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and at the annual convention. Such sessions provided the drama from which most news stories reporting the convention were made. The outcome of debates was to create an association as inclusive as possible. So far as could be determined, differences expressed on these and other issues were settled by voting and without "splitting" the organization.

A correspondent to the national office wrote almost immediately afterwards that it had been "an exciting and exhausting meeting but one which helped me see the need for the broad base of involvement which was present in token form only at the meetings themselves." Joanne Casto, a fourth grade teacher from Ashford, Washington, said that the most important part of the convention for her was meeting other women also working on feminist curriculum in elementary schools. Rosie Doughty, director of secondary instruction and affirmative action officer for Lorain, Ohio, who had come to the conference to observe, left, she said, with a feeling of "new hope." Shirley Harkess, coordinator of women's studies at the University of Kansas, formally thanked Sybil Weir and Marilyn Fleener, two of the many San Jose people who had worked for ten months on the planning and executing of the meeting.

Gayle Graham Yates

Women's Studies in Its Second Phase

A personal statement written for the program at the University of Minnesota and presented at a brown bag lunch.

Women's studies is in its seventh year nationally, its fifth year here, at least under that title. It is appropriate to take stock now and ask why women's studies? What is it about? Where is it going?

Women's studies was born out of the women's movement, is still a child of the women's movement—the academic branch of that family. The women's movement is in what I would now call its fourth phase; women's studies is in a parallel second stage.

At the first stage, women's studies needed the politics of grassroots organization; needed all the community and academic charisma that it could muster, needed to organize as a women-only enterprise; needed to launch out into areas of experiential education that had not been tried before; needed to get a curriculum under way that was somehow acceptable to the college administration but was at the same time faithful to the feminist perspective or the array of feminist perspectives out of which it was conceived.

The point of departure for a second stage—after establishing a program and establishing its acceptability as a bachelor's degree-granting unit—is the less glamorous but essential phase of settling in: of making our presence felt as a potent and viable power within the university; of developing a more sophisticated curriculum that combines the experiential learning that we are gaining with new research that we are doing; of making a new discipline—not necessarily a "discipline" in university parlance of a department, but discipline in the sense of rigorous intellectual activity that must be taken into account by the university and by the society.

We need to put to rest for good that tiresome argument: if androgyny is really the goal of women's studies, then oughtn't it work itself out of business? That is close to the argument Mary Daly disclaims in Beyond God the Father—of those who want to jump over the essential step of feminist rage at women being left out to a plateau of "human liberation." Women's studies need not think of working itself out of business, for there is at least 25 years of research to be done on questions that have already been raised out of the embryonic feminist perspective: Where are the women? Where were the women? What were the women doing? What are the women's points of view? What about female experience, female psychology, female culture; What would physics be like if women had thought up how to do it? There are several more stages after that set of questions is pursued.

While women's studies aims to provide courses and to do research from the point of view of women, it also intends to move toward fundamental change in the university, as Adrienne Rich describes in "Toward a Woman-Centered University" (Women and the Power to Change). We want women to exercise power in the institution, but also to create a place where the power of female experience is acknowledged and carried out. It is a truism in education that education is for the transmission of facts and values. Women's studies seeks to trans-
form values and to muster the facts to bring about transformation and change that will reverberate in society.

How will this occur in practice?

First, there is curriculum. We have begun to offer a liberal arts curriculum on topics about women under the rubric that they are taught with some form of feminist consciousness.

My hope is that some of these courses—Women and Literature; Women and the Law; Comparative Study of Women, an Anthropological Perspective, for example—will move into departments. We would then draw on them from the departments, and their presence would also be influential in the departments.

Then our core courses could be thoroughly interdisciplinary. The feminist journal, Signs, in its first editorial describes three patterns of interdisciplinary work: "one person, skilled in several disciplines, explores one subject; several persons, each skilled in one discipline, explore one subject together; or a group, delegates of several disciplines, publish in more or less random conjunction with each other in a single journal." It is my hope that we can be a program interdisciplinary in all three senses.

Interdisciplinary might also come to mean the use of methods and information from the research of multiple disciplines. It might also mean designing curriculum from a new pattern rather than blending one or more traditional disciplines. For example, I have been thinking about a pedagogy based on C. G. Jung's four types of cognition: thinking, intuition, feeling, sensation. These are similar to categories proposed by theologian Paul Tillich: the cognitive, the aesthetic, the social and the personal. Curriculum organized around such patterns might offer a basis for a new constellation of interdisciplinary work.

Second, there is the practical question of who is to teach women's studies? Must she/he have the conventional academic credentials, namely, the Ph.D.? I would say some should, some shouldn't. There are now a great many Ph.D.'s being earned with a focus on women, and those people promise to be stellar women's studies professors. But also, not unlike other University units such as the Medical School or the Law School, community people with experience of value for students ought to teach women's studies courses.

Can a man teach women's studies? I think that in this second stage my answer to that question is yes. Last spring at the Women and History Conference at the National Archives in Washington, Anne Firor Scott defined the distinctiveness of doing women's history as doing it from the point of view of women. It seems to me that as long as a man can work from that empathetic point of view of women, he is welcome and can make a useful contribution.

A third question is the political one of the exercise of power.

We have answered the question of whether we want to work inside the University by being in the University. The University is an institution holding power in the society. We want to develop an approach that will develop power for women within it. I think that that means that internally in the program we have to be reconciled with each other—that we must come to have a tolerance that some people want to do women's studies to bring about ideological acceptance of specific forms of thought; some people want to do women's studies to carry out specific bits of research about women on items of sociological or psychological knowledge. Saying that women's studies must do all of the above is the beginning of a healthy pluralism in academe. The dominant masculinist method in academic circles is one of present and attack—at the society meeting, one scholar reads a paper and two more are scheduled to attack it; or one scholar writes a book and the reviewers feel compelled to find matters about it to attack. As Adrienne Rich writes in "Toward a Woman-Centered University," argumentation is still today the dominant academic mode, a legacy from the Middle Ages. To present a method of openness to shared work, of the facilitation of each other's work through women's studies would be a challenge to the pugnacious mode of academic competition.

It would also add the dimension that is essential to women's studies—that our work is intimately connected with our lives. We must be reconcilers among women of different class backgrounds, of different ideologies, of different sexual preferences, of different aspirations.

This is a socially-activist objective, not objective learning, but women's studies has been activist from the start.

We have to learn to tolerate the differences among us. Yes, the pro-abortionists and the anti-abortionists can both be feminists, but they must both learn to analyze the components of the issues with clarity and competence; must learn to identify the emotions that they are using in their arguments; must trace out the people and the institutions that have influenced them to think as they do before they entitle themselves to the claim that what they are doing is women's studies.

Women's studies is not an objective science, but one of the objectives it may bring to the university is the rediscovery that nothing is. If I adequately understand it, even physics and mathematics (and I do not understand very adequately, for, though I consistently tested as a young student to have a higher mathematical aptitude than verbal aptitude, I was channeled toward the verbal, humanistic disciplines as more appropriate for a girl and thus now have a great ignorance of mathematics and science) if I understand adequately, even physics and mathematics are posited on hypotheses gained from the imagination.

Sometimes we have done women's studies without enough facts. But we are now moving, it seems to me, out of the necessity to ask the most pressing and personal questions that affect our experiences towards the accumulation of facts to build the new values that we are developing. 
