

A REPORT TO THE YALE CORPORATION
FROM
THE YALE UNDERGRADUATE WOMEN'S CAUCUS

March, 1977

Ann Olivarius
EDITOR

Daisy Douglas
COORDINATOR

CONTRIBUTORS

Tara Ayres
Steve Baxter
Mia Brandt
Judy Butler
Hank Chesbrough
Phyllis Crocker
Harriet Dichter
Margaret Ferguson
Ann Futter
Barbara Frank
Kathy Hayashi
Eugenia Herbert

Linda Hoaglund
Louise Kennedy
Karen Matthews
Jef McAllister
Carol Mostow
Karen Nelson
Michelle Robertson
Rochelle Sharpe
Abbe Smith
Laura Teller
Yalesbians
Marjorie Yudkin

Yale Women's Studies Task Force

A REPORT TO THE YALE CORPORATION
BY
THE YALE UNDERGRADUATE WOMEN'S CAUCUS

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	page 1
II. "What is it Like to be a Woman at Yale?"	page 1
III. Institutional and Non-Institutional Discrimination	
A. An Overview of Sexism at Yale	page 4
B. Institutional Discrimination	
1. Women's Athletics	page 6
2. Affirmative Action	page 8
3. Faculty Women in Arts and Sciences	page 9
4. Women's Studies	page 12
C. Non-Institutional Discrimination	
1. Yalesbians	page 14
2. Secret Societies	page 15
3. Rape	page 17
IV. Conclusion	page 22

I. INTRODUCTION

The Yale Undergraduate Women's Caucus began as an organization of six women in September 1974. Since that time our membership has grown to include nearly two hundred members of the Yale community. As the Caucus has grown in size we have retained a primarily horizontal organization where members work co-operatively towards common goals. Four coordinators are responsible for organizing our educational, cultural and political activities.

As an educational organization, the Women's Caucus is primarily concerned with bringing women's issues and problems to the attention of the Yale community. Our educational activities include: panel discussions("Must Women Sell Out to Succeed?" Fall, 1976; "Sexism at Yale", Fall, 1976); consciousness-raising groups; self-help groups; Women's Studies discussion table; Faculty Women's Lunch Table; a feminist course critique; and publications(Freshwomen's Booklet, Fall, 1975 and Women's Words, a feminist journal, Spring, 1976).

As a cultural organization, the Women's Caucus provides opportunities for women to be together in an enjoyable, relaxed atmosphere. These events include concerts, poetry readings, films, and open houses.

As a political organization, the Caucus works within Yale on issues of concern to women. A summary of our political efforts includes the following concerns: admissions; Affirmative Action; OB-GYN; Office on the Education of Women; secret societies; security; women's athletics; and women's studies. Our political purpose is clear: to promote the position of women at Yale, thus eliminating institutional and attitudinal sexism.

In November 1976, members of the Women's Caucus orally presented a rough summary of the problems women face at Yale to Maxine Singer and Marion Edelman of the Yale Corporation. At the close of that meeting Ms. Edelman and Ms. Singer suggested that we organize our presentation into a written format. This report is a result of our effort.

This report to the Yale Corporation does not represent an exhaustive and definitive evaluation of the status of women in this institution. We do not have the womanpower, energy, time or resources to perform such a task. Moreover, this report in no way pretends to address the special issues and problems of Third World women. Our purpose is to reaffirm to the Corporation and the Yale Administration that the concerns generated by women's presence on this campus have not been adequately addressed or resolved.

II. "WHAT IS IT LIKE TO BE A WOMAN AT YALE?"

Shortly after I received my acceptance letter from Yale, I was invited to attend an alumni function at one of Philadelphia's many strongholds of old wines, old people, old money -- and predictably enough, given the preceding virtues -- Old Blues. I was assured by the invitation that this was no cheap deal; Kingman Brewster himself was to deliver a few well-chosen words on the desirability of a truly liberal education and the importance of a truly liberal contributor. Some lesser notables were also scheduled to speak. In any event, to make a long story somewhat shorter, I accepted the invitation.

Walking into the dimly lit recesses of the Racquet Club, I was at once struck by several reflections. First, I immediately regretted that I had chosen such an irrevocably loud outfit to wear -- lime green and white checked pants and electric yellow blouse conspired to set me apart from the crowd like the proverbial peacock amidst pin-striped sparrows. Second, I wished that the doorman would stop sneering at me as though I had come to steal the chandelier. (A silly enough assumption -- we certainly did not have enough room for it at my house.) Thirdly, I wished that I had not immediately noticed the sign saying, "No women allowed in the downstairs lounge."

But shrugging aside any misgivings, I entered the Club, went upstairs, and sat down. President Brewster gave a short speech and asked for questions from the floor. Someone asked about co-education; was it really necessary? Brewster gave a well-balanced, prudent answer: yes, the only feasible step financially and otherwise, strengthening the University, giving an equal chance to an equally deserving sector of the population. Times must change. There were some grunts, a few nods, mostly silence. Then an Old Blue raised his hand (or, more accurately, waved his cane) and was called upon. Drawing himself slowly to his feet, he said in a quavery but still readily identifiable Main Line accent, "Mr. Brewster, I may not agree with you on that issue, and I daresay many of my colleagues will be in agreement with me, but truth to tell what I'd really like to know now has not much to do with those girls attending Yale. What I'd really like to know is this: Why can't Yale seem to produce a winning football team?"

And he sat down, to much applause and cane stamping. This, then, was my introduction to the status of women at Yale: we were resented by some; we seemed out of place -- but football was a more important issue in many people's minds.

I have been a woman at Yale for almost four years now. Yale has done more to shape me than any other single fact of my existence. To be sure, that is not an altogether heartening statement.

Let me say before I proceed any further that I love Yale; I would defend it to death in the face of any outsider's criticism; and, yes, I am all for beating Harvard. In fact, I have spent my senior year in an orgy of premature nostalgia for the place.

But my appreciation of Yale's virtues does not blind me to its faults. Admittedly, I was stunningly naive when I entered Phelps Gate for the first time four years ago, for I had envisioned Yale as a place of unbounded opportunities. I believed Yale was the place in which I could mature educationally and socially into a strong and confident woman. I thought that here I could find many women to respect and many men who would respect me, as well as challenge me.

Challenge me they did, although attack might be a more telling word to describe my beginning maneuvers with the opposite sex. It is with blessedly detached amusement that I recall the disagreement I had with one Jeremy Fishman on the steps of Linsley-Chittenden Hall my freshman year. Jeremy and I were taking the same Economics course; he had asked me to go with him to a movie. (As an ~~afterthought~~, he had asked my name, and written it down at the bottom of a suspiciously long list. Things did not bode well for us.)

In any case, there we were on the steps of Linsley-Chit, and there I was trying to repay him for the money he had spent on my ticket. It was only 75¢, and for such a small sum, I was determined to stick to my principles.

"Please, Jeremy," I said, "I really wouldn't feel right if you paid for me. I don't do things that way."

(Actually, I didn't do things any way; this was my first date since Women's Liberation had raised my consciousness. I hadn't had the opportunity to develop a dating

style.)

Jeremy said, "Oh, come on. This Women's Lib. stuff is all a bit much. It makes me feel good to pay for my date."

I said, "Yes, but Jeremy, please take the money. It doesn't make me feel good if you pay for me."

He said, "No."

I said, "What do you mean, 'No?'"

He said, "Quite frankly, I think you're being a little silly about the whole thing."

I said, "And I think you're being amazingly sexist."

That was the catchword. People were starting to stare. Moreover, they were starting to take sides.

Jeremy said, "Whaddya mean, sexist? That's the way I've always done it, and no one else has ever complained."

I said, "Well, I don't know what type of date you've taken out in the past, but I certainly know what type of date you're not taking out in the future."

Murmurs of "right on" were audible from some of the women in the audience. This served only to fuel Jeremy's anger.

"You girls," he shouted, "are all crazy. What harm would it do if I paid seventy-five stinking cents for you to see a movie? It is no big deal. You Women's Libbers are full of it, if you ask me!"

Oh, I was calm. I was controlled. I was the epitome of icy bitchiness.

"Jeremy," I said, "you are making a scene. You are acting like a little child. However, if it means that much to you, you may pay for me."

"No," he said. "I wouldn't dream of it. Please, if you wish to pay, you may do so."

Even in my state of moral indignation, I could tell this was getting a little ridiculous. I handed him my last dollar and told him to keep the change.

To be truthful, the lines of fire have not generally been so blatantly delineated. Nevertheless, I believe they do exist. For instance, a male friend of mine recently noted that the difference between Smith women and Yale women is that Smith women don't have to prove they are smarter than Yale men. Apparently, Yale women do. There are other examples: the reactions at Yale movies when a male actor makes a particularly macho comment (the men clap, the women hiss) are telling examples of the polar tensions between men and women.

Much of the problem, it seems to me, is institutionally induced. Women, as a readily identifiable minority at Yale among the faculty as well as the student body, are terribly conscious of their vulnerable position as outlandish peacocks amidst the sparrows. And in a place which glorifies in its traditions and exults in its rich past, women have served as disruptive and modifying forces. Inadvertently, women have threatened the sanctity of the Yale tradition. In turn, they are threatened by the august weight of almost three hundred and fifty years of womanless past.

It is not easy to be a woman in the face of Yale's environment. I have, I confess, an unholy desire to fling scrambled eggs at the pictures in Branford's Dining Hall -- simply because they are, without exception, pictures of men. I am tired of common rooms full of leather chairs built for six-foot-four crew jocks, into which I sink, tiny and insignificant; of male professors, male teaching assistants, male administrators, male successful undergraduates. I am bored with telling hordes of unbelieving strangers that yes, Yale does accept women; yes, I do go there; and no, I am not a pathological liar with delusions of grandeur.

Yes, there are women at Yale now, but we are still, in a subtle way, the outsiders. And one of the more depressing ways in which some women have chosen to react to their status has been to become more like the prototypical male graduate than the male himself: the Yale woman is far more success-oriented, driven, aggressive than most of her male contemporaries. If I say "depressing," I have several reasons in mind. First, I feel that such emphasis on one's achievements leads ultimately to a kind of unhappy pragmatism; Mr. Brewster's creeping preprofessionalism is merely the beginning manifestation of such an outlook. Second, I am not convinced that the world of power, fame and

glory is so attractive or rewarding as to deserve the attention of so many brilliant women. Third, the burden of such a role makes it difficult to maintain honest and intense personal relationships either with men or women.

For me, a position of leadership at Yale has meant I must constantly shuttle back and forth between the vulnerable "female" self of private relationships and the "dynamic" self of my public role. A male friend of mine used to be somewhat amazed and somewhat taken aback at the change in me; the phone would ring and I would bark orders into it like a German drill sergeant, then hang up and become a limp strudel again. Occasionally, the roles would become somewhat confused; there was the time I called my immediate superior in the Yale Broadcasting Company "Honey" during a General Board meeting or the time I took my erstwhile boyfriend to task for being fifteen minutes late for a date ("You don't seem to realize that I'm a very busy person with a very full schedule"). And although it has created some humorous situations, the necessity to play various roles and the need to compartmentalize my life has also left me feeling inconsistent and schizoid.

I believe this split occurs in every woman who wishes to remain open and vulnerable in her private relationships but also desires to be successful in a world which denigrates displays of emotion. But Yale exacerbates the situation because it primes us for success. The three hundred years of Yale's history are studded with the names of the best and the brightest. On the one hand, this inspires confidence and a feeling that success is almost pre-ordained (as in the New England Life advertisements, I picture a sober-suited captain of industry surrounded by fawning Board members, saying to eager reporters, "My college? Yale University, of course. Why?"). On the other hand, such a tradition generates an atmosphere in which one must constantly test and measure oneself. For many years, I asked myself, "Do I really deserve to be at Yale, or did the Admissions Committee goof?" And as a woman, I felt as though failure to meet Yale's demands would reflect harshly on every woman here. For we are, all of us, fighting for a toehold; we are the outsiders still -- we have had to do better here just as we will have to do better in later endeavors. It is small wonder that Yale women must attempt to prove they are smarter than Yale men; we who do not yet feel as though we have a right to this place must earn that privilege constantly. I was surprised when Matina Horner found Radcliffe women afraid of success; I am afraid of failure.

No matter. Whatever my gripes with Yale may be, the place exerts a magnetic force on me. The Yale tradition which I have suggested has generated some of the conflicts facing Yale women is nevertheless in my blood. I feel an absurd kinship with perfect strangers who pass me on I-95 with Yale stickers on the back of their cars. A Yale Cop umbrella has the power to bring tears to my eyes. I plan to buy the gaudiest and most eye-catching frame made in which to display my hard-earned Yale diploma.

And in point of fact, I look forward to the day, fifty years hence, when I wave my cane at some young President of Yale and ask him (or her, perhaps?) why Yale can't seem to produce a winning women's field hockey team.

Laura Teller, '77

III. INSTITUTIONAL AND NON-INSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION

A. An Overview of Sexism at Yale

Midway through Yale's first decade of co-education, it seems appropriate for Yale to reflect upon the question of how well women have been received into the University. Has Yale gone beyond a superficial acquiescence in the Corporation's commitment to co-education? If so, what does this commitment entail, and most pertinently, what should it entail? To what extent do the problems which exist between women and Yale result, directly or indirectly, from Yale policies, institutional procedures, and faculty and administrative behavior? Finally, what kind of consequences will Yale face if these questions remain unresolved?

Sexual discrimination occurs more often in subtle than overt forms. Catherine A. MacKinnon remarks in "Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sexual Discrimination" that

...intimate violation of women by men, in forms that range from a look to a rape, is sufficiently pervasive in American society as to be nearly invisible.

"Discrimination" and "violation" are words that surpass a merely literal signification. They are attitudes as well as acts.

Sexual discrimination is built into some of the most basic assumptions which constitute the meaning of Yale, a meaning which, though not a static one, has been slow to accommodate itself to the presence of women. Yale's fulfillment of her own potential demands a confrontation with the question posed by the presence of women -- a confrontation which has just begun.

Yale remains predominantly "a gentlemen's world." One recent female graduate was quoted in her high school alumnae magazine:

One of the factors contributing to my peculiar feelings about Yale after being there for three years is the sense that some aspects of the place are inaccessible to me just because I am a woman. It has nothing to do with the social situation... it is just the fact that there is a whole body of Yale tradition and experience that I can't identify with because I am not masculine.

This same graduate went on to explain that women at Yale were for the most part career-oriented and serious, characteristics shared by the majority of Yale students, but that a woman is often treated as a prospective domestic or a curious academic anomaly. Despite such attitudes, the fact remains that she is at Yale because she is preparing to take full responsibility for her life, so that she will have the means to support herself and succeed in a competitive world, alone if she chooses.

A Harvard professor says the recommendations his department receives from Yale tend to praise women as "effervescent," a "nice person to be around," or "a cute addition to your staff." Such qualities are never attributed to men, and never to serious career scholars.

That covert discrimination exists and is even widespread may be readily granted. But the task at hand is determining how institutions, policies, administrators and faculty encourage -- whether actively or passively -- this discrimination and perpetuate the exclusion of women from the meaning of Yale.

One student publication which has been notoriously negligent in its treatment of women is the Yale Banner. In 1974, the Banner published the following quotation from a male undergraduate:

I opened myself to love and discovered really for the first time women at Yale, especially three of them.

I discovered them one after another. They were three girls groping for their womanhood -- ironic, not afraid to say "fuck" when the situation demanded it, and embodying the mother and lady whom they will realize in themselves in years to come.

The above quotation, aside from its self-absorption and condescending stance, articulates the still common view that a woman's worth seems inextricably bound to her ability to help promote male growth.

Such attitudes are not confined to the sphere of student publications, but draw support from the classroom behavior of faculty members as well. A professor of the Religious Studies Department wrote the following on a student's paper in the Spring of 1976:

You have certainly matured as a scholar during the course and compare well with all the male graduate students!

Is the student's success here relative to the quality of her work or only insofar as she "kept up" with the men in the class? What other assumptions about women do the faculty promulgate?

In the Fall of 1976, a professor opened English 29 with a slide of the Sphinx which portrayed a man about to be raped by the Sphinx for his attempt to enter Thebes. After a brief discussion of the slide, he turned to the class and remarked: "All men face the same threat of a hungry, gaping vagina."

On October 20, 1976, a professor discussed Machiavelli's notion of "fortune". He quoted the following from Machiavelli's The Prince:

I am absolutely convinced that it is better to be impetuous than circumspect because Fortune is a woman and you must, if you want to subjugate her, beat and strike her.

After finishing the quotation, the professor made some laughing remarks about it and changed the words slightly to say,

like a woman, Fortune must be raped and beaten.

He repeated this last quotation three times, and then a student from the front of the lecture hall asked him, "How do you do it?" The professor grinned and said, "I'll tell you guys after class." This remark was greeted with loud laughter from an audience of approximately 350 people. One student was sufficiently unsettled by the incident that she went to speak to the professor about it. The professor then explained that he was only trying to capture the philosopher's style. When asked if he would have treated the same passage the same way had it read, "Fortune is a black, you have to chain it and make it submit," he responded that he would not, but that he took the claims of racism more seriously than claims of sexism.

The professor's distinction is an odd one because it fails to recognize that whether claims of discrimination come from female or black voices, they are appeals to a larger humanism and to a commitment to understand and purge the unwarranted assumptions of character that we impose upon others.

Yale has demonstrated the same insensitivity in its staff employment policies. During the summer of 1976, a student was working for the Yale Audio-Visual Department. Her boss became sick and she took over his job temporarily. She applied for the permanent position when he did not return. She was not hired for the ostensible reason that she could not carry heavy boxes. She replied that she had been doing precisely that all summer. The second reason was that the man hired had more electrical knowledge than she had. She pointed out that electrical knowledge was not necessary for the job. Yale agreed but insisted upon hiring the man.

In 1976, the Director of the Office on the Education of Women investigated the status of women in the sciences and in leadership positions in student organizations at Yale for the academic years 1971-72 through 1975-76. Results of these studies were published in the Yale Daily News, the Weekly Bulletin and Calendar and the New Haven Journal-Courier. The Director found that during this five-year period, the 68 top officers of 7 major student organizations included only 4 women, 3 of whom were elected in 1975-76. There were 79 women among a total of 420 members of 9 student groups.

The Director of the Office on the Education of Women also studied the absence of women in certain traditionally male academic fields, specifically: Administrative Science, Chemistry, Economics, Engineering and Applied Science, Mathematics, and Physics. Fifteen women as compared to 179 men in the class of 1976 majored in these fields. Ten of the 15 women were in Economics. With the exception of Abstract Algebra, there are no more than two or three women in any course above Math 27. Only one woman math major graduated in 1976. The male-female ratio of those taking courses in the Engineering Department is 10:1. No woman has yet graduated from Yale majoring in Physics. In addition, admission strives for a 60-40 male-female ratio instead of a 50-50 one. There is only one female department head, and two women Directors of Undergraduate Studies. Although there are 2,000 women who work at Yale in clerical and technical positions, 60 percent earn under the minimum wage of \$7,000 per year.

Even the institution set up to monitor the status of women, the Committee on the Education of Women, did not meet all fall term, although its work was at a crucial point. The Yale Administration could not manage to appoint a chairperson.

Perhaps the best known example of Yale's sexism occurred when the Department of Athletics, Physical Education, and Recreation failed to supply shower facilities for the women's crew team in the Fall of 1976. Not only did this failure directly defy the HEW requirement of equal facilities for men and women, but the condition persisted for four months during which numerous requests for facilities were ignored.

Following is a discussion of certain trouble-spots: areas in which Yale women are not treated as equals to Yale men, as well as areas in which Yale as an institution is not doing all it could to alleviate common attitudinal discriminations against women.

B. Institutional Discrimination

1. Women's Athletics

"I am a member of the women's varsity swim team. Women swimmers have an advantage over other women athletes because we have a coach who believes in our equality.

He attempts to place no more emphasis on the men's team than on the women's. Yet, he is a part of the Yale system. He may try not to favor the men's team, but his job as varsity swim coach is more dependent on the men's performance. Thus, we experience a degree of unfairness. However slight, the unfairness is present and noticeable. Whenever a conflict arises between the men's and the women's schedules, it is the men who receive priority.

"Intra-college sports offer a chance for athletic interaction on an equal level, but there remains a tendency to emphasize the male-only sports. Women are not encouraged or welcome to participate in certain sports. An example is crew. Of the twelve residential colleges, I was one of the two women who competed, and even the Master of my college expressed disbelief and some disapproval that I was rowing."

Michelle Robertson '79

Yale's Athletic Department has not provided a sufficient structure for the organization, development and advancement of a women's athletic program. As a result, student athletes must struggle to obtain the financial and administrative support necessary to establish and maintain women's teams. Every Departmental decision reflects inferior commitment to women's athletics.

a. Title IX Yale is in violation of Title IX. The law specifically mandates equal opportunity in key areas where Yale is negligent:

- selection of sports and levels of competition: intracollege and intercollegiate
- use of facilities and provision of equipment and supplies
- scheduling of games and practice times
- travel budget
- coaching (particularly full-time)
- trainers (there is presently only one trainer for women)
- publicity

b. Intercollegiate Athletics Women's varsity teams do not receive adequate support from the athletic department. They must take a back seat to men's sports in the scheduling of games and practices and in the allocation of equipment and supplies. The travel budgets for women are too limited to allow them a broad range of competition. There are too few junior varsity teams -- an indication of Yale's lack of commitment to depth in its women's athletic program. Coaches receive mediocre salaries, and many coaches are part-time so that they are not in a position to plan ahead but must contain their efforts to seasonal responsibilities. Thus women are not fairly represented when the Athletic Department plans ahead, and there is only one woman who takes part in administration policy-making.

Of course, all the teams are having to tighten their belts now. While men's teams, however, can often depend on funds from supportive alumni, women athletes cannot. Yale does not seem to differentiate between the effect of taking money away from a fairly stable program and the effect of decreasing the budget for a program already inadequately provided for.

c. Club Sports Many women must turn to club sport participation because their sport does not exist on a varsity level. They are then forced into a program which relies much more on student initiative and financial independence than a varsity sport. For example, the women's soccer team has a coach who is paid \$350.00. The captain of the team arranges the schedule by calling other schools from her room. Transportation to away games is individually arranged. There is not enough money in the budget for a lot of travel, so she tries to arrange most home games. But "sports etiquette" requires teams to reciprocate away games. Women club sport participants, like their varsity counterparts, also lack alumni support. Since men's teams have existed for so long at

Yale, they are intra-college out of choice. Women's club sports exist with this designation because it is the only inroad into the sports structure available to them. As club sports they receive nominal financial and administrative support. This hampers their attempt to develop their full potential, to reach a level of competence where they can choose whether to keep the informality of club status or advance to more serious athletic competition.

Many women were not involved in high school varsity athletics, so they are not trained, either physically or psychologically, as serious athletes. Women appreciate the flexibility and informality of the club sport program because it allows them to participate on a team from which they might have been excluded by more formal requirements. However, while giving women the opportunity to devote energy and dedication to their sport, this informality has serious drawbacks. Responsibility for running the team rests, for the most part, on players who are full-time students. These women must learn the ropes of the athletic administration and take care of the daily organizational details. There is no continuity among coaches and captains from year to year, and minimal guidance from the administration makes it impossible to plan ahead or build upon established contacts. These problems are obviously frustrating for all involved; they dampen morale, undermine team unity, and force the women to devote their energy to bureaucratic matters rather than to their performance.

Women are caught in a demoralizing cycle perpetuated by Yale. As girls, we were not exposed to a variety of sports, nor were we overly encouraged to participate in those available. Hence, we never received the guidance of qualified coaches and have not developed our athletic potential. But Yale tells us that we cannot receive more support until we show improvement and commitment. So our program does not improve. Our choices are limited. Either we jump into hard-nosed competition and succeed, or we never get any further. Thus far, there is no middle ground. There are very few intramural teams in which we can participate, and Yale has not provided a smooth transition from club to varsity teams. We either have flexibility with no support, or insufficient support with no flexibility. We ask Yale to break this cycle, to provide serious athletes with both strong support and good competition and to provide less serious athletes with a structure in which to experience a healthy team commitment and enjoyable athletic endeavors.

Barbara Frank '77
Karen Nelson '78
Abbe Smith '78

2. Affirmative Action

As an institution of national import, Yale should provide an effective Affirmative Action program for two reasons. First, Yale must be in the vanguard of institutions helping women to overcome social barriers to equal opportunity. Employing higher numbers of qualified women on the prestigious Yale faculty is the most effective example Yale can set for society. Second, as a primary source of future leaders, Yale has a responsibility to the women it admits to provide them with an educational situation encouraging study in whatever discipline they choose to pursue. Female scholars studying in predominantly male departments are not likely to receive the support necessary to induce them to devote the effort required for advanced study.

An effective Affirmative Action program also benefits men. More women faculty would give the faculty a diversity of perspective which would break down socially ingrained stereotypes. The elimination of pejorative stereotypes marks the beginning of a true liberal arts education: it liberates the mind so that a more objective search for truth can occur.

While the Yale Administration has recognized the need for Affirmative Action in its public statements, an examination of the results of its attempts call the sincerity of Yale's commitment into question. The number of women faculty at Yale has increased by 46 over the past five years, and the percentage of women in the total faculty has risen from 9.2 percent to 12.1 percent(excluding the nursing school). While the Medical

School faculty has increased in number by 40 in the last five years, the number of women on the faculty has decreased by five during that time, and the percentage of women on the Medical School faculty has dropped from 13.7 percent to 11.5 percent. The College of Arts and Sciences and the Medical School employ 84 percent of the faculty. If Affirmative Action policies do not succeed in these schools, Yale's Affirmative Action program is doomed to fail throughout the University.

The tenure situation for women faculty is even more discouraging. Both the Medical School and the College of Arts and Sciences have expanded the number of tenure slots moderately in the past five years (Medical School faculty up 43, Arts and Sciences up 20). Five years ago, there were but two women tenured on the Arts and Sciences faculty, and three at the Medical School. Despite the expansion of the tenured faculty, only three more women received tenure in the Arts and Sciences (a total of 5 out of 322, or 1.6 percent), and only 4 more in the Medical School (a total of 7 out of 171, or 4.1 percent).

This record is far from impressive. Yet, the University's financial troubles indicate that the number of tenured faculty is not likely to increase, making the process of tenuring women more difficult in the next five years than it was in the past. If the record now is far from satisfactory, the future augurs for little hope.

Hank Chesbrough '79

3. Faculty Women in Arts and Sciences

Although Yale has an Affirmative Action Plan that has been approved by HEW, opinions provided by the women faculty for this report indicate that women suffer discriminatory treatment. Women faculty believe that they are not welcome at Yale and that there is no "right" approach to being here. The faculty woman who does all the "right" things -- teaches, publishes, scorns all women's activities -- can still find herself not taken seriously when promotion and tenure decisions are made. The woman who acknowledges the special pressures and duties of a woman scholar and who devotes time to trying to challenge discrimination at Yale (e.g., by serving on graduate admissions committees or search committees) finds herself exhausted by having to take upon herself the bettering of a situation without the Administration's support. Women continually feel that when they call the attention of the Provost and Deans to issues involving women, they are viewed as abrasive or annoying.

The University is not committed to Affirmative Action. Major committees dealing with women and minority issues are chaired by white men. Many women see the recent appointment of a man to chair the Committee on the Education of Women representative of the failure of the Administration to select interested women to head key committees. The President's Advisory Committee on Affirmative Action was headed by three successive men. A tenured woman who served on that committee for four years suggested that she would have chaired the committee had she been offered the post. No woman sits on the Senior Appointments Committee in Humanities, Social Sciences, or Physical Sciences. No woman faculty member sits on the Executive Committee of Yale College. President Brewster insists that he is searching for women to act as College Masters; yet the requirements of tenure, marriage and faculty status make finding such a woman virtually impossible. Only two Deans of residential colleges are female although this position provides significant administrative experience for those who would like to seek jobs in college administration. There are no special requirements that would prevent the Yale College Dean's Office from appointing women to this post.

Despite an ostensible commitment to Affirmative Action, the University rarely checks on junior faculty searches and appointments before offers have gone to candidates. The Junior Appointments Committee serves to rubber-stamp commitments departments have already made, rather than examining procedures and credentials of candidates considered. Cases of departure from prescribed procedures in promotion and tenure decisions have prompted women to urge that negative decisions also be reviewed by the Senior Appointments Committee. Faculty members feel that measures for reviewing departmental decisions outside the departments must be institutionalized. If the University were

really committed to Affirmative Action, it would review the case of every woman and minority faculty member eligible for tenure, and would ask departments to solicit outside evaluations before making tenure decisions. For example, a woman recently denied promotion by the Anthropology Department felt her case would have been more fairly judged had her department solicited outside evaluations at the time when they made the decision about whether or not to consider her for tenure. The practice of this department is to solicit letters only when they have definitely decided to consider a person for tenure, and many women are let go prior to this decision.

At a recent reception (given by the Provost) for women faculty, an associate professor in a Humanities department said that she had never met a woman under forty who was content at Yale. She noted that, of the women in the room, almost all of the assistant professors had not been promoted after six difficult years. Of the women present, none of the associate professors had been given tenure. One tenured woman remarked that if she had started at Yale, she would never have had the courage or energy for the fight necessary to achieve promotion. A large number of the women present were in non-ladder faculty slots -- lecturer, research associate -- positions often granted to them by an administration intent on keeping their husbands.

While there must be a small number of faculty women who are content, many women at Yale feel that their presence serves the purpose of tokenism rather than representing a genuine effort on the part of Yale to incorporate women scholars and researchers into the University. In short, as Elizabeth Janeway has said, "Nothing much has happened." The situation at Yale remains intolerable for women faculty given the extra burdens imposed upon them and the initial predisposition against them.

A large group of faculty women is currently working on a report on women at Yale which will incorporate the experiences of faculty women at the various Schools as well as the particular concerns of minority women and men in the Arts and Sciences. We have attached a letter from a faculty woman which expresses the frustration many of us feel, as well as a letter from a group of women scholars and artists who have been trying to establish a Yale research institute.

If members of the Corporation are interested in discussing these matters with women faculty members, such meetings could be arranged through the Yale Women's Forum.

Yale Faculty Women

"When I was a graduate student in 1971, a committee chaired by Professor Thomas Greene asked me for a letter about the problems facing women with academic careers. My reply, which detailed the subtle forms of discrimination I had encountered at Yale (mainly having to do with professorial 'attitudes' toward female students), was part of a chorus of female comments which the Greene report described as 'frequently discouraged, at times impatient, sometimes bitter, always concerned;' the letters led the Committee to conclude that 'at every step of the way, from graduate student to professor, women desiring professional careers face pressures and obstacles that often defeat all but the strongest and most determined.'

"Six years have passed and much has changed for me personally and for women at Yale in general. I received my degree and was hired as an assistant professor in a department which now has two tenured women professors (as opposed to one in 1971) and which has at least twice as many women in non-tenured ladder positions as it had six years ago. I have been part of a statistical improvement in the 'status of women at Yale;' and I am well aware that there have been atmospheric improvements as well: none of my colleagues would now ask, in committee or in class, for the 'girl's point of view' (as one of my graduate professors did). Why, then, do I still agree with the Greene Report that 'the pressures and obstacles' facing women at Yale are immense? And why do I feel that, even if I were to be offered tenure (as no woman from the ranks of my department has ever been) -- if, in other words, I were to join the group of the 'strongest and most determined' -- the human price would be too great for me to want to stay at Yale?

"The pressures on female junior faculty here are, I think, greater than considerable ones (to publish while teaching a heavy load) placed on all assistant professors in my

department. Because there are fewer women than men, we get put on more committees, departmental and University. Like minority men, Yale faculty women are also under more pressure from students wanting advice and special tutorials than are white male colleagues. Finally (and this point bears on my question about the high price that Yale requires women to pay in human terms), I see little evidence that women can succeed at Yale and at the same time have a family life. Neither of my two senior female colleagues has a family, and there is an implicit assumption, which I've seen while sitting on a junior appointments committee, that married women, or women with children, are not 'serious' scholars. Until Yale makes clear its policy about maternity leaves and part-time work, I, like most of my younger women colleagues, will continue to feel that we must leave Yale for places with more flexible policies if we are to have the combination of career and family which our male colleagues take for granted in their own lives. Until Yale's President not only accepts but genuinely supports Affirmative Action, departmental hiring committees (like the one I served on) will continue to evade even the letter, not to mention the spirit, of the Associate Provost's 'guidelines' for conducting national searches for female and minority candidates; and women will continue to feel the special pressures of 'minority number' status. Until Yale makes a stronger and more imaginative commitment to the women who are already here, we will continue to feel that we must not only be like men, but stronger than they are-- and the price of success may seem, to some of us, too high to pay."

Margaret Ferguson
English Department

"In the Spring of 1973 a committee was formed to explore the possibility of establishing an institute for independent research for unaffiliated scholars and artists in the New Haven community. This seemed a vital need because of the lack of adequate opportunities for professionally trained people who are tied to the area because of family commitments and who often suffer from isolation and lack of institutional identification. Such a center would provide professional contacts and stimulus for its at-large members and research grants and working space for a smaller group selected as fellows. It would also hope to produce a series of scholarly publications.

"Since the core of its membership would inevitably be Yale spouses, it was felt that it would be in the University's interest to sponsor the project in order to help attract and hold outstanding faculty who are increasingly concerned over the lack of openings in the New Haven area for their professionally trained wives and in some cases husbands. At the same time it would serve as a resource center for Yale and the community. From the start, however, it has been assumed that the bulk of the funding would come from sources outside the University.

"A draft proposal for the institute was discussed with the Associate Provost in May-June 1973 and with President Brewster the following month. At that time he gave tentative approval and referred representatives of the committee to members of his staff to draw up more specific plans concerning the organization of the institute and its budget and space requirements. This was done over the fall and winter of 1973-74. There followed a year's hiatus while a new provost was appointed, but beginning in January 1975 and continuing through the Spring of 1976 three members of the committee met with Provost Gray. She agreed that there were many well-trained women who were unable to find work in the New Haven area but tended to limit her concern to faculty spouses and minimize the value of reaching out into the community for non-Yale connected scholars and artists. She also expressed some doubts about the value of an institute per se, feeling that professional women should somehow have a closer relationship to appropriate departments within the University. The committee agreed that this would be desirable but doubted the likelihood that it would happen on a significant scale. It was the understanding of the committee, however, that she was ready to appoint a part-time administrator in the fiscal year beginning July of 1976 to draft specific approaches to the problem and explore sources of possible funding for programs.

"No such appointment was made and in late November of 1976 the committee was informed

that a feasibility study would be undertaken by the office of the Associate Provost. No timetable was offered and there is now considerable doubt that the University plans any concrete action to resolve a problem which is becoming increasingly critical with each passing year. An open forum devoted to the question will be held in mid-February and it seems likely that there will be an effort to gain funding for an institute without direct ties to Yale."

Eugenia W. Herbert
Research Affiliate, History

4. Women's Studies

The central intent of inquiry about women is to establish that the human experience is as much female as male. One of its earliest benefits has proved that viewing human experience from the point of view of women illuminates and clarifies the male experience as well as the whole of human culture. Indeed, recent scholarship about women shows that accurate understanding of human behavior, culture and society is unattainable without adequate investigation of women's experience. Innovative inquiry from women's perspective in traditional disciplines has already led scholars to reexamine preexisting assumptions and data. In any discipline, the introduction of women's studies has three major functions: to expand empirical knowledge through the collection of new data; to criticize existing theory and literature, and to formulate new paradigms and organizing concepts.

As of 1974, there were 112 women's studies programs and 4,658 courses at 885 colleges and universities across the country. Stanford, Princeton, Barnard, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Rutgers and the University of Pennsylvania are just a few of the schools with excellent women's studies courses. The growing network of scholars has led to the creation of several new journals (among them, Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society) and the founding of a professional organization; the National Women's Studies Association.

Although Yale has been slow to make an overall commitment to women's studies, there already exists here much potential for an exciting program, one which would both inform the broader curriculum and allow interested students to pursue advanced investigation in the field. Indeed, the need for this kind of curricular development was firmly established by the 1973-1974 Report of the President's Advisory Committee on the Education of Women. A questionnaire which that Committee sent out to a random sample of undergraduates revealed both students' ignorance of basic historical information pertaining to women and their interest in taking women's studies courses. (69 percent of the women and 45 percent of the men expressed a desire to take courses concerning women.) The oversubscription to many women's studies courses further indicates the dimensions of the student constituency, with women's studies seminar professors receiving up to 200 applications for 20-person seminars. And in the sheer number of offerings, Yale has not fared too badly, with a wide variety of titles having been given over the past six years.

These courses have provided much needed information and exciting intellectual discussion to both students and faculty. These courses, however, have also frustrated all those who wish to study the field systematically and developmentally. The near-total turnover in course offerings from year to year leads to critical gaps and replication of substance covered, as well as to difficulties in planning a course of study. In addition, the lack of a coordinated sequence of courses hinders some students' efforts to grapple with sophisticated questions, while others are lost by their lack of preparation.

These problems in turn are closely related to the precarious position of women faculty and other women's studies instructors at Yale. Some very successful women's studies courses have been offered through the college seminar system where they are not renewable after two years. The common University tactic of hiring women as visiting lecturers, or giving them two-year appointments, also affects the departmental offerings. Women assistant professors are overworked and in a sufficiently precarious situation that women's studies is hampered. One assistant professor taught a women's studies college

seminar when she was a graduate student at Yale, but was warned after being hired as full-time faculty that a request to teach a course about women and literature would "peg" her and hurt her career. Another faculty woman spoke of having to divide her research time between her real interest, women's history, and another more "legitimate" topic. The ignorance of senior faculty about the new scholarship about women and their refusal to view it as a legitimate research interest not only inhibits already-hired faculty but also perpetuates the problem in the hiring process. Hence, the scholars doing the most important work in the field of women's studies do not tend to be hired by Yale.

In a first step toward redressing the problems of women's studies at Yale, the Yale Women's Studies Task Force determined to design an introductory interdisciplinary course in women's studies. This Core Course will serve the undergraduate student body at large, introducing both substantive information about women and the conceptual issues, perspectives and paradigms basic to the new scholarship about women. Planning of the course has been progressing this year with the aid of \$4,500 from an endowed Yale College fund for curricular development. But again the problems of the scarcity and overextension of women's studies faculty, and women's faculty in general, have hampered the process. While the course outline has elicited enthusiastic support, with several faculty members expressing a desire to contribute a few lectures there has been great difficulty in locating professors with the time to take the responsibility for the course's overall coordination and integration. (Interestingly, the 1978 Summer Term unit on women's studies has been swamped with faculty proposals for courses, again indicating the potential faculty constituency.)

The Core Course is also the central requirement in the Task Force's proposed Women's Studies major. In addition to the introductory course, students would choose from available departmental offerings six courses that focus on the study of women. Each student would also select six courses in one of the Yale departments such as Anthropology, History, etc. Students would acquire grounding in a specific discipline while retaining the broader interdisciplinary, cross-cultural and comparative perspective necessary for a sophisticated analysis of women and gender in culture and society. Advisors aware of the demands of the field would aid students in establishing criteria for selecting courses and organizing their academic experience.

The problems which have plagued women's studies at Yale are those which are basic to the status of women at Yale; the nagging marginality of women faculty enforced by tokenism, rapid turnover, isolation, the lack of an overall structure and the unwillingness of a male institution to reexamine its assumptions and priorities. A commitment to women's studies is both a commitment to women at Yale and a sign that the University is willing to engage in the fundamental task of higher learning. Yale must not only open classrooms, dormitories, playing fields and health services; it must also open minds.

Recommendations

1. The granting of permanent status to the introductory course in women's studies.
2. The appointment of an Executive Committee of knowledgeable faculty as an administrative and advisory body for women's studies at Yale. This Committee would also serve as liaison with the various departments preventing duplication in course offerings and insuring the continuation of basic women's studies courses. Finally, the Committee would take on an educational and advocacy role within the departments, encouraging relevant departmental colloquia, the hiring of outstanding women's studies scholars and the inclusion of the new scholarships about women in the general curriculum.
3. The approval of the above outlined women's studies program as a major. A member of the Executive Committee would serve as the Director of Undergraduate Studies for the program.
4. The integration of successful women's studies courses from Summer Term of 1978 into the regular curriculum.

5. Consideration should be given to the establishment of an endowed chair to further the study of women and gender in culture and society.

Carol Mostow '77
Yale Women's Studies Task Force

C. Non-Institutional Discrimination

1. Yalesbians

"I was not openly gay, though I never pretended to have any interest in men and wore the kind of clothing I am most comfortable in, namely pants, shirts, and sweaters. I always figured I would run into trouble if at least certain people in the office knew I was gay. I did not realize what kind of trouble until one day during the summer of 1976, Claudia, my immediate supervisor, called me into her office and asked me if I was gay.

"My affirmative answer set off a chain of incidents that made working in the office almost totally impossible. First, Claudia informed me that she had long since figured out that I was gay and had discussed it with several women on my staff, following one woman's telling another that I had made a pass at her (untrue) and the second woman's telling Claudia. Claudia said she had 'discussed' the 'problem' with them, even having to explain to one woman what a lesbian was -- all this without my knowledge and without Claudia asking me if, indeed, I was gay. Claudia then informed me that several women in the office felt uncomfortable around me, including herself, because I was always looking at their breasts. Not having any particular interest in breasts, I knew this was ridiculous and pointed out that I am only 5'2" and that most of the other women were just enough taller than myself that my eyes naturally hit them at breast level. After thinking about this, Claudia agreed and then laughed the whole thing off. I could not. Claudia also informed me that I didn't have my own office because our supervisor couldn't trust me to be alone with a woman on our staff in a closed office, and that he liked being able to pass my desk and realize a dyke was sitting there because it helped fulfill his lesbian sexual fantasies.

"After this first talk with Claudia, similar talks became a regular part of our routine. Any problems with my staff were blamed on my lesbianism."

Lesbians suffer the double bind of belonging to two ~~minorities~~ within the Yale community -- women and gays. While most of us perceive our main problem as being female in a traditionally male institution, our lesbianism is a factor that adds greatly to our adjustment to and functioning within the Yale community.

Lesbians at Yale, both students and staff, face an odd combination of discrimination and invisibility. Hostility towards lesbians manifests itself in a number of ways. Last year the Weekly Bulletin and Calendar refused to accept notices of our meetings until one of our members had returned to their office several times. Subsequently two of our notices were mysteriously "lost". When our office in Hendrie Hall was destroyed in a fire it was over a month before anyone in the administration would see us to arrange alternative space, while a service fraternity that was also burned out was moved almost immediately.

The fact that Yale has no official policy on homosexuals, although it does on women and ethnic minorities, allows individuals to rest safe in their unquestioned assumptions about "queers" in ways they have not been able to rest, at least overtly, in their feelings about women and blacks. A university policy obviously does not erase students' racist or sexist feelings. It does force them to question the acceptability of those feelings. Students, racist or not, realize that "nigger" jokes are not acceptable, while "faggot and dyke" jokes are frequent. The assumption seems to be that of course all students are heterosexual.

Yalesbians was established in September of 1975. Because the Gay Alliance at Yale was predominantly male, we felt that a separate group would minister more directly to our position as women and gays. Although the two groups meet separately, we have continued to work with the men's group. Aside from sharing an office with G.A.Y., we run a nightly telephone counseling and information service, produce a weekly hour-long radio show for WYBC and run a speakers bureau.

We do not maintain a membership list, but we have increased from twenty women in the Fall of 1975 to approximately one hundred. Our members are undergraduates, graduate and professional students, alumnae and staff. Our apparently small membership is deceptive: many lesbians will never approach a lesbian organization largely because they fear discovery.

Academic Problems: Many women do not identify themselves as lesbians until college or later. For those of us who recognized our lesbianism in high school, our first problems with Yale arose during the admission process. Since Yale has no affirmative policy on gays, a lesbian applying for admission is not likely to list gay organizations in her background, or mention them during interviews. And yet parallel experiences in political activities, civil rights work or the Women's Movement are viewed as enriching a student, and are positive factors in admissions.

Once a lesbian has entered Yale, her lesbianism strongly affects her classroom experience. In most cases she is probably not vocally a lesbian, and is afraid to be identified as gay. When one is constantly tense or fearful, it is understandable that the quality of one's work might suffer.

It might seem that a woman's sexual orientation would have little bearing on her academic life. However, homosexuality does come up in classroom settings, e.g., in a psychology course studying "deviant behavior" or in a political science class studying ancient Greece. If a student does admit her lesbianism in a class, it is not unusual for all her subsequent participation to be passed through a lesbian filter, at which point all her opinions may be discredited on the basis of her lesbianism.

A student may remain silent because she fears a poor grade, reflecting the bias of a homophobic instructor. The situation becomes even more tense when the professor or instructor has actually made anti-gay remarks, as happens all too frequently. The student has no one to appeal to outside of the classroom to counter the instructor's bias, and the only answer may seem to be dropping the course. But what does one do when three of her professors have cracked homosexual jokes?

By its silence, the University is tacitly condoning the discrimination faced by its gay students and staff. Yale itself loses by limiting our potential.

Tara Ayres '79 in conjunction with Yalesbians

2. Secret Societies

There is little opposition to the charge that all-male secret societies, Wolf's Head, Skull and Bones and Scroll and Key, are guilty of one of the most blatant examples of sexism still alive at Yale.

Many students at Yale see membership in a secret society as an extreme version of the elitism all students accept when they come to Yale. Taking an unnamed all-male society as an example, there are great material advantages enjoyed by the fifteen members for an entire year: a formidable private building with two libraries, two dining rooms, a ceremonial hall, a recreation room, a large kitchen and a trophy room. The members enjoy a served dinner with wine twice a week, followed by cigars and any kind of liquor they wish. There is also an unlimited supply of marijuana. The society is closed, except on rare occasions, to members of the Yale and New Haven communities.

The ethnic and class composition of this society's membership is also worth noting. Though the society claims to seek a diverse, heterogeneous selection of students, certain trends are in evidence. A significant proportion of those who gain admission are from wealthy white Anglo-Saxon Protestant families. Those who are not rich are members of another elite, captains of teams and other varsity letter athletes. Compared to the percentage of Jewish students at Yale (40 percent), Jewish membership in this particular society is thirteen percent, or two members. Until a confrontation

in the 'fifties, Jewish students could not join at all. There are two black members, neither of whom has a reputation for being vocal on racial issues. While the society claims to be interested in developing leadership potential, it seems that the sincerely activist elements in the Yale community are often overlooked, or perhaps reject the offer of admission.

This secret society has been described by its more disgruntled members as being a miniature version of an exclusive, upper-class businessman's club. These students are being prepared for a world where they will not recognize the existence of women or members of minority groups. The alumni job network, a system whereby better-established alumni give preference to "society-boys" for desirable jobs, further reinforces this invidious distinction. Politically its leanings are liberal and/or apathetic; few activists find the time to sit for hours by a fire, listening to each other's personal histories over brandy and cigars, or would feel justified in possessing the exclusive use of the substantial material privileges with only fourteen other students. As one dissatisfied member puts it, "The ludicrous after-dinner scene of a group of twenty-one year-olds puffing cigars, sipping cognac, and trying to emulate their conception of the Board of Directors of General Motors is nauseating."

It is the general consensus of this society's current members that the alumni feel strongly that the Yale they knew is the only Yale worth having. Their inflexibility has caused observers to speculate that perhaps they have an investment in perpetuating the class, sex and racial segregation that characterized the experience they seek to preserve. Many alumni function in insulated circles similar to that which a secret society emulates. A drastic change in the society threatens the perpetuation of the only social structure they have ever known.

A variety of reasons could be hazarded as to why some alumni so vehemently resist the idea of their societies admitting women. Many went through all-male preparatory schools, on to Yale, and then into all-male business circles. They have lived in a world where sex roles are rigidly defined; the gaps in communication they have experienced as a result of role playing cause them to perceive women as shallow, incapable and even insincere. Perhaps the secret society alumnus who opposes the admission of women believes they could not add substance because the insincere encounters he has had with women naturally had little substance. While he puts women down, he is also terrified of being in close, profound contact with them. This combination of condescension and fear results in threats by various alumni to dynamite the society, or as one construction company owner put it,

raze this building if you let women in here.

It can be concluded, then, that the alumni insist on the exclusion of women from the societies for three reasons. First, some alumni do not consider women equally substantial, capable or profound as men, and therefore believe that their presence would diminish the quality of the social interchange. Second, they do not wish women to attain positions of status and power which membership in a society implies. Third, they wish to insulate themselves from women because of fears developed over years of superficial, alienating sex-role playing.

Of these three, it appears that the present membership is only influenced by the last. Each of the three all-male societies has discussed admitting women this year. There was not even the slightest implication that objections to women's participation were due to any deficiency on women's part. The men were candid about the fact that their primary reason for wanting to exclude women was their own confusion and uneasiness in women's presence, which would make conditions for intimacy less than desirable. Inability to break through sex roles was blamed for the insincere relations between men and women at Yale. The men hoped it would change "some day soon" and candidly admitted that they were unhappy with their necessity to insulate themselves from women.

These men are supposedly being prepared for leadership by means of an educational experience. Yet they refuse to take action to alleviate a condition which they find imperfect. The present members of the societies will probably be employers some day. Will they continue to keep women at arm's length in the career world as well? If they

continue to put off wholly accepting women into their lives, they will simply perpetuate the rift of distrust and misunderstanding between the sexes which they blame for their alienation. But if they face the initial discomforts of the breaking down of barriers, their lives will be enriched and more open. The personal contact with women which they have so far avoided would surely prove to them that women can be deep, sensitive, understanding friends and intelligent, capable professionals and leaders.

3. Rape

Mia Brandt '77

It is not uncommon to hear complaints by women students of being propositioned by Yale faculty members. Here is one example:

a. A Student Being Propositioned by a Faculty Member Sometime around the middle of my first semester at Yale, I was returned a philosophy paper with a grade of 'A' but without any comments except for the sentence, "Please make an arrangement to talk with me about this paper." The paper had been graded by my discussion leader, Charles. I made an appointment to see him to talk about the paper; the appointment was for Wednesday afternoon, the day before Thanksgiving. When I arrived that afternoon for the talk, Charles was not there. I waited for about forty-five minutes, and then left.

After the vacation, I again got in touch with him to have the talk. We agreed to meet on a certain afternoon that week, in his office in Linsley-Chit. A day before we were supposed to meet, I talked with Charles and he asked me, "Do you particularly want to meet in my office?" I replied that it didn't matter to me where we met, thinking he wanted to talk outside instead of in his small office, it being autumn and the weather beautiful. He then suggested we meet to talk at Naples. I had discussed my papers with him twice before, the first time in his office, and the second time at Naples. I agreed to meet him at Naples. Also, somewhere during our conversation we agreed to change the meeting time from afternoon to after dinner, about 7:00 p.m.

When I arrived at Naples at 7:00, Charles was already there waiting on the avenue outside. He asked me if I really wanted to talk at Naples; again, I didn't see any particular reason why we should talk there over any other place, so I replied, "No, it doesn't matter." He said he had his car with him and made a gesture for me to get in. I was surprised, but thought perhaps this was one of the things one did in college, had informal meetings with one's T.A. He didn't tell me where we were going, and I, feeling unsure of what was proper protocol in the situation and also not wanting to seem ignorant in front of someone more sophisticated, at ease, and in authority, declined to ask. I suspected we were going to his home, though; and my suspicion was confirmed when he began to describe his house to me. After what was probably a fifteen-minute drive which took us farther and farther from Yale and into an area I was completely unfamiliar with, we arrived at his house. I had no idea where I was.

Charles offered me a drink almost immediately after we got inside. I said no thank you at first, explaining that I didn't like the taste of alcohol. He continued to suggest different kinds of wines and liqueurs. I accepted a glass of sherry because I felt uncomfortable and wanted him to stop. He had a small glass of wine. We sat down on the sofa and talked about my paper.

The discussion of the paper went well and I forgot my apprehension about being alone with him in his house. I felt that, after all, this meeting was not so different from the previous two. But after we had just about finished talking about the paper, and were trailing off into other related philosophical problems, his tone changed and he said he wanted to ask me a question. He had heard from someone in our discussion section that a certain woman in our section was afraid to talk with him about her work because she was afraid he would make advances towards her. This woman, he had heard, was in my college, Jonathan Edwards, and he wanted to know if I knew the woman or knew anything more about the matter. I was very surprised that he came up with something so bizarre and unrelated to my paper, when the other things we had been talking about had been academic and not personal. I told him I didn't know anything about the matter, and asked him why he had brought it up. He said he had been worried about this woman getting the wrong impression of him, because he had no intentions of the kind, and because

he didn't want rumors circulating about him. He told me that after he heard about this woman, he had tried to figure out who she was by looking in his list of students and recalling which women had been in to discuss their papers with him. I had been the only one he had found in his class records who had had a consultation with him. He said he didn't think I was the one, because the woman in question was supposedly failing in class and I wasn't failing.

After this mysterious turn in the conversation we talked about certain concerns I had brought up in my two papers and possible topics for my third paper. After about ten minutes I decided I had gotten enough help and ideas to think about and wanted to go back to campus to study for the rest of the evening. I told Charles I had to be going because I wanted to do my Japanese. He acknowledged my request, but kept on talking as if he was reluctant to have me leave. After a few minutes I repeated that I really wanted to go back and we got up. Then he came around in front of me and kissed me. It was a "French kiss". I was again surprised but played along because I wasn't sure what was going on, and the idea of being desirable to my teacher attracted me. But after the kiss and the small silence which followed it, I said again that I wanted to go. He said, "You'll come and see me sometime, won't you?" I said, "Yes," because I really didn't know what else to say. I was anxious to leave, but I had to wait for him to find his car keys. While he looked for them he kept talking about me visiting him, or something related to that. I don't remember well because I was preoccupied with wondering why he suddenly couldn't find his keys, when he would find them, and why he was going on about my visiting him. He found the keys, and we drove back to campus. But the drive back was horrible because he held my hand and kept asking me if I would really visit him, saying he was afraid I "really wasn't going to." My attraction to this game had faded during the time he had been searching for his keys, but I was still playing along with him by not withdrawing my hand and by agreeing that I would visit him. I did this not because I wanted to see what would happen but because I wanted to make it easy for myself during the time I was in the car with him. In the course of urging me to visit him he tried to reassure me that our personal relationship would not affect my grade. According to him, he was completely objective about papers, and would separate his feelings toward me from his evaluation of my paper. I admitted that I was apprehensive about personal encounters with him and their relation to my grade and his attitude in criticizing my work. He persisted, however, in talking to me about his complete objectivity, and I fell into silence, seeing it was pointless to try to refute him. When we reached campus I left the car.

Either the next day, or the day after, I called my dean and said, "I would like to have my final paper graded by another T.A. because I don't feel my present one can be objective." The dean asked me to come in to talk about it. I did speak to him and told him very briefly and simply that the reason I wanted my paper graded by another T.A. was because Charles had made advances towards me. My dean asked who my T.A. was and agreed to arrange for my paper to be graded by someone else. But he did not take my statement about Charles' advances very seriously. The dean didn't ask me what I meant, or what had happened, and since I was not anxious to volunteer information, I said no more.

My dean called me in to see him, a day or so after. He had talked to my Philosophy professor. When he told her my reason for wanting another T.A. to grade my paper, she had become very angry and declared that none of her T.A.'s would do such a thing (make advances toward a student). The professor said that I must be failing the course, that this was a trick to save my grade, but that she would talk to Charles anyway. After he told me this, my dean said that he had checked my grade and found I was getting a "B" thus far. It was clear that I couldn't be telling a lie to save my grade. I was hurt that my professor had accused me of slandering a T.A. to save my grade, and also that my dean had checked my grade without talking to me further. I felt that he might just as well have said, "We checked your grade to see if you were a liar, and unfortunately, you weren't." The meeting upset me very much, and I left, still without my dean knowing the details about the night at Charles' house.

I received a phone call ten minutes after I returned to my room. It was Charles.

He wanted me to tell our discussion group that the meeting was changed, or something like that. I wasn't listening closely because I was still upset from my meeting with the dean and because I thought Charles must have called to talk about what the professor has said to him. I thought he was going to get around to the subject sooner or later and vent his anger on me for getting him into trouble, so I said, "Have you talked to the professor yet?" He said he hadn't and seemed puzzled, so I said, "Well, I told my dean I wanted to have my paper graded by another T.A. because you had made advances toward me." There was a short, fearful silence, and then Charles got angry. He asked why I had done it, and claimed he hadn't "made advances" toward me. I asked him about the kiss, and he replied that it was a friendly kiss, that he did that to all his friends. He was very anxious to know exactly what I had told my dean about him, and what the professor knew. He insisted that I had misinterpreted the whole incident, that he had just wanted to be my friend.

The rest of the story can be told briefly. Charles talked to my dean and told him that I had been the one who had made advances toward him, and after being rejected by him, was trying to damage his reputation out of wounded pride. I had more talks with my dean, and with my freshman counsellor, and the full story of what had happened that night at Charles' house finally was told. My dean thought it was a much more serious matter after he knew the entire tale and wanted Charles thrown out of the graduate school as well as fired from his teaching position. I didn't want him thrown out of the graduate school. He was not. The result of the affair was that the dean wrote a letter to the Director of Undergraduate Studies in the Philosophy Department, and Charles was fired from his position as teaching assistant at Yale.

Kathy Hayashi '79

b. Rape and Seduction -- What do we call it when a Yale woman is sexually assaulted by a black New Haven man? Rape. Yet why do we not label other forms of sexual manipulation, far more prevalent at Yale, with the same ugly four-letter word? Professors and teaching assistants forcing their female students into bed with the threat of an "F," male students assaulting their female peers -- why are these sexual violations ignored, glossed over, and even justified by members of this community? Rape is a punishable criminal offense, a crime of physical and mental cruelty, no matter who does the raping. The attitude so often encountered at Yale is that unless the Yale woman does not know her assailant, unless she screams or dies in the process of protecting her "virtue," she was "just asking for it." The victim "brought it upon herself." It is at the very least disconcerting to find this feeling persisting at Yale, a university widely acclaimed for the liberal attitudes and intelligence of its students, faculty and administration. For there are times when a woman cannot scream because no one will hear her and times when fighting is pointless, as the following accounts clearly show.

Case #1

"Rape. I have always thought of that crime as distant, far removed from my immediate sphere of life. It has always been something that happened to other women and other people's friends -- never to me or to my friends. And I certainly did not expect to be made directly aware of the problem here at Yale. Well, now that bubble has burst, and I have removed my rose-colored glasses. There is no boundary drawn around this campus to protect its women from brutal sexual assault. True, the campus police tightly lock the college gates each night to deter any undesirable New Havenites from wandering in. But how can Yale women protect themselves from the threat of rape by residents of the Yale community? And that threat definitely exists. Two of my closest friends were raped in the Spring of 1977, both of them by Yale men. I have the permission of one of the women to recount what happened to her in January.

"Barbara was very close to another woman here and through her made the acquaintance of a senior, Bill. Barbara's friend and Bill had been seeing each other all fall semester and were very intimate, virtually living together. Barbara was also very involved with another man and thought of Bill as nothing but a close friend -- He was almost

like a brother.' So, when Bill asked her to a party one evening, she did not look upon the invitation as any sort of proposition, especially since Bill told her that his woman friend was already there.

"When she arrived at the party, Barbara discovered that her friend was not there after all, but 'although I thought it was odd, I didn't really push the issue.' she had a drink, but only one as she was in training. In short, Barbara was not drunk. Bill then said he wanted to show her around the house, which he did. They sat down for a 'private' conversation on a couch during the tour, and 'immediately he was all over me. I tried to scream; I tried to fight. It didn't make any difference. He was hurting me, so I just gave in. He was an animal, not even vaguely human, and I thought he might really hurt me if I continued to resist. I was nothing but an object.' After it was all over, Bill said he was 'sorry' and took Barbara home. When he saw her the next day, he was with his woman friend and smiled at Barbara as if nothing had happened. I suppose he felt that since he had apologized, everything was just fine -- no hard feelings. Barbara just walked away.

"Barbara spoke with me four days after the assault. Her body was still bruised and aching; she was still unable to go to the gym. But worse than the physical damage were the emotional scars. She cried slowly, barely able to articulate what had happened. After an experience such as that, no woman could be left untouched, and Barbara is not. She does have 'hard feelings.' She feels guilty and abused, angry and humiliated. She doesn't know what to do, how to cleanse herself. And I can't help her; there is nothing I can do or say to alleviate any of Barbara's pain.

"And I'm angry. If I thought that it would make a bit of difference I would gladly kill Bill. But it wouldn't. It would be pointless because Bill's treatment of Barbara as an inanimate object without emotions and unworthy of respect is not as unique as one might think. The only major difference in this case is the amount of force employed, and even that is often equalled and sometimes surpassed. Men at Yale seem to think that women at Yale enjoy being mauled and pawed about, and that it is socially incorrect for a woman to deny a man sexual gratification if he desires it, whether she herself wants it or not. Physical coercion is not the only mode of force either. Many men will attempt to verbally drive women into bed by delivering ultimatums, by making females feel guilty, and by labelling them 'cock-teasers.' It is a sad society where certain men feel they have this 'God-given' right to a woman's body, and an even sadder society where some women acknowledge that right. And that sad society is Yale."

Case #2

"I was raped at Yale in January, 1977, and it didn't happen in the dark alley with the armed assailant we so often think of when we hear the word 'rape.' In a way, what happened to me was worse; I was raped by someone I'd known for two years, in my own bedroom, with my roommate sitting in the next room. That may sound implausible, or it may sound as if it wasn't really rape; but my experience certainly fits the technical definition of 'the illicit carnal knowledge of a woman without her consent.'

"The man who raped me was not a particularly good friend of mine, but I had talked to him several times and had no reason to think that he considered our relationship a potentially romantic one. I certainly did not think of it in that way; he was just one of the many people I talked to at parties. In fact, it was at a party that I ran into him on this particular night in January. We were both leaving, and trying to decide where to go; I mentioned another party nearby, but he said he wanted to talk and suggested going to my room. We did, but my roommate was having a private conversation in the living room so I suggested going elsewhere. He said, 'No, let's go in here,' pushed me into my bedroom, closed the door, flicked off the light, and grabbed me.

"As I write all this down, it seems that it should have been so easy to fight him off. But it wasn't, and I've spent most of my time in the last weeks trying to figure out just why I couldn't scream or fight. Part of it was that I was so stunned by the suddenness of the attack that I couldn't think straight. That doesn't explain it completely, though; I think a more important reason for my lack of effective resistance was that I felt totally intimidated, totally dominated, by a man clearly stronger than I. I was confronted by sheer force, mental as well as physical, and felt that it would

be stupid, even silly, to try to resist. That's the feeling that bothers me most as I think about all of this -- the sense that my resistance would be silly, a foolish refusal to accept one of the simple facts of life at Yale. In a strange way, I felt that my attacker -- and, importantly, the other people who would hear my screams -- would think that I had flirted my way into this situation, and had then refused to grant this man something I owed to him. Because of this feeling that I'd 'asked for it,' and also because I thought that I should have been expecting to be attacked or at least propositioned, I placed most of the blame on myself during the first few days after it happened. My own naivete, my own slow reactions, my own intimidation -- in short, my own stupidity -- had allowed this to happen, I concluded. I'd gotten exactly what I deserved for being unable to deal with a perfectly simple situation.

"But it is not that simple. The point that I had overlooked is that no woman should ever be expected to deal with this kind of situation. For one thing, I hadn't asked for it, I hadn't flirted, I hadn't expected it, and there is no reason why I should have. Furthermore, I was suddenly being treated like a mere animal, and my choice -- if you can call it a choice -- was between being raped and screaming, clawing, kicking. No woman should ever be forced to face those two alternatives, both of them humiliating, violent, and utterly dehumanizing.

"What bothers me almost as much as my own feelings of dehumanization is the probability that this man doesn't even realize what he's done. For certain men at Yale seem to consider sex an unalienable right, to be had whenever and from whomever they wish. It doesn't occur to them that their partner may be far from willing, because the atmosphere here somehow makes many women feel that they do indeed owe something to their male friends. We are intimidated not only by the individual men who rape us, but also by the social conditions which permit and perhaps condone this act of violence.

"I am generalizing here, but I believe that I am justified in doing so. I say that because my rape in January was simply the most graphic demonstration of an attitude I encounter every day. I hope I don't sound bitter, because there are men at Yale who treat me fairly and honestly. But I am disheartened by the fact that they probably would not understand any of what I am trying to say, both about them and about Yale."

If guaranteed confidentiality, the two women who wrote these last two sections will give their names and further testimony to the Yale Corporation.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Yale Undergraduate Women's Caucus recognizes that Yale's legal responsibility to promote women's position only affects problem areas that fall under the rubric of institutional discrimination. For the purposes of this report we have classified Affirmative Action, athletics, faculty women in the arts and sciences and women's studies as areas of institutional discrimination that need fast, focused, effective remedying. We realize, however, that even in these areas the extent of Yale's legal responsibility, if it exists at all, is not clear.

We recognize further that Yale is not legally obliged to address the attitudinal prejudices that exist in this community against women. We especially recognize that the problems discussed in the Yalesbian, secret society and rape sections cannot be effectively resolved through changes in institutional policy alone, but we feel that the Office on the Education of Women should provide a forum for problems of this sort. We call upon the Yale Corporation to provide for Yale women what Yale women need most, i.e., a strong Office on the Education of Women to combat institutional and attitudinal discriminations. Our purpose in writing this report has been to lobby for a women's advocate, i.e., for a first-rate woman scholar who will direct Yale's Office on the Education of Women. It is our expectation as well as the expectation of many individuals and organizations on this campus (e.g., Yale College Council, Council of Third World Women) that such a Director will be appointed at the Administration's earliest possible opportunity.

Our request for a distinguished academic to direct the Office on the Education of Women is not new. The Office on the Education of Women was established in 1969 to assist in fulfilling the University's commitment to women. Since 1969, a number of part-time directors have been appointed. In March 1976 the Committee on the Education of Women presented a report to President Brewster which delineated, for the first time in its seven-year history, the function of the Office.

A year before the Committee on the Education of Women submitted its report, the office was formally defined by the Yale College Dean's Office. At that time, problem areas included career planning, counselling of women, women's athletics, women's health and women in science. Given the dimension of the problems confronting Yale women, it was clear that a full-time Director had to be appointed. A part-time Director cannot minister to the needs of Yale women by herself.

In August of 1975, Connie Gersick was given a one-year, part-time appointment. She was appointed without a national search. Moreover, those individuals and organizations who would be directly affected by her appointment were not consulted. In addition, Ms. Gersick is not a scholar or a career academic. She could only work part-time due to her family situation; she is not renowned in women's circles.

Ms. Gersick continues to be the part-time Director of the Office on the Education of Women, though her initial contract expired in June 1976. In March 1976 the Committee stated in its report to the President:

It is expected that the Office on the Education of Women will move forward vigorously to become a place where all women in Yale College may direct their particular problems and concerns.

In order to address adequately the needs of Yale women, the Committee identified the following issues as ones requiring attention: academic choices and majors for women, Affirmative Action, career planning and counselling, security, women's athletics, women's health and women's studies. The Committee also recommended that the Office on the Education of Women do research on career patterns, choices and experiences of Yale women graduates. To facilitate action on the issues the Committee formally recommended a staff of a full-time Director, Assistant Director, secretary, and bursary students or research assistants as necessary. The recommendations of the Committee have been ignored.

A national search began in March 1976 for a full-time Director. But the Office on the Education of Women staff remains at one assistant and its budget has risen from \$5,000 to only \$7,500. As of March 1977 the Directorship remains unfilled. Two quali-

fied and enthusiastic women have rejected the offer for a combination of personal and political reasons. The political reasons are that they consider the Office on the Education of Women's staff and budget allocations insufficient. Meanwhile, problem spots which were specifically identified in 1975 have yet to be effectively addressed in 1977.

We ask that Yale no longer be complacent where it should be a leader. The University plays a conservative role in this society as a preserver of knowledge and heritage. Yale plays a liberal role as a forum for the advancement of knowledge predicated on the constant questioning of that heritage. This liberal initiative represents the vitality of the institution and its purpose as an intellectual community. Yale's fulfillment of its potential dictates that it actively address the needs generated by women's presence on this campus.