

Winter 1983

Women's Studies Newsletter December 1983

Women's Studies

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/lookingback>

Recommended Citation

Women's Studies, "Women's Studies Newsletter December 1983" (1983). *Looking Back, Looking Forward*. 153.
<http://digitalcommons.denison.edu/lookingback/153>

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the Women's and Gender Studies at Denison Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Looking Back, Looking Forward by an authorized administrator of Denison Digital Commons.



WOMEN'S STUDIES NEWSLETTER

December 9, 1983

VOL. IX, NO. 1

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Mary Schilling	
I AM A BATTERED WOMAN	2
Anonymous	
THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ON CHILDREN	3
Lisa Pittenger	
REAGAN ADMINISTRATION CALLS FOR GUTTING OF TITLE IX	6
Bernice R. Sandler	
FATHER GHOSTS	9
Kimberly Kiefer	
AN ELEVEN-YEAR-OLD MOTHER IN STANTON, TENNESSEE	11
Kate Reynolds	
"LITTLE SISTERS" AND "NICE LADIES": TROUBLEMAKERS IN A TROUBLED WORLD	12
Mary Schilling	
"AN 'A' FOR A LAY": SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES	17
Sherri Gilmore	
ERNEST EVERETT JUST AND BARBARA McCLINTOCK: SCIENTIFIC LESSONS FOR OUR TIMES	24
Juliana Mulroy	

INTRODUCTION

It was Virginia Woolf who suggested that "Anon, who wrote so many poems without signing them, was often a woman." That certainly is true in reference to Anonymous, the author of "I Am a Battered Woman....," a verbatim statement made by a Licking County woman. Recorded on tape for use by Friends of Shelter, a local funding support group for New Directions, the statement reflects a "successful" experience in counseling with caring, professional staff.

Based on both research and field work experience as a volunteer at New Directions, Lisa Pittenger writes on "The Impact of Domestic Violence on Children." Her project and the article evolved out of her participation in a course on Sexual Inequality.

Written as a news release by Bernice Sandler, the article on Title IX details the negative impact of the actions of the Reagan administration on legislation which has greatly improved the status of women in educational institutions throughout the country. Sandler is currently Executive Director of the Project on the Status of Woman associated with the Association of American Colleges. Since 1970, when she helped prepare the first Congressional hearings on discrimination in education, she has been at the forefront in monitoring programs affecting equity in education for women.

Senior poet Kimberly Kiefer and junior Kate Reynolds each offer their work for our readers. Like all good poetry, theirs needs no explanation.

Delivered by Mary Schilling as a Women's Week address, "'Little Sisters' and 'Nice Ladies'" is printed at the request of numerous students and others of the community. The statement attempts to define major themes which build solidarity among women and address the critical problems of our day.

For a course on Discrimination and the Law, Sherri Gilmore addresses the issue of sexual harassment on college campuses. Edited considerably for length, the article builds a context for an understanding of the problem and the need for appropriate policies and procedures. Denison is currently revising its original sexual harassment statement. Following approval by the administration, the revised version will be released to the community and included in the next issue of this newsletter.

In the final article, Juliana Mulroy, Associate Professor of Biology at Denison, uses the recent publication of two biographies of scientists to raise larger questions about the nature of science and recognition within the scientific community. The case studies of Ernest Everett Just and Barbara McClintok are important to a feminist consideration of the impact of race and gender in science.

I AM A BATTERED WOMAN...

Anonymous

I am a battered woman. Even though through months of counseling I finally developed the courage to escape, I am still a battered woman. The physical violence is over, but the mental abuse is still with me.

My main concern for women like me is public opinion towards us. People always say, "She must like it, because she stays." What none of you understand is: number one, I lived in constant fear; and, number two, I was manipulated into believing that what was happening to me was my fault. If I didn't do this or didn't do that, I would not have been beaten. It was for my own good, he told me, and I should have appreciated this wonderful man who loved me and wanted to care for me. Besides, who else would care about a woman like me?

I wasn't allowed to have friends. I was too ashamed to tell my family. The neighbors had to know, but no one wants to get involved. You feel there is no way out. Most of us don't have jobs. If we do, our husbands control the money. Self-esteem is so very low; we feel we cannot make it alone. Then, there are the children. It takes money to care for children. They love their fathers, and they want you to stay. The children, the poor children, most of them grow up to be abusers just like the abusive parent. Isn't that sad? Then, again, there is the fear of what he will do to you if you leave.

I first started going to Family Services to see what I could do to save my marriage. The beatings were coming more frequent and more violent. I am one of the very lucky ones who never ended up in the hospital or had broken bones. I wish I could put into words how I felt the first time Karen (Shelter director) hugged me and said, "I understand. I'm here to help you." No matter what decisions I was going to make for myself, she was there to help me because she cared about me. Karen and Alice, who work for Family Services, and the women in the therapy group were friends that I had never had before. They understood what I said; they understood how I felt; they understood why I stayed there for twelve years.

After awhile, thanks to the group, I started to realize that I didn't have the problem. I was a victim. My ex-husband had the problem, not me. I was a victim. I didn't deserve to be hit. It was his fault, not mine. Then came the hardest part--believing in me. For so many years I was told that I was so worthless, I believed it. Now I had to start all over again. My new wonderful friends helped me there. They knew I had strength in me. They knew I was a good person. They liked me. Why shouldn't anyone else? They gave me moral support month after month. I made it with their help. I made it!

My job doesn't pay much money, but the peace and quiet is worth more than money or clothes or anything. I come home without being afraid of what I am going to walk into when I walk through that door. I feel good when I go to work. I feel good when I come home. I feel good about me. Even though my son misses his father not being here, he is glad the violence is over. We are free.

Thank God and all you wonderful people who support the Shelter. It's safe there. That man can't hurt you there. There is no violence, no ugliness, and no fear. And they are good, kind, decent, caring, loving women--just like you. They need that chance. Before I close, I want...I feel very uncomfortable being too visible. If one of you should feel the need to talk to me, the Shelter knows how to contact me. I'll do anything I can to help in any way.

* * * * *

THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
ON CHILDREN
by Lisa Pittenger

If the American family is a nightmare for spouses involved in domestic violence, it is even more so for their children. They suffer the consequences of their parents' battles simply because they exist. (Battered Wives, Del Martin, p. 23)

With all of the challenges women with young children face after leaving their abusive homes--whether financial, job-related or social--the needs of the children are all too often overlooked. The children suffer in silence.

In a study done by Maria Roy in 1977, 45% of assaults on women were accompanied by similar assaults on at least one child in the household. Further statistics show that in 150 cases, 95% of the women did not report their husbands for any child abuse that occurred.

Frequently, children see parental disputes centering around their own needs and imperfections, and they assume the responsibility for the anger and violence themselves. Children's reactions to such situations include: internalization of the idea that they have caused the behavior of the parents, guilt and inadequacy for not preventing such parental battles, and anxiety over self-control. Feeling threatened, children may push for more parental limits, thus accounting for their sometimes overly-aggressive, attention-drawing behavior.

Abusive parents, often unable to provide adequate nurturance for their children, may also lack an awareness of age-appropriate behavior among their children and expect, instead, for them to fulfill their adult needs as "surrogate parents." Such parents are often looking for the emotional support which they never received as children. In competing for the child's nurturance, parent-parent or parent-child abuse is often precipitated.

Caught in a dilemma full of confusion and pain, the child usually sides with one parent or the other. Rejecting the same-sex parent leaves no role model to identify with, resulting in a confusion of sex role identity. Parents may compete with each other for the child's affection, using slander, bribery, or flattery. Finally, loyalty to the parents as a unit becomes divided; the child learns to use one parent against the other.

In response to these problems, the child often develops resources of emotional and physical protection. First, the child reasons, "If only I can be good, then the violence will surely stop." If this does not work, the child may become overly aggressive or passive, equating maleness with hurting women and femaleness with being hurt by men. Finally, the child may tend to idealize or exaggerate the good characteristics of the father to avoid identifying with his aggressive behavior.

Despite measures to insulate themselves from the pain of a violent home situation, two very distinct fears remain within children: the fear of being left alone brings responses of tears, silence and/or withdrawal. Children may deny or suppress their feelings or accept the blame irrationally. Fear and guilt of anger feelings is also common. Many children are taught that to be angry is to be bad. Children should be encouraged and allowed to feel all of their emotions and not be made to feel guilty for the feeling or expression of anger, as long as it is expressed in constructive ways. Repression of such emotions has been shown to be ultimately more destructive.

Typical child "portraits" emerge from the responses and fears of children that have thus far been discussed. Of the children who are victims or witnesses of domestic violence, those of pre-school age tend to manifest their anger and fear through somatic complaints (for example, stomach and head aches), separation anxiety, and insomnia. Children of kindergarten through grade school age tend to exhibit more sex-differentiated behavior. Boys tend to become more aggressive, disruptive, and prone to temper tantrums (especially in structured situations like classrooms), while girls are more withdrawn, passive, clinging and anxious, often displaying strong attachments to the home.

Much of what I have learned about children and domestic violence has been through observation at New Directions, the shelter for victims of domestic violence in Licking County. During Spring Semester of 1983, I volunteered twice a week, supervising and interacting with the children of the women residents of the shelter. Researching from

the shelter book collection and studying the shelter manual of operations and procedures, I learned that two essentials in working with children who have been victims of or witnesses to domestic violence are good communication and non-violent discipline.

Skills that are basic to good communication between any parent and child can become absolutely crucial when violence has entered the home. The shelter manual suggests kneeling for eye-to-eye contact when speaking with the child, watching for non-verbal cues and trying to interpret the child's feelings, never "talking down" to the child, offering many choices for play based on clearly defined limits, and always remaining calm, raising one's voice only when absolutely necessary.

Essential to the philosophy of the shelter is the exercise of non-violent discipline. No hitting or spanking of any kind is allowed, and violation of this rule is grounds for dismissal. Instead, the shelter recommends replacing physical punishment with a redirection of behavior to a more desirable one, verbal reminders of the rules being broken, and "time out" or removing the child from the situation for a specific amount of time.

The shelter seeks to provide a home-like atmosphere, while fostering a sense of responsibility among both the mother and her children during their residence. Children under twelve are to be in bed by 8:30 p.m.; those over twelve, by 9:00 p.m. Many of the children are not accustomed to such a routine, yet it gives their lives a sense of order and consistency which may have been previously lacking. The women alternate nights preparing meals and share responsibility for some of the housework, laundry, and supervision of the children. Residents must participate in both group and individual counseling. If women need clothes or supplies for themselves and their children, staff members escort them to their homes. Professional staff also assist the women in exploring alternative solutions to their problems and in making connections with various local social service agencies.

Shelter staff report that children tend to absorb the violence of the home environment and apply it in their relationships with others. This certainly seemed to be the case with six-year-old Benny, who displayed many of the aggressive tendencies characteristic of his age and gender. He often behaved violently toward toys and imaginary persons. Intelligent and affectionate, Benny tended to seek much contact comfort from me. When I raised my hand too quickly near his face, he flinched, as if he thought that I might strike him. He indicated a firm dislike for his school teacher who reportedly gets upset, raises her voice, and occasionally shakes an unruly child in the classroom.

Benny's seven-year-old sister was sharing, complimentary and much less aggressive. Clinging and anxious in relationship to her mother, Carey became quite dependent on seeing me each week and always asked about my next visit. Once she set up a doll house and

labeled it "for girls and their children only." When asked where the fathers lived, she replied, "There are no men here, because Daddies get mad and beat up on Mommies."

In each of the children I observed it seemed evident to me that the violence which they had witnessed had had a negative impact on both their self-esteem and their behavior. It does not seem difficult to predict what sorts of problems these children will face interpersonally as they grow older. Studies clearly show that a high percentage of abusive parents were themselves sexually exploited or physically abused as children. "A man who batters is a child who was battered that nobody helped." (Battered Wives, Del Martin p. 24)

While it is helpful for the shelter to provide non-racist, non-sexist, non-violent toys and games for children, that is not enough. Nor is it adequate to have a cheerful playroom and a modern, fenced-in playground. What is desperately needed is professional staff trained in child development, assisted by trained volunteers, who can guide the children into constructive ways of dealing with their feelings. Only by such intervention can the cycle of generational violence be reversed.

Someone must save the children. They are here to carry on what we have begun.

* * * * *

REAGAN ADMINISTRATION CALLS FOR GUTTING OF TITLE IX
by Bernice R. Sandler

On August 8, 1983, the federal government filed a brief with the U.S. Supreme Court, calling for a new interpretation of Title IX which would leave most women students vulnerable to sex discrimination throughout most--if not all--of their college experience.

The brief filed by the Department of Justice in Grove City College v. Bell, would reverse more than a decade of strong federal commitment to ending sex discrimination in education. It supports the college's position that if an institution receives federal dollars only from student grants and loans, only the financial aid program would be covered by Title IX; the institution would be free to discriminate in all other programs and activities.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination in all federally assisted programs. The federal government has consistently interpreted Title IX to prohibit discrimination in an entire institution when the institution received any federal dollars; i.e., the institution as a whole has been considered the educational program. However, several

court cases have challenged this interpretation, claiming that Title IX applies only to the particular program receiving direct federal funding, and court rulings have been inconsistent.

One of these cases, Grove City College v. Bell, will be heard by the Supreme Court this fall. The college, which is not charged with sex discrimination, refused to sign a federal assurance of compliance form, contending that the college was not covered by Title IX because the college itself receives no direct federal aid, although some of its students receive financial assistance. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the college must comply because the financial assistance received by students "inure[s] to the benefit of the entire institution."

Only about 4 percent of the over 13 billion dollars going to colleges and universities could be clearly defined as "direct assistance." Programs which receive direct funding are usually highly specialized such as remedial programs for disadvantaged students, vocational and cooperative education programs, support for libraries and funding to help minority institutions. These programs usually involve only a small number of college students. Most of the funds going to institutions of higher education are for student financial assistance, research contracts and grants. Should the administration's point of view prevail, sex discrimination against students would not be allowed in directly funded activities or in federal financial aid programs. Students working under federally supported research contracts and grants would also be protected. However, sex discrimination against the same students would be allowed elsewhere in the school. In fact, most students would not be protected by Title IX for most of their college experience.

Since most programs in institutions do not receive direct federal assistance, sex discrimination would no longer be prohibited in the following areas, except in the unlikely event that these activities might be part of a program receiving federal assistance. All of these discriminatory activities did in fact occur prior to Title IX.

Extracurricular activities. Student clubs, including honorary and professional societies, for example, could be restricted to men only.

Athletic programs. Women's programs could be limited or abolished; women could be denied athletic scholarships; institutions could refuse to pay travel for women athletes; and could exclude women from any sport.

Admission to classes. Unless a class was directly funded, women could be excluded or preference given to men. Women could be excluded from a criminal justice course because it involved working with male offenders.

Use of facilities. A school could restrict women's use of athletic facilities; it could have a training room or sauna for men students only.

Sexual harassment. Only those few students in programs receiving federal assistance would be covered by Title IX--and then only during the hours they were involved in the program.

Housing. Schools could provide better housing (and more of it) for men, or require women but not men to live on campus.

Marital and parental status. Schools could give preference to married men--and/or discriminate against married women--in admission to classes, programs and institutional aid.

In short, different policies for men and women throughout the institution would be legal. This represents a major shift in the protections that women (and men) students now have against discrimination.

Women's groups, along with civil rights organizations, have deplored the administration's decision to weaken Title IX coverage. Women members of the Congress lobbied the White House to no avail, and were joined by numerous male members of the Congress in protecting the Administration's position. Two hundred and twenty five members of the House of Representatives co-sponsored a Resolution reiterating Congressional intent that Title IX should be given a broad interpretation. The resolution, which is not binding, was introduced by Representative Claudine Schneider (R-R.I.). A bipartisan group of 47 Representatives and three Senators filed a friend-of-the-court brief contending that the Justice Department's position flouts congressional intent. The group, organized by Representative Schneider includes Senator Bob Packwood (R-Ore.), Senator Alan Cranston (D-Cal.), Senator Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) and Representative Paul Simon (D-Ill.), Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Post-Secondary Education. Senator Dole, a frequent ally of the President, stated "Sex discrimination remains a major problem in this country. Thus I find it difficult to understand why the Justice Department has decided to take such a restrictive view of one of the most important anti-sex discrimination laws ever passed." Earlier, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights had urged the administration to continue to interpret Title IX as covering the entire institution.

Having a law in place has indeed made an enormous difference on campus, even though most institutions have never seen a federal investigator--in fact, less than one percent of educational institutions have ever been investigated under Title IX. However, Title IX has given women students the power to challenge discrimination with the clear force of the law behind them. Additionally, the import of Title IX has made it possible for institutions to change policies and procedures to insure that all of their students have equal educational opportunities. Should the Supreme Court accept the administration's position, it will be difficult and in some instances impossible to maintain the gains already made or to successfully press for changes to bring about greater equity.

* * * * *

Father Ghosts

Kitchen coffee and the Plain Dealer
bring up the sun.
The light wakes me.
A pressed flower
between two feather comforters,
I glide down
feet repelling stairs
invisible day dragons chasing me.
They cannot come where Grandma is
the kitchen yields a buffer zone
the dank dining room
our battleground
with carnival glass mine fields.
Electric cold
jolts my feet
on the quarry tile floor,
numbness carries me
skipping to my Lou
with hungry hummed melodies.
There are bread dough arms waiting
wrapping me in
toasting my heart.
Cream of Wheat and honey
smooth the early day into motion --
straighten beds
draw the blinds
iron out wrinkles
sweep the walk
dust picture frames
My father is still
a boy in this house
smiling from every black and white
picture room.
Search
for closet treasure.
A Boy Scout badge or
football letter
bring us no closer.

There are dresser drawer ghosts
in the spare room upstairs
haunting ring boxes
and tatting edged table runners --
If there were no night light when I slept
they could appear
and scare me to death.
But it burns away the night
beside my father's lanky-legged picture and
the crucifix
on the way.
These things
Grandma says
watch over me.

My father's portrait
stares down at me
it is my own reflection
in his glass face
crabapple tree pink,
full
German.
When dinner comes
the resemblance will remain
like ghosts
waiting to haunt me.

Kimberly Kiefer

* * * * *

An Eleven-year-old Mother in Stanton, Tennessee

Her cornstalk ankles
are not anointed, but wooed
by the drip
of her hem.

Hands climb that trail
into a quarry, unshrouded,
pink as a shell's secret;
they rub her gooseflesh
into breasts.

Her hips are driven
into the ground.
She is a tent.

Her spine is a fiddle-head fern,
uncoiling,
supporting a boulder
that bursts
down her legs.
Her mother follows
the stream,
plucks the vegetable,
cuts the roots,
dunks it into her daughter's arms.

Kate Reynolds

* * * * *

"LITTLE SISTERS" AND "NICE LADIES":
TROUBLEMAKERS IN A TROUBLED WORLD
by Mary Schilling

In December of 1982 Michigan Governor-Elect James Blanchard nominated Sister Agnes Mary Mansour as State Director of Social Services. For thirty years, she had served as a Sister of Mercy--living out her vows of poverty, chastity, obedience and an additional vow: serving the poor. She had proven administrative skills as President of Mercy College in Detroit, political experience as a candidate for Congress, and who could be more trusted than a woman who had spent the last thirty years serving the poor?--the very vow Sister Mansour felt most deeply.

However, conservative Catholics objected to her appointment because the job involved the administration of Medicaid funds for abortion. The Detroit archbishop approved the appointment on the condition that Sister Mansour publicly state her personal position against abortion--which she did. Continued pressure soon caused him to change his mind, and he demanded that she publicly commit herself to actively opposing Medicaid payments. She simply could not do this.

In confirmation hearings, Sister Mansour had said she was personally opposed to abortion, but she acknowledged that in a pluralistic society there is more than one moral path. She reasoned: "If rich women can get abortions, there's an injustice if they are not available to poor women." This was her complicated moral answer to a difficult issue.

Carol Gilligan, social psychologist of Harvard, would call this an example of "moral maturity." When thinking combines both intellect and empathy "it joins the heart and the eye in an ethic that ties the activity of thought to the activity of care." Judgment becomes more tolerant and less absolute. In her book entitled In a Different Voice, she notes that men often do not understand women's moral crises--not only because of the silence of women but also the difficulty in hearing what they say when they speak. Moral development, says Gilligan, has traditionally been defined by a male vision and has been compromised by not including the female viewpoint. Women's knowledge comes "not from detachment, but from living in connecting with themselves and others, from being embedded in the conditions of life." Male religious leaders like Luther and Ghandi, she suggests, are often "compromised in their capacity for intimacy and live at a great personal distance from others--ignoring the people most closely around them while working instead toward the glory of God." Gilligan thinks that it is this difference in perspective than has men and women misunderstanding each other so thoroughly on issues like abortion.

Clearly, Gilligan understands how Sister Mansour and the National Coalition of American Nuns arrived at their position. The sisters started by talking to each other, then to women in the community, and then the nation. Only then did they announce their opposition to the Hatch Amendment. They were still opposed to abortion but believed the responsibility for decision in this regard resides primarily with those who are directly and personally involved. They saw the contradictions in public policy and empathized with the effects they had on women and children: "It is paradoxical to us that the same leaders who are currently demanding that women bring their babies to term are simultaneously voting to cut off food stamps, child nutrition programs and related benefits essential for the health and well-being of our children."

So the Sisters of Mercy announced their position and refused to disavow Sister Mansour. The "Little Sisters," as they have come to be called, challenged the moral authority of the Holy Father by placing a higher priority on serving the poor than on their vow of obedience. The Pope underestimated how deeply he had wounded the dignity and slighted the intelligence of the American nuns. After what was described as "a thorough study," he had made a judgment without ever once asking what they thought about the crisis of morals. He hadn't seemed to notice, or at least acknowledge, that most American nuns, like most American women, have experienced a great shift in consciousness in the last decade. While the Holy Father was praying to God for an answer, Sister Mansour and the other "Little Sisters" were talking to poor women.

Finally, the Pope had had enough. His mandate was that Sister Agnes Mary resign--or be secularized. When he called upon her vow of obedience, she responded: "I do not feel that I should or could witness to an obedience which for me would be irrational or blind." There is no appeal process in the hierarchical system; so she publicly gave up her vows as a nun. She denies that she is a hero (or even a "she-ro"). She calls herself a symbol and admits that it will take a few more casualties like her before the church is moved to change its policies and positions.

It is this capacity to speak in a different voice, to make moral decisions which reflect the connectedness and the inter-relationships which bond us that defines the coalition and solidarity of women. And this different voice constitutes a major contribution women are making in our troubled world.

A second concept which unites us and becomes a contribution is a different understanding of power. Feminism rejects the power principle of domination and subjugation. It rejects the concept of power which says that one side's victory must be the other side's defeat. Feminism questions social structures based on this principle at every level, from competition of men and women in personal relationships to the competition of the nations

of the globe. Rosemary Ruether, feminist theologian and scholar, writes: "We seek an alternative power principle of 'empowerment in community' rather than power over and disabling others." Such enabling in community is based on a recognition of the fundamental connectedness of life. Nobody wins unless all win. "As historic victims of violence and repression, as well as those socialized to cultivate supportive roles, women have a particular vantage point. But we are not immune to expressions of hostility, chauvinism, racism, or warmongering. Conversions to a new sense of self that wills the good of others in a community of life must transform traditional women as well as traditional men." According to Ruether, feminism needs to be grounded in an alternative vision of the authentic self and human community. This vision must be clear that we are children of one mother, the Earth, part of one interdependent community of life. On this basis, we must oppose all social systems that create wealth and privilege for some by impoverishing, degrading or eliminating other people, whether they be the systems of domination that repress or assault women or the systems that plan nuclear annihilation in a futile search for security based on competitive world power.

Nowhere is this different understanding of power and what it might mean for our troubled world seen more clearly than in the intense participation of women in the contemporary peace movement.

On May 24 of this year a small group of women representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom convened in Washington to express their solidarity with European women demonstrating at Greenham Common in opposition to the funding and deployment of Euromissiles. First, they lobbied their Senators and Representatives; then, in protest, they marched along Pennsylvania Avenue and soon arrived at The White House. When the East Gates opened up to let in a pick-up truck, five of the women scrambled into the driveway in an intentional act of civil disobedience. Fifty feet inside the gate, they were spotted by the Secret Service who shoved the five to the ground and encouraged them to leave. "Now you ladies don't want to get arrested, do you? Why don't you just be nice ladies and get up and walk out the gates?" But the women explained that their organization had repeatedly requested meetings with the President, and though their most recent requests were signed by Coretta Scott King and Maggie Kuhn, they had been ignored and denied a hearing.

Refusing to leave, the five women were frisked, stripped of their belongings, handcuffed, questioned by Secret Service, and held in custody with no food for the first ten hours. They spent an unbelievably nightmarish night in an overcrowded jail, listening to the guards partying and playing loud music, constantly being interrupted with announcements on the loud speaker, watching cockroaches crawl around in the cell, and smelling the stench which only crowded living situations can have. When they appeared before the judge the following morning, each of them pleaded guilty, but each was allowed to make a statement. One talked about the right to human existence; a second talked about the

Quaker tradition of non-violent disobedience; a third explained about answering to a higher authority; and a fourth talked about the arms race and its cost to human life now and in the future. The judge was obviously moved and would start to speak then fall silent. He said, "I might, in these circumstances, sentence individuals to performing good deeds in their communities, but I know you all do that every day of your lives." He fined them each \$20. and wished them good luck. The "Driveway 5," as they came to call themselves, spoke in a different voice and reflected a different understanding of power.

Perhaps it is this feminist understanding of power, growing out of the full participation of men and women in an interdependent community of life, that led Dr. Lewis Thomas to propose that for the next 100 years, men of the world not be allowed to vote. All national and global leadership in the world would be in the hands of women, including what we euphemistically call our security systems. It is his clear belief that, with a century of leadership by women, wars within and among nations would end and the nuclear threat which hangs over our planet would be dissipated.

Just as the women's movement early concluded that the personal is political, so also do women know that the plight or the oppression of the individual is collective. It is not adequate to address the suffering or the problems of the individual battered woman. The imperative is to address the systems, structures, the values and the attitudes of our society which allow domestic violence in the first place. It is not enough to befriend the visiting Black student from South Africa. We must speak out and work against the apartheid system that oppresses him.

This point is made clear in a recent Doonesbury cartoon which recounts a White House conversation between the President, one of his assistants and the Speaker of the House. After listening to the President's complaints about welfare fraud, Tip offers an anecdote: "Last week I met an elderly widow named Mary Brighton. She lives off Social Security and food stamps. Recently her food stamps were cut. Since what little cash she has must go for medicine, this proud lady must eat twice a day at a soup kitchen." The President replies: "Gosh, that's...that's terrible. Ed, get on the phone. I want this woman helped." To which Tip replies, "No, no, Mr. President. You're missing the point. It's not Mary Brighton the individual who needs relief. It's all the Mary Brightons across the country! She's no different from millions of other needy people who are suffering because of your budget cuts." "She's not?" the President asks. "No, sir," answers Tip. And very quickly, the call is cancelled.

Or consider Sonia Johnson who used to be a "nice lady" in the Mormon Church. Two months following her excommunication for supporting the Equal Rights Amendment, a high ranking official in the church was trying to convince her, once and for all, into believing the church's great love for women. He referred to

President Kimball, the Patriarch of Patriarchs, the leader of the Mormon Church and said, "Why, President Kimball has done more for women than any other living man." Wisely and quietly, Johnson asked, "Such as what?" There was a long pause, some fumbling around and then a feeble answer: "Why, Sonia, he treats his wife so well." Women know that that is not enough. We need to address the collective as well as the individual oppression. We need to be both priest and prophet. We must address the suffering of both "the near and the distant neighbor."

Finally, women have learned that the religious is political, that the religious is social. Whatever base we have for our current value system, a full expression of religious as well as feminist values impels us to act on social issues and in the public or political arena. Equality, love, justice, freedom, peace--all of these energize and mobilize us to action. The vision of a society where such values would reign moves us to action for today.

Let me be clear about one thing: In emphasizing the particular contributions women are making in the world, I do not mean to imply that "little brothers" (or big ones) or even "nice gentlemen" don't or can't share with women the understandings and perspectives I've mentioned. In fact, many do. The challenge for us is together, as men and women, as brothers and sisters, to be troublemakers--to speak in a different voice, to embody a better understanding of power, to recognize the plight of the individual as collective, and to understand that the religious must be both social and political. Then, and only then, can we even begin to transform our troubled world.

[The Gilligan analysis is drawn directly from Mary Kay Blakely's article on "The Nun's Revolt," printed in Ms. Magazine, September, 1983. Quotations from Ruether are from "Feminism and Peace," which appeared in the August 31-September 7, 1983, issue of The Christian Century. The "Driveway Five" incident is reported in Peace and Freedom, August-September, 1983; the Johnson experience, in her book, From Housewife to Heretic.]

* * * * *

"AN 'A' FOR A LAY"¹:
SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES
by Sherri Gilmore

It was not until 1976 that sexual harassment was recognized as a social problem. "Until 1976, lacking a term to express it, sexual harassment was literally unspeakable, which made a generalized, shared, and social definition of it inaccessible."² The first time sexual harassment was brought into full public attention was in 1977 when a group of women students and one male professor filed a class-action suit against Yale University charging that the administration's "failure to combat sexual harassment of female undergraduates and its refusal to institute mechanisms and procedures to address complaints and make investigations of such harassment interferes with the education process and denies equal opportunity in education."³ Thus, Yale University became the first institution to be sued for sexual harassment of its students.

Since this case, there has been an increasing awareness of the problem in the academic world. Along with this awareness has grown an attempt to define sexual harassment, encompassing its vast range of behaviors. The striking consistency throughout the various interpretations is the theme of power: the aggressor, usually male, is in a position of power over the victim, usually female. "The essential ingredient, in any instance of sexual harassment, however, is power."⁴ When harassment occurs, the relationship between the professor and the student becomes one of a power struggle. The National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs provide a working definition for harassment in this context:

Academic sexual harassment is the use of authority to emphasize the sexuality or sexual identity of a student in a manner which prevents or impairs that student's full enjoyment of educational benefits, climate or opportunities.⁵

This definition includes the broad range of behaviors of sexual harassment: from "gender harassment" (verbal harassment of a discriminatory fashion directed against individuals of a particular gender group that the aggressor regards as inferior) to direct physical assault.⁶

Using this definition, an examination of the unique problems its victims experience is required. The initial hardship the victim must deal with are those associated with her gender. These include various myths about the "nature" of women which result in the inhibition of women to communicate their experience to others or to even think of reporting such instances at all. The first myth which plagues women is that they invite sexual harassment by their behavior or dress. This widely accepted fallacy causes the victim

to feel as if she provoked the incident. The consequence is that the victim does not report the assault, feeling guilty because it happened and having nowhere to turn for assistance because of her fear of disbelief. Another common response of women to this expression of inequality is acceptance of the misconduct as "the way things are." Out of a feeling of responsibility for the male ego, the student may acknowledge the notion that "men's behavior is not likely to change, and that men are easily aroused sexually and expect satisfaction."⁷ Again, they tend to claim responsibility for the harassment. An additional fear the victim experiences is that if she does complain, the matter will be taken lightly. If dismissed as a joke by her instructor, the student may be afraid to protest, thinking she has placed too much emphasis on the situation. This is an expression of the extent of power or influence a professor exerts over the student.

This unique power relationship which exists between the instructor and the student adds many more dimensions to the problem of sexual harassment in institutions of higher education. "Sexual harassment must be a matter of particularly deep concern to an academic community in which students and faculty are related by strong bonds of intellectual dependence and trust."⁸ If this trust is broken, the impact on the student can be devastating. The student may appear to be disinterested, undedicated, and may even drop a course or change her major. However, "It is time we recognize that what has been judged female disinterest or lack of dedication is often the effect of sexual harassment."⁹ This can occur when she suddenly realizes that her instructor was not concerned with her intellectual growth, rather with his own sexual satisfaction.

For the student who is confronted with a sexual proposition by her instructor, the superior/subordinate situation exerts an extreme amount of pressure upon her decision to submit or refusal to comply. Refusal to comply could produce great risks; however, even if she submits, she is still being exploited because of the power her professor exerts over her academic future:

The exchange only guarantees a female student that she will be judged by her performance, not that her performance will be inflated. The performance meanwhile is inevitably impaired by the emotional stress of prolonged sexual intimacy exacted through fear and coercion.¹⁰

The fear which may have persuaded her to submit is the fear of academic reprisal for rejecting the proposition. "An instructor enjoys considerable discretionary power to provide or withhold academic rewards (grades, recommendations) and related resources (help, psychological support)."¹¹ As women begin to frame specific career goals, grades and recommendations from an instructor become increasingly important to their future career, and may even

affect the student's entire life. Knowing this, the student cannot freely choose "yes" or "no" because an objection to the sexual attention may mean jeopardizing her future, although the instructor is rarely explicit about retaliatory measures.

A common reaction to this unwanted sexual attention is the adoption of strategies to avoid a confrontation with the instructor or the possibility of it happening again. Some "students often mentioned their boyfriends or husbands to instructors...as an effective means to 'keep him at a safe distance.'"¹² According to recent studies, however, those who communicated directly to the instructor that his sexual attention was not acceptable were more successful in stopping it.¹³ Some victims of sexual harassment develop headaches, stomach ailments, depression, and diminished ambition as a result of the psychological and emotional turmoil of the experience. Others respond more drastically: "...many women leave school because of an explicit demand for sex, because of accumulated sexually harassing experiences, or some combination thereof."¹⁴

Sexual harassment on campus can also produce indirect consequences. Third parties may not approach an instructor because of a concern that they may encounter unwanted sexual attention. They may also feel uncomfortable because of knowledge that the professor has attempted to sexually coerce a peer or may be currently sexually involved with another student. "Anticipated sexual harassment, then, was also a factor in teacher-student relationships, and students sometimes adopted a 'better safe than sorry' cause of action. But..., this tactic may mean foregoing a potentially valuable academic relationship."¹⁵ Male professors may also fear the possible implications of a friendship with a female student. They may be so cautious or concerned that they shut out women from friend-teacher relationships that provide an invaluable learning experience for male students. In this way, women tend to miss out on informal contact with faculty members, affording female students less academic opportunity than male peers and fewer opportunities to obtain good job recommendations. "It appears that whether they are confronted with sexual propositions or are left alone because of the potential for them, women are inhibited in their pursuit of educational and professional goals."¹⁶

Since the issue was first addressed, university administrators have been forced to take action against this form of discrimination. Responding to public pressure, they have begun to acknowledge the prevalence of the problem. According to a recent study, one out of every fourteen women on a university campus are likely to be victims of sexual assault. Administrators have also experienced legal pressure to remedy this problem. Although the previously mentioned case of Alexander v. Yale University (631 F. 2d 178, 1980), failed to reach the Supreme Court, it did succeed in establishing that sexual harassment of students may constitute a violation of Title IX of the Education Amendment Acts of 1972.

Title IX prohibits discrimination based on sex in any educational program receiving federal financing and requires academic institutions 'to adopt and publish a grievance procedure providing for prompt and equitable resolution of student and employee complaints alleging actions which would be prohibited.'¹⁷

By the time this case had reached the United States Court of Appeals, Yale University had begun to establish a grievance procedure for sexual harassment. Thus, the case was lost on appeal because the institution was attempting to remedy the situation by developing a mechanism for formal complaints and failure of the plaintiff to prove an improper advance was made or that she was adversely affected by rejection of the advance.

In August 1981, the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education issued a policy statement defining sexual harassment under Title IX and set forth procedures for handling complaints. Although universities are now required to adopt grievance procedures under the threat that they can be sued if one is not available, the student may opt not to use the procedure and instead file complaints directly with the Department of Education. Other governmental agencies have also made statements regarding the issue. "The National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs has submitted to the Office of Civil Rights a legal memorandum which concludes that Title IX prohibits sexual harassment of students, faculty and staff."¹⁸ They express the belief that sexual harassment is an illegal and serious problem compelling federal involvement. Another claim which has been made is that "Sexual harassment can be seen as a potential source of malpractice litigation, since such activities can have a 'negative effect' on a student's academic standing, which is an essential component of malpractice charges."¹⁹

To date, there have been no Supreme Court cases which confront the issue of sexual harassment on college campuses. The difficulty of litigation provides an obstacle for the victim. Since there are usually no witnesses to incidents of sexual harassment, it becomes problematic to prove. Because the perceptions of the event may differ between men and women, the consequence becomes one interpretation of the situation versus the other. Upon the accusation of "gender harassment," some "faculty argue that any attempt to limit gender harassment violates their First Amendment rights and their academic freedom. They hold that the institution must not intervene."²⁰ In the event of a previously consenting relationship between the professor and his student, the line becomes difficult to draw as to where the consent ends and the harassment begins. The student who does attempt to file a lawsuit against a professor also faces the possibility of a counteraction suit by the professor claiming that the student unfairly implicated him on charges of sexual harassment. This provokes only more feelings of anguish and embarrassment for the student. Many believe that the issue awaits the

functioning of the judicial role to institute specific guidelines as to what actually and legally constitutes sexual harassment and what legal grounds would provide a basis for Supreme Court scrutiny.

As an alternative to the judicial system, the student may choose the grievance procedure of the college or university. Through the use of this mechanism, "At campuses around the country, both tenured and untenured professors have been reprimanded, suspended, or dismissed after being found guilty of sexually harassing students."²¹ An informal as well as a formal grievance procedure should be available for students to report incidents of sexual harassment and receive counselling. The informal procedure is a mechanism to motivate students to share their experiences. They are not required to take action against the harasser, hence alleviating the fear of retaliation. "The procedure encourages openness and candor among all parties."²² An attempt is made to persuade the student to confront the professor directly to try and reach some sort of agreement in an effort to avoid formal faculty disciplinary measures. If an agreement is not reached, the most serious step which is undertaken is the formal grievance procedure. A grievance board is selected from administrators, faculty members and students to hear complaints and act in an advisory capacity. Confidentiality must be maintained among the board. It then must decide whether or not to accept the complaints depending upon its legitimacy. If accepted, the board will officially investigate and review the complaint and will resolve it, ideally within sixty days.²³

Colleges and universities must combat this form of sexism in order to provide a healthy learning environment. Some suggestions which have been made to diminish or eliminate sexual harassment on college campuses have been to: develop a clear policy prohibiting sexual harassment and an adequate grievance procedure to handle complaints, document the problem and bring it into full public attention in order to build support for policies and procedures, establish a faculty code of conduct, include information about sexual harassment in student handbooks and in affirmative action plans and union contracts, and train counsellors and students to deal with the problem.²⁴

Although awareness of sexual harassment of students has increased and various measures to deal with its harmful effects have been adopted, there still remain some unanswered questions and perplexities. First of all, the fear of reprisal exists even with the mechanisms for correcting the situation. If a victim does file a complaint, what absolute protection can she be afforded against sometimes devastating retaliation? Can a woman sue for damages resulting from intentional infliction of severe emotional distress? Can a male faculty member, claiming he was forced to resign because of rumors of sexual harassment of a female student, sue an institution? Another very important issue is raised in the context of a

consenting relationship between a faculty member and a student: When there is a professional, supervisory relationship, should there also be a sexual relationship?

These all remain questions for either academic institutions or the courts to address. Although the Supreme Court has not confronted any of the issues directly involving the sexual harassment of students in the past, the future looks hopeful. The increasing acceptance of Title IX as prohibiting sexual harassment of students, the work of various agencies towards eliminating this sex discrimination and effective grievance procedures within academic institutions provide encouragement. For in our society, "Under the concept of equal educational opportunity, a female student should be able to pursue her academic career without being subjected to unwelcome sexist and sexual innuendo or any other form of verbal or physical sexual harassment."²⁵

Footnotes

¹Ruth Angress, et al. Sexual and Gender Harassment in the Academy (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1981), p. 13.

²Donna J. Benson and Gregg E. Thomson, "Sexual Harassment on a University Campus: The Confluence of Authority Relations, Sexual Interest and Gender Stratification," Social Problems (February 1982), p. 236.

³Lin Farley, Sexual Shakedown (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1978), p. 70.

⁴Anne Field, "Harassment on Campus: Sex in a Tenured Position?," Ms. (September 1981), p. 70.

⁵Amy Somers, "Sexual Harassment in Academe: Legal Issues and Definitions," Journal of Social Issues (Winter 1982), p. 26.

⁶Angress, et al., Sexual and Gender Harassment in the Academy, p. 4.

⁷Dale R. Howard, Bernice Lott and Mary Ellen Reilly, "Sexual Assault and Harassment: A Campus Community Case Study," Signs (Winter 1982), p. 318.

⁸Judith Berman Brandenburg, "Sexual Harassment in the University: Guidelines for Establishing a Grievance Procedure," Signs (Winter 1982), p. 321.

⁹Farley, Sexual Shakedown, p. 70.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 75.

¹¹Benson and Thomson, "Sexual Harassment on a University Campus: The Confluence of Authority Relations, Sexual Interest and Gender Stratification," p. 239.

¹²Ibid., p. 244.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Farley, Sexual Shakedown, p. 74.

¹⁵Benson and Thomson, "Sexual Harassment on a University Campus: The Confluence of Authority Relations, Sexual Interest and Gender Stratification," p. 245.

¹⁶Sandler and Associates, "Sexual Harassment: A Hidden Problem," p. 54.

¹⁷Brandenburg, "Sexual Harassment in the University: Guidelines for Establishing a Grievance Procedure," p. 325.

¹⁸Somers, "Sexual Harassment in Academe: Legal Issues and Definitions," p. 24.

¹⁹Marske, Taich and Vago, "Combatting Sexual Harassment: A New Awareness," USA Today (March 1980), p. 46.

²⁰Angress, et al., Sexual and Gender Harassment in the Academy, p. 23.

²¹Brandenburg, "Sexual Harassment in the University: Guidelines for Establishing a Grievance Procedure," p. 321.

²²Ibid., p. 326.

²³Ibid., p. 328-332.

²⁴Sandler and Associates, "Sexual Harassment: A Hidden Problem," p. 57.

²⁵Angress, et al., Sexual and Gender Harassment in the Academy, p. 11.

* * * * *

ERNEST EVERETT JUST AND BARBARA McCLINTOCK
SCIENTIFIC LESSONS FOR OUR TIMES
by Juliana Mulroy

I was first drawn to pure science because of its purity--the strength and clarity of its vision, the unambiguousness and universality of its answers. I still love science, in spite of, and perhaps somewhat more because of, my increased understanding of how the development of scientific knowledge is not pure, and in the short term at least does not follow a straight and narrow path.

Science is very much affected by the social structure of science and of scientists, and by the structure of the larger society in which science and its practitioners are embedded. What questions are asked and what answers are deemed acceptable depend heavily on the background of the askers and the acceptors, the social relationships among them, and the internal and external politics of funding decisions which make research and/or publication possible.

Not all scientists will agree with me on the above--and it is hard to give up precisely what attracts us to a field in the first place and what continues to be a major romantic myth in our culture. However, any biologist will tell you that we can learn much about structures and general principles of individuals and groups by studying the unusual ones, the exceptions to the rules. For this reason I want to call to your attention two recently published biographies of outstanding scientists who were marginal (and marginalized) by the larger dominant culture as well as by their scientific communities. The stories of Ernest Everett Just, an experimental embryologist at Howard University and Wood's Hole Biological Laboratories, and not incidentally a Black man, and Barbara McClintock, experimental geneticist at Cold Spring Harbor, and not incidentally a White woman, give us an unusual opportunity for an in-depth look at two scientists who were clearly uncommon not only in their ability but also in their persistence in and devotion to science (and who may well have never lost faith in science's purity). They achieved honors, awards and international recognition in spite of tremendous and continual obstacles attributable to color, gender, or finally perhaps to personal characteristics and personal politics which must have been formed at least in part by unequal treatment at the hands of colleagues and peers.

The delight is that Just and McClintock need no excuses for their science--in spite of all they persisted and made major contributions that have been recognized in major ways. The danger is that their very success has caused invocations of "Everyone faces obstacles. If _____ made it, anyone can."--a sort of cream-rises-to-the-top theory that takes no account of lids or caps or micropore filters.

Indeed, both scientists garnered major recognitions early on in their careers. But Just, the top student in his graduating class at Dartmouth (1907), could only get a job at a Black university that offered heavy teaching and administrative responsibilities and no graduate program. He remained there all his life, in spite of an outstanding record of research, publications and grants, and his determined efforts to get jobs at institutions more suited to his research interests and commitment. McClintock had to settle for an undergraduate major in Botany at Cornell because the department of Plant Breeding would not accept women students, but she soon found and joined a group working on the cytology and genetics of corn, and as a graduate student did what was almost immediately recognized as landmark research in experimental genetics. For fifteen years after getting her Ph.D. (in 1927) she could not get a tenure-track job even though she continued to win recognition and awards for her work, including election to the National Academy of Sciences (1944) and to the Presidency of the Genetics Society of America (1945).

The continued research of both Just and McClintock was made possible, if not comfortable, in part by the patronage of two directors of research laboratories. Just was able to pursue his research during summers at Wood's Hole (fancy enough, but the fact remains that no other research institution would have him), but he had to leave his wife and children at home because of the social ostracism by the White scientists and their families. White racism even by his patrons and supporters continued to block other opportunities to find a way to support himself and his family while continuing a research career. Any Denison faculty member can tell you what a commitment (chosen or otherwise) to undergraduate education means to people who also want to be on the "fast track" in research. That Just did not choose that career but was nevertheless given no other choice seems particularly awful to me.

McClintock, after fifteen years of gypsy appointments (some of them prestigious but short-term post-docs) ending in a terminal assistant professorship at Missouri, was invited to join the Carnegie Foundation's Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory (in 1942), where she has lived and worked, mostly in isolation, ever since. As she is still alive (and very much kicking) her biographer's job is very much the harder one--how much to say, how much to interpret, how much to deviate from the wishes of the subject. But there is no question in my mind that the employment history of Barbara McClintock in those first fifteen years was very much a product of society's (and scientists') reacting to her gender. Even with that conservative view (that only fifteen postdoctoral years were insecure and unpredictable and sometimes/often unsupportive of sustained research, and that everything else was rosy), we still must wonder how the course of science must have been changed, at least for a short term, by the narrow social (etc.) vision of scientists and society. Most of the news articles I've read have attributed the forty-year delay in acceptance of McClintock's ideas on transposition of genetic elements--the ideas

now considered so revolutionary that a botanist should be eligible to receive a Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine--as a function of her being, like the monk Gregor Mendel, "ahead of her time." Her life of isolation is suggested to be a product of a delightful eccentricity, and I think there is some truth in that--who but a truly unusual socially and intellectually self-sufficient person, no matter how great her/his natural talent, could have carried on so for 82 years? (What we must ask is, why should this be so, and at what price to individuals and to science?)

While individual cases and life histories are extremely interesting, biologists remind us that it is the patterns that inform. We are fortunate to have careful, meticulous biographies of these scientists by authors who are themselves very interested in the social structure of science and who use their subjects to illuminate the larger patterns and processes of U.S. science. Not only can we look to these works for light shed on the cumulative experiences of minority (by race and culture and gender) scientists in the U.S., but we can also explore the structure of mainstream science which has excluded so many at unknown cost to itself.

Two additional reasons for reading these books: McClintock's biographer Evelyn Fox Keller, Professor of Mathematics and Humanities at Northeastern University, has a special connection to Denison. She was the keynote speaker at Denison's Gender Issues in Science Conference (as she was finishing this book), where she inspired much discussion about how science itself might be different if the major practitioners had not been White, Western and male. Kenneth Manning, an MIT historian of science, has written of Ernest Everett Just what Stephen Jay Gould says is "among the finest biographies I ever read" and "the best book I have read this year." Granted that it is only November, and there aren't all that many biographies in the world. Still, to those of us who are fans of S.J. Gould and his writing on the history of science, this is high praise indeed, and if his recommendation won't entice you, nothing will.

The sudden publicity from McClintock's winning of the Nobel Prize and the enthusiastic reception by reviewers of both books have caused the books, like established Black and female scientists, to be in short supply. In fact, I was not able to get copies to refer to as I write this article and so have borrowed heavily from the reviews cited below.

Citations

Gould, Stephen Jay. 1983. "Thwarted Genius" [Review of Manning]. New York Review of Books, November 24: 3-8.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. 1983. A Feeling for the Organism. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Co. 235 pp. \$14.95

Maienschein, Jane. 1983. "Struggles of a biologist" [Review of Manning]. Science 222:1006-1007.

Manning, Kenneth R. 1983. Black Apollo of Science. The Life of Ernest Everett Just. New York: Oxford University Press. 397 pp. \$29.95.

Rossiter, Margaret W. 1983. "Wanting a lab of one's own" [Review of Keller]. New York Times Book Review, October 2:11,27.