*Senior Program Associate, Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul*
- Dorothy Hokr  
*State Representative, New Hope*
- Sally Howard  
*Alderman, Minneapolis*
- Charlee Hoyt  
*Alderman, Minneapolis*
- Ruby Hunt  
*Councilwoman, St. Paul*
- Pat Jensen  
*Community Relations, The Pillsbury Company*
- Marlene Johnson  
*Candidate, Lt. Governor, State of Minnesota (1982)*  
*Lt. Governor, State of Minnesota 1983—*



Geri Joseph

*Journalist*  
*Former Ambassador to the Netherlands*

Gayle Kincannon

*Chairperson, School Board, Chaska*

Katherine E. Kleeman

*Program Director, Public Leadership Education Network, Center for  
the American Woman and Politics*

Gretchen Kreuter

*Assistant to the President, College of St. Catherine*

Sally Martin

*Consultant, Mark Dayton for U.S. Senate Campaign (1982)*  
*Director, Minnesota Department of Public Service 1983—*

Diana Murphy

*U.S. District Judge, Minnesota*

Barbara O'Grady

*Member, Minneapolis Metropolitan Health Board*

Ann O'Loughlin

*Volunteer Director, Wheelock Whitney for Governor Committee  
(1982)*

Sally Olsen

*State Representative, St. Louis Park*

Mary Jo Richardson

*Assistant Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Economic  
Security for the Division of Training and Community Services*

Kathleen Ridder

*Director, Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund*

Dottie Rietow

*State Coordinator, GOP Feminist Caucus*

Carolyn Ring

*Director, Internal Management, Office of the Governor (1982)*

Nina Rothchild

*Executive Director, Legislative Advisory Council on the Economic  
Status of Woman (1982)*  
*Commissioner, Department of Employee Relations 1983—*

Mary Ellen Schmider

*Director, Continuing Education and Community Services,  
Moorhead State University*

- Kathy A. Stanwick  
*Assistant Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Anne Weyrauch  
*Former Alderman, Minneapolis*
- Susan Williams  
*Co-chairwoman, Southwest Minneapolis Planning District Citizen's  
Advisory Committee*
- Ann Wynia  
*State Representative, St. Paul*

**Women's PACs**  
**October 21, 1982**

- Kare Anderson  
*East Bay Women's Political Action Committee, California*
- Katie Arnold  
*Alabama Foundation for Women In Politics*
- Ernesta Ballard  
*Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Fund*
- Anne Benoit  
*Committee of 21, Louisiana*
- Janis Berman  
*Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund*
- Kim Brenner  
*Democratic National Committee*
- Susan J. Carroll  
*Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Carole Chiamp  
*Michigan Women's Campaign Fund*
- Ranny Cooper  
*Women's Campaign Fund, Washington, DC*
- Janyce Degan  
*Committee of 21, Louisiana*
- Marianne Fowler  
*National Women's Political Caucus*
- Arvonne Fraser  
*Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund*
- Barbara Geiger-Parker  
*Center for the American Woman and Politics*

- Franza Giffen  
*Women's Political Fund, San Francisco*
- Pam Harwood  
*Michigan Women's Campaign Fund*
- Marcia Herman  
*Women's Political Committee, Los Angeles*
- Jane Hickie  
*Ann Richards for Treasurer, Texas*
- Katherine E. Kleeman  
*Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Ruth B. Mandel  
*Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Patsy Mink  
*Women's Political Action League, Hawaii*
- Anne Mitchell  
*Alabama Foundation for Women in Politics*
- JoAnn B. Price  
*East Bay Women's Political Action Committee, California*
- Kathleen Ridder  
*Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund*
- Isabel Singer  
*Women's Political Fund, San Francisco*
- Lilly Spitz  
*Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund, California*
- Kathy A. Stanwick  
*Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Nancy Stultz  
*National Organization for Women, New Jersey*
- Debbie Walsh  
*Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Laurie Westley  
*National Women's Political Caucus*

**Sacramento, California****November 15, 1982**

- Rosario Anaya  
*President, San Francisco Board of Education*
- Kare Anderson  
*East Bay Women's Political Action Committee*
- Ingrid Azvedo  
*Regional Vice Chairman, Republican State Party*
- Jane Baker  
*Mayor, San Mateo*
- Aleta Cannon  
*Councilmember, Oakland*
- Susan J. Carroll  
*Senior Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Eileen Cohn  
*Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund*
- Theresa Cook  
*Supervisor, Placer County*  
*President, California Supervisor's Association*
- Margaret DePriester  
*Mayor, Moraga*
- Ann Duncan  
*Community College Trustee, Hayward*
- Eva Garcia  
*Member, State Board of Education*
- Barbara Geiger-Parker  
*Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*
- Franza Giffen  
*Women's Political Fund*
- Jan Hewitt  
*Chair, Board of Supervisors, Salerno County*
- Beverly Homan  
*School Board Trustee, Sebastopol*
- Sue Hone  
*Berkeley*
- Kate Karpilow  
*California State Senate Fellow*

Peg Kovar

*Mayor, Walnut Creek*

Ruth B. Mandel

*Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Sunne Wright McPeak

*Chair, Board of Supervisors, Contra Costa County*  
*Second Vice President, California Supervisors Association*

Peggy Mensinger

*Mayor, Modesto*

Sandy Motley

*Councilmember, Davis*

Kate Nyegaard

*Candidate, State Assembly, Modesto*

JoAnn B. Price

*East Bay Women's Political Action Committee*

Helen Rudee

*Supervisor, Sonoma County*

Ann Rudin

*Councilmember, Sacramento*

Doris Sayles

*Administrative Assistant to Supervisor Theresa Cook*

Isabel A. Singer

*Women's Political Fund*

Sandra R. Smoley

*Supervisor, Sacramento County*  
*First Vice President, National Association of Counties*

Kathy A. Stanwick

*Assistant Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Andrea Washburn

*Councilmember, Berkeley*

Ilene Weinreb

*Former Mayor, Haywood*

Susanne Wilson

*Supervisor, Santa Clara County*

**Los Angeles, California****November 19, 1982**

Marguerite Archie

*Vice President, Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees*

Jackie Bacharach

*Councilmember, Rancho Palos Verdes*

Ruth Bailey

*Councilmember, Huntington Beach*

Sally Bellerue

*Councilmember, Laguna Beach*

Kathy Buchoz

*Councilmember, Westminster*

Susan J. Carroll

*Senior Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Louise Davis

*Councilmember, Monterey Park*

Maggie Erickson

*Supervisor, Ventura County*

Ruth Finley

*Councilmember, Huntington Beach*

Dona Foster

*Councilmember, El Cajon*

Barbara Geiger-Parker

*Research Associate, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Katy Geissert

*Councilmember, Torrance*

Ruth Yannatta Goldway

*Mayor, Santa Monica*

Jacqueline Heather

*Mayor, Newport Beach*

Mary Herron

*Councilmember, Coronado*

Sue Hone

Berkeley

Teresa Hughes

*Assemblywoman, Los Angeles*

Shirley Jackson

*Executive Director, California Elected Women's Association for  
Education and Research*

Miriam Kaywood

*Councilmember, Anaheim*

Mancha Kurilich

*School Board Trustee, Monterey Park*

Susan Lacey

*Supervisor, Ventura County*

Marilyn Lassman

*Member, Community College Board, Chula Vista*

Ruth B. Mandel

*Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Jean Mansfield

*Councilmember, Riverside*

Gloria Molina

*Assemblywoman-elect (1982)*

*Assemblywoman, Los Angeles 1983—*

Gwen Moore

*Assemblywoman, Los Angeles*

Catherine Morrison

*Administrative Assistant to Assemblywoman Cathie Wright*

Joy Picus

*Councilmember, Los Angeles*

Carol Rapson

*Councilmember, Avalon*

Vicki Reynolds

*President, Board of Education, Beverly Hills*

Ann Rock

*Councilmember, Simi Valley*

Pat Russell

*Councilmember, Los Angeles*

Marilyn Ryan

*Assemblywoman, Redondo Beach*

Eunice Sato

*Councilmember, Long Beach*

Mary Scherr

*School Board Trustee, Carlsbad*

Madge Lee Schaefer

*Councilmember, Thousand Oaks*

Ann Shaw

*Councilmember, Ranchos Palos Verdes*

Barbara Shipnuck

*Supervisor, Monterey County*

*President, California Elected Women's Association for Education  
and Research*

Ruth Smith

*Director, Community Relations, Loyola Marymount University*

Kathy A. Stanwick

*Assistant Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics*

Gordana Swanson

*Councilmember, Rolling Hills*

Roberta Weintraub

*Member, Board of Education, Los Angeles Unified School District*

Cathie Wright

*Assemblywoman, Simi Valley*

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, we have listed the titles which people held at the time they participated in CAWP's consultations.





**Project Staff**

Ruth B. Mandel, *Director, CAWP*

Kathy A. Stanwick, *Assistant Director, CAWP*

*Project Director, "Bringing More Women Into Public Office"*

Susan J. Carroll, *Senior Research Associate, CAWP*

Barbara Geiger-Parker, *Research Associate, CAWP*

Katherine E. Kleeman, *Research Associate, CAWP*

John Cohen, *Research Assistant, CAWP*

---

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) is the only research, education, and public service center of its kind. Established in 1971 with a Ford Foundation grant to the Eagleton Institute of Politics, the Center designs and sponsors a variety of programs aimed at developing and disseminating knowledge about women's political participation. CAWP encourages women's full and effective involvement in all areas of public life.

As a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, CAWP programs reflect Eagleton's long-standing interest in political institutions, political practitioners, and public policy in the United States. CAWP is supported by: Rutgers; grants and contributions from foundations, government, corporations, and individuals; consulting fees; and income from the sale of publications.

Inquiries about the Center for the American Woman and Politics should be directed to Ruth B. Mandel, Director.

---



CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS (CAWP)  
Eagleton Institute of Politics  
Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
201/932-9384