



N.O.W. Bay Area Chapter

NEWS

National Organization for Women

Volume VI Number 9

September, 1978

SEPTEMBER PROGRAM MEETING

THE RELOCATION OF AMERICAN WOMEN

This International Women's Year Slideshow was recently received by the UHCLC Women's Resource Center, and will be loaned to us for our meeting at 7:30 p.m., September 7th (Thursday), at Uniting Church, El Camino Real at Reseda, Clear Lake City, Texas. Marjorie Randal is the program coordinator (488-4396).

NOTES FROM BAY AREA NOW Business Meeting - August 25, 1978

1. Discussed room reservations for National Conference - anyone planning to attend and wishing to stay in the BAY AREA NOW rooms - please contact Dorothy Howard - 486-0752.
 2. Discussed and approved the submission under the Bay Area NOW sponsorship to the National Conference: (1) A resolution that all National and State NOW meetings be held in facilities which are completely accessible to handicapped; (2) A resolution that National, and if possible, State NOW meetings have onboard an interpreter for the deaf.
 3. Frances Hicks urged us to write Senators Byrd, Tower and Bentsen asking them to support the ERA extension and to support a call for cloture (limitation of debate).
 4. Frances Hicks also urged support for Bob Gammage in his election campaign efforts. Not only has he supported the ERA extension, but if by some unthinkable means the extension effort should fail, we will certainly need his support when it is reintroduced into Congress. ---All the above also applies to Bill Carraway our State Representative (and for that matter, anyone who has supported us and who is running for election this fall).
 5. To the above subject - a discussion of a Chapter donation ensued. This will be followed up in the full meeting.
 6. PARA (formerly Rape Task Force) is without effective leadership according to Nora Mertz. If anyone is interested in joining this effort, please call Nora at 554-6738.
 7. The next TEXAS NOW meeting will be held in Dallas on September 23. Gail Baier, San Antonio, is the new TEXAS NOW coordinator. For further details contact Phyllis Tucker, 944-0033, or Dorothy Howard, 486-0752.
 8. We will welcome any input to this newsletter. Send to Melissa Weiksnar, 15722 Parksley, Houston 77059, or call her at 488-1702. (965-3032 days)
 9. To activate the Bay Area NOW telephone tree contact Cynthia Sutton, 488-7936, or Dorothy Howard.
-

BAY AREA NOW CALENDAR

-
- September 7 - Bay Area NOW Program Meeting - 7:30 p.m. - Uniting Church - El Camino Real at Reseda
 - September 23 - TEXAS NOW Meeting - Dallas - No further details at present
 - OCTOBER 6/9 - NATIONAL NOW CONFERENCE - Washington, D.C.
-

Education Task Force Testifies at State Textbook Hearing

For the sixth consecutive year, the Education Task Force of Texas NOW presented testimony at the Texas Education Agency textbook hearing, held in mid-August in Austin. Testimony was based on over 100 Bills of Particulars submitted in protest against sexism in textbooks offered by publishers for selection and purchase by the state for use in Texas public schools. More than 75 persons around the state participated in the development of these Education Task Force Bills.

At the (split session) hearing, one-half of the 15-member State Textbook Committee were addressed by NOW National Board member Barbara Duke and expert witnesses Judy Corder-Bolz, Fredericka Meiners, and Joy Wilson, followed by 24 Task Force members whose testimony on specific textbooks occupied the balance of the 5½ hours allotted to Texas NOW at the Wednesday and Thursday sessions.

Dr. Corder-Bolz, who is a project director at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Austin, outlined for the committee the effect of textbooks on the formation of sex-role stereotypes and occupational aspirations of students. Dr. Meiners, research associate in history at Rice University, pointed to the exclusion of women from traditional historical works and the current progress in redefining the materials of history to acknowledge the influence and accomplishments of women. Dr. Wilson, chair of the Department of English at the University of St. Thomas, focused on the need for a richer variety of role models for girls than those traditionally offered in school literature anthologies. She also commented on the positive correlation that exists between non-stereotypical treatment of female characters and overall literary quality.

Aided by Rema Lou Brown's virtuoso performance on the stop-watch, a large volume of testimony was expeditiously covered by Lynne Mutchler and Gay Cosgriff (Houston), Catherine Nordstrom, Edra Bogle and Jonita Borchardt (Denton), Linda O'Connell, Mary Kay Knief, Pamela Monzingo, Everetta McArthur and Kathi Fite (Austin), Ellen Ray and Michael Stone (Fort Worth), Margaret Champagne (San Antonio), Gretel Winterwood (Galveston), and the invaluable Bay Area NOW contingent: Melissa Weiksnar, Rema Lou and Jim Brown, Dorothy Howard, Susan Keene, Evie Whitsett, Vicki Carr and Elizabeth Glenn, as well as Task Force Coordinators Marjorie Randal and Twiss Butler.

Significant expansion of Texas NOW's lobbying effort against sexism in textbooks was effected this year by the cooperation of four other organizations which filed Bills of Particulars and presented testimony before the other half of the State Textbook Committee during the course of the hearings. These were representatives of the Women's Group of the First Unitarian Church of Houston, led by Audrey Crawford, of the Woman to Woman study group of the National Conference of Christians and Jews of Houston, led by Tressa Tolin, and members of the Bryan-College Station and Montrose (Houston) branches of the American Association of University Women. Such participation is most welcome and is expected to be even more extensive next year.

Twiss Butler will attend voting sessions of the State Textbook Committee in Austin on September 11-12. Call her at 333-4764 if you would like to observe this annual edu-biz true life drama.

From
THE FEMALE
MAN

The Great Happiness Contest

(this happens a lot)

FIRST WOMAN: I'm perfectly happy. I love my husband and we have two darling children. I certainly don't need any change in my lot.

SECOND WOMAN: I'm even happier than you are. My husband does the dishes every Wednesday and we have three darling children, each nicer than the last. I'm tremendously happy.

THIRD WOMAN: Neither of you is as happy as I am. I'm fantastically happy. My husband hasn't looked at another woman in the fifteen years we've been married, he helps around the house whenever I ask it, and he wouldn't mind in the least if I were to go out and get a job. But I'm happiest in fulfilling my responsibilities to him and the children. We have four children.

FOURTH WOMAN: We have six children. (This is too many. A long silence.) I have a part-time job as a clerk in Bloomingdale's to pay for the children's skiing lessons, but I really feel I'm expressing myself best when I make a custard or a meringue or decorate the basement.

ME: You miserable nits, I have a Nobel Peace Prize, fourteen published novels, six lovers, a town house, a box at the Metropolitan Opera, I fly a plane, I fix my own car, and I can do eighteen push-ups before breakfast, that is, if you're interested in numbers.

ALL THE WOMEN: Kill, kill, kill, kill, kill, kill.

OR, FOR STARTERS

HE: I can't stand stupid, vulgar women who read Love Comix and have no intellectual interests.

ME: Oh my, neither can I.

HE: I really admire refined, cultivated, charming women who have careers.

ME: Oh my, so do I.

HE: Why do you think those awful, stupid, vulgar, commonplace women get so awful?

ME: Well, probably, not wishing to give any offense and after considered judgment and all that, and very tentatively, with the hope that you won't jump on me—I think it's at least partly your fault.

(Long silence)

HE: You know, on second thought, I think bitchy, castrating, unattractive, neurotic women are even worse. Besides, you're showing your age. And your figure's going.

OR

HE: Darling, why must you work part-time as a rug salesman?

SHE: Because I wish to enter the marketplace and prove that in spite of my sex I can take a fruitful part in the life of the community and earn what our culture proposes as the sign and symbol of adult independence—namely money.

HE: But darling, by the time we deduct the cost of a baby-sitter and nursery school, a higher tax bracket, and your box lunches from your pay, it actually costs us money for you to work. So you see, you aren't making money at all. You can't make money. Only I can make money. Stop working.

SHE: I won't. And I hate you.

HE: But darling, why be irrational? It doesn't matter that you can't make money because I can make money. And after I've made it, I give it to you, because I love you. So you don't have to make money. Aren't you glad?

SHE: No. Why can't you stay home and take care of the baby? Why can't we deduct all those things from your pay? Why should I be glad because I can't earn a

living? Why—

HE (with dignity): This argument is becoming degraded and ridiculous. I will leave you alone until loneliness, dependence, and a consciousness that I am very much displeased once again turn you into the sweet girl I married. There is no use in arguing with a woman.

OR, LAST OF ALL

HE: Is your dog drinking cold fountain water?

SHE: I guess so.

HE: If your dog drinks cold water, he'll get colic.

SHE: It's a she. And I don't care about the colic. You know, what I really worry about is bringing her out in public when she's in heat like this. I'm not afraid she'll get colic, but that she might get pregnant.

HE: They're the same thing, aren't they? Har har har.

SHE: Maybe for your mother they were.

(At this point Joanna the Grate swoops down on bat's wings, lays He low with one mighty swatt, and elevates She and Dog to the constellation of Victoria Femina, where they sparkle forever.)

I know that somewhere, just to give me the lie, lives a beautiful (got to be beautiful), intellectual, gracious, cultivated, charming woman who has eight children, bakes her own bread, cakes, and pies, takes care of her own house, does her own cooking, brings up her own children, holds down a demanding nine-to-five job at the top decision-making level in a man's field, and is adored by her equally successful husband because although a hard-driving, aggressive business executive with eye of eagle, heart of lion, tongue of adder, and muscles of gorilla (she looks just like Kirk Douglas), she comes home at night, slips into a filmy negligée and a wig, and turns instanter into a *Playboy* dimwit, thus laughingly dispelling the canard that you cannot be eight people simultaneously with two different sets of values. *She has not lost her femininity.*

And I'm Marie of Rumania.

If Jack succeeds in forgetting something, this is of little use if Jill continues to remind him of it. He must induce her not to do so. The safest way would be not just to make her keep quiet about it, but to induce her to forget it also.

Jack may act upon Jill in many ways. He may make her feel guilty for keeping on "bringing it up." He may *invalidate* her experience. This can be done more or less radically. He can indicate merely that it is unimportant or trivial, whereas it is important and significant to her. Going further, he can shift the *modality* of her experience from memory to imagination: "It's all in your imagination." Further still, he can *invalidate* the *content*: "It never happened that way." Finally, he can invalidate not only the significance, modality, and content, but her very capacity to remember at all, and make her feel guilty for doing so into the bargain.

This is not unusual. People are doing such things to each other all the time. In order for such transpersonal invalidation to work, however, it is advisable to overlay it with a thick patina of mystification. For instance, by denying that this is what one is doing, and further invalidating any perception that it is being done by ascriptions such as "How can you think such a thing?" "You must be paranoid." And so on.

Persons interested in working on Abortion rights in Texas should contact Joan Garfinkel Glantz, at 666-0020.

Page 2A, THE DAILY CITIZEN, Thursday, August 31, 1978

the daily citizen *Opinion*

The abortion question

By CHERYL ARVIDSON

WASHINGTON (UPI) — If public opinion polls are to be believed, the majority of Americans believe a woman should have the right to an abortion if she so desires.

Other polls say that rarely, if ever, is a politician's stand in favor of abortion a major factor in a voter's decision of whether to support him at the ballot box.

Commentary

This appears to support the notion that in a nation where majority rules, the majority is content with the 1973 Supreme Court ruling that abortion in the first six months of pregnancy is a private matter between a woman and her doctor.

But these messages don't seem to be getting through to many members of the House.

Time and time again, the House casts anti-abortion votes, then tries to push the Senate, which has taken a consistent pro-abortion stand, into concessions.

Perhaps abortion deserves legislative attention if for no other reason than to quiet the anti-abortionists who want their own religious convictions to prevail.

That battle should come squarely on the issue — whether legal abortions should be available to all American women. But for political expediency, the abortion battle in Congress is being fought on the wrong battleground.

Congressional observers won't find any up and down votes on abortion. Instead, House members have picked a "safe" bill for their anti-abortion stands — legislation financing the departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare.

Using the Labor-HEW bill, the House can restrict the availability of abortions for poor women under the Medicaid program. Lawmakers can cast an anti-abortion vote on that bill and make points with anti-abortion lobbyists — without fear that poor women will rise up and vote them out of office.

And their anti-abortion vote won't affect middle class and upper class women who are more

politically active and could cause trouble for an incumbent congressman.

The House has been relatively successful in past Labor-HEW abortion battles with the Senate, and this year House members have added abortion language to three other bills, pushing the Senate to three more conference committee fights. But lawmakers may have gone too far.

The House added an anti-abortion amendment to legislation that will affect the rights of every woman in the workplace by prohibiting companies from discriminating against women on the basis of pregnancy.

Employers could no longer deny coverage for pregnancy, child birth and related medical conditions if they offer health benefit plans to their workers. Neither could employers refuse to hire or promote a woman because she might become pregnant or refuse to give a woman back her job or strip her of seniority benefits if she left to have a baby.

Every aspect of this bill encourages women to continue their pregnancies rather than opt for abortion for financial reasons.

Yet, the House added an anti-abortion amendment to this bill — allowing companies with religious objections to refuse to cover abortions under their health insurance plans.

The Senate made one attempt at compromise — limiting the right to refuse to religious organizations and institutions if the procedure is in conflict with the church's tenants — but the House flatly rejected the offer.

The Senate conferees say they will go no farther, and unless the House backs off, this very important bill — a priority women's rights issue — may be killed.

The House has also added language to two other bills that would limit abortions for military women, military dependents and Peace Corps women to life-saving situations.

If these groups band together and get some help from women's groups distressed over the fate of the pregnancy disability bill, House members who have been voting anti-abortion might find that for the first time, they'll be held accountable for their stand at the polls this fall.

The Daily Citizen 8/31/78

teen talk

jo ann janney

"I believe that some form of marriage and family will endure," re-written here in its entirety. Wilensky's essay which was judged first-place, is 18, in an essay submitted to the Texas Chemical Council, and

patible Is Marriage With A Business and Professional Career'?

The winning essay goes on to say that marriage and family "will endure not because of moral considerations, but out of sheer necessity. Family and marriage have existed since the dawn of civilization. There are simply no practical alternatives.

"I believe, however, that the majority of Americans will decide to have children. The desire to propagate the family line is very powerful because offspring offer the most tangible link to immortality.

Naturally, if both husband and wife have a career and decide to have children, there will be a great deal of strain. There must be a more equal division of labor with the man assuming much more of the household res-

possibilities normally delegated to the woman.

The woman, unfortunately, will still have to make greater sacrifice. It is imperative that a woman devote all of her energy to her child during the critical years (first five years). The woman would thus have to take a leave of absence from her career for these first few years, after which the child could be placed in a child care center. Some sort of federal law should guarantee the security of her job.

The opportunities for satisfaction in career and family life are greater now than ever before, but the responsibilities are enormous. Only time will tell how we bear them."

Watch for future "Teen Talk" columns with essays from the runners-up.

Any teen or ma woman, or child ma respond with opinion this essay or on a thought, idea, viewpoint of his or h own by writing to me this newspaper or 4219 Crownwood, Sea rook, or by calling 47 4377.

ISN'T IT WONDERFUL...how Steve Wilensky, in a mere eighteen years, has already learned the following basic facts of nature:

- 1) A man must assume household responsibilities "normally delegated to the woman" only if the woman has a career and they decide to have children.
- 2) A woman "unfortunately" will have to make a "greater sacrifice" than her husband's sacrificial assumption of some household responsibilities if the couple decides to have children. (Why, if roles are decreed by nature and therefore of equal dignity is her role described as "unfortunate"?)
- 3) It is "imperative" that a woman devote all of her energy to "her" child during its first five years. (Would young Steve care to name the life-sustaining substance or service which a mother alone can provide to a child and without which it would, presumably, die?)
- 4) A woman must leave the labor force for five years after the birth of "her" child, and may confidently rely on the availability of "a child care center" and the guarantee by "some sort of federal law" that her job will be waiting for her when she returns to her career after an "imperative" interruption of five years.

Is it any wonder that this essay, which totally supports the male-dominated industrial status quo, was judged the best by the Texas Chemical Council?
---Twiss Butler

Anyone with specific points they would like to see addressed in an upcoming program meeting on "The Future of Women in the Future of Corporations" should contact Melissa Weiksnar, 965-3032 or 488-1702.

Teen says family will endure

Houston Post 8/31/78

Coast Guard to place more women at sea

WASHINGTON (AP) — More women will be serving at sea and handling tougher assignments under a new policy announced Wednesday by the Coast Guard.

Coast Guard Commandant John B. Hayes said the service is removing restrictions based solely on sex in the training, assignment and career opportunities of its personnel.

Under the policy, all women graduates of the Coast Guard Academy, like the men, will be assigned to sea duty for their initial tours as commissioned officers, and mixed-sex crews may now be assigned to any unit, afloat or ashore, which can provide reasonable privacy for each sex in berthing and personal hygiene.



"These female fittings, are they Ms. or Mrs.?"

The U.S. House of Representatives passed the extension resolution 233 to 189, approving 39 more months for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Ten of the 24 Texas representatives voted for H.J. Res. 638.

As the vote approached, N.O.W. began a nationwide campaign to turn out mail to Congress, urging representatives to vote for the extension. Two field organizers came to Texas to familiarize local N.O.W. members with the telephoning campaign that had proven so effective in their areas. They were Eleanor Self, of Louisville, Ky., and Joan Denman, Alabama State Coordinator. They assisted N.O.W. chapters in Houston, Corpus Christi, Dallas and Fort Worth.

With considerable assistance from Ms. Self, Frances Hicks of Bay Area N.O.W. coordinated the campaign for Houston and the surrounding area. During the second week of August, they gathered some 45 volunteers from various organizations, including N.O.W., L.W.V., W.E.A.L., A.A.U.W., A.C.L.U., Women's Political Caucus, Unitarian Church Women, teenagers and other unaffiliated women and men. Local business offices donated space and telephone lines while volunteers phoned thousands of area residents and asked their permission to send mail to Congress in their names.

The effort targeted U.S. Representatives Bob Eckhardt and Bob Gammage because they were reportedly wavering in support of H.J. Res. 638. In all, 1080 letters, 2428 post cards, and 266 public opinion messages were generated to the two representatives. Rep. Gammage voted for extension and against rescission while Rep. Eckhardt voted for rescission and against extension.

Despite Eckhardt's turncoat action, the effort was deemed successful and Frances Hicks merits commendation for a splendid job. (Funds for the project were provided about equally by Houston Area N.O.W. and National N.O.W.)

The battle is not over, though. The extension resolution now awaits approval of the U.S. Senate, and N.O.W. members are asked to write Senators John Tower and Lloyd Bentsen, to urge them to vote for extension, against rescission, and for cloture (to cut off filibusters against the resolution). Sen. Tower now says he will not vote for the resolution, but we should still try to change his position. He at least may help the resolution by voting for cloture, so urge him to do that. Sen. Bentsen is now considering voting for rescission, and he must be reminded that the extension is a separate matter from rescission, which should be decided alone at another time.

Ms. Hicks also advises members to write Sen. Robert Byrd, Senate majority leader, urging him to bring the resolution, now called S.J.R. 134, to the Senate floor in September. Congress will adjourn at the end of September, so the Senate vote must occur before then. When Senators return after elections in November, the chances of their continued support for the extension are rated as slim. Also, write the Senate Judiciary Committee to support S.J. Res. 134. The address for all Senators is: Senate Office Building, Washington D.C., 20010.

It is hoped that a telephoning campaign can be organized for pressing the Texas Senators into proper action. As soon as a coordinator of the effort can take over, volunteers will be needed. This effort will only involve postcards and so will last a shorter period. Persons who could volunteer as coordinator should phone Ms. Hicks at 488-8574.

BROADSIDE, Houston Area N.O.W.

JOIN N.O.W.: Clip and mail with your check to Marjorie Randal, 1922 Redway, Houston 77062.

_____ I would like to become a member of Bay Area NOW and National NOW. (\$22)

_____ I am already a member of National NOW and wish to pay local dues. (\$ 7)

_____ I want to join but can only afford \$_____.

_____ I am not a member but would like to receive the NEWSLETTER for a year. (\$4)

_____ I would like to make a contribution of \$_____ to NOW.

_____ As a NOW member, I authorize my name and address to be published on the chapter roster.

NAME _____ Home Phone _____ Other Phone _____

ADDRESS _____ City and Zip _____

Occupation _____

Interests and/or skills which I can contribute to Bay Area NOW projects: