Primary Feminism:
The Politics of Endorsing Hillary Clinton in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary

By Kayla Calkin

B.A. 2007, Wellesley College

A Thesis Submitted to

The Faculty of the
Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
of The George Washington University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Masters of Arts

August 31, 2011

Thesis Directed by

Cynthia Harrison
Associate Professor of History, Women's Studies, and Public Policy

© Copyright 2011 by Kayla Calkin
All rights reserved

Dedication

The author wishes to dedicate this thesis to her campaign host mother, friend, advisor, and heroine Sandra Gillis.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the help she received while writing this paper. Thanks to all the women I interviewed who gave up their time to speak with me. Thanks to Professor Reverby for lending a second ear to this paper, and for four years of help at Wellesley. Thanks to Professor Harrison for a year of emails, questions, drafts and advice. Thanks to The George Washington University for providing with me the GTA Fellowship. And finally thanks to my parents for raising a feminist daughter!

Abstract of Thesis

Primary Feminism:

The Politics of Endorsing Hillary Clinton in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary

This thesis examines five feminist organizations involved in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary including the National Organization for Women (NOW), the National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC), Women's Campaign Forum (WCF), Emily's List, and NARAL. Did these feminist organizations endorse in the primary elections? Whom did they endorse and why? What were their goals and how did they come to their decisions? What was the reaction from the press? Public? Their members? Did they succeed in the aims of their endorsement?

This thesis includes first a look at the theories surrounding women's voting patterns. It then reviews the literature surrounding the 2008 Presidential primary and then follows the history of the formation of these organizations. Next we look at the history of women who have already run for President, how feminist organizations interacted with them, and whether or not they decided to endorse. Finally, this paper discusses the ten interviews of the heads of these feminist organizations. Each of them, excepting NARAL, endorsed Hillary Clinton in the Democratic Presidential primary of 2008. NARAL made the controversial decision to make a general endorsement of Barack Obama with the primary still ongoing. This essay shows how each organization made its decision to endorse, and the results for the future of these organizations, future female Presidential candidates, and feminism.

Table of Contents

Dedication iii

Acknowledgements iv

Abstract v

Chapter 1: Introduction 2

Chapter 2: Women in Office 9

Chapter 3: Historical Context of Women's Organizations 25

Chapter 4: The Women Who Have Run for President 47

Chapter 5: Methods 88

Chapter 6: The Primary Endorsements 99

Chapter 7: Conclusion 139

Works Cited 144

. . . . The right to vote, or equal civil rights, may be good demands, but true emancipation begins neither at the polls nor at the courts. It begins at woman's soul. History tells us that every oppressed class gained true liberation from its masters through its own efforts. It is necessary that woman learn that lesson, that she realize that her freedom will reach as far as her power to achieve her freedom reaches.[1]

Emma Goldman, 1911

[1] Emma Goldman, "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," Ed. Alice Rossi., *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*. (Boston: First Northeastern University Press, 1973), 215.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

On January 21, 2007 my best friend Katie and I met in her dorm room at Wellesley College to discuss our plans for helping Senator Clinton on our campus. From her room, we conceived " Wellesley Students for Hillary." Within weeks we were sending our fellow students up to New Hampshire to start knocking on doors. We created committees on campus to convince fellow students and started taking weekend trips to New York City to volunteer for her fundraisers.

I immediately felt allegiance to Senator Clinton. First of all, she was a progressive candidate with a strong record for women's rights. I knew she had walked the walk for women, not only in the United States, but also around the world. Second, she was an alumna of my college, and we place a strong emphasis on sisterly support. Finally, I felt that Hillary was the first woman to have a legitimate chance at winning the Presidency. I wanted to be a part of living history (to quote Senator Clinton) with her.

But I also had my doubts about Senator Clinton. I doubted her progressiveness on several issues. Why did she vote for the war? What did "safe, legal, and rare" really mean when she discussed abortion? This statement sounded judgmental to me. And beyond her positions, I had doubts about her electability. Didn't she hold the title of most divisive politician? My father told me, and would repeatedly tell me throughout the following year, "I don't know, Kayla; people just hate her." And yet he could never tell me who these people were, or why they hated her. And who was this Obama character? Was he really running as a one-term senator, who had yet to be re-elected? And why did I have so many friends who were enthralled with him? What didn't I get?

Regardless of my doubts, I continued my work with Students for Hillary and started to

meet campaign staff. Katie and I applied to work for Hillary in New Hampshire and her field team immediately hired us as field organizers; we both began a week after our graduation. From June 2007 through June 2008 I campaigned for Hillary in no fewer than five states, including New Hampshire, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Oregon. Here is a sample of some of the comments I heard on the trail from voters:

"Hillary Clinton? Why she's the devil incarnate! When you call do you have to dial 666 first?"

– New Hampshire male voter, first week on the job.

"You sound like you're black, you should be for Obama . . . .*click*"

—Georgia male voter.

"I don't want a blue lipped n****r for President."

—A Pennsylvanian volunteer, after being asked why she was supporting Hillary.

"You're race traitors! Get out of that office!"

—Georgia black man yelling at black female volunteers.

"I can't support Hillary because she's pro-abortion. If women could just learn to close their legs . . . . "

—Female Pennsylvania voter.

"The worst thing about Hillary Clinton is that she's a woman."

—Male Pennsylvanian voter on walking into our office.

"I mean, Barack Hussein Obama?? Didn't we just try to kill that guy?"

—Female Pennsylvanian voter after saying yes to volunteering.

"I can't support her because she stayed with Bill."

—New Hampshire male voter.

"I'm supporting her because she stayed with Bill."

—Another New Hampshire male voter.

"I just wish she were more motherly."

—New Hampshire female voter.

"This country is just not ready for a woman President."

—Heard in every state.

"This country is just not ready for a black President."

—Heard in every state.

"Ugh Hillary Clinton? No way I hate her . . . . Why? Well, I don't know. Okay well I guess I don't really *hate* her, but I know a lot of people who do . . . . Which people? Well I don't know. I just know they're out there."

—Same conversation in every state.

"I want to vote for Hillary, but I'm afraid of betraying my race!"

—Female black volunteer in Georgia.

"I want to volunteer for Hillary, but my husband won't let me."

—Female (potential) volunteer in New Hampshire.

"No way! She voted for the war."

—New Hampshire voters.

"I'm proud of her for not apologizing for her war vote."

—Other New Hampshire voters.

"We can't let a n-word be president."

—Alabama male voter.

"Being First Lady doesn't count as experience."

—Heard in every state.

"Vote for the White Girl – Vote for Hillary."

—Painted on a volunteer's truck in Pennsylvania (and quickly removed)

"I want to support a woman for President who got there on her own merit, not because she has a famous husband."

—Female New Hampshire voter.

"Why am I supporting Hillary? Because I have a f******g uterus."

—Female New Hampshire voter.

Obviously, Hillary had her work cut out for her. And obviously I had my work cut out as well. One voter's opinion negated the other. Every possible sexist or racist belief that could be expressed, voters would articulate in sometimes disguised language, sometimes blatant. The same voters who called themselves die-hard liberals and feminists would tell me "I just wish Hillary were more womanly." Other voters who also called themselves progressive would tell me "I'm not a racist but… [fill in the racist comment here]."

Over the year I also watched feminists and feminist organizations go back and forth on their support for either candidate. In May of 2008, a few weeks before Hillary would concede the nomination, NARAL Pro-Choice America announced its endorsement of Senator Barack Obama. I personally reacted with shock and disappointment. Family, friends, former volunteers, and campaign staff all called me immediately to share some kind of reaction. Most of them could not understand it. The NARAL blog making this announcement exploded with contributors posting hundreds of comments within the hour expressing dismay, hurt, frustration, pleasure, relief, or heartbreak. The most powerful women's lobby group, and arguably one of the most powerful lobbies in Congress, had endorsed a man for President in a primary with a female with a strong pro-choice track record still on the campaign trail.

The NARAL decision made me wonder – had feminism changed? How did gender solidarity now interact with potential political gains? Has gender solidarity ever been as important as political gains? Its decision forced me to consider if and how feminist organizations had affected this primary. What role did they play, and what function would they play if the United States elected a female President? Was NARAL's decision necessarily a bellwether for the future of feminist political endorsements? Or was it just a fluke? Why didn't other feminist organizations make a similar calculation?

This thesis explores the role that feminist organizations played in the 2008 Primary. It is broken into seven chapters. The second chapter explores various theories concerning endorsements, politics, political engagement, and women in office and applies them to the question of what endorsements from feminist organizations can mean. I identify the unique challenges women's organizations face in making endorsement decisions. Finally, I conclude with a critical literature review of four books that have been published since the conclusion of the 2008 Primary. Academics wrote two of the books I discuss, and journalists wrote the other two. Each contributes in its own way to a historical description of the primary, but none quite describes the role of feminist organizations in the primary.

The third chapter explores the historical background surrounding the formation of these feminist groups. It looks at the historical context of the Civil Rights movement and how it contributed to the women's movement of the 1960s. It also examines the President's Commission on the Status of Women and how that group contributed in a circuitous way to the formation of the National Organization for Women. Chapter 3 goes into detail about the subsequent women's political groups that followed soon after NOW. Chapter 3 also explores the

response from groups of women of color, who were frustrated with the emerging women's movement.

Chapter 4 discusses various female Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. Not every candidate is discussed, but I touch on the main groundbreakers. I ask whether feminists and feminist groups endorsed? How did they contribute to a candidate's campaign? How did these campaigns set up the context for the 2008 Democratic Primary? I also explore why these women lost, and what happened to the feminist organizations that endorsed them (or not). Did they gain or lose prestige? Power? Money?

Chapter 5 describes my methods for this project. I discuss my objectives and purpose. I go into detail about how I chose these organizations and how I conducted my research. I explain the interview questions I asked and why. I also discuss feminist ethics of research and study. Chapter 6 discusses the ten interviews I did with each organization in this study. I explain each endorsement in chronological order of their endorsements: Emily's List, NWPC, NOW, Women's Campaign Forum, and NARAL. For most organizations I interviewed the president and the political director (or some equivalent) of the organization at the time of the endorsement. I detail how each organization decided to endorse and the procedure; the conversation around the endorsement; the press release; and finally the effects of the endorsement. I ask what the endorsement meant in relation to that organization's past, and what it means for feminisms' futures. I explain each organization's response to NARAL's endorsement (the only organization to endorse Senator Obama) and finally NOW's endorsement of Senator Obama in the general election.

Chapter 7, the conclusion, discusses the themes and general conclusions from this work. I organize the themes and commonalities from the interviews. What do these endorsements

mean? Do they display any change in feminism? Is that an important question? And after the 2008 primary, what is the future of feminism?

CHAPTER 2: WOMEN IN OFFICE

Why explore gender patterns and politics? This chapter examines the questions behind my motivation and research. Do women act differently in office and does it/should it matter? If it helps women, do endorsements matter? Why do groups make endorsements and what do endorsements do? Then I conclude with asking: When a feminist group does make an endorsement of a female candidate, what are the effects? Does it increase voter turnout? Does it effectively implement the goals the organization has in mind?

Endorsements and Women in Office

Given the number of endorsements various interest groups make in elections, it is a relevant question to ask—what difference do they make? Most endorsements come with money, notifying the membership within the organization of the endorsement, and sometimes helping the candidate in other tangible ways (commercials, literature, mailings, volunteers, canvassers, etc). According to political scientists Abramowitz, Rapport, and Stone, "Groups have a vested interest in signing on early with a preferred candidate to extract the maximum reward and to repay past support for group goals by that candidate."[2] However, do these endorsements translate into a change in voting behavior? According to sociologist Monika McDermott's research, when liberal groups make endorsements, this leads to more group cohesion among liberal voters. However, endorsement by liberals has the opposite effect with conservatives. In her research, when labor had endorsed a liberal candidate, it made Democrats more likely to support that candidate; however, when labor endorsed a conservative candidate, it had no effect on Republican voting behavior.[3]

---

[2] Alan Abramowitz, et al, "Do Endorsements Matter? Group Influence in the 1984 Democratic Caucuses," *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 85, No. 1 (Mar. 1991), 194.
[3] Monika L. McDermott, "Not for Members Only: Group Endorsements as Electoral Information Cues," *Political Research Quarterly* Vol. 59, No. 2 (June, 2006), 255.

Abramowitz, Rapport, and Stone's study of the 1984 election found that members of women's rights groups were less likely to support Mondale than nonmembers—roughly 40 percent vs. 44.4 percent, despite the fact that NOW, the most prominent women's rights group, had endorsed Mondale. On the other hand, when compared to labor and teacher's union activists, women activists within NOW were less likely to caucus for Mondale, but after the endorsement they were more likely to be more active in the campaign (volunteering, donating, etc).[4] This study demonstrates that while a NOW endorsement has clout, and certainly it had an effect on the election of 1984, it did not guarantee support from all its members. However at the same time, the endorsement did guarantee a level of involvement from the members unseen in other comparable groups.

Both of these studies show that endorsements do translate into votes and action from members within an organization. Monika McDermott's research also shows that traditionally "liberal" group endorsements affect liberal voting patterns, beyond just members of the group itself. Abramowitz, Rapport, and Stone's research shows that endorsements translate not necessarily into votes but definitely into action, especially in regard to the women's rights community. Therefore, if women's rights groups have a vested interest in supporting candidates who support women's rights, endorsing those candidates clearly helps those candidates get elected, therefore helping fulfill the missions of these women's rights groups.

Women in Office

After examining the effects of endorsements, it is then critical to ask why women? Theories about women in office and women's voting patterns vary widely and usually depend on who is asking what, and why. Is the question simply about symbolic representation—since

[4] Abramowitz, "Do Endorsements Matter?" 196.

women make up more than 50 percent of the population should they therefore be represented adequately?[5] But if the question is more than that—do women substantively vote and legislate differently from men, in style or in issues they care about – what does that mean for promoting equality? Many people assume that women will naturally care more about women's issues as women. But how do you define "women's issues" and how does that definition further the separation of the genders? And how do you define women? When a minority group makes up 50 percent of the population, won't every issue impact that group in some way?

The term "women" seems straightforward, but if one tries to define it, the word becomes more complex. A woman can be any race, any income level, any religion, any sexuality, and/or any gender identity. In the U.S., political scientists also have to account for regional differences. The "average female voter" in Massachusetts is not going to be the same as the "average female voter" in Mississippi. Women are such a diverse group that according to political scientists Anne Costain and Steven Majstorovic it is difficult to establish what a "women's issue" can be. Therefore, they assert, "the general public has been slower to come to the belief that women as a group have been systematically discriminated against."[6]

However, depending on the definitions of these "women's interests," most contemporary research indicates that women have a tendency to vote more "liberally" than men, both as individuals and elected officials.[7] Professor of Political Science and Women and Gender Studies, Susan Carroll argues in *Women as Candidates in American Politics* that men do not

---

[5] Richard Logan Fox, *Gender Dynamics in Congressional Elections* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 3.
[6] Anne Costain and Steven Majstorovic, "Congress, Social Movements, and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights Legislation," *Political Research Quarterly*: Vol. 47, No. 1 (Mar. 1994), 118.
[7] See Carroll's "Woman Candidates and Support for Feminist Concerns: The Closet Feminist Syndrome"; Norton's "Uncovering the Dimensionality of Gender Voting in Congress"; Poggione's "Exploring Gender Differences in State Legislators' Policy Preferences"; Sanbonmatsu's "Gender Stereotypes and Vote Choice"; Sanbonmatu's "Gender-Related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women"; Swers' "Are Women More Likely to Vote for Women's Issue Bills than Their Male Colleagues"; Welch's "Are Women More Liberal than Men in the U.S. Congress"

adequately represent women's interests.[8] As she explains, if one looks at the history of policy, while keeping in mind constituent needs of both genders, male politicians have not made significant progress on issues that matter to women. Her research also suggests that while female candidates may hold both feminist and anti-feminist positions, the majority of them trend towards voting in support of women's issues.[9]

Political scientist Kira Sanbonmatsu adds to this argument that "women legislators more feel a special responsibility to act for women as a group."[10] Previous research by political scientist Noelle Norton also demonstrates that women have a tendency to be more supportive of legislation "that directly affects the lives of women and children and that women are more likely to vote for candidates who support women's issues."[11] Political scientist Michele Swers, like others in this field, defines "women's issues" as health care, welfare, reproductive rights, and education. Her work shows that women are more likely in general to vote for "women's issues" than men but their vote depends on how directly correlated legislation is with women's interests. The more "directly an issue affects women, such as votes concerning abortion and other reproductive issues, women's health concerns, and the protection of women against violent crime, the more likely it is that gender will play a role in determining a representative's vote."[12] This study therefore concludes that legislation that concerns women's bodies has more salience.

Susan Welch's research on women in Congress found that because women are not interested in what she calls "macho culture" including war, and they are more likely to vote against such measures. Thus women vote the way they do not because women particularly care

---

[8] Susan Carroll, *Women as Candidates in American Politics* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 17.
[9] Ibid., 144.
[10] Kira Sanbonmatsu, "Gender-related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women," *Political Behavior* Vol. 25, No. 4 (Dec. 2003), 367.
[11] Noelle Norton, "Uncovering the Dimensionality of Gender Voting in Congress," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 24, No. 1 (Feb. 1999), 66.
[12] Michele Swers, "Are Women More Likely to Vote for Women's Issue Bills than Their Male Colleagues?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 23, No. 3 (Aug, 1998), 445.

about women's issues, but because they are not interested in masculine or "macho" issues. Her research also demonstrates that women are less interested in, and have fewer opportunities for political career advancement than men, so women are able to "swim against the tide."[13] This means they are able to vote more progressively and without concern for the political ramifications men face. Perhaps it is this lack of concern for political career advancement that allows women to vote more progressively, or with more disregard to popular conventions on women's roles.

Political scientist Jane Mansbridge found that women in office matters more than just which legislation they support. According to Mansbridge, the power divide between men and women interferes with their ability to communicate freely. Therefore, when a man represents women's interests, he does so at the peril of knowing that the women's rights groups he may be working with might not be able to communicate with him in the same way as they would with a woman. Mansbridge mentions, for instance, that this power divide interfered with women's rights groups to effectively work with Senator Birch Bayh on ERA legislation, possibly leading to its demise. As Mansbridge argues, "The deeper the communicative chasm between a dominant and a subordinate group, the more descriptive representation is needed to bridge that chasm."[14]

Some research indicates that other less obvious factors have a salient impact on the vote choice of women. Sanbonmatsu's research, for example, argues that women are simply not as informed about politics and therefore do not understand when they are voting out of their "best interests." She says if more women held public office, there would be less disparity among

[13] Susan Welch, "Are Women More Liberal than Men in the US Congress?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 1 (Feb., 1985), 127.
[14] Jane Mansbridge, "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent Yes," *The Journal of Politics* Vol. 61, No. 3 (Aug. 1999), 643.

women's voting patterns: "Women's candidacies in turn, provide the opportunity to enhance the descriptive and substantive representation of women."[15] Janice McCabe's research suggests that while women are likely to agree with feminist platforms, they are not likely to identify as feminist, which ultimately affects their vote. If more women understood what feminist platforms they actually agreed with, they would be more likely to vote for women's issues, and candidates who supported women's issues.[16] Her research supports Susan Welch's findings that women might eschew the "women's movement" but embrace and vote for feminist issues.[17] Therefore, not only are women less informed about the issues that should matter to them, but they also do not embrace the label that would help them identify how to vote.

When it comes to race and gender, in general, many researchers argue that race "trumps gender" as if one could be separate from the other. Sociologist Juanita Firestone's research indicates that ethnicity "is significant and among the strongest predictors of scores for all years."[18] Many political scientists acknowledge however, that there is so much irregularity within these categories that it is relatively difficult to make any kind of assumptions about race, gender and voting. For instance, political scientist Pei Te Lien's research indicates that Asian women may be more conservative than Asian men, while Latina women may vote similarly to Latino men.[19]

---

[15] Sanbonmatsu, "Gender-related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women," 381.
[16] Janice McCabe, "What's in a label? The Relationship between Feminist Self-Identification and 'Feminist' Attitudes among U.S. Women and Men," *Gender and Society* Vol. 19, No. 4 (Aug. 2005), 497.
[17] Susan Welch, "Support Among Women for the Issues of the Women's Movement," *The Sociological Quarterly* Vol. 16, No. 2 (Spring, 1975), 226.
[18] Juanita M. Firestone and Arturo Vega, "The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 20, No. 2, (May 1995), 220.
[19] Pei-Te Lien, "Does the Gender Gap in Political Attitudes and Behavior Vary across Racial Groups?" *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No. 4, (Dec. 1998), 887.

In regard to feminist identities, political scientist Claudine Gay finds that black women are more likely to identify as feminists than white women.[20] According to her research, women who identified strongly with their race also identified more strongly as a feminist.[21] This identification makes black women more strongly connected to voting for women's issues than white women. In addition, according to political scientist Tasha Philpot's research on black women candidates, when gender and race interact, "the intersection trumps both"; in other words, in the case of black women, black women are more likely to support other black women.[22] Philpot concludes that while it might appear that race is a more significant voting factor than gender, this does not mean that black women are not aware of sexism.[23]

However, while most research indicates that women generally vote in a "liberal" pattern, and generally vote for "women's issues" there are many other factors that can have more salience than gender or even race. Other researchers argue that political party, economic income, religion, or Congressional district intersect with gender identity, or sometimes have more impact on voting patterns than gender.[24] Research by Juanita Firestone and political scientist Margaret Trevor found that party, constituency, and district remain better predictors of voting patterns than gender.[25] Another article by Susan Welch found that while men and women may have similar economic backgrounds, they might not have similar voting outcomes. But Welch explains that

[20] Claudine Gay and Katherine Tate, "Doubly Bound: The Impact of Gender and Race on the Politics of Black Women," *Political Psychology* Vol. 19, No. 1 (March, 1998), 171.
[21] Ibid., 171.
[22] Tasha S. Philpot, "One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Jan 2007), 49.
[23] Lien, "Does the Gender Gap in Political Attitudes and Behavior Vary across Racial Groups?" 887-888.
[24] See Margaret Trevor's "Political Socialization, Party Identification, and the Gender Gap"; Regina Branton's "Examining Individual- Level Voting Behavior on State Ballot Propositions"; Juanita Firestone's "The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women"; Sue Rinehart's "The Intersection of Gender Politics and Religious Beliefs"; Susan Welch's "Financial Conditions, Gender, and Voting in American National Elections"; and Sanbonmatu's "Gender Stereotypes and Vote Choice"
[25] Juanita M. Firestone and Arturo Vega, "The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior," 220; Margaret Trevor, "Political Socialization, Party Identification, and the Gender Gap," *The Public Opinion Quarterly,* Vol. 63, No. 1 (Spring 1999).

personal economic background may not explain voting patterns any more than gender might.[26] Political scientists Susan Rinehart and Jerry Perkins argue that religion does not necessarily make women more or less conservative.[27] Finally, according to political scientists Leonie Huddy and Tony E. Carey, women are more likely to support female candidates than men, but it is difficult to determine if this behavior is simply a result of women's generally liberal voting patterns, or a result of gender solidarity.[28]

Political scientists Barbara Norrander, Claudine Gay, Katherine Tate, and Susan Welch all argue that the more women join politics, the more diversity there will be in voting.[29] In addition, the more diversity within the women who join politics, the greater the plethora of issues women vote on. These other identities and issues may signify why women might not vote as a cohesive bloc: "Multiple group identities that develop as a consequence of greater social and economic integration have the effect of weakening an individual's group orientation toward politics."[30] When more women join politics over time, the gender gap in voting decreases.[31]

And what about the effects of female representation on voters both male and female? In political scientist Jennifer Lawless's article "Politics of Presence? Congresswomen and Symbolic Representation" Lawless shows that clearly symbolic representation makes a difference. Women are more likely to feel better about their representation, approve of their representative, and approve of Congress in general, when represented by a woman than by a man. This finding

[26] Susan Welch and John Hibbing, "Financial Conditions, Gender, and Voting in American National Elections," *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Feb. 1992), 210.
[27] Susan Tolleson Rinehart and Jerry Perkins, "The Intersection of Gender Politics and Religious Beliefs," *Political Behavior* Vol. 11, No. 1 (March 1989).
[28] Leonie Huddy and Tony E. Carey, Jr, "Group Politics Redux: Race and Gender in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primaries," *Politics and Gender:* Vol, 5 No. 1 (2009), 84.
[29] See Barbara Norrander's "The Evolution of the Gender Gap"; Claudine Gay's "Doubly Bound: The Impact of Gender and Race on the Politics of Black Women"; and Welch's "Are Women More Liberal than Men in the US Congress"
[30] Claudine Gay and Katherine Tate, "Doubly Bound," 171.
[31] Susan Welch, "Are Women More Liberal than Men in the US Congress?"

holds true regardless of political party or other socio-demographics including race, income, and age. Given other research that indicates that women in office are more likely to care about and make progress for "women's issues," it seems like this research perpetuates a happy cycle for women's rights. And as Lawless points out, this symbolic representation and high approval rating might also encourage women to also run for office.

On the other hand, her research also demonstrates that gender congruence (between the voter and the person running for office) does not necessarily indicate higher levels of voter trust, registration, or participation. Women are not necessarily more likely to be politically engaged if the candidate is also a woman. They are also not more likely to trust their representative if they are represented by a woman. Consequently the research shows that gender congruence only positively affects Congressional approval, but it has no impact on trust and voter engagement.[32]

This research explains the frustrations women's organizations face in trying to mobilize other women for women candidates. Endorsements matter and make a difference—they translate into real money, votes, and liberal voter cohesion for their candidates. In addition, women legislators generally are more likely to fight for women's rights and women's groups are more likely to be able to communicate more freely with female legislators than male legislators.[33] Therefore, women's organizations have a vested interest in promoting women in office and making political endorsements. However, as some research shows, women as voters may not know the issues that matter to them, and they are also not likely to necessarily connect those issues with a feminist identity.[34] And while women are slightly more likely to support

---

[32] Jennifer Lawless, "Politics of Presence? Congresswomen and Symbolic Representation," *Political Research Quarterly* Vol. 57, No. 1 (Mar. 2004), 93.
[33] Mansbridge, "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women?" 643.
[34] See Carroll's "Woman Candidates and Support for Feminist Concerns: The Closet Feminist Syndrome"; Sanbonmatsu's "Gender-related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women"; and McCabe's "What's in a label? The Relationship between Feminist Self-Identification and 'Feminist' Attitudes among U.S. Women and Men."

female candidates, it is not clear if this is a result of gender solidarity or simply liberal voting.[35] As a result, women's organizations and feminist identity do not necessarily help these organizations in their goals of mobilizing women to vote for progressive female candidates.

But then, even the gender of the candidate does not increase mobilization or voter registration.[36] Therefore, women's organizations cannot rely on gender alone to mobilize women to register and vote. So the question becomes: What should women's groups do first? Should women's groups promote women candidates? Or should they mobilize women to vote and how? Should they register women? Should they educate women on the importance of voting for other women?

When feminist organizations often do make the choice to endorse a candidate, they have a Herculean task. Organization leaders know that studies demonstrate that an increase of women in Congress leads to more pro-women legislation, which then increases public support for women's rights. In making their decisions about where to focus their energies, however, they not only have to weigh the qualifications of the candidate they are endorsing, but also to examine how other possibly more salient issues or demographic identifications will interact with her gender identity. Once deciding to make an endorsement, they have to educate other women about the importance of supporting that candidate, and then also make sure the women they are educating are registered. Once registered, they have to make sure the voter actually gets to the polls. At every point in the voting process these organizations face significant challenges.

However, there is hope. According to political scientists Anne Costain and Steven Majstorovic, when Congress passes legislation that increase women's rights, public opinion of women's abilities increases. While very often public opinion will shape Congress, in the case of

[35] Leonie Huddy and Tony E. Carey, Jr., "Group Politics Redux," 84.
[36] Lawless, "Politics of Presence?" 93.

the women's movement, it is apparent that Congress also shapes public opinion. With the increase in legislation supporting women's rights, the general public supports more women's rights, which leads to more Americans willing to vote for a woman president.[37]

Recent Publications

Since the end of the campaign in 2008, journalists and academics have published tons of material on the election. The most prominent books published thus far specifically on feminism and the campaign include (but are not limited to): Nichola D. Gutgold's *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton "Won" in 2008,* Beverly Guy Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole's *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign*, Anne Kornblut's *Notes from the Cracked Ceiling: Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and What it Will Take for a Woman to Win,* and Rebecca Traister's *Big Girl's Don't Cry: The Election that Changed Everything for American Women.* All four ask what feminists, politics, and future female candidates can learn from this primary. The first two are academic dissections, while the second two are journalists' interpretations of the events. In this section I will explain what each author hopes to communicate in her work, and the gaps that my research fills.

Professor Nichola Gutgold's *Almost Madam President* reads similarly to her previous book, *Paving the Way for Madam President*. Gutgold asserts that "what is remarkable isn't that she ran for President. What is remarkable is that she *almost won*."[38] She breaks down Hillary's campaign, debate, speech, and communication style. She explains the various ways her sex, race, and class influenced the way the media treated her. Gutgold studies the media to analyze

[37] See Anne Costain and Steven Majstorovic's "Congress, Social Movements, and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights legislation."
[38] Nichola Gutgold, *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton "Won" in 2008* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2009), 2.

the impact the image of women in power can have on future generations. She explains that unfortunately, young girls are unaware of the women who have run for President before Hillary, some of them saying, "Only Hillary has ever run."[39] All in all, her examination and academic work is part of an effort to show that Hillary's presence in the media has forever influenced what younger American girls will think of the possibility of a woman running for President.

Professors Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnnetta Betsch Cole's book *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out on the 2008 Presidential Campaign* is a compendium of various articles, editorials, speeches, and musings from professors, feminists, lawyers, candidates, and journalists. The anthology includes well-known names like Gloria Steinem and Carol Moseley Braun, but it also includes younger less familiar feminist activists. They were careful to include as many different races, sexualities, genders, and generational differences as possible.

Guy-Sheftall and Cole write in their introduction, "The race for the White House between Senators Obama and Clinton was the most divisive battle we have witnessed among feminists in our lifetimes." They explain the feminist identity politics and infighting was their biggest take away from the primary, and one that they want to learn from:

> We believed that what we learned as feminists of all races and ages during many painful, even heart-wrenching moments during the campaign would be instructive in the future. At the very least we hoped that never again—*not in our lifetimes*—would we minimize or fail to comprehend the dire consequences of pitting race against gender in any political arena, including presidential campaigns"[sic].[40]

[39] Ibid., 10.
[40] Ed. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole, *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010), 6-7.

As they explain in their introduction, the book is a thoughtful look at how the primary campaign shaped our understanding of what feminism means. It examines how history has played a role in the debate today between various groups within the feminist movement.

Finally, the anthology acknowledges the various positions and vote choices held by feminists involved in the campaigns. The first section is broken into "Editorials, Opinions, and Petitions," the second is "Personal Reflections," the third is "Essays: Making Our Case," and they conclude with the final section "Post-election: What We Learned." The first chapter opens with an article entitled "Feminists for Peace and Barack Obama" by seven well-known feminists who specifically addressed Hillary's vote for the War in Iraq and called on feminists to support President Obama because of his anti-war stance. The articles that follow in this section include feminist defenses of Hillary and feminist defenses of Obama—but many articles explain that the election is not about gender versus race.

In the second section "Personal Reflections"—Guy-Sheftall and Cole included pieces from Alice Walker, Jessica Valenti, Erica Jong, Katha Pollitt, and Carol Moseley Braun to name a few. Alice Walker opens the chapter with a touching essay about the challenges of being black in America and openly calls on her white feminist sisters to stop demanding gender solidarity over the other qualities Obama presented as a candidate. Carol Moseley Braun follows with an article titled "Culture Trumps Politics and Gender Trumps Race"—detailing her experience on the campaign trail and how thrilled she felt to see a black man and a white woman running in a primary only four years after she had run and lost. Jessica Valenti's piece addresses the supposed racial/gender divide while also claiming a third wave approach to the movement. She urges feminists to move past the divide and think about what could be best for the feminist

movement—which in her opinion would be supporting President Obama. The rest of the section includes pieces by writers of all races, ages, and genders explaining their personal vote choice.

The final two sections "Essays: Making Our Case" and "Post-Election: What We Learned" highlight some of the most sentient articles of the campaign. Robin Morgan's piece "Goodbye to All That #2" rippled through the feminist community when she published it in February of 2008. She titled this article as a response to her original piece "Goodbye to All That" which she published in 1970. Morgan called out all the sexism and sexist stereotypes that had been plaguing Hillary throughout the campaign and directed a challenge to other feminists with her final line: "Me, I'm voting for Hillary not because she's a woman—but because *I* am" [sic].[41] For some, this article reified the divide between race and gender in the 1970s. Finally, Guy-Sheftall and Cole finish with articles by Andrea Smith, Gloria Steinem, M. Jacqui Alexander, Gail Lewis, and Gloria Wekker. Each article acknowledges the strife of the campaign, but also the hope for the future.

Journalists who covered the primary and general election wrote the following two books. In *Big Girls Don't Cry: The Election That Changed Everything for American Women,* Rebecca Traister of *Salon* recaps the primary by specifically gauging women's reactions and involvement. She goes into depth about her own personal turmoil as a younger woman split between the two waves of feminism and covers the similar dilemmas many female voters faced during the campaign. Traister makes the assertion that Hillary's loss in Iowa opened women's eyes across America. She argues the media backlash started to affect American women personally: "Women

[41] Robin Morgan, "Goodbye to All That #2," Ed. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole, *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010), 162.

who had spent months pretending that Clinton was not a woman suddenly could not help but recognize how she had been treated."[42]

A few days after her loss in Iowa, Hillary displayed unscripted and natural emotion on television (hence the title of Traister's book). The media attacked her again harshly, questioning Hillary's ability to "do the job." Her moment of exposed vulnerability convinced even more women, and particularly female New Hampshire voters, that it was time to get on board to support Hillary. Traister asserts that New Hampshire's turnout for Hillary was not a result of sisterly affection and loyalty, but rather the expression of a latent but now resurgent feminist political force, "The women's vote in New Hampshire was not a sign of essentialist gynocentric solidarity; it was a show of political and rebellious feminist force more potent than any march on Washington."[43] Indeed, New Hampshire's turnout for Hillary precipitated Traister's own switch from leaning towards Edwards to fully supporting Hillary.

Traister writes a thoughtful analysis of the two generations of feminism, relating both to feminisms' histories. She explains to readers that a "feminist monolith" is a myth and that rarely has there been a time when "women" as a group came together and agreed on anything. She explains that at best the "feminist movement" (if it can even be termed such) has been a loosely organized group of diverse women who got together briefly for a shared goal. At worst it has been "a self-destructive mash-up of competing priorities and identities."[44] Traister reminds readers that feminist debates about identity and politics are as old as feminism itself; Hillary's campaign revealed no different and should not be considered a distinctive case. Hillary's campaign proved unique only in that it magnified the generational tensions between the second

[42] Rebecca Traister, *Big Girls Don't Cry: The Election that Changed Everything For American Women* (New York: Free Press, 2010), 103.
[43] Ibid., 106.
[44] Ibid., 148.

and third waves of feminism, tensions which had been there all along, but which had never emerged.

Anne Kornblut of the *Washington Post* wrote *Notes from the Cracked Ceiling.* Kornblut details the campaign, but mostly attempts to explain why Hillary's campaign failed. She suggests that while other factors certainly contributed to her defeat, Hillary's eschewing of her own feminine identity coupled with her inattention to female voters comprised the primary cause behind her primary loss. Like Traister, she argues that Hillary's victory in New Hampshire signified a turning point: "For the first time in the campaign, women started keeping track" (though somehow she forgets that feminist groups had been keeping track all along).[45] Unlike Traister, Kornblut argues that the New Hampshire primary happened far too late and regardless, Hillary still did not capitalize on this potential newfound support from women.

Each of these four books contributes to a better understanding of the 2008 Primary. And each author creates her own narrative of the primary: Gutgold attempts to analyze the effects of the campaign through the eyes of the media while Guy-Sheftall and Cole analyze the effects with a feminist lens. Kornblut tries to explain why Hillary lost in terms of gender, but Traister tries to explain why Hillary actually won (although too late), in terms of gender. My contribution to the discussion consists of explaining the role of the feminist organizations themselves and what they represent. While many of them refer to women's organizations, female voters, or prominent feminists, scholars have not analyzed how these organizations made decisions or why. This study also considers the impact their endorsements had on the primary and will have for years to come. In particular, this study examines the NARAL endorsement and its potential impact on the feminist community.

---

[45] Anne Kornblut, *Notes from the Cracked Ceiling: Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and What it Will Take for A Woman to Win,* (New York: Crown Publishers), 64.

CHAPTER 3: THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

Given the problems women's groups face, one wonders why they focus on elections and endorsements at all. History clarifies the significance of these organizations in their motivations, formation, and results. In this chapter I look at the historical context of the formation of these women's groups. How did they come together? What served as their impetus? This background will help set up an understanding of these groups and their individual histories and help us understand how they eventually came to their endorsement decisions in the 2008 primary. First I discuss the President's Commission on the Status of Women and how that organization led to the formation of NOW. Then I will follow with the other feminist organizations that quickly came after. Finally, I will conclude with the backlash from NOW and the formation of groups for women of color and more radical feminists.

President's Commission on the Status of Women

In 1961, newly elected President Kennedy immediately appointed Esther Peterson to head the Women's Bureau. Peterson had previously worked for the AFL-CIO and had a strong labor background. She also had the ear of the President, which was unusual for a director of the Women's Bureau, but she had worked on his campaign and had developed a close relationship with him. He also appointed her to Assistant Secretary of Labor, giving her a prominent place in his administration.[46]

Unlike Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, Kennedy did not appoint any women to his cabinet.[47] At the same time, the Women's Bureau had floated the idea of a commission or comprehensive study of women since the 1940s, which the National Manpower

[46] Cynthia Harrison, "A 'New Frontier' for Women: The Public Policy of the Kennedy Administration," *The Journal of American History* Vol. 67, No. 3 (Dec. 1980), 637.
[47] Ibid., 635.

Council reaffirmed in the 1950s.[48] On December 1961, Kennedy agreed to Esther Peterson's suggestion to create a commission on the status of women and issued Executive Order 10980, officially establishing the commission. The Executive Order asked for a "review" of women's economic struggles, family life, employment policies and practices, and labor legislation with the planned termination of the Commission in October of 1963.[49] The primary reason behind the Women's Bureau's support for the commission was to bridge the persistent divide between feminists over the Equal Rights Amendment. The Bureau also wanted to show that despite its opposition to the ERA, it still believed in equal opportunities for women.[50]

For Kennedy, the Commission benefited him on several levels. The Commission allowed him to demonstrate his concern for women's issues. It made recommendations that, if enacted, would help women to enter and remain in the paid labor force, for the sake of their families and the country. It also helped to counter the attack by the Soviet Union that women in the U.S. were not treated fairly. And Kennedy knew that his relationship with Esther Peterson would ensure that the findings of the report would not embarrass him.[51]

Under the advice of Esther Peterson, President Kennedy named Eleanor Roosevelt the head of the Commission, though she died in 1962 before the Commission submitted the final report. Peterson served as the functional director of the Commission and oversaw the selection of members.[52] The President and Peterson appointed several Cabinet Secretaries, U.S. Senators, and U.S. Representatives to the Commission. Most of the Commissioners were white Christian men and women, though Dorothy Height from the National Council of Negro Women sat on the

[48] Esther Peterson, "The Kennedy Commission," Tinker, Irene Ed., *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983), 26.
[49] "Establishing the President's Commission on the Status of Women," *Executive Order 10980,* December 14, 1961, 3 C F R (1959-1963), 500-01.
[50] Peterson, "The Kennedy Commission," 26- 27.
[51] Sarah Slavin, Ed., *U.S. Women's Interest Groups: Institutional Profiles* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press,1995), 583.
[52] Harrison, "A 'New Frontier' for Women," 638.

Commission as well as Viola Hymes from the National Council of Jewish Women.[53] Though Peterson said she wanted diversity of ideas, she was sure to include only one voice supporting the ERA, Marguerite Rawalt, an attorney and women's rights advocate, who, Peterson noted, "served ably as that spokesperson."[54]

The Commission released the report on October 11, 1963—Eleanor Roosevelt's birthday. It produced a number of publications including: American Women, the general report of the Commission; and Reports of the Committees: Civil and Political Rights, Education, Federal Employment, Home and Community, Private Employment, Protective Labor Legislation, Social Insurance and Taxes.[55] It also completed four special consultations, one of which specifically addressed Negro women.[56]

The President's Commission on the Status of Women was the first of its kind and it documented the inequalities women faced in the 1960s. It staunchly supported women in the workforce and promoted the idea that women could work and not neglect their families.[57] Specifically, it acknowledged the need for constitutional protection, as the pro-ERA feminists argued. It established the need for legislation preventing sex discrimination, for the first time legitimizing opposition to the mistreatment and prejudice women faced in the workplace. It gave a detailed plan with specific proposals on how to combat inequality, as well as a model for states to create their own commissions. The Commission also found tremendous inequalities for black women in its special consultation: In 1960 black women earned roughly half the wages of white

---

[53] Cynthia Harrison, *On Account of Sex: The Politics of Women's Issues: 1945-1958*, (Los Angeles: University of California Press 1988), 229.
[54] Peterson, "The Kennedy Commission," 27.
[55] *The President's Commission on the Status of Women: Report of the Committee on Education.* US Government Printing Office: October, 1963.
[56] Esther Peterson. "Working Women." *Daedalus,* Vol. 93, No. 2, The Woman in America (Spring, 1964): 685.
[57] *American Women: Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women*. (Washington, DC: U.S. Printing Office, Oct. 11, 1963): 71.

women, roughly 40 percent of the wages of black men, and about 20 percent of the wages of white men.[58]

The Commission also established the importance of women serving in the government. The federal government has a mixed history of women's employment in the Civil Service. The U.S. government began to hire women during the Civil War although managers were permitted to specify the sex of candidates for a given position. After the creation of the Women's Bureau in 1920 and the Classification Act of 1923, men and women had to receive the same pay for any particular job, although women or men could still be excluded from jobs. The PCSW recommended the elimination of this policy change to increase the number of women in high-paying civil service jobs, trying to use the government as an example of an equal opportunity employer.[59]

Most important, however, in a section entitled "Women as Citizens" the PCSW clearly outlined the need for women's participation in government as voters and as public servants. Women's low registration rates and participation at the polls hindered their political strength. The PCSW also pointed out the pitiful numbers of women in office; in 1963 only two women served as US Senators and only eleven as members of the House of Representatives. Only two women had served as Cabinet members (Frances Perkins as Secretary of Labor in Franklin Roosevelt's administration and Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under Eisenhower), and the number of court appointments and ambassador appointments were likewise abysmal. The PCSW explained that the low numbers of women in the private sphere contributed to the low numbers in public office. Women, they wrote, are usually restricted to the home, which hinders their ability to work. However, while advocating

[58] Peterson, "Working Women," 685.
[59] Harrison, *On Account of Sex,* 146.

the inclusion of women in the private sector, they also explained that women were clearly already involved in politics in many levels and that it would not be hard for women to find the time to become elected officials if they had a family, stating running for office could be possibly easier for women than for self-employed men. The PCSW finished the "Women as Citizens" section in bold font stating: "**Women should be encouraged to seek elective and appointive posts at local state and national levels and in all three branches of government**."[60]

The Report never states in particular why it is important for women (rather than just men) to hold public office. However, as a government sponsored body, the PCSW established the idea that equality between the genders demanded more women in office. They demonstrated that by promoting more women in office, either through the civil service, elected office, or executive appointment, the government would promote women in powerful positions and advance equality for women.

Perhaps the two most lasting legacies of the President's Commission on the Status of Women included its rejection of the Equal Rights Amendment and the roots it laid for the second wave of feminism.[61] Since Esther Peterson ran the Commission, she made certain the results of the Commission would support a finding of equal rights under the existing U.S. Constitution, including the 5th and 14th Amendment, rather than requiring an Equal Rights Amendment.[62] As a result, during the Kennedy and Johnson administration, protective labor legislation prevailed. Professor Joan Hoff-Wilson argues that "in retrospect this reluctance was most unfortunate because, had ratification of the a ERA been pending at the state level in the reform decade of the 1960s, its chances of passage would have been considerably greater than in the 1970s—the

[60] *American Women,* 52.
[61] Harrison, *On Account of Sex,* 165.
[62] Harrison, "A 'New Frontier' for Women," 643.

decade in which the postwar backlash began."[63] Thus, the Commission could have contributed to the downfall of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Second, the Commission laid the foundation for the second wave of feminism. It provided the impetus for state commissions, which created state networks.[64] Following its recommendations, President Kennedy issued Executive Order 11126, which created the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women and the Citizens' Advisory Council on women.[65] The purposes of this committee and council were to check the progress of women in the United States and check the status of these recommendations. The CACSW (Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women), led first by Margaret Hickey of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, supported the recommendations of the Commission and did not endorse the ERA.[66] It mainly worked on promoting state commissions and state laws—actively encouraging state women's networks.[67] The committee and the council worked together in that the committee acted on recommendations from the council.[68] And finally, in transmittal of the Final Report, the Commissioners also recommended a Committee on Civil and Political Rights, to which both Marguerite Rawalt and Pauli Murray were appointed. Both of these women would lay the groundwork for NOW.

Throughout the 1960s and 70s, the Women's Bureau, the PCSW, and the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs persuaded states to establish their own commissions. Michigan became the first in 1962, and by 1967 all fifty of the states including the

---

[63] Joan Hoff-Wilson, "The Unfinished Revolution: Changing Legal Status of U.S. Women," *Signs* Vol. 13, No. 1 (Autumn 1987), 17.
[64] Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation* (New York: David McKay Company Inc:, 1975), 170.
[65] "Establishing a committee and a council relating to the status of women," *Executive Order 11126,* 28 FR 11717, November 1, 1963.
[66] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 578.
[67] Harrison, *On Account of Sex,* 184.
[68] *A Guide to Federal Laws and Regulations Prohibiting Sex Discrimination,* Clearinghouse Publication No. 46, United States Commission on Civil Rights (July, 1976), 149.

territories and DC had created women's agencies.[69] These were the first officially government sponsored women's groups in many of these states. For several years, these state commissions met with the Women's Bureau on official events, until 1970 when they created the Interstate Association of Commissions on the Status of Women. This organization, unlike the PCSW or the Women's Bureau, made the ERA its top priority and also gave these states a chance to compare and contrast methods on passage of the Amendment.[70]

While the Women's Bureau worked on this historic commission, its staff also worked on passage of equal pay legislation. With the Women's Bureau and the AFL-CIO drafting the legislation, President Kennedy offered a bill, which amended the Fair Labor Standards Act, requiring that men and women receive equal pay for doing the same job.[71] The original bill banned discrimination based on "comparable work"; but after a lengthy house debate, the final wording was "equal work." Representative Goodell (R-NY) in changing the wording reasoned that Congress did not want the Labor Department in charge of determining what could be considered comparable work and that "we want the private enterprise system . . . to have a maximum degree of discretion in working out the evaluation of the employees work and how much he should be paid for it."[72] In sum, while Congress passed the Equal Pay Act with the purpose of decreasing the pay gap, it did not intend to interfere too significantly with the private market.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 went into effect on June 11, 1964. The Act, which amended the Fair Labor Standards Act, covers both men and women equally.[73] It prohibits sex

---

[69] Janine A. Parry, "What Women Wanted: Arkansas Women's Commissions and the ERA," *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* Vol. 59, No. 3 (Autumn 2000), 166.
[70] Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*, 159.
[71] Harrison, *On Account of Sex,* 91.
[72] Paul Weiler, "The Wages of Sex: The Uses and Limits of Comparable Worth," *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 99, No. 17 (June, 1986), 1732.
[73] Barbara Gamble, *Sex Discrimination Handbook* (Washington, DC: The Bureau of National Affairs, 1992), 47.

discrimination in jobs that require "equal skill, effort and responsibility" and jobs that are performed under "similar working conditions."[7475] In practice, however, courts interpreted "equal work" as " 'substantially equal' rather than 'identical.'"[76]

One year after passing the Equal Pay Act, Congress passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Title VII makes it unlawful to discriminate based on a person's race, religion, color, or sex.[77] While the Civil Rights Act represented over one hundred years of activism on behalf of oppressed racial minorities, during the debate on its passage sex discrimination was added a day before the Act passed.[78] Congressman Howard Smith, a Democrat from Virginia and a long-time supporter of the ERA, added sex for two strategic reasons: first so that some Northerners could vote against the bill without looking racist (they could claim they were voting against sex equality while really voting against it to oppose racial equality), and second to make sure black women would not have rights above white women.[79]

Title VII attacked sex discrimination more broadly than the Equal Pay Act, as Law Professor Paul Weiler states, "extending not merely to wages but to all 'compensation, terms, conditions or privileges of employment.'"[80] With the Equal Pay Act and Title VII, an employer cannot deny women equal pay for equal work; deny women transfers, promotions, or wage increases; manipulate job evaluations to relegate women's pay; or intentionally segregate men

[74] Excepting for a "(i) seniority system; (ii) a merit system; (iii) a system which measures earnings by quantity or equality of production or (iv) a differential based on any other factor than sex. "Equal Pay Act of 1963." 29 U.S.C. § 206 (d)
[75] "Equal Pay Act of 1963." 29 U.S.C. § 206 (d)
[76] Weiler, "The Wages of Sex," 1733.
[77] "Civil Rights Act of 1964." 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2000e-17.
[78] Katie Webber, "Comparable Worth—Its Present Status and the Problem of Measurement," *Hamline Journal of Public Law*, Vol. 6, No. 38 (1985), 37.
[79] Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open* (New York: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 71.
[80] Weiler, "The Wages of Sex," 1734.

and women into jobs according to their gender.[81]

Representative Martha Griffiths (R-MI) built a coalition around Smith's amendment to ensure its passage in the House of Representatives. Once the amendment passed, many feminist activists and women's groups immediately got involved to ensure passage of the entire bill in the Senate. Members of the National Woman's Party and the Business and Professional Women's Clubs flooded Capitol Hill. They also had the critical support of Lady Bird Johnson, which helped ensure the eventual passage of this landmark piece of legislation.[82]

The act created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and during its first year, all seven members were male.[83] Betty Friedan and friends urged the EEOC to "combat sex discrimination as vigorously as they seek to combat racial discrimination." They also urged President Johnson in a letter to "include women in your Great Society program for the underprivileged and excluded."[84]

However, the EEOC had no such aim. During its first year, the EEOC made it clear that it did not consider sex discrimination one of its priorities, and it did not consider the inclusion of sex discrimination in Title VII legitimate.[85] The first director, Harold Edelsberg, stated that the addition of sex discrimination was a "fluke;" that "there are people on this commission who think that no man should be required to have a male secretary, and I am one of them."[86] The CACSW wrote several position papers decrying the lack of support for acknowledgement of

[81] Robert Williams, et al*, Closer Look at Comparable Worth: A Study of the Basic Questions to be Addressed in Approaching Pay Equity* (Washington, DC: National Foundation for the Study of Equal Employment Policy, 1984), 28.
[82] Rosen, *The World Split Open,* 72.
[83] Marguerite Rawalt, "The Equal Rights Amendment," Tinker, Irene Ed., *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications,1983), 59.
[84] Rita Kramer, "The Third Wave," *The Wilson Quarterly* Vol. 10., No. 4 (Autumn 1986), 115.
[85] Harrison, *On Account of Sex,* 187.
[86] Rosen, *The World Split Open,* 72.

mistreatment of women[87] in the workplace.[88] In 1965, the EEOC found itself flooded with complaints of sex discrimination in the work place, but the Commission refused to enforce anything but racial discrimination.[89] In 1966 the CACSW began issuing memorandums, demanding the EEOC prohibit newspapers from advertising jobs separately for men and women, which the EEOC ignored.[90]

Formation of NOW

This history leads us to the eventual formation of NOW. The beginnings of NOW and the various feminist movements of the 1960s and 70s took place in a perfect storm with several elements in the 1960s crashing together to create one "second wave": married mothers continued to enter the labor force at increasing rates, Esther Peterson headed the Women's Bureau and used her position to advocate for women, the EEOC sneered at its responsibility to prevent sex discrimination in employment, women activists' rejected the "new left" when it displayed its derision of feminism, and Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique*.

During the 1950s, the United States, though seemingly tranquil, saw the growing discontent of white women, women of color, and male minorities. Women at first relieved to have some sense of established gender order after World War II soon grew tired of the constrictive gender roles society demanded. In 1956, *Life* Magazine wrote an article about the growing discontentment of housewives.[91] In 1963, Betty Friedan, a suburban housewife with a labor and journalism background interviewed women from her graduating class at Smith, asking

[87] The term "sexism" would emerge in the 1960s as a result of second wave activism.
[88] Rawalt, "The Equal Rights Amendment," 59.
[89] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 74.
[90] Nicholas Pedriana. "Help Wanted NOW: Legal Resources, the Women's Movement, and the Battle over Sex-Segregated Job Advertisements." *Social Problems:* Vol. 51, No. 2 (May, 2004): 192.
[91] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 34.

them about their lives after graduation. These privileged white women shared with her their deep discontent about their lives.[92] Friedan identified this general discontentment as the "problem that had no name," publishing her soon to be classic *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. The book hit a nerve with that same group of women: white and middle class. Friedan would later defend her appeal to this group of women by saying that in order for the women's movement to have legitimacy, it must have appeal to this particular group.[93]

At the same time, while the sixties were bringing tumultuous changes to all kinds of groups, women who were involved in the Civil Rights movement found themselves still stuck in stereotyped gender roles. In 1964, Stokeley Carmichael uttered the now famous phrase "the only position for women in SNCC is prone."[94] Many historians claim Carmichael meant this comment to be a joke. But whether in jest or not, many women felt subordinated in the movement. In 1965, many white women became disenchanted with the "New Left" and Civil Rights movement, and increasingly voiced their opinion that they were relegated to housekeeping, secretarial work, and exploited as sex objects. They also protested that they lacked leadership positions within the movement.[95] While some men did consider women's rights unimportant, many men in the New Left were not explicitly against women's issues: they simply thought that feminism would disrupt and distract the movement and gender oppression could wait until the class and race issues had first been solved.[96]

In June 1966, female and male activists gathered together in Washington D.C. for a Conference of State Commissions. Many hoped that the CACSW and the ICSW

---

[92] Ibid., 4.
[93] Deborah Siegel, *Sisterhood Interrupted: From Radical Women to Girls Gone Wild* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2007), 74.
[94] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 109.
[95] Benita Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America's Second Wave* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 53.
[96] Ibid., 63.

(Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women) would take more aggressive action against the EEOC.[97] However, government officials at the federally funded meeting told activists from around the country that they could not pass resolutions to this effect. In reaction, a group of 15 activists, former members of the PCSW, and several former employees of the EEOC met in Betty Friedan's hotel room to discuss their frustration with the EEOC.[98] The next day, "within sight of the conference directors," Betty Friedan wrote out the words "National Organization for Women" on a napkin. This marked the first time women activists moved outside the federal government in demanding an agenda for their rights. As historian Cynthia Harrison states, until the formation of NOW:

> Either influential individuals or official government bodies had created a federal agenda for women, . . . carefully couching requests for specific improvements in the language of liberal ideals and obeisance to women's "natural" roles as wife and mother. The formation of NOW indicated that many women were no longer satisfied working within the constraints imposed by being official members of government. From that time forward, the federal government would no longer control or restrain the agenda for the women's movement; NOW could take action, as official groups could not, without executive sanction.[99]

In October of 1966, NOW held its first conference. It elected Betty Friedan president, and former EEOC commissioners Aileen Hernandez and Richard Graham were elected vice-presidents.[100] Marguerite Rawalt, who was appointed to chair the legal committee, and who would be later named general counsel, stated: "the purpose of NOW was to provide a mechanism

[97] Pedriana, "Help Wanted NOW," 192.
[98] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 74.
[99] Harrison, *On Account of Sex,* 195.
[100] Ibid., 196.

with which women could pressure the government."[101] While its formation and agenda were expressly outside of government, its purpose was not inherently revolutionary, but to enforce existing law, specifically Title VII.[102]

In 1967 NOW voted on a new bill of rights. They expressly supported enforcing employment laws, childcare, banning sex discrimination, and equal job opportunities and welfare for poor women.[103] However, the organization began splintering over whether or not to include reproductive rights (mainly abortion) in its platform. They ultimately did approve it, after which several members resigned.[104] The other controversial item included the Equal Rights Amendment. The National Woman's Party advocated tirelessly for NOW to endorse it, which it ultimately did, to the chagrin of many union leaders. Caroline Davis, an official in the United Auto Workers (UAW) left her position as secretary-treasurer due to this conflict, therefore causing NOW to lose major resources from that relationship. However, over time, many labor organizations changed their position on the ERA, helping unite the feminist movement with the labor movement.[105]

NOW and its members however wanted to increase the political clout of women voters in addition to electing more women to Congress. However, NOW's particular tax status did not allow it to make any political endorsements. Out of this lacuna, in 1971 three hundred women from all over the country gathered to create the National Women's Political Caucus the first women's political organization in the United States to make political endorsements.[106] In its

[101] Rawalt, "The Equal Rights Amendment," 60.
[102] Pedriana, "Help Wanted NOW," 194.
[103] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 82.
[104] Rawalt, "The Equal Rights Amendment," 60.
[105] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 82.
[106] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 403.

original formation, several chapters allowed men to be members.[107] The NWPC believed that putting more women in positions of political power would not only ease the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, which was gathering steam at the time, but it would also help pass legislation related to women. In 1970 there were 344 women in state legislatures; and in 1990 this number increased fourfold.[108] The NWPC is also one of the first organizations to have had women of color on its board.

Several women's political groups followed quickly after. In 1969, Lawrence Lader, Ruth Proskauer Smith, Betty Friedan, and Bernard Nathanson joined together at the first abortion rights conference in the country to form the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws (NARAL).[109] They aimed to coordinate a national movement based on the single issue of legalizing abortion. As a single-issue group, it had the ability to "maintain the zealous, round-the-clock vigilance on abortion rights that the multi-issue groups were unable to provide."[110]

From 1969 to 1973 through protests and litigation the organization focused on states liberalizing their abortion laws. In 1973 the Supreme Court decided *Roe v. Wade* which caused NARAL to change its name to the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. NARAL banded together with other pro-choice lobbying groups to fight for protective legislation for abortion. In 1989 the Supreme Court decision *Webster vs. Reproductive Health Services* forced NARAL again to shift back to the grass roots style of state-by-state campaigns, protests, and litigation.

The FEC declared NARAL a PAC on August 5, 1977, permitting it to raise money for the

[107] Barbara Ryan, "Ideological Purity and Feminism: The U.S. Women's Movement from 1966 to 1975," *Gender and Society* Vol. 3, No. 2 (Jun. 1989), 250.
[108] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 444-45.
[109] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 277.
[110] Ann Kolker, "Women Lobbyists," Tinker, Irene Ed. *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983), 212.

purpose of supporting candidates for election, and in its first two years NARAL donated over $51,000 to campaigns nationwide. By 1989, it rose to $384,225. While NARAL is explicitly non-partisan, from 1977 through 1990 over 86 percent of its donations went to Democrats. This increase in partisanship is also due in part to the pro-life backlash during the Reagan years and the resulting GOP's adoption of a pro-life platform. Republicans increasing withdrawal of support for abortion rights conflicted with the rigid pro-choice standard NARAL requires of all of its candidates. To receive an endorsement, a candidate must be 100 percent pro-choice and support any and all pro-choice legislation. NARAL will not endorse if there are two equally pro-choice candidates in a race. By 1995, NARAL became one of the twentieth wealthiest PACs in the United States.[111]

Other political endorsement groups followed after NARAL to continue to push for pro-choice legislation. The year 1974 marked the foundation of the Women's Campaign Fund, the first bipartisan Political Action Committee to raise significant funds for women running for office. WCF began over a lunch between two prominent feminist activists Arvonne S. Fraser and Sandra Kramer. According to Arvonne Fraser, they believed that "women raising money for other women would demonstrate their potential political clout, in addition to increasing the number of women in Congress." They were also tired of the "old boys network" of politics and were quickly becoming attuned to the need for women in government. With a $10,000 donation from a wealthy feminist philanthropist, the Women's Campaign Forum began.[112]

Since this audacious beginning, WCF has gone through victories and challenges. In the beginning, the Women's Campaign Forum focused on federal and governor races. In its first year, WCF contributed over $22,500 to over 25 female candidates. In 1978 it expanded to state

[111] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 279.
[112] Arvonne S. Fraser. "Insiders and Outsiders: Women in the Political Arena." *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy.* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications,1983): 137.

legislative races, and contributed over $103,609 to federal and state candidates. In 1981, WCF realized that women were only running for higher offices once they had experience at lower offices; consequently it committed to expanding their endorsements at the lower level. In 1983 it added a tax-exempt non-profit group barred from campaigning (usually referred to as a 501(c)3 organization) called the Women's Campaign Research Fund (WCRF) in order to research how to help women develop political skills. The WCRF also conducted candidate training and recruitment. In 1992, WCF boasted more than 18,000 contributors and donated over $1 million to candidates. Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), former Governor Ann Richards, Congresswoman Patsy Mink (D-HI), Cherokee Nation Chief Wilma Mankiller all name WCF as crucial for their victories.[113]

Probably its biggest achievement in the first fifteen years, besides the various women WCF has helped and endorsed, includes starting the wave of women's organizations devoted to getting women to run for office and giving these candidates money. The National Organization for Women and the National Women's Political Caucus took WCF's lead and started raising and donating money to female candidates soon after WCF. Eleven years after WCF, Emily's List followed suit in 1985 and then in 1991 Republicans began Women in the House and Senate (WISH).

In 1984, Ellen Malcolm (formerly the Press Secretary for the NWPC) created Emily's List after gathering her closest friends at her house, asking them to pull out their rolodexes, and call their friends to ask them to donate to women candidates around the country.[114] Emily's List (EMILY which stands for Early Money Is Like Yeast) started endorsing only female Democratic pro-choice candidates because the parties had so greatly divided, especially in regard to choice,

[113] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 534-35.
[114] "Emily's List: Our History," *Emily's List Website* http://emilyslist.org/who/history/ (accessed Dec., 6 2010).

that it only made sense to help elect progressive pro-choice women."[115] By June 1985, Ellen explained to the National Women's Political Caucus Convention, that no woman had been elected to the Senate in her own right, and that the missing ingredient for women candidates was early money, the gap which their organization worked to fill.[116]

By January 1985, Emily's List raised over $60,000 dollars for candidates across the country and in 1988 Emily's List raised over $1 million dollars.[117] In 1992, the "Year of the Woman," organizational membership grew by over 600 percent, and Emily's List endorsed and gave money to over twenty successful Congressional female candidates and four female Senators. On January 20, 2007 Emily's List made its first Presidential endorsement by endorsing Senator Hillary Clinton in her Presidential bid.[118]

Emergence of Women of Color Groups

NOW was revolutionary in that it became the first explicitly feminist organization to advocate an agenda outside of the government. However, its founders were women who had been constrained by discrimination during their careers.[119] Betty Friedan herself had even stated the "participation in the Mainstream is the Real Revolution."[120] Therefore, many feminists felt that NOW should be more critical of "the system."[121] This embrace of change within the mainstream led to the emergence of more radical groups, single-issue groups, and groups for women of color.

---

[115] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 175.
[116] "Press Release June 28, 1985," *Emily's List Website.* http://emilyslist.org/assets/pdfs/timeline/1985_new_concept.pdf (accessed Dec. 6, 2010).
[117] Ibid.
[118] "Emily's List: Our History."
[119] Ryan, "Ideological Purity and Feminism," 242.
[120] Siegel, *Sisterhood Interrupted,* 81.
[121] Ryan, "Ideological Purity and Feminism," 242.

White women in the new women's movement fought for the idea of a universal sisterhood. Sociologist and Professor of Women's Studies Benita Roth argues, "Much as civil rights activists had envisioned a true brotherhood among those of different races as necessary to overcoming racism, so many women's liberationists saw that a universal sisterhood was needed to end gender oppression." Though having previously experienced ideological dismissal from their counterparts in the "new left," white women, in an attempt at "universal sisterhood," debated but eventually decided to prioritize race and class behind gender. This decision made allying with feminism difficult for many women of color when the men within their race and class accused them of disloyalty.[122]

The National Organization of Colored Women's Clubs (NACW), begun in 1896, became the first national organization for African American women. However, black feminist activist Mary McLeod Bethune had fundamental issues with the structure of the organization and began the National Council of Negro Women (NCNW) on December 6, 1935. Through Bethune's leadership, black women began receiving appointments in the federal government. While never expressly political, and never involved in promoting specific candidates, the NCNW has held a prominent place in the history of the black women's rights in the United States.[123]

Nearly one hundred years after its formation, black women faced a new challenge in the form of a government document. In 1965, the "Moynihan Report" (actually titled "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action") decried the structure of the typical African American family as the consequence of racism but blamed it for the ongoing poverty within the black community. As the report stated, "Negro children without fathers flounder -- and fail."[124]

---

[122] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 194-95.
[123] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 360-63.
[124] "The Moynihan Report," March 1965, *Department of Labor Website*. http://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/webid-meynihan.htm (accessed Dec. 4, 2010).

Conservative black men's groups, and black male sociologists, upon whom Moynihan relied, said he was right: Men should head the black family and black women needed to be reminded of their place in the family.[125] Others called the report racist although many black women agreed that the person most in need of help was the black man.

Black women coming out of the Civil Rights movement, and partly in reaction to the black male activist response to the Moynihan report, had a growing sense for the need for their own feminist organization. In May of 1973, 30 black women gathered together to create the National Black Feminist Organization (NBFO). Borrowing an office from the National Organization for Women, its statement of purpose reflected the general frustrations black women felt as members of a doubly bound group. They stated "We must together, as a people, work to eliminate racism from without the Black community which is trying to destroy us as an entire people, but we must remember that sexism is destroying and crippling us from within."[126] Black feminist scholars began arguing that feminism is implicit in the fight against racism, while also reiterating the racist history of the first wave of feminism.[127] The NBFO disbanded a few years later, but it contributed to the creation of several other organizations including the National Alliance of Black Feminists, Combhaee River Collective, and the Black Women Organized for Action.[128]

Chicana feminism at the time also began to mobilize as an offshoot of the Civil Rights movement, but with key differences from the mainstream white feminist or black feminist movement. Chicano activism in the 1960s began around the labor and farm workers movement, most notably led by Dolores Huerta who worked with Cesar Chavez for the United Farm

[125] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 86.
[126] Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*, 156- 57.
[127] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 79.
[128] Ibid., 118.

Workers (UFW).[129] Huerta did not challenge Chavez's leadership but acknowledged the necessary involvement of women in the movement.[130] Similarly to what white feminists and black feminists experienced in Civil Rights work, Chicana feminists, especially students, began to feel sidelined in the fight against their oppression as a race: doing typical women's work and being denied leadership roles. As Benita Roth states, "On the one hand, college attendance and social movement experience expanded their sense of their own capabilities; on the other hand masculinist versions of Chicanismo focused on traditional sex roles."[131]

In May of 1971, 600 Chicana women met in Houston for the First National Conference of Chicanas. They passed several controversial resolutions including one that spoke out vehemently against the Catholic Church's oppression of their reproductive control. Many Chicana women went on to found their own women's organizations. In 1974, the Mexican-American Women's National Association (MANA) began with the goal of strengthening Latina leadership within the Mexican community, while still supporting the role of the family. By 1990 this group had sixteen chapters across the country,[132] and in 2010 it boasted the largest membership of any Latina group in the United States.[133]

Chicana feminists argue that while they also experienced racism, the sexism they experienced within their community resulted from a legacy of imperialist exploitation, which men within their community recreated.[134] Chicana feminists' fight differed from that of black feminists in that they did not have a state sponsored attack on their families like the Moynihan Report but their fight instead concerned engrained cultural sexism. In addition, some Chicana

[129] Ibid 133.
[130] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 287.
[131] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 137.
[132] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 288-290.
[133] "MANA—A National Latina Organization," http://www.hermana.org/orgfrm.htm (accessed Dec. 6, 2010).
[134] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 138.

feminists argue that their feminism puts some aspects of femininity in a positive light, whereas Anglo feminism eschews all femininity as negative.[135] And while Chicana feminists did grow out of a backlash to the way the Civil Rights movement treated women, their feminism is fundamentally unique from both white and black feminism in that it was organizationally distinct from both movements as well as more than a reaction to racism within white feminism.[136]

Native American women, Asian-American and Pacific Islanders have also organized over feminist issues within their respective communities. Native American women share the burden of a colonial past with Chicana feminists and in many ways identify with the need to defend their ethnicity, language, culture, and family structure.[137] Many Native American women have engaged in feminist activities within their communities since the majority of their population lives on reservations. Many work to combat domestic violence and sexual assault. Like Chicana women, they also have engaged in action to protect the right to reproductive freedom and control from the government after being subject to state-sponsored sterilization.[138]

Asian-American and Pacific Islander women have come to the United States in different waves over time. At first legislation excluding Chinese people prevented many of them from coming over, while Japanese women were permitted to enter before 1920 as prospective wives for Japanese men. After World War II, U.S. immigration law changed to permit the entry of Asian immigrants. Japanese-American and Chinese-American women have organized to protest the cultural ideals that promote the image of women as seen and not heard, supporting each other as strong independent women.[139] In 1995, at the United Nations World Conference on Women

[135] Jo Freeman, *Women: A Feminist Perspective* (California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1984), 437.
[136] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 132.
[137] Freeman, *Women: A Feminist Perspective,* 441.
[138] Rosen, *The World Split Open*, 291.
[139] Freeman, *Women: A Feminist Perspective,* 437- 39.

in Beijing, Asian American women began to feel the need for their own organization for their community, and in 1996 they founded the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum.[140]

While some of these organizations are now defunct, and many have not formed PACs and can therefore not endorse political candidates, it is important for a feminist researcher to emphasize the work other feminist organizations have done. The accomplishments of these groups have contributed to the diversity of feminisms, which help explain the range of opinions and goals of women's rights organizations today. This list of women's organizations is not complete, as I have not included the disabilities movement, the lesbian movement, or the transgender movement. There are many organizations that have made substantial contributions to the feminist community. All of these organizations have helped promote women's entrance into the public and political sphere, whether or not they endorsed women candidates for office.

[140] "History," *National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum Website* http://napawf.org/about/our-history/ (accessed Dec. 6, 2010).

CHAPTER 4: THE WOMEN WHO HAVE RUN FOR PRESIDENT

This section will examine most of the female candidates who have run for President. Given the restraints of this project, I will focus specifically on those candidates who ran for a major party nomination (Republican or Democrat). However, not one of the organizations in this study has ever endorsed a Republican Presidential candidate; therefore their inclusion in this paper is merely to serve as a historical context. I review the history of these candidates to determine the circumstances under which feminist organizations will make endorsements.

In this section I ask who these women were and why they ran for office. I will look at each woman's campaign and specifically examine if and why they received endorsements from prominent feminist political groups. These groups include NOW, Emily's List, Women's Campaign Forum, and the National Women's Political Caucus. Throughout their existence, these organizations have been torn between supporting women for president whose chances of winning might be low, or supporting a candidate who might win – that is, a male candidate. Alternatively, they can choose not to support any candidate and save their money and political influence for a future campaign.

With each endorsement, these groups spend significant amounts of their membership's money, but they also risk undermining their claim that they influence both elections and policy-making if their candidate loses. On the other hand, if they choose not to endorse a potentially winning candidate of either sex, they put at risk access to the President, who is much more likely to favor early supporters. In addition, when they do not support a woman candidate, the media, and sometimes their membership, criticize them and challenge their purpose. In other words, they have to weigh viability of the candidate against their own mission: supporting feminist candidates and issues. In sum, this section will look at the historical context of these candidates

and specifically look at the historical context of feminist organizational endorsements preceding Hillary Clinton's candidacy.

Victoria Woodhull and Belva Lockwood

The history of female candidates begins long before the second wave of feminism. Victoria Woodhull and Belva Lockwood both made history in the nineteenth century, Woodhull the first to brave a Presidential campaign and Lockwood the second. However, they both ran on third party tickets, and both knew the impossible chances of their success. Their purpose in running focused on the issues they stood for, rather than the possibility of winning the election. Victoria Woodhull ran in 1872 as the first woman on any Presidential ballot. She accepted the nomination of the Equal Rights Party in 1872, seeking greater fame and acknowledgement for herself and her ideas.[141] The party named Frederick Douglass as her Vice Presidential running mate, but it is unclear whether he ever accepted. However, at the age of 33, Woodhull could not constitutionally be elected President, so both she and the party members knew the impossibility of her election.[142]

Victoria Woodhull had mixed support from suffragists at the time. She strongly supported the idea of "voluntary motherhood" – that women themselves should decide whether or not to have sex and children. Many women's rights leaders supported her because of her position on women's sexual freedom. However this position also made it difficult for them to support her, given these leaders' goal of decreasing the sexualization of women in order to advocate for greater legal rights.[143] In 1872, when Woodhull added women's rights to her platform, she also convinced Elizabeth Cady Stanton to have the National Woman's Suffrage

[141] Helen Leftkowitz Horowitz, "Victoria Woodhull, Anthony Comstock, and Conflict over Sex in the United States in the 1870s," *The Journal of American History* Vol. 87, No. 2 (Sep. 2000), 411.
[142] Jo Freeman, *We Will Be Heard: Women's Struggles for Political Power in the United States* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2008), 86.
[143] Horowitz, "Victoria Woodhull," 430.

Association sponsor the formation of her new political party, the Equality party.[144] However, Woodhull was continually swept up in scandals, partly due to the cause she championed, and partly due to her own somewhat dramatic actions. Concerned for the legitimacy of their own causes and frankly afraid of Woodhull's tactics, many women's rights leaders allowed Anthony Comstock and other anti-voluntary motherhood advocates to bully her.[145] However, it is debatable whether or not Woodhull even took her campaign seriously. Historian Jo Freeman observes that she did not actively campaign, making her candidacy primarily symbolic.

In 1884 Belva Lockwood, a lawyer in Washington D.C., ran for President and became the first woman to legitimately campaign for the office. She ran for the same party nomination as Woodhull—the Equal Rights Party. Lockwood had personally lobbied Congress to allow women to argue in front of the Supreme Court. In 1884 the Republican Party denied her appeal to put women's rights on its platform, but immediately afterward Marietta Stow and Clara Foltz, heads of the Equal Rights Party, announced Lockwood as their candidate.[146] Lockwood observed, "I cannot vote, but I can be voted for" as the Constitution simply says that a person and citizen must be 35 to run for President, but it does not specify gender.

Her campaign in 1884, though small and unsuccessful, demonstrated a serious effort in that time to support suffrage and promote the women's rights agenda. Lockwood especially focused on the need to eliminate or at least lessen coverture, the legal rights of a husband over his wife.[147] While suffrage certainly constituted a significant part of her platform, she also covered a broad range of issues including tariff reform. However, many leading suffrage and

[144] Benjamin Quarles, "Frederick Douglass and the Woman's Rights Movement," *The Journal of Negro History* Vol. 25, No. 1 (Jan. 1940), 42.
[145] Horowitz, "Victoria Woodhull," 431.
[146] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 86- 7.
[147] Jean Baker, "Nogren, Jill. Belva Lockwood: The Woman Who Would Be President," *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 1 (February 2008), 197.

women's rights leaders opposed her campaign as they argued it would bring ridicule of the movement, and it certainly did. Lockwood, however, won 4,711 votes in seven states, enough votes to persuade her to run again in 1888.[148]

Victoria Woodhull and Belva Lockwood both ran their campaigns knowing their extremely unlikely chances of election. However, they both felt a symbolic gesture justified their efforts. They ran as women representing and pushing women's issues. They also both willingly faced ridicule and public humiliation. Although their positions firmly sought to move the women's rights agenda, women's groups and leading suffragists still gave them mixed support. These women's rights leaders knew that these candidates were running before their time, and they feared that the backlash would be more detrimental in the long run than the greater benefits that lay with a woman running for President.

After these two pioneers, in 1964 Senator Margaret Chase Smith (R-ME) became the first woman to run for a major party Presidential nomination. Smith became well known for her speech against Senator Joseph McCarthy (R-WI). At first a supporter of his attempts to eradicate communism, Smith gradually became disaffected with McCarthy's tactics. On June 1, 1950, two years into her first Senate term, Smith gave her "Declaration of Conscience" speech, which would give her national acclaim. She bravely stood up to Senator McCarthy and denounced the fear and intimidation he used to conduct his anti-communism trials. McCarthy responded with a sneer, stating, "I don't fight with women senators." A few years later, George Aiken (R-VT) asked her to join his ticket as his running mate for the Presidential nomination, which she refused partly due to the negative attention she received nationwide from her speech.[149]

---

[148] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 87.
[149] Nichola Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006), 30.

While Senator Smith championed women's political representation, her conservative votes earned her tepid support from Republican women activists. Sometimes a contradiction, Smith on the one hand had no problem telling off men who told her about her "proper place"; on the other hand she stated clearly "I definitely resent being called a feminist."[150] In one memorable television moment, she debated Eleanor Roosevelt over the 1956 election, at which Smith defended President Eisenhower and the Republican Party. Upset with Smith's arguments and unwavering support for the Republican Party, Roosevelt left the debate without shaking her hand.[151] This interaction with Roosevelt could not have helped Smith win support among liberals, but they probably would not have voted for her in any case.

Smith's decision to run, she says, originated from the mail she received for a year before and after President Kennedy's death.[152] Her motivation to run did not come from the Republican Party or from women's rights activists. Smith says she ran " 'to break the barrier against women being seriously considered for the presidency of the United States—to destroy any bigotry against women on this score.'"[153] She argued in her speech announcing her candidacy on January 27, 1964 that it seemed only fair that she follow in the footsteps of the women who had broken down the barriers before her.[154] While women's political groups at the time were yet to be organized as they would be only eight years later, the smaller groups that existed at the time neither encouraged nor discouraged her candidacy.[155]

On the campaign trail, Smith refused personal donations. She ran an extremely frugal campaign, spending only $250 in New Hampshire, and $85 in Illinois, where she placed second

[150] Hope Chamberlin, *A Minority of Members: Women in the U.S. Congress* (New York: Mentor, 1973), 152.
[151] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 32.
[152] Ibid., 22.
[153] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 89- 90.
[154] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 23.
[155] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 89.

to Barry Goldwater.[156] She eventually pulled out of the California primary, the last primary before the convention, since Barry Goldwater needed only a few delegates to win the nomination. In July of 1964 she spoke at the Republican National Convention, only the second woman ever to do so at the event. She came in second, and Goldwater won the nomination.[157]

Between 1964 and 1972, several women ran for minor party nominations, including Charlene Mitchell, who ran on the Communist Party ticket as "the great-granddaughter of a slave." Mitchell (the first woman in charge of a minor party and the first African American person of any party, major or minor, on the Presidential ballot) campaigned mostly against the United States' foreign policy. The Communist party won more than one thousand votes in four states but since then the party has not nominated another woman.[158] Most of these candidacies were symbolic, just running for office to advocate for a particular platform. In 1972, however, two women ran for the Democratic nomination and both of them made history.

In 1964, Congresswoman Patsy Mink (D-HI) became the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman elected to Congress. As a member of Congress, Representative Mink spoke out against the war in Vietnam, supported women's issues, and demanded women's representation in politics. When President Nixon recommended George Harold Carswell to the Supreme Court, Mink demanded that the Senate reject his confirmation on the grounds that his nomination embodied an "affront to the women of America," partly because he refused to hear a case from a woman who had been fired because she had young children.[159] She would receive the most acclaim and attention from the women's rights community for her pivotal role in Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments Act.

---

[156] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 37.
[157] Ibid., 22.
[158] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 90.
[159] Karen Foerstel and Herbert Foerstel, *Climbing the Hill: Gender Conflict in Congress* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1996), 26.

In 1971, a group of progressives in Oregon approached Representative Mink to put her on the primary ballot so they could have an anti-war platform. Since many of these members were also members of the local chapter of the National Women's Political Caucus, they purposely chose her because of her gender.[160] However, Representative Mink said herself that she did not seek the nomination solely because of her gender: "Without a woman contending for the Presidency, the concept of absolute equality will continue to be placed on the back-burner as warmed-over lip service. My candidacy offers a real and tangible [political] alternative, based—if any one word can be singled out—on humanism."[161] She received more than five thousand votes in Oregon, and a few hundred in Maryland and Wisconsin.[162] However, because her campaign served chiefly as a symbol, she campaigned only from January to May of 1972.[163] While technically the Democratic Primary ballot listed Mink in several states, the Party did not present her at the convention, and she did not receive any delegates.[164] Sadly when Congresswoman Mink died in 2002, her obituary in the *New York Times* did not even mention her Presidential bid.[165]

In the same Democratic primary of 1972, Representative Shirley Chisholm (D-NY), the first black woman in Congress, threw her hat in the ring. Chisholm not only made strides for women – black or white – but she also became the first African American person—male or female—to seek a major party nomination.[166] Chisholm is notable in her candidacy as no female

[160] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 91- 2.
[161] Chamberlin, *A Minority of Members*, 322.
[162] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 92.
[163] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 62.
[164] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 92.
[165] Nichola Gutgold, *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton "Won" in 2008* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2009), 2.
[166] Kim Gandy, "NOW Honors Guts and Glory of Shirley Chisholm," 3 Jan. 2005, *NOW Website,* http://www.now.org/press/01-05/01-03.html (accessed Jan. 16, 2011).

candidate for President has done as well as she did until Hillary Clinton ran in 2008.[167] Like Patsy Mink, as a member of Congress Chisholm opposed the war in Vietnam and fiercely supported women's equality. She demanded attention to poverty and advocated for reproductive rights for women. However, finding a lack of support on both issues prompted her to run for the Democratic nomination, after winning her second Congressional term.[168]

In the declaration of her bid for the Presidency she famously said:

> I am not the candidate of black America, although I am black and proud. I am not the candidate of the women's movement of this country, although I am a woman and I am equally proud of that [. . . .] I am a candidate of the people of America. And my presence before you now symbolizes a new era in American political history.[169]

At the time, the other white male candidates for the Democratic nomination urged her to drop out of the race, afraid that she would detract from potential voters. These candidates worried she would take away Democratic votes from more seemingly legitimate candidates. And though she knew herself that she had no chance to win the Democratic nomination or the Presidency, she remained steadfast in her candidacy saying she had to "repudiate the ridiculous notion that the American people will not vote for a qualified candidate simply because he is not white, or because she is not male."[170]

Representative Chisholm, however, received mixed and competing support from these black men and white women. As she later recounted in her book *The Good Fight,* in which she detailed her experience on the campaign, "For me, the conflict between blacks and whites

---

[167] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 92.
[168] Mark Anthony Neal, "What Would Shirley Chisholm Say?" Ed. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole, *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010), 60.
[169] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 51-2.
[170] Ibid., 52.

appeared to be a competition over which group was going to own my candidacy."[171] Chisholm firmly supported the issues that the black caucus cared about, but many members of the caucus were upset with her announcement to run, because they felt she should have asked their permission. Many black leaders also grew incensed by how often she sought alliances with other minority groups to gain support and insight, especially from white feminist groups.[172] Some specifically demanded that she remove white women from her events and campaign to "prove she was black."[173] Tom Buckley of the *New York Times* scolded her for the time she spent on women's issues, "most of them middle class and white, when the great majority of black men are still scuffling for a place in the sun."[174] However, as Chisholm recounts in *The Good Fight*, "even if I had rejected the support of white women, which would have been wrong and undemocratic, I would probably not have picked up much black support for it. The criticism came from believers in separatism, and that is not my philosophical or political position."[175]

Some leaders in the black community, so upset by her candidacy, ran candidates against her in primaries simply to take away her support and delegates.[176] The National Black Political Convention held in Gary, Indiana of that year chose not to back her. Upset by this lack of support from her black male colleagues, Chisholm claimed this rift between black men and women served as "a tremendous hindrance to the race." Representative Chisholm did receive and ultimately accepted the support from the Black Panthers, the only black group to endorse her, much to the dismay of many of her more moderate supporters.[177]

---

[171] Shirley Chisholm, *The Good Fight* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973), 106.
[172] Marcy Kaptur, *Women of Congress: A Twentieth-Century Odyssey* (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1996), 150.
[173] Chisholm, *The Good Fight,* 106.
[174] Chamberlin, *A Minority of Members*, 340.
[175] Chisholm, *The Good Fight,* 107.
[176] Kaptur, *Women of Congress,* 150.
[177] Julie Gallagher, "Waging the 'Good Fight': The Political Career of Shirley Chisholm," *The Journal of African American History* Vol. 92, No. 3, (Summer 2007), 408-10.

Representative Chisholm also strongly campaigned for women's equality. As a principal founder of the National Organization for Women (NOW), she made no secret of her feminist ideals.[178] Due to her experience founding NOW, and realizing the need for more women in office, she helped form the National Women's Political Caucus in 1971.[179] Eventually she would also become an honorary President of the National Abortion and Rights Action League.[180] However, when she decided to run for President, Chisholm received mixed and somewhat perplexing support from the organizations she had helped to establish.

On the one hand, she received positive support from women all over the country. On the local level, women reached out to her to make campaign stops, raised funds for her, and organized local events. African American women in particular responded with enthusiasm in her swing through the south. In her hometown of Brooklyn, women gathered donations for her campaign as they had done for her previous campaigns.[181] Women's organizations however did not demonstrate the same level of support.

Regarding the NWPC, Chisholm never sought its endorsement, as she "did not want to embarrass any of the board members." With Republicans and a wife of another Democratic candidate on the board of the NWPC, it did not make sense for Chisholm to seek or expect the organization's support. However, even individual members of the NWPC expressed hesitancy to support her. Representative Bella Abzug, one of the other four co-founders of the National Women's Political Caucus, "hedged" according to Chisholm's autobiography. While Rep. Abzug had appeared with Chisholm during her Presidential announcement, she told the press that

[178] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 59.
[179] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 92.
[180] Traister, *Big Girls Don't Cry,* 64.
[181] Gallagher, "Waging the 'Good Fight,'" 407.

she "supported the idea" of her candidacy. Abzug also never campaigned for her in the crucial primary states of Florida, North Carolina or even Rep. Abzug's home state of New York.[182]

Chisholm did receive the support of other board members at the time, particularly from the "black and brown members of the NWPC Policy Council." According to her account of the situation, the women of color on the policy council did not have the conflict the white members did. The white members knew she could never win and felt that they were supporting a "lost cause." The women of color on the other hand had experience in the civil rights movement and had grown accustomed to fighting seemingly impossible campaigns if only for the symbolism and attention it would bring to the issue.[183] They did not have the internal struggle of the worth of her campaign in the long run because they felt that Chisholm just running made enough of a difference. In the end, the NWPC never endorsed Representative Chisholm.[184]

NOW could not legally endorse her at the time, due to its tax status. But Wilma Scott Heide, its national president, personally endorsed her and threw herself into the campaign whole-heartedly.[185] However, in NOW's press release about Chisholm's death, former President Kim Gandy wrote that they did endorse Chisholm— that Chisholm was in fact NOW's first Presidential endorsement.[186] In an interview with President Gandy, she stated her uncertainties about whether or not NOW had formally endorsed Chisholm. Gandy said she remembers working on Rep. Chisholm's campaign through NOW but did not remember the organizational endorsement.[187]

[182] Chisholm, *The Good Fight,* 74-75.
[183] Ibid., 77.
[184] Sharon Ball, Personal Interview, 12 January 2011.
[185] Chisholm, *The Good Fight,* 75-77.
[186] Kim Gandy, "NOW Honors Guts and Glory of Shirley Chisholm."
[187] Gandy, Personal Interview.

Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem both offered lukewarm support for Chisholm in her bid. Friedan, while supportive of Chisholm's bid, told her she supported McCarthy, and wanted to work on his campaign in the states where Chisholm was not running. Gloria Steinem also said something similar to the press—that she supported Chisholm but that McGovern would "be the best *male* candidate." Steinem even went so far as to express this view on a televised interview while sitting next to Chisholm. While Chisholm understood these women's hesitancy, she explained that this "double endorsement" would hurt her campaign's legitimacy, and frankly she found this kind of half-hearted support "exasperating."[188] However, Gloria Steinem writes that she ran in New York as Chisholm's delegate for the DNC in 1972 and did campaign for Chisholm nation-wide.[189] Clearly there is a slight discrepancy in how both feminists remember the campaign.

Historian Julia Gallagher writes that Chisholm had a difficult time persuading these women's groups to work on the different economic oppressions American women face. This inattention to poverty only served to confirm black male leaders' resistance to support her candidacy and black women felt similarly. As she would later say at a National Women's Political Caucus Convention in 1973, "The use of the word 'Ms.' is not a burning issue to them. They are more concerned about extension of the minimum wage . . . . and about welfare reform. They are not only women, but women of color and they are subject to more discrimination than whites." Chisholm's frankness on these issues and her ability to reach out to these predominantly white women's organizations did increase their awareness, and this awareness changed the issues most significant to the women's movement at the time.

---

[188] Chisholm, *The Good Fight*, 76.
[189] Gloria Steinem, "Learning from a Year of Hope and Hard Choices," Eds. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole, *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010), 257.

In the end, Chisholm had trouble reaching out and receiving endorsements from both groups. They both knew that her campaign primarily served as a symbol and that she did not have the resources to win. Beyond that, Chisholm's disorganized campaign, at one point without a campaign manager, forced these groups to confront the reality of her viability as a Presidential candidate. They knew that endorsing her would be politically risky. If they endorsed her, they could perhaps give her more legitimacy at the Democratic National Convention. But if they endorsed a candidate more likely to win, they would have more leverage if that candidate became President. Unfortunately, though Chisholm put forth her best efforts, building a coalition between these two disadvantaged groups would take more time and resources than Chisholm had. The history of these two sometimes competing groups resulted in more division than could be remedied with her campaign.[190]

Shirley Chisholm campaigned in 12 states and received 152 delegates at the Democratic National Convention.[191] Percy Sutton, Manhattan borough president, presented her nomination at the DNC:

> I stand to present to you the Presidential candidacy of a very unique individual—an individual who by her very presence, action and conduct suggests change. An individual who by her action hastened the opening of the doors of the political process and the corridors of power, so that blacks, browns, women, young people – and old people – indeed, all Americans might begin to share meaningful input into the halls of power that control our lives.[192]

[190] Gallagher, "Waging the 'Good Fight,'" 409-11.
[191] Kaptur, *Women of Congress,* 150.
[192] Percy Sutton, "In Nomination for the Presidency the Name of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm," *The Massachusetts Review* Vol. 13, No. 4 (Autumn, 1972), 705.

Chisholm's 152 delegates roughly equaled the delegates Senator Margaret Chase Smith received from the Republican National Convention a few years before. However, had she received support from more women's groups and black groups, she could perhaps have received the support of more delegates at the 1972 Democratic National Convention, which would have given her more leverage to make certain demands on the platform.[193] On the other hand, had these groups endorsed her over more viable Democratic candidates, the candidates themselves would have been less indebted to the groups and less likely to make their issues as prominent.

Shirley Chisholm stayed in office until 1982, advocating for women's issues, and black issues. Active in the NWPC and NOW, she continued to campaign for more women in office. She observed: "Women I have known in government have seemed to me to be much more apt to act for the sake of a principle or moral purpose. They are not as likely as men to engage in deals, manipulations, and sharp tactics."[194] Women's groups often quote her saying that during all her years in politics, "I had met far more discrimination because I am a woman than because I am black."[195]

From 1972 to 1984, the number of female candidates on the Presidential ballot increased dramatically. In 1976, new federal election laws went into effect that provided matching federal funds to candidates for major party nominations who raised a certain amount on their own.[196] There was ambiguity about how this new legislation would affect lesser-known candidates, but three women who ran in at least three different primaries in the Democratic Presidential campaign in 1976 soon found out. Two women ran for the nomination only in their home states: Gertrude Donahey ran in the Ohio Democratic primary winning almost 44,000 votes and Fifi

[193] Gallagher, "Waging the 'Good Fight,'" 410.
[194] Kaptur, *Women of Congress,* 151.
[195] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 92.
[196] Joel Goldstein, "The Influence of Money on the Pre-nomination Stage of the Presidential Selection Process: The Case of the 1976 election," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 8, No. 2. (Spring 1978), 164.

Taft Rockefeller ran in the Kentucky primary winning 2,300 votes. Donahey ran as a "placeholder" for the party to control power, and Rockefeller ran because, as Jo Freeman writes it "she liked running for office." However, neither of these campaigns constituted a serious attempt for the Democratic nomination, and neither of these women continued the race outside of their own home states.[197]

One of these three candidates, however, did have a significant impact on the 1976 election, and the future of female Presidential candidates. In 1972, both the Democratic and Republican Parties had no concrete platform on abortion, but the National Women's Political Caucus started pressuring both parties about the right to abortion, and the Democratic Party began considering adopting a pro-choice platform.[198] Ellen McCormack, a housewife from New York, ran for the first time for any public office in 1976 on a single issue: opposing legal abortion. Concerned with the pro-choice trending of the Democratic Party, she decided to run, with the backing of the Pro-Life Action Committee, to make the strength of the pro-life wing clear to the party. She argued that the Democratic platform on abortion should be a pro-life platform. With no campaign or political experience, McCormack is notable for receiving 238,000 votes after campaigning in more than 22 states.[199] Then, by raising enough funds to receive matching federal funds in accordance with the new legislation, McCormack became the first woman to receive federal dollars for the Presidency (nearly $250,000).[200] This funding gave her enough money to run television ads and to create a national dialogue over whether the Democratic Party should maintain its pro-choice stance.

[197] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 93.
[198] Byron Daynes and Raymond Tatlovich, "Presidential Politics and Abortion," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 22, No. 3 (Summer 1992), 546.
[199] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 93.
[200] Goldstein, "The Influence of Money on the Pre-nomination Stage of the Presidential Selection Process," 171.

Ellen McCormack, while clearly not a viable candidate, is notable for several reasons. First, she showed that women could raise substantial money and that the new federal legislation would not necessarily eliminate her. Her campaign, while unsuccessful, also forced the candidates to talk about abortion and confront the issue in new ways. As the President of Georgia Right to Life Committee said, "She's not a serious candidate, but she can get equal time [on television] for the pro-life message and she can get the federal government to pay for the ads."[201] She also forced the feminist community to consider whether or not to support a relatively progressive woman, but one who did not meet their bottom line issue of abortion. There is no mention of supporting her in any feminist texts or historical overviews of her candidacy.

The Democratic National Convention of 1976 showed the increasing influence of women to the Democratic Party and the issues they represented. McCormack's votes and attention gave her a platform at the Democratic National Convention, where she addressed the body.[202] At the convention she won 22 delegates from five states for the first ballot. Also at the convention, Barbara Jordan became the first black woman to address the DNC. Her speech inspired so many at the Convention that several Democrats circulated a petition to put her on the ballot as Vice President. Jordan quickly moved to reject that offer, stating in a press conference immediately after the petition started circulating, "It has been suggested that my name be placed before the convention to demonstrate in some symbolic way the position of blacks in the country. I really have not much interest in being a symbol . . . . When my name gets before a convention, I hope it is not just to raise some issues, but to elect me to something."[203]

---

[201] Maris A. Vinovskis, "Abortion and the Presidential Election of 1976: A Multivariate Analysis of Voting Behavior," *Michigan Law Review*, Vol. 77, No. 7 (Aug. 1979), 1757.
[202] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 93.
[203] "Rep. Jordan Rejects Bid for Attempt at 2nd Spot," *The New York Times,* 14 July 1976.

Throughout the 1970s, the idea of a woman president became gradually more acceptable to mainstream America. According to political scientists Anne Costain and Steven Majostorovic, willingness to vote for a "qualified" woman for president grew from roughly 60 percent of the general public in 1970 to 85 percent of the general public in 1984. At the same time, the number of women in office, as well as the percentage of laws affecting women increased dramatically.[204] From 1974 to 1984, women state legislators increased as well, the average percentage of female state legislators jumping from 5.7 percent to 12.1 percent. Colorado's percentage of female legislators increased the most with 17 percent, with Maryland and Wyoming not far behind with a 15 percent increase each.[205]

The election of 1980 would become a momentous election for several reasons. First, NOW made the decision not to endorse Jimmy Carter for President. Given the new campaign finance laws, and an increase in its desire to be politically active, NOW's tax status had changed, and it had developed its own PAC to be able to endorse. NOW at the time grew aware of the power it had in politics, and it wanted to exercise its might.[206] It appealed to President Carter, asking him to support a plank to deny funds to any Democratic candidate who did not support the ERA. Carter did not agree with its demands; however, NOW ultimately won.[207] The *National NOW Times* published an article in 1980, boasting that "we were victorious on the planks withholding Democratic Party funds from Democratic candidates who did not support the ERA and [. . .] federal funding of abortion."[208]

---

[204] Anne Costain and Steven Majstorovic, "Congress, Social Movements, and Public Opinion," 124.
[205] Wilma Rule, "Why More Women Are State Legislators," *The Western Political Quarterly* Vol. 43, No. 2 (Jun., 1990), 438-40.
[206] Mary Fainsod Katzenstein, "Feminism and the Meaning of the Vote," *Signs* Vol. 10, No. 1 (Autumn, 1984), 21.
[207] Jo Freeman, "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention," *PS: Political Science and Politics* Vol. 21, No. 4 (Autumn 1988), 875.
[208] Katzenstein, "Feminism and the Meaning of the Vote," 21.

But, second, NOW also discovered at the Convention that its real success lay in its ability to demonstrate the influence women now had in electoral politics. NOW proved its might with women's newfound political power, beyond simply the Democratic Convention. In 1980, for the first time, women favored Democrats by a significant majority of five percent. A majority of men voted for Reagan, and only a minority of women did the same and polls showed increasing support from women for the Democratic Party. Reagan became so unsettled by the gap that he hired a pollster to look into the problem for his reelection bid.[209] Political scientists as well had to revise their approach, overturning previous wisdom that claimed, as Professor Louis Bolce states, "gender or sex were not merely substantively unimportant but were not even interesting enough to merit separate attention."[210]

Bolstered by this political strength, in the election of 1984 NOW decided to take another, bolder approach. NOW and the NWPC both eagerly wanted to play a commanding role in the election, and they invited they all of the candidates to speak at their respective national conventions, in order to consider making endorsements. NWPC did not endorse any men but still asked all the candidates to attend their convention in July of 1983.[211] At the time, NOW had never endorsed a male politician.[212]

In spring of 1983, the six declared candidates for the Democratic nomination received two competing letters from women's rights activists. Bella Abzug sponsored the first. As one of the co-founders of the National Women's Political Caucus, she wanted to start drumming up publicity around NOW and NWPC's endorsement. She told the *New York Times* on May 9 that

---

[209] Susan Faludi, *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (New York: Crown Publishers Inc., 1991), 270.
[210] Louis Bolce, "The Role of Gender in Recent Presidential Elections: Reagan and the Reverse Gender Gap," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 15, No. 2 (Spring 1985), 373.
[211] Geraldine Ferraro, *Ferraro, My Storys* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1985), 24.
[212] Gandy, Personal Interview.

"Usually we don't bargain until the convention . . . . Now we're saying there is a real bloc of votes out there. We want to create a fight for us." Abzug's letter warned the officials to "agree on an agenda for issues affecting women or face the possibility of women staying away."[213] The agenda included many women's issues but particularly equal pay and female political appointments.

The second letter responded to Abzug's letter. Nine Democratic Congresswomen simply affirmed, more moderately, that they hoped the candidates would support women's issues. Representative Geraldine Ferraro (D-NY) added her name to the list of women who signed the second letter, saying "I felt it was a little strong . . . . I don't think we should be talking about a possibility of women staying home." Pat Schroeder on the other hand signed both, claiming proudly that "any letter than any women want to write about women's issues and the feminization of poverty, I'll sign."[214]

Schroeder, Abzug, and other women's rights leaders at the time started discussing the possibility of a woman on the ticket as a Vice Presidential nominee. In May of 1983, though her name had been discussed as a possibility, Ferraro seemed unconcerned with the gender of the Vice Presidential nominee telling the *New York Times*, "We're interested in a Democratic win. It's a little early to be talking who or what type of person should be Vice President."[215] Ferraro meant at the time that installing a Democratic administration surpassed the importance of a female candidate.

For the first time, the (male) Democratic candidates came to the NWPC Convention as well as the NOW Convention in July of 1983, to win women's support. Until 1983 candidates had merely sent in position papers on women's issues generally. As Ferraro relates in her

[213] Jane Perlez, "Democratic Women Split on Best Strategy for '84," *The New York Times,* 10 May 1983.
[214] Ibid.
[215] Ibid.

autobiography about the convention, "It felt nice to be wooed."[216] As *The Washington Post* reported, the now 250,000 member organization with an annual budget of over $10 million now held a position prominent enough to test its political might.[217]

The NOW Convention grew lively in its unwavering demands for a woman Vice Presidential candidate. When Rep. Schroeder stood on stage she received a standing ovation. She used the platform to speak about the deleterious effect of President Reagan's policies on women. While all the candidates received thunderous applause and ovations, according to the *Miami Herald* the "highlight" of the Convention occurred when Rep. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), Rep. Mary Oakar (D-OH), and Rep. Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) announced that they had endorsed Ferraro for the Vice Presidential nomination as Mondale's running mate. Rep. Oakar qualified her endorsement acknowledging the qualifications of the other candidates, but asserting, "I just think we're going to lose this unless we focus on this one person."[218]

Elected from Queens, New York to the House of Representatives in 1978, Ferraro described herself as a "conservative with a small c." Ferraro strongly supported pro-choice legislation, despite the largely Catholic and pro-life demographic she represented in Congress. She cosponsored the 1981 Economic Equity Act and as a member of the Select Committee of Aging, she worked for older women's rights and pensions.[219] However, on many other issues she fell to the center, and women's groups did not particularly see her as out in front for women compared to other potential candidates at the time. Perhaps for these reasons, the feminist community did not know her particularly well.[220]

---

[216] Geraldine Ferraro, *Ferraro, My Story*, 25.
[217] Alison Muscatine, "The Vice Presidency and the Future of NOW; The Women's Political Organization: From Outsider Status to Grass Roots Appeal," *The Washington Post*, 2 July 1984.
[218] Ellen Livingston, "Three at NOW Convention Favor Ferraro as VP," *The New York Times*, 1 July 1984.
[219] Karen Foerstel and Herbert Foerstel, *Climbing the Hill,* 33.
[220] Gandy, Personal Interview.

Ferraro informed the press of her delight with this support: "I think what we're doing is making a statement about a woman on the ticket . . . We're voices that want to be heard."[221] However, to her friends and the leaders within the movement, Ferraro expressed doubt that she would be chosen, or that any woman would be chosen for that matter. Ferraro was, in her own words, a "doomsayer": "There is no way any Presidential candidate is going to choose a woman as a running mate . . . . They're never going to choose a woman [just] because it's the right thing to do."[222]

After the Conference, the members of the board met to make their decision on whom to endorse. Former NOW President Kim Gandy sat on the board during the endorsement decision and notes that "there wasn't a fight but there were very, very, passionate advocates on the board." According to Gandy all the candidates supported women's issues making the decision particularly challenging, especially since they had just come out of a long ERA fight and defeat with most of these candidates. She says that by that time they knew which candidates were "with you or ag'in you." But in the end, NOW endorsed Mondale, making him the first male NOW had ever endorsed.[223] In exchange Mondale gave NOW the authority to approve or veto all language concerning women's issues.[224] NOW designated Mary Jean Collins, NOW's Action Vice President, to be in charge of all platform language for Mondale and the party.[225] This kind of unchecked authority on feminist issues was unheard of at the time.

However, less than two weeks later, Mondale proved Ferraro's doubts wrong, by choosing her as his running mate on July 12, 1984.[226] As Susan Faludi says in her book

---

[221] Livingston, "Three at NOW Convention Favor Ferraro as VP."
[222] Geraldine Ferraro. *Ferraro, My Story.* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1985): 25.
[223] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[224] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 126.
[225] Freeman, "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention," 875.
[226] Bernard Weinraub, "Geraldine Ferraro is Chosen by Mondale as Running Mate, First Women on Major Ticket," *The New York Times,* 13 July 1984.

Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women, the "Democrats boldly advertised to women the clear differences between the parties."[227] Women responded in kind. More than 26,000 new Democratic women registered in 1984, the largest registration seen up until that point and in 1984, more women donated to the Mondale/Ferraro campaign than they had to any other campaign in history. Moreover, the number of women running for office increased significantly with her candidacy; the number of female candidates for Senate tripled and a record number of women ran for the House.[228]

The *New York Times* reported that while the National Organization for Women heavily favored her, Democratic advisers at the time argued that Ferraro's ability to attract white blue collar workers and Catholics proved to be a more salient factor in Mondale's decision than her gender.[229] In the introductory speech, however, at the DNC, the speaker would finish the introduction with "and most importantly a mother."[230] After this curious but significant introduction, Ferraro appeared. As she remarked her in acceptance speech: "By choosing a woman to run for our nation's second highest office, you send a powerful signal to all Americans. There are no doors we cannot unlock. We will place no limits on achievement."[231]

While many feminists were pleased, Mondale's choice and decision process did not gain wide acceptance even within feminist organizations. Besides those women who supported Schroeder or other women for the nomination, black women particularly expressed their frustration with this choice. Many women of color supported Jesse Jackson's candidacy and wanted a vice presidential candidate who reflected not only their race and gender, but also one who cared about poverty and other urban issues. According to historian Jo Freeman, the

---

[227] Faludi, *Backlash,* 267.
[228] Ibid., 167-68.
[229] Weinraub, "Geraldine Ferraro is Chosen by Mondale as Running Mate, First Women on Major Ticket."
[230] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 88.
[231] Geraldine Ferraro, *Changing History* (Rhode Island: Moyer Bell, 1993), 7.

Women's Coalition at the convention ignored Shirley Chisholm's requests to do more outreach for minority issues. Mondale also never even interviewed a woman of color in his search for a running mate. After the convention, Chisholm later created the National Political Congress of Black Women, in order to persuade more women of color to run for office. Delores Tucker, former chair of the DNC black caucus, noted at their first meeting that at the DNC of 1984 "our white sisters disappeared."[232]

This national endorsement by NOW created a mixed effect on the members throughout the fifty states. State chapters do not have to endorse candidates that the national NOW endorses. Therefore, while the national endorsement certainly had an impact, it by no means served as a directive to the dispersed and somewhat disorganized state groups. One study of NOW's 1984 endorsement found that members of women's rights groups were less likely to support Mondale than nonmembers—roughly 40 percent vs. 44.4 percent. Women activists within NOW were less likely to caucus for Mondale, but after the endorsement they were more likely to actively get involved in the campaign when compared to other groups.[233] These data demonstrate that while a NOW endorsement has clout, and certainly had an effect on the election of 1984, it did not guarantee support from all its members. At the same time, the endorsement did engender a level of involvement from the members unseen in other comparative groups.

In November of 1984, Mondale lost handily to President Reagan. While it certainly did not constitute the main reason the campaign lost, the intense scrutiny into the personal financial affairs of Ferraro and her family did not help.[234] Many party insiders blamed the feminist community for pressuring Mondale to select a female Vice President. The Republican Party even used NOW's involvement in the campaign to show Mondale's indebtedness to "special

[232] Freeman, "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention," 875- 78.
[233] Abramowitz, "Do Endorsements Matter?" 196.
[234] Kaptur, *Women of Congress,* 142.

interests." Her candidacy would also unnerve party leaders for years to come. But according to Jo Freeman, party officials pronounced the idea of running a woman candidate a failure despite exit polls definitively showing that Ferraro's presence on the ticket did not hurt Mondale, and probably helped him slightly."[235] Afterwards, a national survey found that one quarter of voters were more likely to support a woman for President than before the campaign.[236] At the time, Democratic Party leaders wanted someone to blame for the loss, however, and Ferraro and her distinctive gender became the easiest target.

As noted earlier, the elections of 1980 and 1984 are often discussed in terms of the emerging gender gap. Given the uniqueness of the 1984 election in terms of gender, political scientist Louis Bolce argues that the alignment of white voters with the Republican Party is a result that political scientists and historians often neglect to discuss. One study found that this alignment represented a more significance from 1980-1984 than the gender gap, and it played a more considerable role in both elections. The election of 1984 may have even shown a decrease in the effects of the gender gap according to how one looks at the data, but they reveal the "continued drift of the white male toward the national Republican party."[237]

Pushing Ferraro's candidacy certainly demonstrated a brave experiment on behalf of NOW and other women's groups who were involved. While it certainly helped register women to vote, and put NOW on the map, it also resulted in a significant backlash. Some political analysts decried NOW and declared it had made Mondale look "weak." *The Washington Post* columnist Richard Cohen contended that the women's movement had "henpecked" Mondale and he had fallen victim to the "threats of the organized women's movement." This response to Ferraro's candidacy, and NOW's involvement, had its negative impact. From 1984 to 1987, a

[235] Freeman, "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention," 880.
[236] Faludi, *Backlash,* 269.
[237] Bolce, "The Role of Gender in Recent Presidential Elections," 383-84.

national poll indicated that 13 percent fewer voters believed that a woman would be President before the year 2000.[238] The participants in this poll turned out to be perspicacious.

One might wonder if perhaps NOW made a deal with Mondale that in exchange for its endorsement, he would select a female running mate, but former NOW President Kim Gandy, calls the idea "ridiculous." She says that NOW endorsed Mondale because the organization wanted to back a feminist and "that's the kind of person he was."[239] She also adds that if Mondale had allowed them to pick a candidate, it might not have been Ferraro as NOW did not know Ferraro very well at the time.

An additional question arises: Why did these organizations not make a bigger effort to include the advice and insight of women of color? Mondale did not even interview a woman of color as a running mate, hence he failed to engage female communities of color. NOW, with its clear anti-racist policy, also did not heed Shirley Chisholm's request to include minority issues in its plank for recruiting a woman candidate for Vice President. One can only guess how different the outcome might have been had both the Democratic Party and NOW worked to engage more people of color in its decision-making and final choice of candidate.

In the following election cycle, another female candidate decided to make a run for President. Colorado elected Congresswoman Pat Schroeder (D-CO) to Congress as a Democrat in 1972. Schroeder became the second youngest woman ever elected to Congress, as well as the first woman to ever sit on the House Armed Services Committee. The party eventually elected her Democratic Whip, and in 1978 she co-founded the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues.[240]

---

[238] Faludi, *Backlash,* 269.
[239] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[240] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 86.

Throughout her tenure in Congress, Schroeder became well known for her pro-family legislation. Once elected, she immediately signed onto the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, which passed in 1978.[241] In the 1980s she also strengthened the aid mothers received in divorce with the Child Support Enforcement Amendment, which also received support from then Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole.[242] Throughout the 1980s she played a pivotal role by campaigning vigorously for the passage of the landmark legislation – the Family Medical Leave Act. [243]

In 1987, Representative Schroeder "cleared her schedule" to help then Senator Gary Hart, a fellow Coloradoan run for President.[244] A few weeks after Hart entered the race, however, the media exposed his extra-marital affair, and within a week he had dropped out. Immediately, the press turned their attention to Schroeder. Stating frequently that she thought "America is man enough to back a woman" she decided to open an exploratory committee.[245]

Schroeder spent the summer of 1987 raising money for her bid. She stated from the beginning that if she could not raise $2 million by September, she would drop out.[246] She wanted to make a decision by September so that in case she decided to drop out, she could still run for reelection to her seat in Congress. In July of 1987, NOW invited no candidates to their Convention, as a result of burnout from 1984.[247] However, Schroeder attended as she had been invited before she had decided to run. At the 1987 Convention in Philadelphia, Schroeder quickly amassed $351,344 for her bid from NOW members, making her a much more serious contender. While Betty Friedan said that her candidacy revealed a "ray of hope," many women's

[241] Kaptur, *Women of Congress,* 178.
[242] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 86.
[243] Kaptur, *Women of Congress,* 178.
[244] Pat Schroeder, Interview with Josh Israel, "The Buying of the American Presidency: Interviews: Patricia Schroeder," 21 February 2008, *The Buying of the President*, http://www.buyingofthepresident.org/index.php/interviews/patricia_schroeder/ (accessed 26 January 2011).
[245] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 87.
[246] Ibid., 88.
[247] Maralee Schwartz, "NOW says Not Now to Presidential Candidates," *The Washington Post,* 12 July 1987,

activists at the time were concerned that her candidacy was too little, too late.[248] Some expressed concern over the fallout of 1984, one Democratic Party activist stating that if Schroeder dropped out or lost it would "be one more example of 'you see, women are not ready for prime time.'"[249] As another NOW member said, "We're tired of being scapegoated for the 1984 presidential election . . . and none of these candidates look very good to us anyway."[250] According to the *Boston Globe*, women were split between supporting her, again divided on the purpose of her campaign:

> Far from being a unifying force, Schroeder's brief candidacy rent the women's community, splitting it into camps. There were those who rallied to Schroeder because of her pioneer status, her scimitar wit, and her own unfailing support for issues of concern to women during her fifteen years in Congress; and others who said Schroeder's bid, despite her best efforts, was merely symbolic, and who choose instead to work on electing a progressive man.[251]

Democrats and Republicans looked at her candidacy with amusement, fear, and skepticism. Republicans thought it would benefit their party, as her race, as well as Jesse Jackson's would lead to the "balkanization of the Democratic party." Democratic party leaders on the other hand were concerned Schroeder would take away much needed votes from women, and if she lost the nomination, the fallout would lead to bitterness and apathy at the polls.[252] Throughout her campaign, journalists asked her, "Are you running as a woman?" to which Schroeder would reply "Do I have an option?"[253]

---

[248] Alessandra Stanley, "Run, Pat, Schroeder, Run!" 3 August 1987, *Time Magazine* http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,965133,00.html (accessed January 26, 2011).
[249] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 88.
[250] Schwartz, "NOW says Not Now to Presidential Candidates."
[251] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 93.
[252] Stanley, "Run, Pat, Schroeder, Run!"
[253] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 88.

By August of 1987, NOW had pledged Schroeder another $400,000 for her bid, although it never gave her a formal endorsement.[254] The NWPC also never endorsed her, as she "wasn't in the race long enough."[255] A nascent Emily's List had only existed for a few years and really had not considered endorsing a Presidential candidate. As Schroeder said in an interview, "they were [thinking], 'We want to play where we're going to win and we don't think we're going to win here.' So they weren't interested in making an investment in it."[256] Ellen Malcolm, then President of Emily's List, justified its lack of involvement saying that Schroeder pulled out before she actually got in the race, that she just explored it.[257] *Time* magazine had her as third in its polling, and with her direct mail campaign and house party campaign she raised nearly $1 million.[258] However, Schroeder began to believe that third was as far as she could get.

On September 28, 1987, Schroeder announced her withdrawal from the race. In the middle of her speech, however, she broke down and cried for a recorded seventeen seconds.[259] Naturally the media had a field day, while women's rights activists around the country either cried along side her or cringed.

Schroeder's defeat, and the hesitancy from some feminist groups to support her, could have also been a result of leftover anguish from the Mondale/Ferraro defeat in 1984. According to journalist Susan Faludi, in 1988, women's groups had trouble recruiting female candidates. Even the Women's Campaign Forum had difficulty finding women to give money to. Only two women ran for Senate, down from ten in 1984 and both of them lost. The number of women who ran for the House also decreased, and only half those women who ran won. The percentage

[254] Freeman, "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention," 880.
[255] Ball, Personal Interview.
[256] Schroeder, Interview with Josh Israel.
[257] Ellen Malcolm, Personal Interview, 24 February 2011.
[258] John Dillin, "Presidential Race; Schroeder Stays out for '88," *The Christian Science Monitor,* 29 September 1987.
[259] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 89-90.

of women in statewide office also decreased for the first time in eleven years. On the other hand, women were more of a political voting force than ever before. The newly discovered "gender gap" increased significantly in 1988, with over 10 million more women than men voting.[260]

Three years later in 1991, attorney Anita Hill made headlines, accusing President Bush's Supreme Court nominee of sexual harassment. America watched as an all-male Senate Judiciary Committee panel grilled this neat and eloquent woman about lurid details.[261] After the Senate confirmed Thomas's nomination by a small margin (52 to 48 with one female Senator voting yea and one female Senator voting nay), 100 women including legislators marched on Washington yelling, "We'll remember in November." Patricia Ireland, then the President of NOW, called the reaction to the all-male Senate Judiciary panel the "feminization of power."[262] This event, more women in the workforce, and the gradual rolling back of abortion rights led to the culmination of the election of 1992.

The election of 1992 would come to be known as the "Year of the Woman." The House added 24 new women, the most ever elected in a single national election. This class included an unprecedented number of women of color as well. Congress added more women than ever before to significant leadership positions in the House. American voters also sent four women to the Senate: Patty Murray (D-WA), Diane Feinstein (D-CA), Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and Carol Moseley Braun, the first African-American woman to serve in the Senate. [263]

The 1992 election cycle also became a significant moment for feminist organizations and PACs as well. NOW, NWPC, Emily's List, Women's Campaign Fund, and the Fund for the

---

[260] Faludi, *Backlash,* 270-72.
[261] Miachel X. Delli Carpini and Ester R. Fuchs, "The Year of the Woman? Candidates, Voters, and the 1992 Elections," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 108, No. 1 (Spring 1993), 34.
[262] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 141.
[263] "The Decade of Women: 1992-2002," *Women in Congress Website*, http://womenincongress.house.gov/historical-essays/essay.html?intID=5&intSectionID=26#foot38 (accessed 2 February 2011).

Feminist Majority spent millions on candidates.[264] From 1991 to 1992 Emily's List grew in membership from a mere 3,000 to a staggering 22,000 members.[265] In 1992 Emily's List brought in more money than all other federal PACs—raising over $6 million for candidates. The Women's Campaign Forum (then the Women's Campaign Fund) also doubled what it raised from 1991 to 1992 raising 2 million for the 1992 campaign cycle, an increase that they have yet to replicate.[266]

Studies have also shown that gender itself played a direct role in the "1992 Year of the Woman." According to Eric Plutzer and John F. Zipp, in their study of the 1992 election, "gender was more salient in 1992 than [in] any other election."[267] They found that sex of the voter significantly related to voter choice in 8 out of 13 states. However, it is important to recognize, as they explain, that "gender identity is not the same as feminist consciousness."[268] In addition, the 1992 election possibly exhibited a fluke convergence of national events, especially including Anita Hill's testimony, which precipitated gender identity motivation in voting, but it is unlikely to happen again given the uniqueness of the circumstances.[269]

In 2000, Elizabeth Dole ran for the Republican nomination for President, but as Sharon Ball of the NWPC explained recently, "She's not pro-choice. We did not endorse her in her Senate race for that reason. And she did not seek our endorsement for that reason."[270] She did supposedly support abortion in the cases of rape and incest; however, the feminist community did not consider this position pro-choice enough to garner their support. Women made up half of

---

[264] Miachel X. Delli Carpini and Ester R. Fuchs, "The Year of the Woman?" 35.
[265] "Our History," *Emily's List Website*, December 1992, Printed in *Glamour*. http://emilyslist.org/assets/pdfs/timeline/1992_glamour_women_of_the_year.pdf (accessed Feb. 2, 2011).
[266] "Women's Campaign Fund," *Open Secrets*, 2 February 2011 http://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/lookup2.php?strID=C00015024&cycle=2010 (accessed Feb. 2, 2011).
[267] Eric Plutzer and John F. Zipp, "Identity Politics, Partisanship, and Voting for Women Candidates," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* Vol. 60, No. 1 (Spring 1996), 52.
[268] Ibid., 30-33.
[269] Ibid., 52.
[270] Ball, Personal Interview.

her donors but in the end their donations were not enough. In October of 1999, she pulled out from the primaries mostly because of a lack of funds. When Dole made the announcement about leaving the campaign, she said she saw "some women sit up a little straighter," taking pride in Dole's campaign through the shared experience of womanhood.[271] And even though Dole withdrew from the race early, she received the support of 231 write-in votes in the New Hampshire primaries.[272]

The shameful Clarence Thomas judiciary hearings directly affected then Illinois Register of Deeds, Carol Moseley Braun. After watching the Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas debate, Moseley Braun decided to run for the United States Senate. On the trail she made no secret of her strongly pro-choice stance, often criticizing President Bush for scaling back reproductive rights.[273] In her primary bid, no one expected her to win; the other primary contenders were outspending her 10:1. As one journalist noted, "she was last in funding, last in organization, and last in on-air commercials." However, on election night, she won 38 percent of the vote, and danced to the song "Ain't No Stopping Us Now" on her victory night.

During her primary campaign for the Senate, Moseley Braun did receive support from prominent feminists, and indeed she claims "Gloria Steinem was the single most important support for my candidacy bar none."[274] She received her first PAC check from the Women's Campaign Forum, and Emily's List followed suit soon after WCF's endorsement.[275] In the general campaign she raised more than three times as much as her opponent. While she did endure a few scandals during her campaign—using taxpayer money to help her elderly mother,

[271] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 112-17.
[272] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 101.
[273] Karen Foerstel and Herbert Foerstel, *Climbing the Hill,* 33.
[274] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 142.
[275] "WCF Experience," Women's Campaign Forum Website, http://www.wcfonline.org/pages/about-us/wcf-experience.html (accessed Feb. 5, 2011).

and not reporting a substantial inheritance to Medicaid—she ended up winning by a margin of 8 percent, with 58 percent of women supporting her.[276] The *New York Times* reported that her race received more attention than any other in 1992, partly because of who she was, and partly because of "angry women voters." As of today, Moseley Braun is the only African-American woman to have served in the United States Senate.

Moseley Braun received media attention and acclaim after only six months in office. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) wanted to add an amendment in order to renew the patent for the United Daughters of the Confederacy, which included the Confederate flag their insignia. In other words, had the Senate voted to renew the patent, this would have translated into federal approval of the Confederate flag. In her outrage, she stormed the Senate floor shouting, "it is about racial symbolism . . . . I have too on many occasions, as the only African-American here, constrain myself to be calm, to restrain myself, to be laid back . . . . [But] on this issue there can be no consensus."[277] The *New York Times* reported on the incident saying the freshman Senator hushed the Senate as "freshmen seldom do." And the freshman Senator Barbara Boxer also noted, "If ever there was proof of the value of diversity, we have it here today."[278] The amendment failed.

Her colleagues quickly grew to know the Senator as a champion for women and African American issues, and they grew accustomed to her sometimes brash style. Once in a committee discussion over whether or not to publicly fund co-payments for breast exams, she declared "As the only senator in the room with breasts . . . ."[279] However, all manner of scandals plagued Moseley-Braun's tenure in the Senate and her re-election bid. She never got her finances under

[276] Karen Foerstel and Herbert Foerstel, *Climbing the Hill,* 65.
[277] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 145- 46.
[278] Adam Clymer, "Daughter of Slavery Hushes Senate," *The New York Times,* 23 July 1993.
[279] Ann Gerhart, "What Makes Carol Run?; Moseley Braun is Short on Campaign Cash and Staff But Long on Determination," *The Washington Post*, 12 Nov. 2003.

control; between personal family financial incidents, and a half a million-dollar debt from her first campaign, voters grew wary of her as a Senator. She did not raise enough money while in office to compete for reelection. In 1999, she lost reelection to state Senator Peter Fitzgerald, a Republican millionaire. In 1999, President Clinton asked her to become the Ambassador to New Zealand, a post that she happily accepted.

In February of 2003, Moseley Braun decided to open an exploratory bid for President with little fanfare, telling *Ms.* Magazine that she was not "unaware that she's trying to do what no woman has done before."[280] Later describing her motivation behind her bid, she explained, "The thought occurred, if I were not a woman—if I were a guy—with my credentials and my experience and what I bring to the table, there would be no reason why I wouldn't think about running for president."[281] In her announcement, *USA Today* reported that "she hopes to appeal to Americans across the board, but she also made it clear she intends to 'advance and advocate' for blacks and women." The paper also reported that "party strategists say she will energize black and feminists, two pillars of the Democratic vote."[282]

On the trail, Moseley Braun did not shy away from focusing on her gender, or using it to emphasize her points. At a forum on women's issues in New Hampshire she stated, "I'm the only mom up here. I did it all. Sick babies, nursing, day care, picking up from soccer, classes, faxing homework."[283] On August 25, Moseley Braun announced to the crowd that "together we will take the 'men only' sign off the White House." She added that women bring a "practical

[280] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 149- 50.
[281] Monica Davey, "In Seeking Presidency, Braun Could Win Back Reputation," *The New York Times,* 18 Dec. 2003.
[282] Jill Lawrence, "Senate pioneer has her eyes on the White House prize," *USA Today,* 20 Feb. 2003.
[283] Gerhart, "What Makes Carol Run?"

perspective to policy making."[284] On August 26, Women's Equality Day, Carol Moseley Braun received the endorsements of both NOW/PAC and the NWPC. NOW's press release stated:

> After considering the positions and past records of all the candidates lined up to challenge George W. Bush, one candidate stood above the rest for her lifetime commitment to feminist ideals and her 25-year record fighting for the rights of women at the local, state, national and international levels. We are particularly excited when out of a field of strong progressive candidates, the strongest feminist candidate is also a woman.[285]

In an interview with Gandy, she stated that after 1984 and the Mondale endorsement, NOW "didn't endorse for a long time" and this endorsement represented a "big deal" for the organization. She explains that NOW endorsed only if "we felt there was a candidate who shared our ideals."[286] In November of 2003, Patricia Ireland the former President of NOW would join Moseley Braun's campaign as her campaign manager.[287]

While the NWPC did also endorse Moseley Braun for President, Sharon Ball who at the time served as the VP of the Political Planning Committee of the NWPC explains that the decision was not unanimous across the board:

> It was less than unanimous . . . . when we endorsed Carol Moseley Braun. A couple of our members were adamant Kerry supporters, and they couldn't endorse her. As one woman put it, "I used to change his diapers." Primarily knew him personally and also because they knew there was no way in hell Carol was going to win, and we all knew that. But the caucus had never endorsed a woman for president, we had a viable woman

---

[284] Natalie McNeal, "Candidate Braun Tells Women: Remove White House Barrier," *The Miami Herald,* 25 August 2003.
[285] Kim Gandy, "NOW/PAC Endorses Carol Moseley-Braun for President," 26 August 2003, *NOW Website.*, http://www.now.org/press/08-03/08-26.html (accessed February 4, 2011).
[286] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[287] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,*152.

> who was running and we needed to support her now . . . . That was the first woman we ever endorsed for president . . . . Carol was more symbolic in terms of an endorsement. Well, we really didn't think, most of us, personally, I didn't think she could win but I think it was important for the caucus to come out in support of her. And she always fit the bottom line issue.[288]

Though Moseley Braun had received support from Emily's List for her Senate campaign, she claimed that the organization "rejected my candidacy out of hand" giving her no support.[289] Ellen Malcolm says that Emily's List just didn't consider her a "realistic contender" for the 2004 Presidential race. Malcolm could not even remember if she merited a discussion on the board; they simply thought she did not have the money, or the ability to put a campaign together.[290]

Moseley Braun also had her skeptics throughout the campaign. An opinion writer for *USA Today* (also black) wrote of her that she has "two politically fatal flaws, she is black and female."[291] Diane Sawyer asked her "Why don't you work for a candidate who has a real shot at victory?"[292] Eventually it became clear throughout the fall that she would not be able to raise enough money. The *New York Times*, though not giving her an interview, called out NOW for its support in an editorial titled "NOW's Woman Problem." The paper called Moseley Braun's campaign a "vanity affair," simply an attempt to fix her damaged reputation. While acknowledging that Moseley Braun stood for the issues important to NOW, it also claimed that

---

[288] Ball, Personal Interview.
[289] Carol Moseley Braun, Interview with Sara Fritz, "The Buying of the President: 2008: Interviews: Carol Moseley Braun," 17 August 2007, *The Buying of the President,* http://www.buyingofthepresident.org/index.php/interviews/carol_moseley_braun/ (accessed February 5, 2011).
[290] Malcolm, Personal Interview.
[291] Dewayne Wickham, "Black, female: both impair Moseley-Braun's chances," *USA Today,* 24 Feb. 2003 http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/columnist/wickham/2003-02-24-wickham_x.htm (accessed Feb. 12, 2011).
[292] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 151.

NOW "trivialized the important role women will play in the coming election" making themselves look silly to boot.[293]

Moseley Braun had a difficult time getting voters and the media to take her bid for President seriously. As said before, she could not even get an interview with the *New York Times*.[294] Political pundits and the media continuously pointed out that she did not have enough experience to run for President.[295] But, as she would willingly volunteer, her resume proved "more impressive than those of many of the men running."[296] Former NOW President Kim Gandy says that despite her local, national and international experience "she wasn't taken seriously by anyone at all. Not by anybody."[297] Moseley Braun complained to *The Washington Post* that "people look at me like I'm making it up. But I'm not." To those who told her to drop out, she simply replied that she had been told to quit in every race she had ever run in.[298]

Moseley Braun also received negative press because of her checkered past. She would either bristle in her own defense to the press, or brush it off. Eleanor Smeal came to her defense stating, "These scandals are the making of the press, and the press is reflecting the bias of our time . . . . The Republicans targeted her, and why did the target her? Because she was African-American, because she was a woman."[299] However, these scandals and her response or lack of, undermined her legitimacy.

The *Washington Times* also reported that she received mixed support from the black community. Many accused her of being in competition only with Al Sharpton, to which she replied, "The Black Community is not a monolith and to suggest that black voters have to be in

---

[293] Opinion, "NOW's Woman Problem," *The New York Times*, 14 September 2003.
[294] Carol Moseley Braun, Interview with Sara Fritz.
[295] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[296] Gerhart. "What Makes Carol Run?"
[297] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[298] Gerhart, "What Makes Carol Run?"
[299] Davey, "In Seeking Presidency, Braun Could Win Back Reputation."

lockstep and have to get behind a single black candidate seems to take that community for granted."[300] Of all the Democrats in the race, as of December 2003, John Edwards had picked up the most endorsements from the Black Caucus. David Bositis, then chief researcher for the Joint Center on Political and Economic studies commented, "the black caucus members are reflecting on where the black population is." Democratic strategist Donna Brazile noted the frequency for the black vote to be widely dispersed and undecided, comparing the primary of 2004 to Jesse Jackson's 1984 primary bid. And Rep. James Clyburn (D- SC), former Congressional Black Caucus Chair said, "I've always thought it was a mistake for people to think that the entire caucus should settle on one candidate. I don't see or expect all whites to get behind one person, and there is no reason to think blacks will."[301]

By January 2004 though she came in third in a DC primary, her campaign funds were exhausted, and her campaign organization had withered away.[302] While the other Democratic candidates had raised millions, Moseley Braun raised $600,000.[303] On January 15, on the Daily Show with Jon Stewart, Moseley Braun officially ended her campaign. Her short and simple speech concluded with an endorsement of Governor Howard Dean.[304] However, she still amassed over one hundred thousand votes in several states, where there was not enough time to take her name off the ballot.[305]

Carol Moseley Braun's unsuccessful campaign resulted from many failures beyond her control, but many within it. Incidents from her past involving financial reporting scandals, foreign travel, and a sexual harassment allegation from her former staff against her former fiancé

[300] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 153.
[301] Brian Debose, "Black voters divided on candidates; Presidential hopefuls woo support," *The Washington Times,* 4 Dec. 2003.
[302] Jo Freeman, "The Women Who Ran for President," http://www.jofreeman.com/politics/womprez03.htm (accessed February 5, 2011).
[303] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 101.
[304] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 153.
[305] Freeman, *We Will Be Heard,* 101.

plagued her campaign.[306] Her continual disregard for the reality of her situation (read: no money, staff, or support) led the press and political pundits to question the validity and earnestness of her campaign. The press began asking if her campaign truly cared about running for President or if it simply exhibited a "vanity affair" to clean up her reputation?[307] Or did she run simply to be able to demand more money on the lecture circuit?[308] Even those who bothered to take her candidacy seriously continually called her inexperienced, despite her extensive resume. In Kim Gandy's opinion, her treatment by the press was ludicrous and unfair. As Gandy explains, "It's certainly been my experience that women have to be a lot better at what they're talking about in order to be considered the equivalent of a man with less experience."[309] This frame of her "inexperience," however, painted a narrative of her candidacy that followed her throughout the year.

On the other hand, Moseley Braun made plenty of mistakes that were within her control. She had trouble asking people for support either financial or political. From the beginning she proved to be a poor fundraiser, and she admitted in an interview later that she felt like the campaign was "doomed from the start in that nobody was prepared to put money behind the effort."[310] This mindset could not have helped her in her efforts. At events, she would forget to ask the crowd for their support, and when people would approach her to support her, she would tell them to visit the website rather than demanding what she truly needed: money. Her organizational and managerial skills were also severely lacking. By November of 2003, she

[306] Jill Lawrence, "Senate pioneer has eyes on the White House prize."
[307] Opinion, "NOW's Woman Problem."
[308] Gerhart, "What Makes Carol Run?"
[309] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[310] Carol Moseley Braun, Interview with Sara Fritz.

didn't have any staff in Iowa or New Hampshire, and a meager staff of ten in Washington, D.C.[311]

It seemed at least from the media's perspective she was not only oblivious to the poor progress of her campaign but also unwilling to make the necessary changes. When reporters asked her about campaign supplies like buttons or signs, she would say she wasn't very into "stuff."[312] When they confronted her on the scandals of her past, she simply brushed them aside instead of addressing them, calling them "foolishness."[313] When they would challenge her on her chances, she would reply, sometimes with frustration that polls were on her side and the media's constant critique was the result of prejudice against her race and gender. She claimed that even if she had "29 million dollars in the bank that I had no way to even spend, they wouldn't take me seriously."[314] Certainly, Moseley Braun faced a great deal of prejudice in terms of the double jeopardy she faced as a candidate. However, it is undeniable that her lack of attention to the greater campaign needs made her seriousness as a candidate doubtful.

Comparing the difference in support for the only Democratic female candidate from feminist groups from 2004 to 2008 reveals two different approaches. In 2004, NOW and the NWPC rallied around her campaign in August, roughly seven months after she announced. Emily's List and the Women's Campaign Forum would never end up supporting her bid. While each of these groups contributed and participated in her Senate bid, their collective tepid response for her Presidential bid suggests that her viability as a candidate proved to be the main difference between these two campaigns. Timing of Moseley Braun's Senate race also must have played a key role. In 1992, she campaigned against an outgoing unpopular President, and

[311] Gerhart, "What Makes Carol Run?"
[312] Ibid.
[313] Davey, "In Seeking Presidency, Braun Could Win Back Reputation."
[314] Gerhart, "What Makes Carol Run?"

part of a wave that would sweep more women into the Senate than ever before. In 2004, with the Democratic field wide open, but facing a serious incumbent, Moseley Braun faced a different challenge on a different level. She seemed unprepared for the fundraising she would need. Beyond this lack of awareness about her funds, the scandals that began in her Senate campaign only increased throughout her time in office.[315] And she also did not succeed in her reelection campaign. It seems likely that Emily's List and Women's Campaign Forum wanted to save their money for candidates who were more likely to win.

And similarly to Shirley Chisholm, Carol Moseley Braun failed to win the support of the black community. While Al Sharpton also campaigned in this race, and perhaps could have split black votes, neither one of them amassed a majority of black support. Chisholm and Moseley Braun's experiences demonstrate that race is not necessarily a unifying factor, and that black candidates—male or female— are not necessarily guaranteed support from the black community.[316]

Perhaps Moseley Braun also herself expected that her primary race would turn out like her Senate primary race. Her challengers outspent her 10:1; she had very little institutional support; little to no organization; but in the end she shocked everyone by emerging victorious.[317] It seems that Moseley-Braun had heard so many times that she had no chance to win she stopped taking that possibility seriously. However, the presidential primary of 2004 turned out to be a different beast all together, one she clearly did not prepare for.

[315] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 149.
[316] Valeria Sinclair-Chapman and Melanye Price, "Black Politics, the 2008 Election, and the (Im)Possibility of Race Transendence," *PSOnline* (October, 2008), 741.
[317] Gutgold, *Paving the Way for Madam President,* 142.

As Nichola Gutgold puts it, none of these candidates ever achieved the status of front-runner, a historical truth that Hillary Rodham Clinton would change forever.[318]

[318] Gutgold, *Almost Madam President,* 2.

CHAPTER 5: METHODS

As stated in the introduction, from June of 2007 until June of 2008 I worked as a Field Organizer for the Hillary Clinton for President campaign in New Hampshire, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Indiana and Oregon. On the campaign trail, I saw firsthand the panoply of opinions of the candidates in the primary. I watched the reactions of female voters and volunteers. What issues did they care about? How did they identify, or not identify with Hillary? Which women supported her and why? And once feminist organizations started endorsing, I began to wonder – why did they get involved? How are they contributing to the campaign? How do these organizations make their decisions and why? And how would Hillary's campaign change the role of these organizations for the future?

The purpose of the study is to investigate those questions. As Benita Roth says in her study of the movements of feminisms: "recognition of feminist organizing in different communities allows us to ask questions about who came to feminism, how they came to feminism, and how feminism was done in different social spaces."[319] Examining how these prominent feminist organizations made endorsement decisions allows one to see how and if "feminism" has been realized, what it means, and what the future holds.

The "second wave" of feminism, during the 1960s and 1970s, emphasized getting women involved in the political process, as candidates and otherwise. As discussed in the previous chapter, endorsing a female presidential candidate has not always been as straightforward as it might seem. Since the formation of these organizations, each immediately faced weighing the viability of a candidate against its credibility as an organization. Endorsements for these organizations have never been as simple as "She's female; let's endorse."

In this study I ask why some of these organizations endorsed Hillary. Did they endorse

[319] Roth, *Separate Roads to Feminism*, 4.

her because of her gender? Because they had endorsed her before for other races? Because she had a feminist history? Why did NARAL endorse Obama? How did Obama's race and gender influence their decision? What were the politics behind their decision? Why did none of them endorse Edwards, even though his platform was singularly progressive, he had received the endorsements of notable feminists, and his policies might well have done the most good for women? Moreover, where is the feminist movement going and what can the next female presidential candidate expect?

As a graduate student at George Washington University, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed my study plan. Any study that uses human subjects has to submit a request through the GWU IRB. In the application process I submitted the names of the organizations I targeted, my methods, my questions, and what I would do with the data after the study was over. My questions are attached to the end of this chapter.

For the study, I selected Women's Campaign Forum (WCF), Emily's List, National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC), National Organization for Women (NOW), and NARAL. I chose these organizations because they each made a political endorsement in the 2008 Presidential Primary.[320] I attempted to get an interview with staff of the Feminist Majority, as it also endorsed Hillary Clinton in the primary, but no one agreed to meet with me. For WCF, NWPC, and NOW I interviewed the presidents of the organizations at the time of the endorsement, as well as their political committee chairs (or an equivalent). For NOW, I interviewed both the Action VP and the former President, as well as a board member at the time of the endorsement. For Emily's List I interviewed Ellen Malcolm, the creator of Emily's List and the President at the time of the endorsement. For NARAL, the political director rejected my

[320] The political director of NARAL told this author that its endorsement was for the general campaign, not the Democratic primary, though the timing of the endorsement took place while the primary was not resolved, and Hillary had not yet conceded.

requests on behalf of herself and the current staff. However, I attained two interviews of lower level staff members who had worked there during the decision, though both chose to remain anonymous (and whom I refer to as X and Y). Eight of all the women I interviewed identified as Caucasian, and all of them identified as women.

I reached out to these women by researching their involvement during the 2008 campaign at each of these organizations. Occasionally I would interview one woman at an organization and she would recommend another staff member to interview. I began each interview with a set of prepared questions, but each interview evolved into a unique conversation that made the end results a little more random, but also more interesting. The interviews lasted anywhere from thirty minutes to three hours. I ended each interview asking if my interviewee wanted to add anything, a tool I learned from Pamela Stone's research in *Opting Out*.[321] This question allows the interviewee to express anything that she felt the interviewer left out, and it gives her an opportunity to ask the interviewer questions.

I conducted every interview except for one over the phone.[322] I took notes on my computer as each one spoke during the interview. I was able to keep up with the speed of conversation, but frequently asked my interviewees to repeat themselves or slow down if necessary. I would also repeat back something I was unsure about. I also intended to look at each organization's board meeting notes or minutes, but that information was not available to me. Thus, the only documents I was able to view were public press releases, and blogs.

The consent form elucidated the conditions of the study. I made clear on the consent form as well as at the start of the interview that the interviewee could stop at any time, or

[321] Pamela Stone, *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 207.
[322] Originally I had intended for the majority of interviews to be in person, at a place outside of their work. However at the beginning of the interviews, I broke my ankle and was unable to move very easily.

rephrase at any time. Two interviewees explicitly asked me to review the final transcript before I began writing my thesis. One of these interviewees stated she would not consent to being interviewed unless she had final say not only on the transcript, but also on my final written product. I obliged both of her requests.

I also informed them that as a feminist I did not intend to make any organization "look bad" but I hoped to give as accurate a portrayal of the endorsement decision as I could. At first I felt undecided about telling my interviewees that I worked for Hillary on the campaign trail. I worried it would taint their responses by constructing a comfort level that would induce them to divulge more than they would have otherwise. But informing my interviewees of my work for Clinton resulted in the unforeseen harm of making the interviews chattier and we would get off track. Therefore the more interviews I completed, the longer I would wait in the interview to tell my interviewee I had worked for Clinton.

Each interviewee signed a consent form, and none were compensated.

What is a "feminist" research and what makes a researcher a "feminist researcher"?

As a feminist, I wanted to emulate the goals of feminist research practice. Since research often ignores women's personal experience as invalid, my research turned out to be inherently feminist since it explicitly emphasized these personal experiences. As Pamela Stone says in her own research interviewing women, learning what women have to say about their own experiences is intrinsically valuable.[323] A feminist researcher understands that s/he has lived in a world created by "male" knowledge. Men have historically been the researchers and the researched. Beyond the subject/object genders, the methods many male scholars embrace in their research are different from feminist methods. Male knowledge has typically embraced a form of empiricism that emphasizes objectivity. This attempt at so-called "objectivity" can lead

[323] Stone, *Opting Out?* 7.

to positivism in research that fails to report accurately the subtleties of human interaction and that conceals problematic prejudices of the researcher.[324]

A feminist researcher also understands Professor Donna Harraway's premise that "there is no way to 'be' simultaneously in all, or wholly in any, of the privileged (i.e. subjugated) positions structured by race, nation, and class" [sic].[325] Patricia Hill Collins reaffirms Harraway's premise using the "matrix of domination."[326] Biber explains Hill Collins' matrix as the way all the different oppressions women face intersect and interplay with one another. Therefore in conducting interviews, it is critical to keep in mind that women face a constant interaction of various statuses, some of them subordinate to the statuses of those around them and some superordinate.

Joey Sprague argues in her book *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers* that feminists believe there are three ways researchers have power over the subjects they research: they have more control over the process, they have power over the findings, and finally they have more social power given the typical researcher and typical researched group.[327] This means that usually the researcher has more education and economic privilege than the researched group. Sprague also discusses standpoint perspective and the privilege and knowledge base that come with being the researcher.[328] The standpoint every researcher has shapes her research and can stop her from attaining a legitimate perspective from their interviewees.

---

[324] Denise Leckenby, "Challenging Gender Bias and 'Setting the Record Straight,'" Ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy, *Feminist Research Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007), 126.
[325] Donna Harraway, "Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," Alison Jaggar, Ed., *Just Methods: An Interdisciplinary Feminist Reader* (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008), 349.
[326] Abigail Brooks and Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, "An Invitation to Feminist Research," Ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy, *Feminist Research Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007), 19.
[327] Joey Sprague, *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers* (New York: AltaMira Press, 2005), 54.
[328] Sprague, *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers,* 56.

To mitigate my privilege as a researcher, I offered the interviewee the chance to be anonymous, and two interviewees took me up on that offer. At any time my interviewees could refuse to answer a question or stop the interview. If they said something they wanted to modify, I gave them the chance to delete and begin again. I told my interviewees that they also had the option to make any comment anonymous or off the record and many took it. There were no special populations[329] participating in this study, so there was no inherent risk of harming or endangering any specific population.

While conducting the interviews, I tried to make the conversation comfortable and relaxed. As Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber explains, "A feminist perspective on the in-depth interview process reveals that it is more of a conversation between co-participants than a simple question and answer session."[330] I also considered Marjorie Devault's premise that when we interview as women with women about personal experiences, we need to go beyond standard, structured dialogue.[331] Therefore I took notice of the pauses, hesitations, and unspoken expressions of language.

As a feminist, I had an internal struggle with which information to release. Sometimes my interviewees would divulge information that could be possibly damaging to their coworkers, former coworkers, or organization. As a feminist, I have no interest in damaging these organizations. I also have no interest in perpetuating the narrative that feminist organizations are constantly filled with inner conflict.

In addition, occasionally the women at these organizations would give me information that could potentially mobilize the anti-feminist organization. For instance, the political director

[329] including prisoners, elderly, physically or mentally disabled.
[330] Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, "The Practice of Feminist In-Depth Interviewing." Ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy, *Feminist Research Practice*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007), 134.
[331] Marjorie DeVault, "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis," *Social Problems* Vol. 37, No. 1 (February 1990), 99.

of NARAL told me over e-mail that the general public did not consider NARAL a "feminist organization" or "women-centric" one. Since NARAL is the most prominent abortion rights organization in the country, her statement shocked me. If NARAL does not consider itself "feminist" or "women-centric" then what are they and whom are they trying to help? Is one to assume that abortion, which has been among the most prominent issues in the feminist movement, is no longer a feminist concern? One can only imagine what this information could give to the pro-life community, many of which claim that pro-life organizations are more feminist in their goals (see Feminists for Life). I struggled with the potential damage this quote could do to NARAL. However, what the political director told me was significant for what it means for the feminist movement, feminist organizations, and single-issue organizations. This mindset also contributed to NARAL's decision in the primary. I ultimately decided that this information is historically significant and shows a possible shift in feminist thinking.

Limitations to my Research

The organizations I am studying restrict the usage of their own records. Therefore, I rely primarily on interviews as my source of data.

The largest obstacle when depending on interviews as a main source of data is that memory is unreliable. At the time of the interviews, these organizations had made primary endorsement decisions roughly four years ago, so many of the women I interviewed had trouble recalling the details of events, meetings, and conversations. I frequently had to remind my interviewees of various events to trigger their memories. The validity of their facts is therefore obviously questionable. However, this ambiguity did not prove to be a significant problem for

this project, since my interests lay in endorsement procedures at the time, which had not changed for most organizations since 2007, as well as the general discussion around the endorsement.

During the interviews it also became difficult to glean exact procedures and conversations since many of these processes are confidential. Many organizations do not inform the public of how they make endorsement decisions and keep that information within the privacy of the boardroom. Beyond this difficulty, each organization had a different endorsement procedure, so the responsibilities of the head of the "political department" (whatever named) were very different depending on the organization. Each interviewee also had different time availabilities, so some of the interviews lasted over two hours, while others lasted only thirty minutes. Therefore I unfortunately had in-depth interviews with more information about some organizations and not from others.

Finally, for two of the interviews I dealt with the added frustration of waiting for their approval after our conversation. One of them modified her transcript to sound more professional and to better represent her organization. She also wanted to edit her transcript to include only information that was absolutely relevant to the topic. It was frustrating because though her initial statements may not have been as articulate, they were more expressive. Some of her comments may have not been entirely relevant to my study, but they were still interesting and important as a commentary on the moment in time: thus they could have been useful for context. Overall though, her modifications were understandable.

One of my interviewees turned out to be much more difficult and insisted on seeing my transcript and then my written interpretation of her comments. Given the chance to interview her again, I am not sure I would. It does not make sense for the subject to tell the researcher how to interpret the research. I underestimated the power dynamic these women had over me.

Finally, my two NARAL interviewees also asked to keep their names, job titles, and departments anonymous. One of my interviewees also requested to see my final NARAL section to make sure it did not reveal too much identifying information. I had no problem keeping their information anonymous, but it made their interviews sound very vague and ambiguous. But my concern for their job safety surpassed my concern for a precise record of their experiences.

In conclusion, my methods were far from perfect. The interviews were far from uniform, and the limits of the sample are clear. The information gleaned from each person and each organization varied widely. However, I did answer the main questions of why, when, and how they endorsed. This information will serve as a record of the events that happened during the primary, and the difficult decisions these organizations faced.

My Interview Questions

These questions are intended to be open ended.

1) What were your organization's reasons for your endorsement?

2) What were the strategic motivations? Political motivations?

3) What was the public reaction to your decision?

4) Did you lose any members over this decision? Gain any members?

5) What was the media's reaction? Did they paint a positive or negative narrative in your opinion?

6) Your organization's mission statement is: XYZ. Was your endorsement in sync with the goals of your organization?

7) How did your endorsement further the goals of your organization?

8) Who is the ultimate decision maker in endorsements? The board? The President? The membership?

9) Do you have male staff that were a part of the decision? Did they influence your decision at all, in a different way than the women did?

10) Since making this decision, have there been any negative repercussions?

11) The National Women's Political Caucus- roughly the beginning of the feminist movement's organized political involvement- began with the philosophy that placing more women in Congress would lead to passage of the ERA. But beyond that, its founders assumed more women in Congress would also lead to other progressive legislation for women, including child care, equal pay, and abortion rights. All of its members were and are women. How has this ethic changed? Has it not? Is it still important to have women in higher levels of government to achieve progressive legislation for women?

12) Have feminist goals changed in the past 30 years? Should women in Congress/politics/ positions of power not be the focus it once was?

13) NARAL endorsed Obama in the Presidential primary—how do you think that has played out for them? Was this a wise strategic move? Does this show a shift in feminist thinking?

14) How has your organization changed its goals at all in the past 30 years?

15) Hillary's strongest demographic in the primary was women over 50. Do you think this shows a generational gap? How will this affect feminist politics as we know it?

16) Does your organization regret its endorsement? If it could do it over again, would it?

17) If you would like to share, who did you vote for in the primary? Was it different than your organization? Why or why not?

18) Did you have trouble continuing to work for your organization after the primary endorsement?

CHAPTER 6: THE PRIMARY ENDORSEMENTS

The 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary would forever change the face of Presidential candidates. In this chapter, I detail feminist organizational involvement in this historic 2008 Presidential Primary. I explain Hillary's campaign chronologically through the various endorsements she received from feminist organizations. For each organization, I will delineate its reasons for the endorsement, its endorsement procedure, the press release, and the aftermath of the decision. My interviews and public statements make up my primary sources of data.

Emily's List

On January 20, 2007, the day Hillary announced the creation of her exploratory committee, within hours Emily's List became the first organization to officially endorse Hillary Clinton for President in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary. According to Emily's List founder Ellen Malcolm, also President at the time, the organization had known for days about Hillary's announcement, and on the board there was "no question that we should endorse, and endorse early."[332]

At Emily's List, the Board and President together make the decisions about endorsement, without consulting its members. Malcolm acknowledged that there may have been differences in opinions among its membership on whom to endorse and when, but since the main purpose of Emily's List is to support Democratic pro-choice women, the members and the board saw this as an obvious opportunity to put this value into action. Malcolm explains that while an endorsement from Emily's List means money and press for the candidate, the list functions as a bundler which merely suggests to the membership whom to write checks to:

[332] Malcolm, Personal Interview.

> We really work hard to make sure the candidates we recommend to members have a realistic chance of winning and we recommend candidates to the members so they can support whoever they want. So they can decide to make a contribution to Hillary, they can wait–that's their decision, but Emily's List . . . . gets the info to members to make a decision on their own.

In terms of board discussion, when considering a candidate, Emily's List considers everything. Can she put the race together? What's the district like? Who is her opposition? How much money does she already have in the bank? Malcolm says the board had "tremendous excitement" over the possibility of helping elect the first woman President, and she argues Hillary Clinton happened to be its first chance. Malcolm explained that Clinton just ran in a "different class entirely" from any previous Democratic pro-choice female Presidential candidates.

Emily's List does not just endorse pro-choice Democratic women, it endorses pro-choice Democratic women who have a good chance in winning, therefore increasing the weight of its endorsement, and the significance of the candidate herself. Since the organization's founding in 1985, Patricia Schroeder and Carol Moseley Braun are the only pro-choice Democratic women Emily's List could have had the chance to endorse in a Presidential primary. Emily's List decided not to endorse either, since it did not think either candidate had political viability, and it wanted its endorsements to be taken seriously. Since its founding in 1985, Emily's List has prided itself on endorsing candidates early, but only making endorsements for candidates who have a good chance of putting together a winning campaign. This way, Malcolm explains, its endorsement means something more. It means that the "political world sits up straight and says I better pay more attention to that woman." In Hillary's case, Malcolm explains, its endorsement

proved to be less substantial, as everyone already considered Hillary a viable candidate, but the List's early endorsement gave more excitement and early money to the campaign.[333]

In the press release from its website published in November of 2007, Emily's List explained in the opening sentence: "No Presidential contender is more qualified to lead the nation or better positioned to help Democrats take back the White House than New York Sen. Hillary Clinton." Throughout the fact sheet, they repeatedly mentioned Hillary's strong pro-choice and pro-women voting record.[334] However, the second sentence mentions Hillary's need to raise substantial funds to contend for the seat. Mentioning fundraising in the second sentence clearly demonstrates Emily's List's focus on early money.

During the campaign, Emily's List provided Hillary Clinton with tangible support. It gave her the maximum amount of money an organization can give to a Presidential candidate. It sent out emails to their membership on a regular basis, updating members on Hillary's status state by state, and pointing members to the website to donate to Hillary directly. Emily's List also sent out its own field organizers to various states throughout the campaign to organize volunteers and canvass door to door. Ellen Malcolm herself went on the road to act as a "surrogate" for the campaign, meaning she would talk to supporters and motivate them to get involved.

In terms of a reaction to the endorsement, Malcolm says they certainly lost members over the decision: "There were members who said they were for Obama and we aren't going to fund any of [your] efforts of Hillary and then there were some who were just angry and unhappy and said we're not supporting you . . . . They're family fights." Malcolm mentioned that a loss in membership happens with every endorsement. In terms of the public's reaction, she suggested

[333] Malcolm, Personal Interview.
[334] "Emily's List Recommends… Hillary Clinton for President of the United States," November 2007, *Emily's List Website* http://emilyslist.org/assets/pdfs/timeline/2007_hillary_clinton_for_president.pdf (accessed April 2, 2011).

that the media were not surprised, but that she generally thought the public felt more excited about Hillary's candidacy due to its involvement and especially by the timing of the endorsement.

The weekend after Hillary conceded the nomination, Malcolm jumped on the plane to meet with Obama staff to discuss helping Senator Obama secure the Presidency. Emily's List sent out an email from Ellen Malcolm stating that she now whole-heartedly supported Senator Obama. However, she did not shy away from showing sympathy to women still grieving Hillary's loss. Malcolm's email read, "Those of us who have been wholehearted supporters of Sen. Clinton feel disappointment and sadness, even anger, that this opportunity to elect a fine candidate and the first woman president is passing us by." Malcolm also elaborated that she herself had not yet fully grieved, and she still felt upset, and even angry.[335] The email allowed members to acknowledge that they could be upset about Hillary's loss, without forgetting their commitment to women's rights and electing Democratic pro-choice politicians to office. Since many Emily's List members still expressed anger at the Obama campaign over Hillary's loss, Malcolm made it clear that solidarity in their issues trumped staying bitter over Hillary. Helping Senator Obama now win the Presidency mattered more.

Despite her loss though, Malcolm believed that Emily's List endorsement of Hillary Clinton was a step forward for Emily's List, women candidates, and women's rights. Malcolm shared with me that on the night she won the New Hampshire Democratic primary, Hillary pulled Malcolm aside before she went on stage to deliver her acceptance speech and said "Ellen, I'm the first woman to ever win a presidential primary." Malcolm choked up in her interview, saying "I just cry just telling you now it was a really fabulous moment." She repeated that even

[335] Ellen R. Malcolm. <information@emilyslist.org> to Kayla Calkin [and others] via email. "Hillary and Barack." 6 June 2008.

though Hillary ultimately lost, simply the image of a woman running for President in a national campaign forever altered the image and possibility of women in power. She contended that Hillary helped every future female candidate who will run for office.

In terms of the future, Malcolm suggests that promoting women to elective office is still as important as it has ever been. When asked if it should still be a feminist goal to promote women to office, Malcolm responded with an affirmative, without hesitation. She replied, "Having women in the room makes for a different experience when legislation is considered . . . . Our Congress would be less hostile and partisan if we had more women in the room trying to find common ground."

NOW

NOW's process of endorsing is entirely different from the process Emily's List uses. At NOW I interviewed Kim Gandy, who was President and chair of the PAC when NOW made its official endorsement; Melody Drnach, who was the Action VP during the decision; and Erin Matson who was a Board member and part of the conversation of the endorsement and who is the current "Action VP" of NOW. The President, Board, and the Action VP were definitely part of the decision to endorse Hillary Clinton, but they were by no means the most significant contributors to the decision.

Erin Matson attended the NOW national board meeting in December of 2006, well before Hillary officially entered the race. She says the members discussed in the meeting whether or not to endorse at all, whom to endorse, and when. Some members of the board wanted to wait until more candidates entered the race; or some even wanted to wait to see how the primary election would play out. Matson suggested to the board that Hillary "stuck out her neck for us

on health care far before any of us were ready and it's time for us to stick our neck out for her now." Matson mentions that other members discussed their dislike for Hillary's vote for the war in Iraq, while others expressed concern about Hillary's lukewarm support for gay marriage. One of NOW's central tenets is LGBT equality, which Hillary fell short on as she only supported civil unions at the time. Overall though, Matson says that the Board continually discussed the "transformative power of the first woman President."[336]

According to Gandy, NOW has no formal endorsement policy in place—every campaign and election cycle is different.[337] In this case, NOW sent out an email survey to its chapters asking if it should endorse anyone in the 2008 primary presidential race, if it should in the primary as well as in the general election, and if so, which candidate should win NOW's endorsement. The survey also asked when NOW should announce an endorsement (if it did)—immediately, before the national conference (planned for 2007), during the conference, or even in the fall after all potential candidates had gotten into the race. Gandy suggested that the survey was by no means scientific and results depended entirely on chapters and state presidents returning the survey.

The results of the survey were "quite strong" for endorsing Hillary Clinton.[338] Mostly they showed that members and chapters were divided over when to endorse her, as most wanted Hillary to come to the national conference. In previous presidential elections, NOW invited the primary candidates to the conference to consider how strong the candidates stood on its issues, but also for the members to meet the primary candidates. In 2004, NOW invited all the primary candidates but only Dean, Kucinich, and Moseley-Braun showed up to debate. NOW endorsed Moseley-Braun shortly thereafter. Gandy suggests that about a third of the members who filled

[336] Erin Matson, Personal Interview, 27 January 2011.
[337] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[338] Ibid.

out the survey returned it hoping NOW would make the same invitation and would wait until after the conference to endorse.

In February of 2007, NOW held a national board meeting to discuss the results of the survey and whether or not the national board should make a recommendation to the PAC, which the PAC would not have to follow. At the meeting in February, the "conversation was lively and thoughtful" and eventually the National Board unanimously decided to make a recommendation to the PAC. Melody Drnach says that the National Board made the decision to advise the PAC on the endorsement to show "solidarity and sisterhood" between the board and the PAC.

At the following PAC meeting, the decision to endorse Hillary seemed to be obvious at least to Melody Drnach. Drnach explained, "Organizationally it would have been completely counter intuitive to anybody that was familiar with NOW and our forty-year history if we would not have endorsed Senator Clinton as the first woman who was . . . in every respect a viable candidate and who was one hundred percent with us in support of women's issues."[339] But then Drnach paused and clarified saying, "Well, 99.9 percent of our issues."

Drnach's hesitancy shows that NOW's endorsement did not happen without lengthy discussion on the Senators' positives and negatives. Gandy says the repetitive theme of the meeting was: Senator Clinton had done many wonderful things for the women's movement, but wasn't she too conservative for NOW? Others were frustrated by her war vote, her support for civil unions for gay people instead of marriage, and her support for sex segregation in schools. But in the end, Gandy says the discussion amounted to asking, "Are we going to let the perfect be the enemy of the really, really great."[340]

[339] Melody Drnach, Personal Interview, 4 February 2011.
[340] Gandy, Personal Interview.

At the same time, both Drnach and Gandy suggested that while the Board discussed other candidates, none compared to Hillary. It seemed at the time that Hillary was just out there ahead "in every way."[341] Gandy says that while they found Obama's candidacy exciting, the organization saw him an unknown, whereas NOW had had a long-standing relationship with Senator Clinton through her work as first lady, the Children's Defense Fund, and as a Senator. Also according to Gandy, NOW PAC certainly considered Senator Obama and admired him for his campaign, but nearly everyone on the board doubted that a one-term Senator would be elected. She related Obama's race to Senator Moseley-Braun's – comparing the facts that both were African-American Senators from Illinois, yet Moseley-Braun had considerably more political experience than Obama. But, as Gandy points out, "she wasn't taken seriously by anyone at all."[342]

Matson, Gandy, and Drnach also explained that NOW does not endorse in presidential elections very frequently, so some NOW members expressed an uncertainty over endorsing anyone at all. According to Matson, NOW typically does not endorse, since NOW has six core issues (reproductive rights, lesbian rights, stopping violence against women, constitutional equality, ending racism) and it is difficult for candidates to hit all six. All three mentioned that Carol Moseley-Braun was the first Presidential candidate they had endorsed since Walter Mondale in 1984. But according to Matson, "Hillary was very strong in all areas. We felt she was a dream of a candidate."[343]

Mostly, according to Gandy and Drnach, both the National Board meeting and the PAC meeting focused on the timing of the endorsement. Both Gandy and Drnach recall the PAC meeting primarily discussing how exciting the campaign was, and the importance of NOW as an

[341] Drnach, Personal Interview.
[342] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[343] Matson, Personal Interview.

early force for Senator Clinton. As Drnach explains, "the energy and enthusiasm and excitement and just the belief that we could elect the first woman president of the US was the topic of conversation."[344]

This enthusiasm also included NOW's realization of what the endorsement would do for its members and its organization. Gandy indicates that NOW considered it an opportunity to mobilize its members:

> It was an opportunity as with the equal rights amendment, or violence against women act, major issues that have come along, really mobilized members and potential members really excited about getting active and making something happen. Being part of something bigger. We felt that that would be a motivation. We did expect that it would be a side effect of the endorsement and get individual members active in the campaign.[345]

After lengthy discussion of all the merits and drawbacks, the NOW PAC decided to endorse and endorse early. NOW announced the endorsement on March 28, 2007 from the Sewall–Belmont house, the former headquarters of the National Woman's Party. In the press release, Kim Gandy stated:

> [Clinton] has a long history of support for women's empowerment, and her public record is a testimony to her leadership on issues important to women in the U.S. and around the globe. She has eloquently articulated the need for full economic, political and social equality for women in every institution of society, taking action throughout her career —

[344] Drnach, Personal Interview.
[345] Gandy, Personal Interview.

> as a lawyer, community leader, First Lady, Senator and candidate for the presidency — to advance the civil and human rights of women and girls.[346]

In addition to this glowing illumination of Senator Clinton's record on the issues, Gandy also outlined the ways NOW intended to help her campaign. NOW created a website entitled "Make History with Hillary" to give NOW members and other supporters tools and training to help Hillary in primary states.[347] She promised that NOW would work to educate members on Hillary Clinton's record, as well as to register voters all over the country. Finally, Gandy stated that NOW would work to elect other feminists to higher office to help would-be President Clinton achieve her legislative objectives.

Melody Drnach, as the "Action VP" of NOW, took charge of engaging members around the country to campaign for Senator Clinton. At first she said it consisted of carefully following the strict 501c3 versus 501c4 tax code provisions to make sure they were in compliance with federal laws concerning endorsements. These codes establish different rules for non-profit and for PAC endorsements/donations. Then NOW worked with the campaign to set up the website with the right talking points and materials the campaign wanted to reproduce. NOW eventually started creating "tscotchkes" as Drnach called it, including buttons, t-shirts, and other materials to help spread the word about the endorsement.

After that, Drnach says her main job became connecting people with the campaign. As the primary got more exciting, the campaign would call her before events to let her know where Senator Clinton would be, so Drnach could contact members in the area to turn them out to

---

[346] Kim Gandy, "NOW Political Action Committee Proudly Endorses Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton for President of the United States in 2008," March 28, 2007, Press Release http://www.now.org/press/03-07/03-28.html (accessed April 12, 2011).

[347] "Make History with Hillary," *NOW PAC Website.* < http://www.nowpacs.org/2008/hillary/index.html/> (accessed July 21, 2011).

support her. Drnach also helped Gandy on the road since Gandy became a "surrogate"—meaning she visited various offices around the country to stump for Hillary and get volunteers excited. However all three women would end up eventually traveling around the country and personally volunteering for Senator Clinton's campaign.

In terms of a public reaction to the endorsement, Gandy says the media criticized NOW for the endorsement, accusing it of making a thoughtless, easy, and obvious decision. However, the organization faced a Catch – 22. If they had not endorsed Hillary, the media would have given them a hard time for not supporting a woman, but once they did endorse her, they made it sound as if NOW had not put any critical thinking into the decision. Yet as Gandy pointed out with frustration, if only the media had been a part of NOW's board discussions, they would have seen how intensely the organization discussed the endorsement and the ramifications.

The majority of the membership responded with excitement about the decision, but there were definitely a number of displeased members. Some posted on NOW's blog while others sent letters and emails explaining their frustrations. Gandy says some members accused NOW of not considering other candidates thoroughly. She explained that many people who posted on their blog or wrote NOW emails also realized what the Board had recognized from the beginning—that you cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Many members would post something like this comment: "She's not as progressive as I would like, but if a candidate is too progressive, she would never get elected."[348] However, NOW made the effort to respond to every message and email, explaining its endorsement and its reasons for supporting Senator Clinton.

After the campaign ended, NOW sent another survey to its members, and held another Board meeting over whether or not to endorse Senator Obama. According to Matson, the PAC sent out an email to the leadership and chapters, asking if NOW should endorse Obama/Biden,

[348] Gandy, Personal Interview.

just "support" Obama/Biden, or only speak out against McCain/Palin but not explicitly support Obama. The results of the survey indicated the strong desire to endorse the Obama/Biden ticket. As Melody Drnach says, NOW listened very carefully to what Senator Clinton said in her concession speech. NOW decided that if Hillary had endorsed Obama and moved on, the time had come for them to endorse and move on as well.

The general endorsement decision proved not to be an easy one for the PAC or for the organization. Matson remarked she personally believed the organization would be making a mistake to endorse Senator Obama at all. She argued at the time that the wounds were still deep and she felt concerned about his "lukewarm" record on choice as a state legislator in Illinois. Many members felt Hillary had been "pushed" out of the race, and Matson felt that endorsing her opponent would be inappropriate. Melody Drnach says that at the PAC meeting many members echoed Matson, expressing outrage at the Democratic Party and claiming it had abandoned Hillary and her supporters. As did Matson, they questioned his record and his commitment to women's rights.

Eventually, the PAC took the advice of its membership, leadership, and Senator Clinton. On September 16, 2008, Kim Gandy on behalf of NOW issued a press release announcing the endorsement. In the press release, Gandy clearly outlined Obama's strong support of women's issues. She did not shy away from reminding members and the media that NOW proudly supported Senator Clinton in the primary. In the present circumstances, however, NOW joins Hillary in saying "No Way, No How, No McCain!"[349] Matson, Drnach, and Gandy would also all cast their votes for Obama in the general election.

[349] Kim Gandy, "National Organization for Women PAC Endorses Obama/Biden," Press Release, 16 September 2008, http://www.now.org/press/09-08/09-16.html (accessed April 2, 2011).

All three expressed no regrets of the decision to endorse Hillary Clinton in the primary, and they believed it helped NOW progress as an organization. Drnach and Gandy also argued that the endorsement of Obama in the general election furthered NOW's goals, but Matson thought the general endorsement tore the feminist community apart. At one point during the interview, she mentioned her displeasure over a sticker NOW created that mimicked the style and wording of the Obama campaign. She stated in a board meeting and in the interview that NOW is not affiliated with the Democratic Party and should have no obligation to endorse a Democrat. In fact, NOW should not affiliate itself with any particular party at all. She claimed: "My job is not to defend the Democratic Party. The women's movement is independent and must be independent . . . . Certainly there have been some really wonderful feminists in the Democratic Party, but that does not mean the party itself is feminist."[350] However, all three women felt that Hillary's candidacy, with the help of NOW's endorsement, had furthered feminist goals for generations to come.

Matson, Drnach, and Gandy all firmly believed in the importance of electing more women to office, however, they emphasized the importance of electing particularly progressive women to office, acknowledging that there are differences between the priorities of women legislators and those of male legislators. But, as Gandy said, "Even if it's a room of conservatives, the presence of women, and women of leadership in that room, is likely to make a difference." Drnach added the caveat that the ultimate candidate is a feminist woman.

Looking towards the future of feminisms, Drnach, Matson, and Gandy all voiced the motto: "Movements move." When asked if feminist goals have changed in the past thirty years, Matson and Drnach believed that, while the core issues remain the same for NOW and for the women's movement generally, the issues they care about have broadened. Matson observed,

[350] Matson, Personal Interview.

"The concept of feminism and justice is constantly expanding to be more inclusive—constantly, by its nature."[351] Drnach mentioned broadening the definition of womanhood by including trans-identified people in NOW's advocacy. Gandy, on the other hand demurred, "I don't know that we've progressed enough for them to have changed very much."[352]

National Women's Political Caucus

To understand the National Women's Political Caucus (NWPC) endorsement, I interviewed Sharon Ball and Lulu Flores. Sharon was the Vice President of the Political Planning and Appointments Committee at the time of the endorsement as well as a member of the National Board, and Lulu Flores was President of the Organization. Lulu Flores was not President during the endorsement, but she came on in August of 2007 to run the organization and coordinate the rest of NWPC's involvement in Hillary's campaign. Around the same time President Flores became President, Sharon Ball stepped down as VP of Political Planning and Appointments, but President Flores soon after appointed her to the "Hillary Task Force." So while she no longer headed the Political Committee, Sharon Ball remained very involved in NWPC and the campaign. Lulu Flores also incidentally served as a Super Delegate for Hillary at the Democratic National Convention.

In March, the Political Planning and Appointments Committee met to discuss the possible endorsement of Senator Clinton. The NWPC Political Planning and Appointments Committee makes recommendations to the National Board and according to Sharon Ball "99 percent of the time the Board agrees" with the Committee's recommendations.[353] The National NWPC makes Federal endorsements, while the state and local NWPCs will make gubernatorial

[351] Matson, Personal Interview.
[352] Gandy, Personal Interview.
[353] Ball, Personal Interview.

or other statewide endorsements.[354] In order to endorse, a majority of the members must agree with the endorsement. The President can weigh in and give her opinion if she feels strongly against the decision, but the President does not have final say on the endorsement. Sharon Ball says in her seven years on the National Board she has never seen a President speak out against a Board's endorsement.[355]

In March of 2007, the political planning and appointments committee met to review Senator Clinton's application. This application included the questionnaire she filled out to answer their bottom line questions on the ERA, abortion, affordable childcare, and freedom from discrimination. Sharon Ball says that since Senator Clinton answered these questions appropriately, the political appointments' committee had endorsed her candidacy before, and she was a "friend of the caucus," they recommended to the Board to endorse for President.

In the board decision, Ball and Flores made it clear that endorsing Senator Clinton was within their mission and goals as an organization. NWPC wanted to be out there early for her and wanted to show strong united support. President Flores said that endorsing Hillary "obviously fell into our mission" of supporting pro-choice women.[356] Ball also affirmed, as did other organizations, that they wanted to use Senator Clinton's candidacy to mobilize their members. And as many other organizations claimed, Ball said she thought NWPC was "one of the first women's organizations to endorse."[357] On May 1, the NWPC officially endorsed, announcing in its press release, "Senator Clinton had to pass a rigorous vetting to determine that she met NWPC qualifications. To support the Clinton campaign, NWPC organized its members in 30 states, running grassroots fundraising events throughout the nation, (wo)manning phone

[354] Lulu Flores. Personal Interview. December 17, 2010.
[355] Ball, Personal Interview.
[356] Flores, Personal Interview.
[357] Ball, Personal Interview.

banks, and other activities."[358] In another press release, the NWPC quoted Sharon Ball stating, "We believe that we are finally about to realize the dream of winning the White House and that America is that much closer to fulfilling the vision of equality and democracy that has eluded us for so long."

Immediately NPWC went to work. The national organization contacted its roughly twenty different local and state affiliates to organize in their respective locales. It also put up a special code on the website so NWPC members could donate through them. In total it raised about $50,000, from donations and from the PAC, according to former President Flores a strong showing for the NWPC.[359] Sharon Ball led the Hillary Task Force that reached out to the other chapters to alert them when the Senator would be in the area. She also used this network to inform chapters how they could help in their state primaries or caucuses. President Flores helped organize her local Texas Caucus and as noted above, also became a Super Delegate at the DNC. At the DNC she represented NWPC and fought for Hillary's delegates from Florida and Michigan to be seated and counted.

Looking back on the endorsement, both Flores and Ball could think only of positive impacts. According to both of them, the chapters embraced the decision, and they felt no fallout or loss in membership that they were aware of. They both noted tremendous excitement around her campaign from all generations all over the country. Sharon Ball noted that Hillary's campaign is "going to pay dividends for years" for their organization and women around the world.[360]

Both expressed the idea that the NWPC has naturally evolved over time, and will continue to evolve. Both thought the evolution within the organization was expected and

[358] Press Release. National Women's Political Caucus. May 1, 2007.
[359] Flores, Personal Interview.
[360] Ball, Personal Interview.

completely natural. President Flores remarked that there were issues they had not even considered would be issues during the formation of the organization, especially concerning gay rights and transgender rights. The organization has made both of those groups more of a priority than they did in the 1970s.[361]

Flores also expressed the idea that while there may have been a generation gap, feminist goals are not necessarily inherently different from one generation to the next, but rather the younger generation comes to feminism with a different perspective from the previous generation's. But fundamentally she observes, younger and older women both believe in equality for all women. Ball agreed, stating that she saw plenty of younger women on the campaign trail for Hillary who were equally excited about the idea of a woman as President. While there may be new issues and new perspectives, the fundamentals are the same.

In terms of future feminist goals, both Ball and Flores affirmed the importance of continuing to elect more women to higher office. President Flores expressed her view that women need to make up at least half the legislature in order to pass more progressive legislation. She commented:

> I know that men are also responsive to women voters. But I think women have changed the discourse of the policy arena, they have brought issues to the forefront, and have usually been the ones to put them on the table and fight for legislation. I think it's absolutely critical to get more women to office. I frankly believe that we need to have progressive pro-choice women in office. But women still tend to reach across the aisle more collaboratively on issues that matter to women.[362]

[361] Flores, Personal Interview.
[362] Ibid.

They both agreed that, at least in this respect, feminist goals have not changed since the second wave. However, when asked if supporting Republicans then helps Republicans attain a majority, which undermines the passage of progressive legislation, Sharon Ball says, "that will be an issue that the caucus will deal with in the future."[363] For now, there are not enough women in public office to merit that particular concern.

Women's Campaign Forum

The Women's Campaign Forum (WCF) is the fourth and final prominent women's organization in this study to endorse Hillary Clinton that I included in this study. The Women's Campaign Forum, according to its website, "is dedicated to advancing the political participation and leadership of women who support reproductive health choices for all."[364] For this organization I interviewed two women. First I interviewed Erin Loos Cutraro, the current and former Political Director who helped make the recommendation to the board to endorse during the primary. Second, I interviewed Ilana Goldman who served as President of the organization at the time.

The Women's Campaign Forum functions similarly to other organizations in this study, in that it relies primarily on a board to make its endorsement decisions. According to Erin Cutraro, every candidate no matter which level of office goes through the same process. A candidate fills out an application, and the political team decides whether or not to recommend endorsing that candidate. If they do, then the Executive Committee, which is a sub-committee of the full board, makes the ultimate decision on the endorsement. The Executive Committee can decide to endorse, or to send it back and ask for more info. There are five members on the

[363] Ball, Personal Interview.
[364] "About Us," Women's Campaign Forum Website, http://www.wcfonline.org/pages/about-us/about-us.html (Accessed April 30, 2011).

board, and at least three out of the five need to support an endorsement decision before the organization will commit to endorse a candidate.[365]

The Executive Committee and the organization does not poll or survey the members in making endorsement decisions. The President only weighs in when the board is undecided about the candidate and thus serves as a sort of tiebreaker, but mostly as advisor. According to Goldman, this situation rarely happens.[366] In the case of Hillary, however, Cutraro and Goldman said the Executive Committee decided to make it a full board decision. The Executive Committee was not undecided, but they felt the decision deserved to be a joint decision.[367] Goldman said the impact would be so massive, they really "felt like everyone needed a chance to weigh in."[368]

While Cutraro says some brushed the endorsement off as— "Well she's the only woman running"—the decision involved much more consideration than just her gender. WCF considers several factors in the endorsement process including a candidate's pro-choice stance, competency, electability, and fundraising. WCF also has a history of sticking with women it has endorsed in the past. In those two instances, WCF saw Hillary as a clear choice. WCF has endorsed Hillary for her previous Senate campaigns. In addition, Hillary's record on choice proved she had "walked the walk" on issues WCF cares about.[369] But Hillary's candidacy presented some new dilemmas the organization had never faced before.

The decision about whether it should be its role to endorse at the national level turned out to be more ambiguous. WCF has never endorsed for President before, so the organization faced some uncharted territory. According to Cutraro and Goldman, the board expressed concern

[365] Erin Cutraro, Personal Interview, 6 January 2011.
[366] Ilana Goldman, Personal Interview, 23 February 2011.
[367] Cutraro, Personal Interview.
[368] Goldman, Personal Interview.
[369] Ibid.

about its perception as a non-partisan organization. Some of the Republicans on the board were wary of WCF getting involved when it did not explicitly need to.[370] As Goldman said, "We were really worried it would not be seen as an endorsement of an incredibly talented woman and more an endorsement of the Democratic Party."[371] Goldman stated one Republican board member in particular felt extremely concerned about Hillary's candidacy and the perception of the organization. Many were concerned for what it would mean for the future of the organization. But Cutraro also stated that she felt more concern than disagreement, and that the board members definitely "weren't disappointed" when WCF did make the final decision to endorse.[372] Indeed, though neither could remember exactly, they both remembered the board's final decision as unanimous.

Ultimately, Cutraro and Goldman explained that it the combination of Hillary's strong pro-choice stance, WCF's previously established relationship with her, and the opportunity for mobilizing its members finally led to its decision to endorse. Goldman said that in the end they all felt that "this was the day we'd been waiting for." She voiced what many other organizations also expressed—if they did not get involved "what's the point? What have we been doing all these years?"[373] While WCF discussed about Hillary as a candidate and her ability to win, the organization knew her candidacy would be more than a symbol. And as Cutraro noted, it provided an opportunity for WCF to engage its membership on a different level.[374]

On May 19, 2007, Women's Campaign Forum officially announced its endorsement, through a press release with the "Hillary Clinton for President Exploratory Committee." In it, Goldman stated, "We could not ask for a better candidate . . . . She shows that women can

[370] Cutraro, Personal Interview.
[371] Goldman, Personal Interview.
[372] Cutraro, Personal Interview.
[373] Goldman, Personal Interview.
[374] Cutraro, Personal Interview.

succeed at the highest levels. Hillary Clinton is an inspiration for our daughters and for women across the country who are running – or considering running – for elected office." Clinton responded to the endorsement stating, "I am grateful for the outpouring of support I've received from The Women's Campaign Forum and women across the country . . . . I will continue to reach out to women and all Americans who are ready for change, and ask them to join me in renewing America's promise."[375]

The membership and public reacted enthusiastically in large measure. However, not all members agreed one hundred percent with WCF's endorsement. In the short term, Goldman said the organization felt significant "pushback." For most endorsements, WCF does not see the volume of responses it saw for Hillary. Most of the reaction concerned the partisan nature of the endorsement, while some members just did not like Hillary.[376] Cutraro said that every time WCF sent out an email about Hillary, the organization would see an increase in requests to unsubscribe. But Cutraro reasoned that those people were probably not invested in the organization, or they were just supporting another candidate. In terms of media reaction, Goldman did not recall a significant media reaction one way or the other, except that the media and the campaign asked WCF to comment on Clinton's campaign more often.

For the long term both expressed the belief that WCF's endorsement of Clinton ultimately benefited their organization. Goldman explained:

> We dramatically increased our membership because of people's growing enthusiasm, the fantastic way she was conducting her campaign, and simply the arc of Hillary's success on the campaign trail. I think our organization mirrored the trajectory—as she hit her

[375] "Women's Campaign Forum Endorses Clinton, Joins Women Leaders Across the Country," 19 May 2007, Press Release, http://www.gwu.edu/~action/2008/clinton/clinton051907pr.html (accessed May 10, 2011).
[376] Goldman, Personal Interview.

stride we were engaging many more people who were excited about our support for her and for seeing her make the presidency.

Goldman also said that, while she cannot speak for everyone in the organization, she says she would be hard pressed to find someone who thought WCF made the wrong choice. She says everyone felt it was a historic moment, and they felt proud to be a part of the organization that helped the first serious female bid for the presidency. Cutraro also expressed no regrets in WCF's endorsement. When asked if perhaps not endorsing Hillary and remaining neutral would have helped President Obama take WCF and its concerns more seriously, she stated a terse but polite "no."

In terms of how far the organization has come since its formation in the 1970s, Cutraro expressed her view that the organization has changed and adapted significantly. She stated the organization formed primarily with the purpose of providing early money for candidates. This focus changed to training for candidates, which morphed into education for candidates. Most recently in 2006 when WCF reorganized, they added a greater emphasis on the entry points for recruiting more women to run for office in the first place.

In terms of whether feminist goals generally have changed, both expressed ambivalence. Both said that new issues have come up, but some are still the same. Both adamantly stressed the importance of electing more pro-choice women to office. But in terms of feminist goals more broadly, Goldman rephrased my question saying, "I guess the question you are asking is, 'Is feminism still relevant today?'" as Cutraro said, the younger generation has a sort of "complacency" about feminism today, as it has grown up with the privileges denied the older generation. Cutraro said maybe the younger generation's support of Obama manifested a rejection of the older generation's take on feminism, in some ways.

For these feminist organizations to survive, Cutraro believes that all feminist organizations need to pay more attention to the younger generation. "It's no secret that the donor base for most of these organizations is aging," she said, and they all need to figure out how to appeal to younger women in order to survive. WCF is taking the initiative to work with MTV, for example, to appeal to a younger base and to engage younger women. And in terms of the reproductive rights movement, Cutraro warned against using the second wave language of "choice" and advised for a shift in language towards reproductive health and rights more broadly. But as Goldman also explained, there is always a generation gap with respect to social issues, as every generation will face new challenges. The women's movement is not alone in facing a split in what each generation cares about.

Every future female candidate, according to Goldman, owes Hillary a debt of gratitude for the boundaries she broke down. But even with the broken barriers, the work is not done yet, and feminist organizations are still as necessary as ever. Cutraro says that she is sure that the next pro-choice Democratic female candidate will still gather feminist organizational support, and she will still garner excitement. She concluded the interview: "My hope is that it's within time for the older generation to see."

NARAL

NARAL made the final endorsement during the Democratic Presidential Primary of 2008, on May 14, 2008.[377] NARAL was the only organization in this study to endorse Senator Barack Obama. Technically the endorsement occurred during the primary (the last primary vote took place on June 3, and Hillary conceded the nomination shortly thereafter). But according to

[377] "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President," 14 May 2008, *Blog for Choice.* http://www.blogforchoice.com/archives/2008/05/naral-prochoice-6.html (accessed May 16, 2011).

the NARAL political director Beth Shipp and NARAL's press releases, NARAL considered this endorsement a general election endorsement, and not a primary endorsement. When I emailed NARAL to request an interview, Shipp explained that NARAL does not consider itself (nor do others consider it) a "feminist" or "women-centric" organization. From her perspective, NARAL should not be included in this study, and to do so would be inappropriate.

While it is true that NARAL is an issue-oriented organization, I had several reasons for including it. First of all, the original founders of NARAL in the late 1960s overlapped with the founders of NOW, Feminist Majority, and the NWPC. It seemed more incorrect to leave NARAL out given this apparent overlap. Second, NARAL is one of the most powerful lobbies in the country, donating nearly $250,000 to candidates all over the country in 2008.[378] NARAL is also nationally known, maintaining chapters in nearly every state. Third, while it shocked me to hear from the political director of NARAL that an abortion rights organization does not consider itself "woman-centric" or "feminist," whether it embraces the descriptions or not, the organization works to promote women's rights. Only women have abortions. Fourth, many of the leaders who founded these organizations created them in the belief that more women in Congress would lead to more pro-choice legislation. Therefore knowing the decision-making process behind endorsements for the most prominent pro-choice lobby in the country is crucial to understanding if the endorsement principles of these feminist organizations have changed.

Unfortunately NARAL refused my request for an interview. Beth Shipp told me over email it was a general election endorsement, and that NARAL does not divulge its endorsement-making procedures with the public. However I ultimately did attain to interviews with lower level staff who worked at NARAL during the primary decision but do not work there currently.

[378] "NARAL Pro-Choice America," Open Secrets Website, http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000000246&year=2008 (accessed May 16, 2011).

My first interviewee, who asked to remain anonymous, I will refer to as Y. The other, who also asked to remain anonymous I will refer to as X. Both asked me not to disclose the departments they worked in during the primary decision.

Before NARAL made its May 14 endorsement announcement, it was decidedly neutral, though actively defended each Democratic candidate. During the New Hampshire primary when Clinton created an ad attacking Obama's record on choice, NARAL jumped to his defense. Shipp stated in a press release that each Democrat running for President had a strong pro-choice record. She stated further, "We are confident that any one of these candidates would protect and defend a woman's right to choose, if elected president."[379]

According to X, like many other organizations in this study, the PAC of NARAL makes the decision to endorse, they inform the President, and then the organization disseminates the decision to the members.[380] NARAL is explicitly non-partisan and does not endorse in a race if both candidates are fully pro-choice.[381] Though it has many powerful state affiliates, the state chapters are not included in national endorsement decisions. This decision proved no exception, and the National NARAL did not include or seek out the opinion of state chapters for this endorsement at all.[382]

After the PAC had made the decision, the upper level staff called a meeting with the entire staff. According to Y, President Nancy Keenan made the announcement to the office and "everyone was pretty positive about it." This reaction could reflect staff support for Senator Obama at the time.[383] The higher-level staff also announced that the board and PAC had already

[379] Sam Stein, "NARAL Reaffirms Support for Obama Following Clinton Attack," 6 January 2008, *Huffington Post,* http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/01/06/naral-reaffirms-support-f_n_80107.html (accessed May 16, 2011).
[380] X, Personal Interview, 2 March 2011.
[381] Slavin, *U.S. Women's Interest Groups*, 279.
[382] Y, Personal Interview, 9 February 2011.
[383] X, Personal Interview.

made the decision, but now they wanted to make sure the rest of the staff organized and prepared for the response.[384]

During the meeting, Nancy Keenan and other higher-level staff members described to the entire staff the board's decision-making process behind the endorsement. They discussed Senator Obama's 100 percent pro-choice record, which is a tough standard at NARAL according to X. They also explained that at that point NARAL's job included informing the nation that Obama was the pro-choice candidate, and he had the support of the pro-choice community:

> And I think that was the right time for us to get as much attention for the pro-choice issue and let the country know that this is a prominent voting block, a powerful block of voters that have a say and by endorsing someone at this time, during the process, it was the best time we could get attention for our issue.[385]

The "writing was on the wall" for Hillary, X explained. Now was the time to move beyond the primary, and into the general. NARAL wanted to be the force that pushed pro-choice voters past their lingering and persistent support for Hillary. Y disclosed that during the meeting, the staff members kept stating the desire for NARAL's endorsement to "mean something." The higher-level staff expressed the idea that if they endorsed now, Obama would be more likely to work with them if elected President.[386]

X says that once NARAL made the decision they called Clinton's staff to inform the campaign of the impending endorsement. Clinton was unavailable when they called her at first, but within the hour she called them back herself, which as X says, "showed how important it was to her." According to X, Clinton sounded very upset when she called. Clinton did not

[384] Ibid.
[385] Ibid.
[386] Y, Personal Interview.

understand the reasoning behind their endorsement when both she and Senator Obama were equally pro-choice.[387]

Nancy Keenan published her press release endorsing Senator Obama on the *Huffington Post*. In it she writes that she believes Senator Obama will be the nominee as he had more superdelegates, popular vote, more money, and more general movement behind his campaign. She intimates that for too long NARAL has taken a backseat in endorsements. Keenan says the time had come for NARAL to take a "leadership role" to help pro-choice voters move on. She concludes: "Sen. Obama is the leader who can unify Americans on both sides of our issue. He has reached new generations and energized young voters, independent voters, and Republican voters. He's the candidate of the future, and today we are proud to put the power of NARAL Pro-Choice America's one million strong members, activists and supporters behind Sen. Barack Obama."[388] Her press release implied that she considered it NARAL's role to shift pro-choice voters in this new direction. NARAL also published a blog post that it emailed to its members. The blog featured a video of Nancy Keenan explaining excitedly that importance of quickly turning support to Senator Obama as "only one can go forward to the general election."[389] Beth Shipp also explained in the *New York Times* that she hoped it would prove that NARAL is an organization for more than just white women.[390]

The public and the media reacted immediately, and with fervor. Over one thousand people commented on the blog post announcing the endorsement in less than 12 hours. These

---

[387] X, Personal Interview.
[388] Nancy Keenan, "Why NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorsed Barack Obama," 14 May 2008, *Huffington Post,* http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nancy-keenan/why-naral-pro-choice-amer_b_101708.html (accessed July 1, 2011).
[389] "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President."
[390] Katherine Seelye, "NARAL picks Obama, and Uproar Breaks Out," 16 May 2008, *The New York Times,* http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/16/us/politics/16campaign.html?scp=1&sq=seelye&st=nyt (accessed July 1, 2011).

posts rarely receive any comments let alone hundreds.[391] On the blog everyone from NARAL members, Hillary supporters, Obama supporters, and miscellaneous individual Democrats and Republicans posted. Comments included "What a sellout," "Shame on you," "You're stabbing Hillary in the back," "You couldn't ask your members?" "What treachery," and "Women support women."[392] Many members exclaimed dramatically they were canceling their membership. One commenter who identified herself as "Gretchen Thompson" perspicaciously posted: "I cannot believe how socially irresponsible this organization is. How can you possibley think that your advocating for women when you make a decision that could divide the women's movement for years to come? [sic]"[393] Others were concerned and upset about the timing of the endorsement. While the odds were clearly stacked against Clinton, everyone knew it would be a matter of weeks before she conceded the nomination. Many remarked that the timing of the endorsement seemed simply hurtful to Clinton and her supporters. One commenter posted, "NARAL could not wait three weeks? What was the point of endorsing now?" Some of the comments mimic the gender/race divide in the feminist movement, also clearly reflected in the primary. As one angry commenter who identified herself as "Carol Groves" posted, "I'm supporting Hillary. I prefer to support my own minority, not someone else's."

On the other hand, not all the comments were negative. Other comments included, "Thank you for your insight," "The sooner we unite against McCain, the better our chances of ensuring Mccain's defeat," "I want change," and "Thank you for your courage" [sic]. Many thanked NARAL for "crossing the gender divide." Some reminded others on the blog that NARAL's purpose is to protect choice, not to support female candidates. Many commenters

[391] X, Personal Interview.
[392] "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President."
[393] Gretchan Thompson, "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President," 14 May 2008. *Blog for Choice,* http://www.blogforchoice.com/archives/2008/05/naral-prochoice-6.html (accessed 16 May 2011).

posted Senator Obama's voting record, and his 100 percent pro-choice record from NARAL. Others indicated that this decision proved NARAL was more than the second wave feminist organization it once was. "Amanda Stevens" wrote:

> I have to admit that I was losing faith in NARAL, thinking that you had become just another complascent, conservative organization for middle class, white, second wave feminists. I am glad to say that I am reinspired but this wonderful endorsement . . . . too many feminists have been scared to speak out for fear of the vitriol they will get for daring to oppose Clinton, even though she is clearly not the feminist choice for president. Woman does not equal feminist. I am so sorry that NARAL has received such negative feedback from such narrowminded individuals on this brave choice. [sic][394]

At NARAL headquarters, Y and X reported that everyone's workload tripled to respond to the state chapters, members, and the media. State chapters of NARAL responded with frustration and anger, and some even sent emails to their state members stating they were explicitly not a part of the decision and did not support it.[395] The day after the endorsement *Huffington Post* published an article discussing the "massive blowback." In the article they detail as an example Washington State's branch's immediate rebuttal of the endorsement in its press release protesting, "To endorse Obama at this point in the race is an unconscionable slap in the face to Senator Hillary Clinton."[396] Y says this break with the national organization "was a disaster for NARAL leadership." With chapters basically disowning the national office, everyone at NARAL wondered what would become of the hierarchy and the now strained relationship between the national organization and the state chapters.

---

[394] "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President."
[395] Y, Personal Interview.
[396] Sam Stein, "Massive Blowback To NARAL's Obama Endorsement," 15 May 2008, *Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/05/15/massive-blowback-to-naral_n_101889.html (accessed July 1, 2011).

NARAL received thousands of emails in response to their endorsement announcement. An overwhelming majority of these emails expressed an overwhelming sense of betrayal from NARAL. The emails repeatedly made arguments for Hillary: "She has done so much for women," "How can you turn your back on her," and "she's fought so hard for choice."[397] Y added that many considered NARAL a top women's organization, and "that idea got shattered for a lot of people because of this endorsement."

Talking points were created to respond to the angered members and supporters. The talking points explained that Clinton was nearly out of the primary race and NARAL wanted to make an endorsement when it would have relevance. They told members that an earlier endorsement would give NARAL an inside line to the White House. It reminded members consistently that NARAL's purpose is to protect reproductive health no matter the gender of the candidate. In its messaging they did not particularly touch on Obama's voting record, as opposed to Hillary's, since they both had 100 percent pro-choice records from NARAL as well as many previous endorsements.[398]

X explained the media reaction depends on what one considers "media." The mainstream media, as in the AP and the cable networks, were overall positive about the endorsement. They questioned it and NARAL's decision making process as they would with any other endorsement, but overall they did not portray the endorsement negatively.[399] They did however capitalize on the split in the feminist community. *Huffington Post*, as noted above, wrote about the "massive blowback."[400] *Time* Magazine wrote two days later about the "Feminist Divide Over Obama."[401]

---

[397] Y, Personal Interview.
[398] Ibid.
[399] X, Personal Interview.
[400] Stein, "Massive Blowback To NARAL's Obama Endorsement."
[401] Amy Sullivan, "The Feminist Divide Over Obama," 16 May 2008, *Time Magazine*, http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1807242,00.html (accessed July 1, 2011).

The New York Times contributed to the narrative, writing an article with the title "NARAL Picks Obama, and Uproar Breaks Out."[402] These articles demonstrate the repetitive theme the media likes to perpetuate: feminist infighting and catty women disagreeing over seemingly simple issues.

The response from the blogosphere, however, mirrored the passionate responses from NARAL's members. The online community responded with confusion and frustration about the timing of the endorsement, and the lack of gender solidarity on NARAL's part. They felt this endorsement, within a few weeks of Clinton conceding the nomination, had the potential to alienate Clinton and her supporters, which would be detrimental to NARAL's base. X explained the particular frustration that people did not understand that NARAL is fundamentally different from other women's organizations in its endorsements since they endorse both men and women: "So for us the gender was not, and could not be the main focus." Y observed that staff repeatedly explained this to NARAL's members, but to no avail: "I don't think it helped."

Both stated that NARAL definitely lost members over the decision, "enough to be noticeable," but neither knew exact numbers.[403] X said that in response, NARAL tried to actively recruit more Obama supporters to try to make up for their loss in membership from the Hillary supporters who had dropped out. Neither knew if this recruitment proved ultimately effective.

Both X and Y believed this endorsement represented a defining moment for NARAL. Y says from her perspective, "people were in a panic." Y showed concern for the membership of the organization, disclosing she thinks it angered many members so much that they will not return to the organization. But beyond the pure numbers, Y said that this endorsement made

[402] Seelye, "NARAL picks Obama, and Uproar Breaks Out."
[403] X, Personal Interview.

clear that NARAL is not out to support women candidates, but only reproductive choice no matter what. She fears that NARAL lost the reputation as the most prominent women's organization in a lot of feminists' eyes. And NARAL's decision seemed to be insensitive to what so many women were feeling towards the end of the primary, saying it appeared as though NARAL could not have "cared less" that they did not support the woman candidate.[404] X says from the inside the endorsement decision felt very political. She says NARAL's decision making methods for the endorsement did not feel feminist, and the ultimate decision did not feel feminist. X expressed the view that NARAL wants to show that it is the "political arm" of the pro-choice movement. Some organizations are service oriented, policy oriented, or female pro-choice candidate oriented. But in this decision, NARAL made its role clear in the choice community:

> As the political arm it was important that we make it known that Senator Obama is fully pro-choice . . . . and that was more important than the possible alienation of older feminists especially, but any of our membership who supported NARAL and equally enthusiastically supported Hillary Clinton . . . . Even though Senator Clinton was the more outspoken advocate and had done more for feminists and women's rights and history, that didn't matter more than making the right political decision.[405]

Does NARAL regret its endorsement? If NARAL could do it over again would it? Both Y and X equivocated, but eventually they supposed it probably would endorse Obama again since, Y says, NARAL wants to be explicitly not a feminist organization. In addition, Obama won the election after all, so no one could say definitively that NARAL's endorsement did not necessarily aid him, and thus further the goals of NARAL and the choice movement. X

[404] Y, Personal Interview.
[405] X, Personal Interview.

explained no one in the national office seemed to express any doubt or regret after the endorsement. However, Y found that NARAL was ill-prepared for the backlash and that NARAL leadership in particular expressed a little too much optimism about what the endorsement would do for the organization. Keenan's emphasis on the leadership role NARAL should take belies an over-confidence and audacity about NARAL's actual role in the feminist community. Clearly she overestimated the pull NARAL's endorsement would have on bringing feminists over to Obama. Y added that while NARAL handled itself professionally the endorsement composed the larger problem. X agreed—she did not think anyone expected how the severity of the fall-out from the feminist community.

Both said they do not think NARAL ultimately benefited from this endorsement. Y said, "Our endorsement, you know, didn't make or break Obama's campaign." X says on the one hand they do seem to have a special relationship with the White House, which is an improvement given the previous eight years of the anti-choice Bush presidency. And yet, NARAL does not seem to have any more of a special relationship than any other women's rights organization, none of which endorsed him in the primaries. Y does not think Obama acts like he owes NARAL any special favors, nor does she think he has been any more involved in the pro-choice community than any other Democrat would have been. She says if NARAL had waited two weeks, it still could have endorsed Obama and gained the so-called "special relationship" with him without losing so many of its members. Or, as Y explained, "we wouldn't have greatly and forever offended all of the stalwart Hillary supporters that NARAL will never get back." They both said in the end the alienation of the base of supporters of NARAL was not worth this special relationship.

X says well after NARAL made the decision, it heard "blowback" for months, and even well into Obama's second year as President. She says she heard "Hillary Clinton would have never done that to us [no matter what it was], Hillary never would have let it get this far, she never would have signed a bill that would have hurt women like that. It still comes up, still a theme we hear about. It didn't go away once the [general] election was over." X explained NARAL heard this sentiment over several issues. Clearly many in the feminist community still felt discontent, bitterness, and doubt about the endorsement. NARAL's endorsement had a lasting impact, and the effects have not eased over time.

In terms of what this meant for feminism now versus the past, Y thought the endorsement represented a shift in feminist thinking and priorities. Y again stressed that the decision demonstrated to the nation and feminist community that NARAL is not a feminist organization but a political interest group. X expressed possibly the most sentient reflection on the decision. She said these groups have not changed, nor do they have new priorities. She says instead they have become politically savvier. X says the feminist community is more aware now of the timing of issues and the importance of the "incrementalist" approach to policy. She cited the health care bill and the re-codification of the Hyde Amendment—while awful—still ultimately provided other services and health care for women after Congress passed it. She thinks feminist organizations are now "willing to make so-called deals to make a little bit of progress, as opposed to all or nothing views or stance back when *Roe v. Wade* was decided."

The medium through which activism occurs has also changed, adapting to a new generation. X says we are looking at and fighting for the same issues, but in a new way. X says with the Internet, blogs, and social networks, we can communicate and protest in ways the second wave never could have foreseen. This changes how we are talking, what we are saying,

and who can listen. She says our generation is still involved in the movement we are just expressing activism in a new way.

Both explained that given that the younger generation has grown up with the privileges denied the older generation, so of course younger women are going to feel differently about feminist issues. X says for example in terms of abortion, the choice movement has absolutely changed—illustrated most obviously by the fact that NARAL is no longer an acronym. Originally NARAL stood for first National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws, then changed to National Abortion Rights Action League after *Roe v. Wade*, but now it is just NARAL Pro-Choice America, no acronym. She says now there is a bigger focus on birth control and emergency contraception, since younger women cannot relate as well to the days before legal abortion, but they can relate to the difficulty of getting birth control. Y echoed X's sentiments, stating younger women did not have to fight for the rights the older generation fought for. Therefore, so much has changed: "And so I think that we have a different viewpoint on feminism, a different way of looking at it, and certainly a different way of looking the world." But feminists of the older generation feel that instead of seeing feminism in a new way, the younger generation simply does not appreciate the fights they went through, and survived. Thus whether right or wrong, Y says the older generation interpreted the younger generation's lukewarm support for Hillary as a reflection of the lack of veneration for the feminist battles the older generation fought.

For feminisms' futures, both X and Y explained that there is still a need for feminism. Y said the "bedrocks of sexism" are still around though maybe in subtler forms. X stated again that as technology changes and our mediums evolve, the new generation of feminists will approach

feminism in new ways. But both adamantly agree that the U.S. needs more women in Congress and other elected offices.

Reflections on the NARAL Decision

I asked each woman in the study this question: "NARAL endorsed Obama in the Presidential primary. How do you think that has played out for them? Was this a wise strategic move? Does this show a shift in feminist thinking?" Each woman expressed her own response to the question, though there were some common themes.

Seven of the ten women in this study expressed frustration and some even expressed outright anger with the decision. Some of the comments I gathered included: "Profoundly disappointed"; "stunning and shocking"; "very angry"; "bad timing"; "totally unnecessary"; "tremendously disrespectful"; "no need"; "why not wait three weeks – seriously"; "slap in the face"; "couldn't understand it"; "bullshit"; "I was . . . not excited." Some women just expressed disgust, and many would utter a profanity then ask me to delete it.

Two sent Nancy Keenan, the President of NARAL, a personal email expressing their dissatisfaction. Ellen Malcolm went so far as to issue a press release on the same day as the endorsement expressing her anger at the decision. She elucidated Hillary's record on choice, and finished with, "It certainly must be disconcerting for elected leaders who stand up for reproductive rights and expect the choice community will stand with them."[406] Lulu Flores of the NWPC says she sent Nancy Keenan a personal email, but never heard back from her. Erin Matson of NOW posted on the blog: "I have carried your WHO DECIDES? Signs with pride several times. Who decided this time? It's shameful NARAL made this decision so quickly at

[406] Foon Rhee, "NARAL endorses Obama," 14 May 2008, *Boston Globe.* http://www.boston.com/news/politics/politicalintelligence/2008/05/naral_endorses.html (accessed 6 June 2011).

this exact juncture in the campaign cycle. Let the voters decide who the Democratic nominee should be."[407]

However, not all the women in this study responded with anger or disappointment. Kim Gandy from NOW said while she was upset by the decision, she personally felt a little disappointed that other women's organizations so publicly expressed their discontent with NARAL's decision. She says, "They are their organization. I don't expect them to criticize me, they have their own process, they have their own members to answer to just like we would." Some simply stated that they were not a part of the decision, and as a different organization it has different priorities. Though most agreed they would have made that decision had they been in charge, they could understand why NARAL made its final decision. Melody Drnach of NOW said, "It's the decision they made and it fit with what their agenda was." Erin Cutraro explained NARAL does not have the "gendered lens" of other women's organizations, so gender is not a priority for them. But as Erin said, "I can't imagine it wasn't a tough decision for them."

When asked if they thought the endorsement showed a shift in feminist thinking, generally the older women expressed an adamant no. The younger women were more equivocal. Kim Gandy, one of the older women in this study, explained that the decision did not reflect the feminist movement or its goals because "equality for women is not their goal." Melody Drnach of NOW explained that NARAL has a much narrower focus than other organizations, so it's not necessarily correct to look to them as a leader of the feminist movement. Ellen Malcolm said similarly, "NARAL is not for women, NARAL is for reproductive issues . . . . They made a decision to choose between two opponents in the last gas when it had no political impact. It certainly wasn't about influencing the results of the campaign and it wasn't about supporting a

[407] Erin Matson, Blog post, 14 May 2008, "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President," http://www.blogforchoice.com/archives/2008/05/naral-prochoice-6.html (accessed 6 June 2011).

woman candidate."[408] Sharon Ball of the NWPC agreed, stating the decision showed no shift in feminist priorities or feminist endorsements. She also explained while she found the decision upsetting, she is glad that NARAL is single-issue minded, as there needs to be organizations out there fighting for reproductive rights alone.

Younger women in the study, with the exception of Erin Matson, were more hesitant with their answers, and generally a little more curious about NARAL's motivations, and final decision. While women of the older generation were more likely to say something like "No, NARAL is not feminist, therefore the endorsement was unrelated," women of the younger generation were more likely to try to explain NARAL's motivations without necessarily rejecting them as not feminist. Y of NARAL said she thought the endorsement for the first time, made her start to wonder if this showed an adjusting of priorities in the feminist movement. She thought it demonstrated that feminist organizations are trying to move past just endorsing women. X of NARAL explained that she felt it showed more of a strategic shift rather than a shift in feminist priorities. She says it "showed a shift in how feminist organizations felt they needed to play the game, the political game." As explained before, X thought it demonstrated NARAL's attempt to be politically savvy, more than anything else. Matson's thinking mirrored X's, though she thought the endorsement showed more of an allegiance to the Democratic Party than to feminism or abortion rights. Erin Cutraro of WCF said she thought it showed a shift in demographic appeal: "I think that it could reflect an attempt to reach a demographic that I would say women's organizations, whether or not they consider themselves part of that, haven't been able to tap effectively." She also says that polling shows women vote for issues, rather than for other women, and maybe that is where the shift in feminist thinking lies.

[408] Last gas referring to the last primary.

NOW Endorses Obama

After the primary, NOW started discussing a possible endorsement of Senator Obama in the general election. For this endorsement, NOW once again reached out to the membership. The officers sent out an email survey to the chapters and leadership, asking if NOW should endorse Obama/Biden, support Obama/Biden, or not endorse anyone but speak out against McCain/Palin.[409] The PAC then took the results of the survey and met with the rest of the board. Matson said she did not know the exact timing, but roughly 48 hours after the PAC received the results of the survey, they made the ultimate decision to endorse.

Matson expressed the difficulty of the endorsement decision, and how a "fiery debate" ensued at the Board meeting. She felt it was improper for NOW to conduct such a significant survey over email. She also thought the timing was inappropriate, and the wounds had not healed from Hillary's loss. Regarding Obama's stand on the issues, she considered his record on women's rights, particularly abortion, tenuous. Beyond that, she found it frustrating that NOW presumed to take a role at all in this process. She adamantly feels it is inappropriate for NOW to take any kind of party role.

Regardless at least of Erin's particular feelings, on September 16, 2008 NOW broke with tradition and endorsed Senator Obama in the general election. In the press release, Kim Gandy stated, "Although it is very unusual for us to endorse in a presidential election, this is an unprecedented candidate and an unprecedented time for our country."[410] Gandy explained Obama's support for various legislation concerning women's rights. She also stated in the press release that NOW endorsed Hillary in the primary and now joined her in supporting Senator Obama and working against John McCain. Women's Campaign Forum, Emily's List, and

[409] Matson, Personal Interview.
[410] Kim Gandy, "National Organization for Women PAC Endorses Obama-Biden," 16 September 2008, Press Release, http://www.now.org/press/09-08/09-16.html (accessed June 6, 2011).

NWPC only endorse women; therefore they were not able to endorse Senator Obama in the general election, though many of the women on the boards for these organizations eventually helped with Senator Obama's campaign in various capacities.

Drnach explained that NOW listened very closely and considerately to what Senator Clinton said in her concession speech, and her advice to support endorse Senator Obama contributed significantly to their ultimate decision to endorse. She says NOW supported Hillary, and Hillary wanted everyone to support Obama for the sake of women and girls. So NOW did just that.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

The beauty of living in a democracy lies in the breadth of opinions and forms of activism. The glory of being an American is that one citizen can hold the exact opposite conviction as another, yet both are equally within their rights to express them. Not only do we each have the opportunity to vote, but also to donate, assemble, and speak freely in support of any candidate for political office. These freedoms necessarily create a wide diversity of opinions, movements, and definitions of activism.

The American feminist community is no different, despite assumptions in the media to the contrary. The range of opinions, theories, and beliefs is no less extreme than the diversity of opinions in the general public. One person's feminism is another person's replication of patriarchy. One feminist's life goal is another feminist's life goal to overturn. The feminist community, in its own glory, exists within this constant instability of ideas and definitions.

These feminist organizations' reflections on Hillary's primary campaign demonstrate that movements move. Change is inevitable, and sometimes demonstrates progress. Many second-wavers, while understandably frustrated with the younger generation's lack of understanding of their struggles, should feel relieved that women today never have to know a life without equal access to education, politics, and the professional world. This older generation should feel excited that the younger generation now has such a range of female and male minority candidates that we are able to be more discerning. "Female candidate" does not mean the same to the younger generation as it does to the older generation, and how fortunate for everyone that this is a reflection of the changing faces and positions of candidates.

Each of the interviews discussed this "generation gap" as it related to Hillary. Polling and turnout during the campaign suggested that the older the woman, the more likely she would

support Hillary. Some disputed that the gap existed at all, citing the number of younger women who supported Hillary in their organizations. Some said it was difficult to grapple with, and even lead to disagreements in their offices. Y from NARAL explained she felt that the older generation constantly challenged the younger generation in their expressions of feminism, especially during the campaign.

But in truth, perhaps it does not exist in what each generation cares about, but simply in terms of how each generation goes about their goals. With the creation of facebook, twitter, and other social networking tools, the definition of activism will continually change. As Melody Drnach of NOW and Y of NARAL pointed out, technology is daily changing the definition of activism. Of course the movement is going to look and mean something different to a younger generation.

Reflecting on the second wave and incorporating its history into this study shows that maybe it is better for women's groups to debate and discuss the merits of these endorsement decisions, even if it causes disharmony in the organization. Perhaps it shows progress that the endorsement decisions were not necessarily easy for any group. It means they are not taking traditionally marginalized groups for granted. It shows that maybe feminist organizations today have learned from feminisms past, or at the very least are increasingly aware of the struggles the previous generation faced.

But beyond this diverse group of women, interviews, experiences, and organizations, the next question follows: What conclusions, if any, can be drawn? Are there any common themes? What is the main take away from the primary and the endorsements these organizations made? And while diversity of thought is worthy of celebration in any movement, doesn't a movement ultimately have to have some common goals?

Several common themes emerged from the interviews, my research, and my analysis. Each interviewee told me her organization was the first to endorse her campaign, or one of the first, showing how proud they were of their organization's involvement. Most of my interviewees campaigned and donated for Hillary themselves, in addition to encouraging their organizations to endorse her. Each woman expressed emotional investment in her campaign, and took her campaign extremely personally. For many, Hillary's campaign embodied the Second Wave's motto from the 1960s all over again: The personal is political.

All expressed frustration with the abysmal number of women in politics, reflecting the same ideals from the 1960s and 70s. Each woman interviewed said it should still be a feminist goal to get more women in office, with the caveat that the candidates support women's rights. Each woman interviewed considered abortion a core issue, and it still remains a generally accurate barometer of the strength of feminism of a particular candidate.

Regarding NARAL's decision, it is important for the feminist community to remember that issue groups are issue groups, even if they primarily affect women. What one can learn from this endorsement is how critical it can be to look at whether the organization identifies as feminist or not. NARAL explicitly does not identify as feminist, it only identifies as pro-choice, and this identification clearly intersected with their decision to endorse Obama. This does not mean that supporting Obama negated the label feminist, but rather this lack of feminist identity certainly shaped the way the organization made their ultimate decision.

X from NARAL stated perhaps we are not changing our goals but instead just becoming politically savvier. As more women get involved in the political process, we are naturally learning the rules of the political game. Sometimes that involves making tough choices, and putting the needs of an organization above the beliefs of many in the feminist community.

Feminists must keep the long run in mind, while enduring the sometimes painful short run. If in the long run, Congress passes more pro-choice legislation, then all will be worth it.

On the other hand, at what cost should the women's rights movement accept this political savviness? Y said over the past few years NARAL has increasingly embraced a more political attitude and shied away from "divisive" words and labels. As the anti-choice movement increases in power, money, and successful messaging campaigns, NARAL has felt pressure to avoid as much controversy as possible and to stick to the talking points and messaging that works. Y observed, "The current leadership at least would even avoid the word feminist based on how divisive it is alone." While making an idea more mainstream and less extreme certainly appeals to a greater demographic, abandoning the base of an organizations' ideals also comes at a heavy cost. One has to ask, isn't the avoidance of feminism giving in to what the anti-choice political machine wants? And if the tough choices actually decrease the number of women committed to a cause, and split the movement—is that "tough choice" worth it? At what cost should the feminist community learn and embrace this "political savviness?"

And if the feminist community does decide to embrace a political savviness that includes endorsing pro-choice men over pro-choice women, what will be the ultimate repercussions? More men in office, but achieving more rights for women? Will endorsing a pro-choice man ever truly be as "feminist" a choice as endorsing a pro-choice woman? Could a pro-choice male politician ever represent women's concerns better than a pro-choice female could? NARAL will be forced to answer these questions for years to come.

Another overarching question thus develops over feminist solidarity. Doesn't a movement need to agree on something if not for its own accomplishments, at least for the

purpose of the greater public to understand and appreciate its goals? Theodore Roosevelt once said in a letter to a friend:

> Personally I believe in woman's suffrage, but I am not an enthusiastic advocate of it, because I do not regard it as a very important matter . . . . I am very certain that when women as a whole take any special interest in the matter they will have suffrage if they desire it. But at present I think most of them are lukewarm; I find some actively for it, and some actively against it.[411]

President Roosevelt's quote could apply to any moment in the history of feminist organizing. For thousands of years, women have not only agreed to their inferior status but also campaigned to maintain it. Only forty years ago, the United States watched the collapse of the Equal Rights Amendment, its demise lead by no other than a powerful rich white woman. What will it take for the women's movement to band together to agree over something as ostensibly simple as an amendment guaranteeing equal rights? Or even something as ostensibly simple as supporting a feminist female Presidential candidate?

So what of it? If women banded together over common rights, would we achieve the goals we desire? But how would the feminist movement define "common rights," "goals," or even "we"?

[411] "Prominent Americans and Woman Suffrage," Miller NWSA Suffrage Scrapbooks 1897-1911, 5 Nov. 2010, http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/connections/suffrage-scrapbooks/history4.html (accessed July 5, 2011).

WORKS CITED

A Guide to Federal Laws and Regulations Prohibiting Sex Discrimination. Clearinghouse Publication No. 46, United States Commission on Civil Rights (July, 1976).

"About Us." Women's Campaign Forum Website. http://www.wcfonline.org/pages/about-us/about-us.html (accessed April 30, 2011).

Abramowitz, Alan et al. "Do Endorsements Matter? Group Influence in the 1984 Democratic Caucuses." *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 85, No. 1 (Mar. 1991).

American Women: Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. (Washington, DC: U.S. Printing Office, Oct. 11, 1963).

Baker, Jean. "Nogren, Jill. Belva Lockwood: The Woman Who Would Be President." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 1 (February 2008).

Ball, Sharon. Personal Interview. 12 January 2011.

Bolce, Louis. "The Role of Gender in Recent Presidential Elections: Reagan and the Reverse Gender Gap." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*Vol. 15, No. 2 (Spring 1985).

Braun, Carol Moseley. Interview with Sara Fritz. "The Buying of the President: 2008: Interviews: Carol Moseley Braun." 17 August 2007. *The Buying of the President.* http://www.buyingofthepresident.org/index.php/interviews/carol_moseley_braun/ (accessed February 5, 2011).

Brooks, Abigail and Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber. "An Invitation to Feminist Research." Ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy. *Feminist Research Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007.

Carroll, Susan. *Women as Candidates in American Politics.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Carpini, Michael X. Delli and Ester R. Fuchs. "The Year of the Woman? Candidates, Voters, and the 1992 Elections." *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 108, No. 1 (Spring 1993).

Chamberlin, Hope. *A Minority of Members: Women in the U.S. Congress.* New York: Mentor, 1973.

Chisholm, Shirley. *The Good Fight.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.

"Civil Rights Act of 1964." 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2000e-17.

Clymer, Adam. "Daughter of Slavery Hushes Senate." *The New York Times.* 23 July 1993.

Costain, Anne and Steven Majstorovic. "Congress, Social Movements, and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights legislation." *Political Research Quarterly*: Vol. 47, No. 1 (Mar. 1994).

Cutraro, Erin. Personal Interview. 6 January 2011.

Davey, Monica. "In Seeking Presidency, Braun Could Win Back Reputation." *The New York Times.* 18 Dec. 2003.

Daynes, Byron and Raymond Tatlovich. "Presidential Politics and Abortion." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 22, No. 3 (Summer 1992).

DeBose, Brian. "Black voters divided on candidates; Presidential hopefuls woo support." *The Washington Times.* 4 Dec. 2003.

DeVault, Marjorie. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis." *Social Problems* Vol. 37, No. 1 (February 1990).

Dillin, John. "Presidential Race; Schroeder Stays out for '88." *The Christian Science Monitor.* 29 September 1987.

Drnach, Melody. Personal Interview. 4 February 2011.

"Emily's List: Our History." *Emily's List Website.* 6 Dec., 2010. < http://emilyslist.org/who/history/>

"Emily's List Recommends… Hillary Clinton for President of the United States." November 2007. *Emily's List Website*. 2 April 2011. <http://emilyslist.org/assets/pdfs/timeline/2007_hillary_clinton_for_president.pdf>

"Establishing the President's Commission on the Status of Women." *Executive Order 10980.* December 14, 1961, 3 C F R (1959-1963), 500-01.

"Equal Pay Act of 1963." 29 U.S.C. § 206 (d)

Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Crown Publishers Inc., 1991.

Flores, Lulu. Personal Interview. December 17, 2010.

Ferraro, Geraldine. *Changing History.* (Rhode Island: Moyer Bell, 1993).

---- *Ferraro, My Story*. (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1985).

Firestone, Juanita M. and Arturo Vega. "The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 20, No. 2, (May 1995).

Foerstel, Karen and Herbert Foerstel. *Climbing the Hill: Gender Conflict in Congress.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1996.

Fox, Richard Logan. *Gender Dynamics in Congressional Elections.* London: Sage Publications, 1997.

Fraser, Arvonne S. "Insiders and Outsiders: Women in the Political Arena." Irene Tinker, Ed. *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.

Freeman, Jo. *The Politics of Women's Liberation*. New York: David McKay Company Inc:, 1975.

---- "The Women Who Ran for President." February 5, 2011. < http://www.jofreeman.com/politics/womprez03.htm>

---- *We Will Be Heard: Women's Struggles for Political Power in the United States*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2008.

---- *Women: A Feminist Perspective.* California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1984.

---- "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention." *PS: Political Science and Politics* Vol. 21, No. 4 (Autumn 1988).

Gallagher, Julie. "Waging the 'Good Fight': The Political Career of Shirley Chisholm." *The Journal of African American History* Vol. 92, No. 3, (Summer 2007).

Gamble, Barbara. *Sex Discrimination Handbook*. Washington, DC: The Bureau of National Affairs, 1992.

Gandy, Kim. "National Organization for Women PAC Endorses Obama/Biden." Press Release. 16 September 2008. http://www.now.org/press/09-08/09-16.html (accessed April 2, 2011).

---- "NOW Honors Guts and Glory of Shirley Chisholm." 3 Jan., 2005. *NOW Website.* http://www.now.org/press/01-05/01-03.html (accessed Jan. 16, 2011).

---- "NOW Political Action Committee Proudly Endorses Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton for President of the United States in 2008." March 28, 2007. Press Release. http://www.now.org/press/03-07/03-28.html (accessed 3 April 2011).

---- Personal Interview. 21 January 2011.

Gay, Claudine and Katherine Tate. "Doubly Bound: The Impact of Gender and Race on the Politics of Black Women." *Political Psychology* Vol. 19, No. 1 (March, 1998).

Gerhart, Ann. "What Makes Carol Run?; Moseley Braun is Short on Campaign Cash and Staff But Long on Determination." *The Washington Post*. 12 Nov. 2003.

Goldman, Emma. "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation." Ed. Alice Rossi. *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir.* (Boston: First Northeastern University Press, 1973).

Goldman, Ilana. Personal Interview. 23 February 2011.

Goldstein, Joel. "The Influence of Money on the Pre-nomination Stage of the Presidential Selection Process: The Case of the 1976 election." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* Vol. 8, No. 2. (Spring 1978).

Gutgold, Nichola. *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton "Won" in 2008.* New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2009.

---- *Paving the Way for Madam President.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006.

Guy-Sheftall, Beverly and Johnetta Betsch Cole, Eds. *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010.

Harraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." Alison Jaggar, Ed. *Just Methods: An Interdisciplinary Feminist Reader*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2008.

Harrison, Cynthia. "A 'New Frontier' for Women: The Public Policy of the Kennedy Administration." *The Journal of American History* Vol. 67, No. 3 (Dec. 1980).

---- *On Account of Sex: The Politics of Women's Issues: 1945-1958*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy. "The Practice of Feminist In-Depth Interviewing." Ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy. *Feminist Research Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007.

"History." *National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum Website.* http://napawf.org/about/our-history/ (accessed Dec. 6, 2010).

Hoff-Wilson, Joan. "The Unfinished Revolution: Changing Legal Status of U.S. Women." *Signs* Vol. 13, No. 1 (Autumn 1987).

Horowitz, Helen Leftkowitz. "Victoria Woodhull, Anthony Comstock, and Conflict over Sex in the United States in the 1870s." *The Journal of American History* Vol. 87, No. 2 (Sep. 2000).

Huddy, Leonie and Tony E. Carey, Jr. "Group Politics Redux: Race and Gender in the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primaries." *Politics and Gender:* Vol, 5 No. 1 (2009).

Kaptur, Marcy. *Women of Congress: A Twentieth-Century Odyssey*. (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1996.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. "Feminism and the Meaning of the Vote." *Signs* Vol. 10, No. 1 (Autumn, 1984).

Keenan, Nancy. "Why NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorsed Barack Obama." 14 May 2008. *Huffington Post.* http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nancy-keenan/why-naral-pro-choice-amer_b_101708.html (accessed July 1, 2011).

Kolker, Ann. "Women Lobbyists." Tinker, Irene Ed. *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.

Kornblut, Anne. *Notes from the Cracked Ceiling: Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and What it Will Take for A Woman to Win.* New York: Crown Publishers, 2009.

Kramer, Rita. "The Third Wave." *The Wilson Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 4 (Autumn 1986).

Lawless, Jennifer. "Politics of Presence? Congresswomen and Symbolic Representation." *Political Research Quarterly* Vol. 57, No. 1 (Mar. 2004).

Lawrence, Jill. "Senate pioneer has her eyes on the White House prize." *USA Today.* 20 Feb. 2003.

Leckenby, Denise. "Challenging Gender Bias and 'Setting the Record Straight.'" Ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Lina Leavy. *Feminist Research Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2007.

Lien, Pie-Te. "Does the Gender Gap in Political Attitudes and Behavior Vary across Racial Groups?" *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No. 4, (Dec. 1998).

Livingston, Ellen. "Three at NOW Convention Favor Ferraro as VP." *The New York Times*. 1 July 1984.

"Make History with Hillary." *NOW PAC Website.* http://www.nowpacs.org/2008/hillary/index.html/ (accessed 21 July 2011).

Malcolm, Ellen R. <information@emilyslist.org> to Kayla Calkin [and others] via email. "Hillary and Barack." 6 June 2008.

--- Personal Interview. 24 February 2011.

Mansbridge, Jane. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent Yes." *The Journal of Politics* Vol. 61, No. 3 (Aug. 1999).

Matson, Erin. Blog post. 14 May 2008. "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President." http://www.blogforchoice.com/archives/2008/05/naral-prochoice-6.html (accessed June 6, 2011).

Matson, Erin. Personal Interview. 27 January 2011.

McCabe, Janice. "What's in a label? The Relationship between Feminist Self-Identification and 'Feminist' Attitudes among U.S. Women and Men." *Gender and Society* Vol. 19, No. 4 (Aug. 2005).

McDermott, Monika L. "Not for Members Only: Group Endorsements as Electoral Information Cues." *Political Research Quarterly* Vol. 59, No. 2 (June, 2006).

McNeal, Natalie. "Candidate Braun Tells Women: Remove White House Barrier." *The Miami Herald.* August 25, 2003.

Morgan, Robin. "Goodbye to All That #2." Ed. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole. *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign.* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010).

Muscatine, Alison. "The Vice Presidency and the Future of NOW; The Women's Political Organization: From Outsider Status to Grass Roots Appeal." *The Washington Post*. 2 July 1984.

"NARAL Pro-Choice America." Open Secrets Website. http://www.opensecrets.org/lobby/clientsum.php?id=D000000246&year=2008 (accessed May 16, 2011).

"NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President." 14 May 2008. *Blog for Choice.* http://www.blogforchoice.com/archives/2008/05/naral-prochoice-6.html (accessed 16 May 2008).

Neal, Mark Anthony. "What Would Shirley Chisholm Say?" Ed. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole. *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign.* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010).

Norton, Noelle. "Uncovering the Dimensionality of Gender Voting in Congress." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 24, No. 1 (Feb. 1999).

Opinion. "NOW's Woman Problem." *The New York Times*. September 14, 2003.

"Our History." *Emily's List Website*. December 1992. Printed in *Glamour*. http://emilyslist.org/assets/pdfs/timeline/1992_glamour_women_of_the_year.pdf (accessed February 2, 2011).

Parry, Janine A. "What Women Wanted: Arkansas Women's Commissions and the ERA." *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly* Vol. 59, No. 3 (Autumn 2000).

Pedriana, Nicholas. "Help Wanted NOW: Legal Resources, the Women's Movement, and the Battle over Sex-Segregated Job Advertisements." *Social Problems:* Vol. 51, No. 2 (May, 2004).

Perlez, Jane. "Democratic Women Split on Best Strategy for '84." *The New York Times.* 10 May 1983.

Peterson, Esther. "The Kennedy Commission." Tinker, Irene Ed. *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.

---- "Working Women." *Daedalus,* Vol. 93, No. 2, The Woman in America (Spring, 1964).

Philpot, Tasha S. "One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Jan 2007).

Plutzer, Eric and John F. Zipp. "Identity Politics, Partisanship, and Voting for Women Candidates." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* Vol. 60, No. 1 (Spring 1996).

Press Release. National Women's Political Caucus. May 1, 2007.

"Press Release June 28, 1985." *Emily's List Website.* Accessed Dec. 6, 2010. <http://emilyslist.org/assets/pdfs/timeline/1985_new_concept.pdf>

Quarles, Benjamin. "Frederick Douglass and the Woman's Rights Movement." *The Journal of Negro History* Vol. 25, No. 1 (Jan. 1940).

Rawalt, Marguerite. "The Equal Rights Amendment." Tinker, Irene Ed. *Women in Washington: Advocates for Public Policy.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications,1983.

"Rep. Jordan Rejects Bid for Attempt at 2nd Spot." *The New York Times.* 14 July 1976.

Rhee, Foon. "NARAL endorses Obama." 14 May 2008. *Boston Globe.* http://www.boston.com/news/politics/politicalintelligence/2008/05/naral_endorses.html (Accessed June 6, 2011).

Rosen, Ruth. *World Split Open.* New York: Georgetown University Press, 2000.

Roth, Benita. *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America's Second Wave*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Rule, Wilma. "Why More Women Are State Legislators." *The Western Political Quarterly* Vol. 43, No. 2 (Jun., 1990).

Ryan, Barbara. "Ideological Purity and Feminism: The U.S. Women's Movement from 1966 to 1975." *Gender and Society* Vol. 3, No. 2 (Jun. 1989).

Rinehart, Susan Tolleson and Jerry Perkins. "The Intersection of Gender Politics and Religious Beliefs." *Political Behavior* Vol. 11, No. 1 (March 1989).

Sanbonmatsu, Kira. "Gender-related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women." *Political Behavior* Vol. 25, No. 4 (Dec. 2003).

Schroeder, Pat. Interview with Josh Israel. "The Buying of the American Presidency: Interviews: Patricia Schroeder." 21 February 2008. *The Buying of the President*. http://www.buyingofthepresident.org/index.php/interviews/patricia_schroeder/ (accessed Jan. 26, 2011).

Schwartz, Maralee. "NOW says Not Now to Presidential Candidates." *The Washington Post.* 12 July 1987.

Seelye, Katherine. "NARAL picks Obama, and Uproar Breaks Out." 16 May 2008. *The New York Times.* http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/16/us/politics/16campaign.html?scp=1&sq=seelye&st=nyt (accessed July 1, 2011).

Siegel, Deborah. *Sisterhood Interrupted: From Radical Women to Girls Gone Wild.* New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2007.

Sinclair-Chapman, Valeria and Melanye Price. "Black Politics, the 2008 Election, and the (Im)Possibility of Race Transendence." *PSOnline* (October, 2008).

Slavin, Sarah. Ed. U.S. *Women's Interest Groups: Institutional Profiles.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.

Sprague, Joey. *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers.* New York: AltaMira Press, 2005.

Stanley, Alessandra. "Run, Pat, Schroeder, Run!" 3 August 1987. *Time Magazine*. http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,965133,00.html (accessed Jan. 26, 2011).

Stein, Sam. "Massive Blowback To NARAL's Obama Endorsement." 15 May 2008. *Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/05/15/massive-blowback-to-naral_n_101889.html (accessed July 1, 2011).

---- "NARAL Reaffirms Support for Obama Following Clinton Attack." 6 January 2008. *Huffington Post.* Accessed 16 May 2008. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/01/06/naral-reaffirms-support-f_n_80107.html>

Steinem, Gloria. "Learning from a Year of Hope and Hard Choices." Eds. Beverly Guy-Sheftall and Johnetta Betsch Cole. *Who Should be First? Feminists Speak Out On the 2008 Presidential Campaign.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2010.

Stone, Pamela. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Sullivan, Amy. "The Feminist Divide Over Obama." 16 May 2008. *Time Magazine*. 1 July 2011. < http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1807242,00.html>

Sutton, Percy. "In Nomination for the Presidency the Name of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm." *The Massachusetts Review* Vol. 13, No. 4 (Autumn, 1972).

Swers, Michele. "Are Women More Likely to Vote for Women's Issue Bills than Their Male Colleagues?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 23, No. 3 (Aug, 1998).

"The Decade of Women: 1992-2002." *Women in Congress Website.* 2 February 2011. <http://womenincongress.house.gov/historical-essays/essay.html?intID=5&intSectionID=26#foot38 >

"The Moynihan Report." March 1965. *Department of Labor Website*. Accessed Dec. 4, 2010. < http://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/webid-meynihan.htm>

The President's Commission on the Status of Women: Report of the Committee on Education. US Government Printing Office: October, 1963.

Thompson, Gretchan. "NARAL Pro-Choice America Endorses Sen. Barack Obama for President." 14 May 2008. *Blog for Choice.* http://www.blogforchoice.com/archives/2008/05/naral-prochoice-6.html (accessed May 16, 2011).

Traister, Rebecca. *Big Girls Don't Cry: The Election that Changed Everything For American Women.* New York: Free Press, 2010.

Trevor, Margaret. "Political Socialization, Party Identification, and the Gender Gap." *The Public Opinion Quarterly,* Vol. 63, No. 1 (Spring 1999).

Vinovskis, Maris A. "Abortion and the Presidential Election of 1976: A Multivariate Analysis of Voting Behavior." *Michigan Law Review*, Vol. 77, No. 7 (Aug. 1979).

"WCF Experience." Women's Campaign Forum Website. http://www.wcfonline.org/pages/about-us/wcf-experience.html (accessed Feb. 5, 2011).

Webber, Katie. "Comparable Worth—It's Present Status and the Problem of Measurement." *Hamline Journal of Public Law*, Vol. 6, No. 38 (1985).

Weiler, Paul. "The Wages of Sex: The Uses and Limits of Comparable Worth." *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 99, No. 17 (June, 1986).

Weinraub, Bernard. "Geraldine Ferraro is Chosen by Mondale as Running Mate, First Women on Major Ticket." *The New York Times.* 13 July 1984.

Welch, Susan. "Are Women More Liberal than Men in the US Congress?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* Vol. 10, No. 1 (Feb., 1985).

Welch, Susan and John Hibbing. "Financial Conditions, Gender, and Voting in American National Elections." *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Feb. 1992).

Wickham, Dewayne. "Black, female: both impair Moseley-Braun's chances." *USA Today*. 24 Feb. 2003. http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/columnist/wickham/2003-02-24-wickham_x.htm (accessed Feb. 12, 2011).

Robert Williams, et al. *Closer Look at Comparable Worth: A Study of the Basic Questions to be Addressed in Approaching Pay Equity*. Washington, DC: National Foundation for the Study of Equal Employment Policy, 1984.

"Women's Campaign Fund." *Open Secrets*. http://www.opensecrets.org/pacs/lookup2.php?strID=C00015024&cycle=2010 (accessed February 2, 2011).

"Women's Campaign Forum Endorses Clinton, Joins Women Leaders Across the Country." 19 May 2007. Press Release. http://www.gwu.edu/~action/2008/clinton/clinton051907pr.html (accessed May 10, 2011).

X. Personal Interview. 2 March 2011.

Y. Personal Interview. 9 February 2011.