

PROSPECTS OF MANKIND
SEASON 3, EPISODE 10, WHAT STATUS FOR WOMEN?

June 3, 1962

Description: In a program about the status of women, ER opens with a ten-minute interview of President John F. Kennedy. She then hosts her usual round-table discussion with guests ER, Arthur Goldberg, Agda Rossel, Thomas Mendenhall, and Mirra Komarovsky. This program was recorded in Washington, D.C. on May 23, 1962.

Participants: ER, John F. Kennedy, Arthur J. Goldberg, Agda Rossel, Thomas Mendenhall, Mirra Komarovsky

[Theme Music begins 0:01]

[Title Sequence:] [Text overlaid *Prospects of Mankind* logo] National Educational Television/ Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt/ *Prospects of Mankind*

[Bob Hall:] Recorded in Washington. National Educational Television presents the WGBH TV production Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt *Prospects of Mankind* produced in cooperation with Brandeis University.

[Introduction Music begins 0:19]

[As announcer speaks, film rotates through images related to the announcer's comments]

[Unknown announcer:] A far-reaching social revolution has completely changed the status of women in the past hundred years. Emerging from the home to work and study, American women soon militantly demanded and won equal status and the right to vote. Their achievements since 1919 have been impressive. Higher education is commonplace. An increasing number of women spend part of their life working, some even do work traditionally performed by men. Adjustment to this great revolution has not been easy for either sex. Not completely happy being just a housewife, the American woman at the same time does not seem to be making the most of the rights her grandmother secured for her. Few American women hold high office. Too few are entering professions where they are sorely needed. Sometimes those who do work receive less pay than men performing the same functions.

[Loud noise in left headphone begins at 1:20]

President Kennedy recently created the Commission on the Status of Women to uncover these inequalities and recommend appropriate action. But in today's rapidly changing society, the complex reasons behind women's apparent indifference to their opportunities and rights also need to be explored so that women can fulfill themselves not only as wives and mothers but as complete individuals. At the White House, recently President Kennedy discussed the Commission on the Status of Women with its Chairman, Mrs. Roosevelt:

[Cuts to ER and John F. Kennedy sitting by a coffee table in the White House]

[ER:] Mr. President, I would like to thank you for being on this program. You probably don't realize it but in the three years that we have run this program you have been our most distinguished guest each year, and we are very grateful to you.

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, we're glad to have you at the White House again, Mrs. Roosevelt.

[ER:] Thank you, Mr. President. Now I would like to ask you, because I have always been interested in women's affairs, and I was very much honored when you made me chairman of your new committee on the Status of Women, perhaps you would be willing to tell the people what prompted you to name this committee at this time and what you feel is the real need for it?

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, we are attempting to uh make sure that the women, for example, who work--uh one-third of our working force are women--we want to try uh to encourage every company in the United States and certainly stimulate governmental leadership in providing equal pay and equal conditions for women. Twenty-two states do it now, but we can do a much better job on that. We want to make sure that the available talent which we have in this country in trained women is being used effectively. I think we want to make sure thatuh some recognition is given to the special problems women have as the mother and the housewife and at the same time their desires to participate usefully in public and private life. This is a matter of great national concern, and I think that in this great society of ours, we want to be sure that we-- that women are used as effectively as they can, to provide a better life for our people, in addition to meeting their primary responsibility, which is in the home.

[ER:] Thank you very much. I think that's a very good objective, but there is one thing that I think a great many women are interested in, and that is that here, where women have in many ways a very much better situation than they have in other countries, that still in some of the other countries, women can be found in higher positions -- policy-making positions or legislative positions -- than they are in this country. Have you any idea why it is that in this country we have not, somehow managed or found uh people to put into these higher positions?

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, the-- I suppose the first -- the response -- the interruption in their careers that takes place in the lives of most women because of their keeping a family, raising children. But I quite agree. I don't think we make the most use of our talent, not only in the government. And there are an awful lot of women that hold very key positions in the government. I think most of us -- In fact, the other day, when we gave the awards for the five outstanding civil servants, two of them were women of great technical skill. We have women in the UN delegation, of which you are a distinguished example, and uh we have them in the--as Treasurer. But I still think we ought to do better. I think we ought to do better in the field of medicine, for example. I think that the number of girls who are admitted to medical school, the number of practicing doctors, I don't think we do as good a job in this country as we ought to. We do better than a number of other countries, but not nearly as well, considering the talented women that we have, the great need for doctors. I think they do a good job in teaching but in medicine is one of the great areas where I think we should stimulate. I think women make good doctors. They have the personal qualities and the patience. And I think to have 2 or 3 percent of each class admitted to be women is a great lack. But I know, Mrs. Roosevelt, I am always getting letters from you about getting women in these policy-making jobs, and we are very conscious of that responsibility.

[ER:] Well, I am very conscious of the fact that this ought to happen, but I am also very conscious of the difficulties, and I uh frequently, in answering foreign people who say that women because we are such a big country in this country, have greater difficulties because of our ways of life. That a woman in India has a multiple family, she can leave her children because she lives with grandparents and sisters and brothers, [John Kennedy: Yeah.] and so forth, and here this is a great problem. So that I have -- I see all

the problems, but I still think that we should use everything available, and uh therefore, I want to see women used to the very best of their ability. And that's the thing I'd like to ask you about.

Um, we have this high standard, and I think women in their homes set the standards in America for many things, both for men and women. And in view of this, I am wondering if American women are using their educations to the best possible advantage, or whether many women who don't want to leave their families, who don't want to be in outside work, um still couldn't do a better job if they used their education better than they have? What do you think about that?

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, I think when you look at Radcliffe College, that the curve of academic excellence at Radcliffe is higher than it is at Harvard. And therefore, you assume that this is really the most highly developed student body. What happens to those girls two or three years later? They get uh married, many of them become housewives, and all that talent [ER: Is wasted.] Well, it's used in this family life but is not used outside. Now, of course, it is true that they work on school boards, they work in the League of Women Voters, they form -- they work in church groups, in a whole variety of ways they use this talent for strengthening the cohesion of our society. But I wonder whether they have the full opportunity to develop their talents, and as the Greeks said, the definition of happiness is full use of your powers along lines of excellence, and I wonder whether they have that opportunity. And this is not true just of Radcliffe, but of colleges and educated women, talented women, all over the country. Whether they [unclear words]--

[ER:] Well, of course, one of the things that you have asked us to look for in the status of women is what services could be given, which would make it easier to use to the maximum. Do you think before our report even is in that certain things are going to be done?

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, I think we are going to wait--this -- particularly, the problem of how a mother can meet her responsibilities to her children and at the same time contribute to society in general, is the most sensitive and important matter, and I think that's really what I am interested in -- what your suggestions would be. [er: Well--] We do have legislation, before you do make a report, for example, on this matter of equal pay in interstate commerce, [ER: Yes.] of which, I think, would be very helpful.

[ER:] Yes. Well, that, of course, is one of the things we are studying already. But I do think that we will make this is one of the studies that we uh in our mission are going to hope to find recommendations that will be of value. And I would like -- I think as a last thing to ask you, whether you have any objection to helping women to be employed from people who say that we should have more uh-uh women taken out because there are unemployed men?

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, I-- in the first place, most of the women who work really need to to maintain their families. That's the first point. And secondly, most of the women work in-- a high proportion work in areas which are really more suited to them than to men. Uh and the kind of work uh, and in some cases, the pay, is not competitive with men, so that I don't think that many women are working who are not contributing directly to the maintenance of the household, the family, the children, and uh so that I don't think that there is a broad duplication. We have to meet this problem of unemployment for men and women, and I think the way to do it is not to attempt to deprive women of the chance to work and contribute, but to try to expand the opportunity generally in the economy. I think that's the direction of our efforts, rather than squeezing the labor force.

[ER:] That-that is what I would say, too. And now I am sorry but our time is up, and I want to thank you so much again, Mr. President.

[John F. Kennedy:] Well, we are glad to have a chance to. And I think the report of the commission can be extremely useful, and all the progress that has been made has been the results of these kind of periodic examinations of the status of women, both privately and in government. So we are very hopeful.

[ER:] And I am hopeful it will be useful. Thank you again.

[John F. Kennedy:] Thank you.

[Cuts to studio with ER and her guests]

[Unknown announcer:] Also in Washington to continue the discussion with Mrs. Roosevelt are Arthur Goldberg, United States secretary of labor. Before joining the new frontier, Secretary Goldberg was a prominent labor lawyer and leading expert on labor-management relations. Extremely active since his appointment, he has interested himself in a variety of issues and spoken all over the country on widely assorted subjects. The President's Commission on the Status of Women comes under the jurisdiction of his department.

Agda Rossel, Sweden's permanent representative to the United Nations, has long been concerned with women's affairs, concentrating particularly on the problems of business and professional women. Before assuming her present position, Mrs. Rossel was President of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

Thomas Mendenhall, sixth president of Smith College for Women. Before coming to Smith in 1959, Dr. Mendenhall's entire career had been at Yale University, where he had been a well-known history professor and administrator. Dr. Mendenhall is the author of several books on English and general European history and since his appointment to Smith has spoken frequently about women's problems.

[Loud Noise in left headphone ends at 12:00]

Mirra Komarovsky, professor of sociology at Barnard College and Columbia University. Her special fields of interest in research and teaching have been the family and the status of women. Dr. Komarovsky's latest book is *Women in the Modern World: Their Education and Their Dilemmas*. She will assist Mrs. Roosevelt in directing the discussion.

[ER:] I'm so glad that the president was interested enough in this question to appoint the--a commission on the status of women. So, Mr. Secretary, my first question is going to be ask you in what areas do you feel the commission can make recommendations that would offer something really new to American women?

[Arthur Goldberg:] Mrs. Roosevelt, there are so many areas where I think constructive recommendations are called for that it's hard really to define the limited areas that time permits to talk about. But I would say they are pretty well set forth in the presidential order setting up the commission, and the importance of them is apparent from their listing. First, we ought to talk about the employment policies of women in private employment. Women get paid less than men for doing the same work. Why should that be? Commission ought to study that and advise the American people about it. Women in the employment of the government, which is paid for by all taxes, men and women alike. They don't have their proper treatment, I won't say proportion, because I don't believe in proportion. What inhibits the employment of qualified women in federal, state, and local employment? Why should women be differently treated in their civil rights, in their property rights, in their political rights, in their family relations? That's a subject we need to study. What about federal labor laws and state labor laws? Mrs. Roosevelt, you were one of the pioneers in getting special laws for women, to protect them. Do we still need them, or do we now emerge in a period where we ought to abolish them--discrimination in laws in favor of women. I want to study that. What about tax policy and social insurance? Should a woman have the same treatment as a

man when they retire or be an appendage to a man in the social security sense? We want them to be an appendage in the Biblical sense, but not in the social security sense. What about tax laws? Women have earnings at various times of their life. We ought to study that too. What about new services that are required for a new age? Twenty-four million women are in the working force. One third, as the president has said, of the working force now are women. Do we need new services? Should a working mother be worried if she has to work --as most of them do-- about what happens to her children? What do we do about that? This is one of the subjects that we ought to study. So I would say we have so many subjects, Mrs. Roosevelt, that even under your great leadership, [ER laughs] I'm wondering can we provide the studies and the answers that we need to provide in all of these important areas.

[ER:] Well, of course, Mr. Secretary, I'm interested, after we've written the report, in seeing that something is done. Now the commission comes to an end, but I'm still--that's one of the points that I'm anxious about. But now I'd like to ask Ambassador Rossel from Sweden if she would tell us a little bit about developments in her country because they have done a great deal in-in this particular field, giving women the opportunity to do new things. Would you tell us something about it?

[Agda Rossel:] Well, first of all, maybe I should say that the proportion of working women is about the same in my country as in your country. We have since many years tried to find out ways and means of making it possible for the women who want to, or uh must utilize their economic opportunities, to make it possible for her to do it. That is to say, we have built day nurseries for working women. We are trying to build houses where they can get half or fully prepared food that they can take home when they come from their work and uh pick up their children from the day nurseries. We are trying to get domestic help and home- eh- home --household workers who come and take over if the children are ill so that the mother can go to her job, and they also can come and help if the mother is ill, to take care of the children and the household. These are a few of the things we are trying to do, and maybe I should say in this connection that the trade unions are very keen that the day nurseries should be run by the community--not by the employer--because then they are forced to stay with the employer who gives them opportunities to use the day nurseries. [ER: I see.] They want them detached, impersonal from the point of view of the employer's interests, and I think there is an agreement between the employer and the workers that this is the best way.

[Mirra Komarovsky:] May I ask a question about the day nurseries in cooperative housing? We have heard a good deal at one time about the spread of cooperative houses with nurseries and other services right in the housing. Has it developed? Or did it turn out to be a brief --

[Agda Rossel:] It is developing, and I have had both my children in a day nursery of that type and lived in a house of that kind. And may I say eh that it's very good for the children and for the mother, with a feeling of security that the children are in good hands and well taken care of. Of course, it's a harder physical work for the mother because she then has to take care of all the household work herself if she does not have a housemaid at home. But on the other hand, it's well-trained personnel in the day nurseries, and they stay there year after year so the children have the same nurses around.

[ER:] Don't you also have something, which, I think, was first developed in Sweden, and that is, a hot meal for the children in the middle of the day--or at some period of the day--which lightens the responsibility of the home to some extent.

[Agda Rossel:] Do you mean the school children or the --

[ER:] Yes, the school children --

[Agda Rossel:] Yes, every school child in Sweden has a hot meal every day

[ER:] In the middle of day?

[Agda Rossel:] Between eleven and twelve, or twelve to one o'clock.

[ER:] Is it like a breakfast? Is it because children come without breakfast, or is it--or with a very light breakfast, or is it a real mid-day--a real dinner?

[Agda Rossel:] It's a luncheon. Well, luncheon or dinner, whatever you want to call it. Everybody's supposed to have had breakfast before they leave their homes, and the school starts at eight o'clock, so then they get a break around eleven-eleven thirty and they have a hot meal.

[ER:] Well, that is a service which has great value, I think, for what children need, don't you think so Dr. Komarovksy?

[Mirra Komarovsky:] Indeed. I've just finished a year of interviewing of working-class mothers and fathers in a working-class community. It was the aristocracy of labor. They were all native born of native parentage and all white, and so they were not as disadvantaged as some working class groups. And so what I think applies to them applies doubly to other groups. But my impression was that a development of nursery schools, perhaps under school educational auspices, for children of four and five, would be of immense benefit if it can--if we can do it, because a significant minority of the mothers were deeply troubled about their children. And I think I would estimate that they were about two or three decades behind in their thinking about human behavior, about elementary principles of mental hygiene. And so whether they work or not, I think such nursery schools would be useful.

[ER:] Well, you think -- Well, what you're talking about really, is nursery schools for three and four year olds, isn't it? Um now I'm wondering whether real nurseries aren't necessary--

[Thomas Mendenhall:] How young would the babies be, for instance, in Sweden when they would be put in these nurseries of which you speak?

[Agda Rossel:] They can be received by the day nurseries already at the age of six to seven months.

[Arthur Goldberg:] That early?

[Agda Rossel:] Yes, but preferably they should not come there before they are one year old.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] So-so having a child might represent for a woman who is working in Sweden an interruption in her working life of perhaps six or seven months, at least?

[Agda Rossel:] Well, the weeks or months before the child's birth, [Thomas Mendenhall: Yes.] and then during this five to six months when she's nursing the baby herself.

[Arthur Goldberg:] Can I make a point here, which reflects both of your discussion, Mrs. Roosevelt? Mr. Mendenhall's point. It has been assumed too often that when a woman works that this constitutes a disruption in family life. This, of course, is a matter, I think, which would concern all of us. Now isn't what we're talking about a concern of perfecting -- protecting family life, which means the welfare of the mother, the welfare of the child, and at the same time recognizing what turned out to me to be an astonishing fact when I saw it in my own department: that nine out of ten women in modern life will work at some point in their life. And that many of them will work by necessity, most of them, or by choice, some of them, just at the point when children are being raised?

[ER:] Well, that brings us to the question of occupations. You see now where a woman is educated--we'll come to education and type perhaps a little later--but uh she can practically go into any profession or any education -- any-any occupation that she is trained to undertake.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] There are some occupations, let's admit it, more suited for women than others. Are you going to argue that they're all equally suited, Mr. Secretary?

[Arthur Goldberg:] Well, I would argue about the desirability of having in an open society every opportunity for every person, man or woman, to opt -- to a profession. [Thomas Mendenhall: Agreed. Agreed.] On the other hand, we would be foolish to deny that for women raising a family is a tremendously important thing. And I would certainly urge every woman to evaluate that enormous joy in determining an occupation. I have a very good friend of mine who became a scientist and who opted for a field of science that required continuous devotion to that science. She became a mother, and she opted then--as is her right and is, of course, her supreme joy--to spend the early years of life with the children. She has said to me that between two branches of science, thinking it over, she would've taken another branch that permitted her to go back easily to that other branch, rather than the branch that she was in. Now I think that those are legitimate considerations because we all have to make choices in life of one kind or another, man or woman, in what we want to do.

[Agda Rossel:] I would like to comment a little upon this. I agree entirely with you, Mr. Secretary. First of all, I think, we should leave it to the women to make the choice and not choose for them. And say, "You are not suited for this or that, or this type of life is not suitable for you." Let her make the choice, but give her the tools so she really can make a choice.

[Arthur Goldberg:] I would agree with you.

[Agda Rossel:] Of course, it is a hardship for a working mother--of course it is--I have gone through it. I know what I'm talking about, and I've seen it in many cases. But maybe it's also a hardship to be forced not to continue with a job you're interested in and where you also feel that you're contributing to the society. I--may I just add one more word [Mirra Komarovskiy: Yes. Sure, sure, sure.]--I think also that we're very conventional when it comes to the point of view of the age period when women should have their professional training. Why do they have to start so early, and why can't they start later on in their life? Why can't they come back and complete their training later on?

[Mirra Komarovskiy:] What I wanted to add is uh statistical support of these ideas. An occupation gets tagged a feminine or a masculine occupation, and that works towards the disadvantage-disadvantage of the whole society. I don't know whether you are familiar with the fact that pharmacists and dentists in France are to a much greater extent women. We have women in real estate and insurance. England does not. We don't have women in engineering or medicine. Soviet Union does. And even within our country, sometimes an occupation say in canning, in Wisconsin, it is a masculine occupation. In Illinois --

[Thomas Mendenhall:] Is that because beer is involved in Wisconsin? [Laughter]

[Mirra Komarovskiy:] I don't know. Tradition and accident and what-not get involved. And as a result of it, uh many a good teacher is lost to teaching because it's considered a feminine occupation, and many a good scientist is lost to--woman scientist--is lost to science.

[Arthur Goldberg:] You're trying to--if I understand your point, you're saying there's really no rational basis for describing this, except tradition that may develop. Because, you proved it, I think, by saying in one country this is regarded to be a woman's occupation, and in the other country, this is not. So that really there's not a rational basis. It's kind of a tradition.

[Mirra Komarovsky:] I have one correction. Um what is the fact here, I think, is that the occupations are more differentiated than they need to be on rational grounds, but I do not expect that men and women would have, as a group, the same occupational patterns. I expect some differences partially for the reasons that you have suggested. I don't expect them to have the identical occupations.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] I think the secretary gave the key word a moment ago, as far as women's- women and working is concerned, and that was continuous. I think, as in the story you described, uh the woman should recognize that if she wants to have a family, her working life is going to have a discontinuity to it that often the working life of a man does not have. And that she should face up to this fact in advance and be prepared to make whatever adjustments uh she and society can make so that she can pursue these two things. Sometimes in sequence, sometimes concurrently, depending on what the profession or work is.

[Arthur Goldberg:] I think Ambassador Rossel made a valuable point, though. At some point, this may involve merely a postponement in an educational pattern, not necessarily an abandonment of it. When I was in your country, I saw a training program which interested me very because we are embarking now for the first time on a big, governmental training program and retraining program, which you have had for some time. My wife and I, at the invitation of your prime minister last year, saw a training program for women that invited women who had raised their families and who wanted to do this--that was their choice as a full time occupation--at a later stage in their life to become trained for a different career. And I thought that was an excellent program because it illustrated that you do not have to feel that because you are not able at one point in your career to pursue in a continuous pattern that this excludes you at a later point in your life picking up and pursuing and continuing study.

[ER:] This is a difficult thing, though. I think that uh from observation, that it is difficult for people sometimes, when they're in the habit of being in college or in a university, eh--they have certain habits of learning. To go back to those after you have been out for a certain length of time requires a good deal of self discipline. That happens to be one of the things I'm not quite sure we teach, and I'm-I'm wondering how much this will really be done. And I'm wondering about another question, Mr. Secretary. You recommend, at present, that we freeze uh wages for a time. Would you have this apply to some of the very low paid wages that women earn in certain capacities? And also, many women could do part-time work and don't do it because either they can't get it, or they don't feel that it's really worth doing because they don't get enough pay and it puts them on a lower status.

[Arthur Goldberg:] Well, Mrs. Roosevelt, to use an old cliché, I'm glad you asked that question. We do not recommend that wages be frozen. And we are not recommending that as a matter of national policy. We have been recommending responsibility and restraint, both in the wage and price area in America generally to avoid inflation, to promote price stability, to make ourselves competitive in the world markets, and to meet our commitments abroad and protect the dollar. However, I have said, and I've said it to labor conventions many of which are attended by high-wage earners, that when we say this, we don't mean in the same degrees. I would appeal, for example, to the industries and wage earners in the higher wage industries to take a little less so that the wage earners in the lower wage industries--particularly women--many of whom fall because of lack of training, lack of experience in those industries--can get a little bit more. As a matter of fact, I feel very strongly about this subject. I think that we ought to place a major emphasis upon the less affluent parts of our society. I'm reminded of a statement that your husband once made [Arthur Goldberg is speaking directly to ER]: "We will be judged, not only in domestic affairs, but in foreign affairs," because we're talking about concepts that are universal, as is apparent here. "Not on what we do for those who have too much, but on what we do for those who have too little." And I think that's a universal truth. And it's true throughout the world in our foreign policy. It's true in our domestic policy, as well.

[ER:] It's very important to us that we help raise the standards in other countries.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] What, Mr. Secretary, then, about the argument one often hears that with unemployment among men, it is not uh politic and desirable to encourage greater employment among women?

[Arthur Goldberg:] Well, I was interested in Ambassador Rossel, when she talked about their employment things, and I was going to ask the same question you did. I'll try to answer it in part, and then we ought to ask her for it. In her country, they have a full-employment economy, so they are anxious to get women into the labor market, and they encourage it. In our country, we don't have a full employment economy. We haven't had it for some years. And the question does arise, "Are women displacing men, and is this desirable?" I have two answers to this. First of all, our statistics show that a great majority of the women in the working force are in the working force because they have to be. Women are heads of family. Women live alone. Women uh are required to work, and that represents the overwhelming proportion of women. And then it is a very interesting thing that during the period of unemployment of men, women who do not normally choose to work are required to work because their husbands are unemployed, and the job opportunities that are available are only available to women. And, actually, I would say that today we are having more women employed during the period of unemployment out of the necessities of family life.

[Mirra Komarovsky:] There is another point --

[ER:] Would you, Dr. Komarovsky, speak to that?

[Mirra Komarovsky:] This other point is that we pride ourselves, and rightly so, about the American standard of living and thinking that we are a middle-class society. Well now, what is a middle class income? About 40 percent of American wage earners earned -- of the population earned in 1955 --and I don't know whether it's the last-- between four thousand and seventy five hundred. Now that's not a tremendously high income. And one-half of those had a second earner and that was a woman. And I doubt that we can maintain the so-called middle class standard of living otherwise. We think, of course, that this is something new; that there was a time that the family was willing to live on the earnings of the husband. But what had happened is that children worked before. That to some extent the mother now replaces the work of children, and I don't know that it was true. I knew it wasn't, as a matter of fact.

[Arthur Goldberg:] We can all testify that it wasn't true. [Mirra Komarovsky: Yes.] I come from a family of eight children and everybody worked. I mean my mother did not. You are quite correct in that --

[Mirra Komarovsky:] The children worked.

[Arthur Goldberg:] Children worked.

[Mirra Komarovsky:] And mothers replace children now.

[Arthur Goldberg:] Yeah, you're very correct in that.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] And certainly, we've just begun to explore, haven't we, the area of part-time work and voluntary work for--by women in our society? There are so many areas, which are crying out loud for help here, and uh often I think it's actually the mores of the particular profession. I'm a teacher but I do think we could use part-time teachers up and down the whole range of teaching much more than we do.

[ER:] Well, also I think there is volunteer work, which -- where women really have training could be immensely valuable to the community in many cases. We have never really advanced volunteer work on a professional status.

[Arthur Goldberg:] Mrs. Roosevelt, I think that's very important because today in all of our areas -- schools, education, handling children, handling the aged -- we cannot manage this only with the professional group available. And one of the great services that women can do on a part-time basis or, if their children are raised, on a full-time basis, is this great area of volunteer work. My wife, for example, has been looking into this in the District. And she has found enormous enthusiasm on the part of women who want to make a contribution to this. To help in education, help with juvenile problems, help with the aged problems, -- if they're invited to do it--and to be also trained to do it. And part of our training must not only encompass training for jobs that pay, [ER: Well now, this bring us--] but training for public service.

[ER:] This brings us to education. And I really think that this is-is one of the things we should discuss. Are we- are we giving women the proper kind of education? I'll start with you, Mr. Mendenhall.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] I knew that education would take it sooner or later, Mrs. Roosevelt. We always do. I suppose I should first come back at the group with a question. Do they think that the education of women should be substantially different from the education of men? I think this is a fairly important ground rule to get decided.

[ER:] How about that. How about it? What do you think, Dr. Komarovksy.

[Mirra Komarovsky:] I once wrote a book saying, "No."

[ER:] [unclear term] saying no.

[Thomas Mendenhall:] Well, I assume you're sticking to the position you took in the book?

[Mirra Komarovsky:] And I have not changed this position. That is to say, women do have special problems. That's why we have an hour devoted to women's problems. It isn't because we've assumed that men don't have problems. [Thomas Mendenhall: That's taken for granted.] It's after all the men who have the ulcers and the coronaries, so they certainly do have problems, but we happen to be talking about women's problems.

[Arthur Goldberg:] Would you amend your statement by saying women not only have special problems but special characteristics?

[Mirra Komarovsky:] Yes, yes. But I believe that--I'm talking about college education--and that's something I know a little something about, and I'm not sure about secondary education. I think it applies even more so there. I think within the framework of essentially a similar strong liberal arts education, the special interests of the sexes can find their answer. I don't believe that we can-- we need to design a distinctively feminine college curriculum. If we did, I think we would unfit women for occupations as well as for family life. A mother needs to know about an amoeba, [ER laughs] not only about homemaking.

[ER:] How-- What would be your answer, Mrs. Rossel?

[Agda Rossel:] I would not like to see a different kind of education for girls compared to boys. I think they should have the same curriculum. Then they can add to that, if they want to, other subjects which

they need sooner or later. But I would like to go back again from education to vocational training and to suitable or non-suitable occupations. Because you have to base the education on-on some future needs for workers. If we are going to look into this, I think we should rather try to see which occupations or professions are supposed not to be suitable for women, and then ask ourselves why and could something be done about it, or should something be done about it? And I'm sure that when we study them a little closer, we'll see that it's a lot of prejudice. As you said, in different states those jobs are not for women, and in other states the other kinds of jobs are not for women. So that's one field. I would also like to go back to the part-time work. Maybe the eh part-time work is not so attractive because we have not made-- we have not invented the field properly. We have not encouraged the employers to invent the field and see if they could drop a few of the prejudices against dividing up jobs, put them on different hours of the day so that they suit the women better. Why I went over to this instead of sticking to your educational problem was that girls' interest and parents' interest in giving girls a suitable education--college or vocational training education--has very much to do with the future possibilities. She cannot decide when she's fifteen or sixteen whether she's going to be married or is going to have children, but she has to make up her mind that she wants a real sound basis for possibilities to have a job if her life should be such that she can have a job and chooses to have one. And that's why I'm so afraid that we plan the education and the training believing that they will sooner or later leave the labor market and not need to return to it. As you said, Mr. Goldberg, most of them need to work, but I don't think they should be forced to go to the employer and give valid reasons for their desire to work.

[Arthur Goldberg:] But don't you think that at some point in a woman's-- take graduate school. Now it's true a fifteen year old isn't sure as to whether she's going to get married, but when you reach graduate school, you may have that question pretty well resolved. Now don't you think it is a valid consideration, because we can't have everything in life? [Agda Rossel: No.] And don't you think it's a valid consideration for a woman entering graduate school to say to herself, "I have to consider that if I want to" -- I'm a great believer in freedom of choice. I'm a believer that a woman has a right if she wants to make arrangements to have her child taken care of and that is her pattern of life, and she performs her duties as a mother, that's her business, and she ought to make that decision with her husband. Let's assume that she has made that evaluation and she wants to think in terms of staying at home while the youngster is being raised. Don't you think that that is a valid consideration for her to take into mind in where she is going in the graduate school at that point?

[Agda Rossel:] Most certainly. It's the same evaluation as a boy does. In which field would he like to have his training? What will he be more suitable and most profitable for him? This is the same kind of evaluation, although it leads into something else.

[Mirra Komarovsky:] I don't share Mrs. Roosevelt's compete pessimism about the possibility of returning, after the children are older, to professional or occupational world. Something is stirring in the country, and I think the period of talking about it is over, and the period of doing something about it has begun. But of course, the beginnings are only few. If you see what is being done at Barnard now, at Radcliffe, at Sarah Lawrence. Those are all attempts to --

[Thomas Mendenhall:] We're doing it at Smith too --

[Mirra Komarovsky:] I beg your pardon. [Thomas Mendenhall: Thank you.] I'm not informed, apparently, but will happiness include every [ER: You-you think--] university -- retraining or new training.

[ER:] Re-training or new training? You rather lean towards deferring marriages, don't you, Mr. Mendenhall?

[Thomas Mendenhall:] I have created an unhappy reputation for myself, Mrs. Roosevelt, as being one of those who's raised his voice in mild protest but continuing protest, against rushing into early marriages. Uh for lots of complicated reasons, not all of which are relevant to our discussion today. I think that uh no young person, man or woman, should contemplate marriage until he's a free-standing, independent individual. And to rush into marriage for reasons of seeking some kind of dependent situation, I think is unfortunate for either party. I do think that the tendency towards the early marriage, as we have all agreed is such, that all of us in education should look to adapt our educational patterns to assisting not only the young girl who is in her education to finish her education, but as was said a moment ago, I believe, we should think of ways by which we could come to the aid of the young woman or the young mother with her children now out of the nest sufficiently so that she can get back into a profession, vocation, or perhaps take up one which she had not yet even identified with. And I think it's uh- it's a very true thing that most of the colleges and universities of the country are in their differing ways becoming more and more aware of this. Uh how much of a revolution this will have on-on the education of women, I don't know. There are those who would say we should deliberately encourage them to take off and get married in their late teens, have their families, and then give them their college education. I'm not sure any of us here would quite favor that yet. But I do think the patterns are changing and that we must uh work with them. One of the things that worries me -- and I know I'm not supposed to make a speech -- but uh one of the things that worries me is, I'm not sure that the young women at a certain point in here don't lose their nerve and uh aren't, perhaps, the first to refuse to make the judgment which you, Mrs. Rossel, were describing, or make the evaluation of themselves that the secretary was speaking to. I think at a certain point some of them--are well, to put it in a phrase--are too "ready to carry a man's coat," when, in fact, they have the ability and training to go it alone, and they ought to recognize that they have this professional interest and perhaps uh ability and aptitude and they ought to make something of it.

[ER:] Well, that, in a way, is a change from deferring to a partnership in marriage, really, so that each of them has a right for self-development. I would like to ask you, Dr. Komarovsky, what do you think the effect on the children is of a working mother?

[Mirra Komarovsky:] As I read the evidence of a number of studies -- let's talk about research first; everyone has opinions on this subject. There have been a number of studies made about the effect of employment upon adjustment of the child, academic standing, rejection or acceptance of the mother, types of discipline. And, as I said, I would sum it all up by saying that the mere fact of employment appears to make very little difference. The more careful the study, the more the various conditions are matched. So that income is compared for income, class for class, and so forth. The less difference does the mere fact of employment have upon all of these variables that I mentioned. As I was leaving New York, I received a report of a study which does this kind of a careful comparison. Well, with regard to delinquency, amazing as it seems, working mothers do not have a higher proportion of delinquent children. And it is for the melancholy reason that a mother can be at home and still not give the child proper care. Are they being overburdened or just being irresponsible? That doesn't mean that working doesn't have any effect. It means that we have to think about it in a much more complex way, taking into consideration the personality of the child and the mother and so forth and so on. And so, if I were to have to give a categorical answer, it would be that some mothers should work and others should not. [All laugh]

[ER:] That's a very safe answer to give! What would you say from the point of view of the development in other countries in the world and particularly in new countries, Mrs. Rossel, do you think that there is going to develop a system to help women uh to get an education whereby they can be more independent, or do you think the trend is in the other way?

[Agda Rossel:] Well, I think first of all that all the new countries are looking towards you--your country and countries like mine.

[ER:] That is a very heavy responsibility for us. For all of us.

[Agda Rossel:] Yes, it is. Yes, it is. It's not just a domestic problem. It's also an international responsibility. I don't think we can run away from that, neither in your country nor in mine. And uh maybe we should say sometime--it's so obvious it doesn't have to be said, but nevertheless, if we were not worried about the children, we should not have to discuss all this. So may we make it clear that it's because the mothers, the women, and the men, [Arthur Goldberg: And the fathers.] the society, the fathers, everybody is concerned about the wellbeing of children, that we are discussing this, but we are also concerned about the women and their happiness, and by that their possibility to make the home happy and harmonious. And that comes there the difficulty, and that's woman's dual loyalty to her man and her home, and to the society and to the other women. And I think it puts them in an especially difficult position. Now I'm coming back again to these young people and coming back to re-training and so on. Only a few years ago when we took up this question in the UN Commission on the Status of Women and in the ILO, we spoke about older women workers, that is to say, women of forty.

[Arthur Goldberg:] That sounds very young to me!

[Agda Rossel:] We have at least dropped that word. They are no more called older women workers. [Arthur Goldberg: Prime of life.] And it becomes more and more natural that they can come out in employment and for re-training. Our experience um from studies and from practice is that whatever kind of education or training in whatever field they've had before marriage, they are much easier to re-train, much easier to guide into even a new field of training because they already have had the training of their minds, their hands, their skill, even if they change entirely. I'm again coming back to you, [Agda Rossel speaks directly to Thomas Mendenhall] and I will ask you, could, for instance, not the students in a teachers' college, start their studies at the very old age of thirty-eight or forty, when they've had the training and experience of their own children? Because they could still uh work strongly and happily until they're sixty, sixty-five?

[Thomas Mendenhall:] I would not only agree with you that they could start it. I would also argue that they could be taken carried through this training at probably a faster rate than a younger person, and I think that our training pattern or program for such people at such an age should be very different than it is with the teenager. I think any of us, for instance, who taught in programs in the war, which involved older men--officer-training things, and courses of this sort--realize that you didn't teach a class of men in their thirties the same way you taught teenagers. And I think we have a great deal of re-adjustment and new thinking to do in-in colleges and vocational programs of various sorts to take cognizance of these--of the imponderables that experience gives to these women in this case.

[ER:] These are exciting these new things because it leads to new points. Have you a point you want to make?

[Mirra Komarovsky:] I have a number. Now, [Laughing] in connection with this particular? May I go back to one? You asked me about the influence of employment upon children--employment of mothers. May I just say that there seems to be a general agreement among child psychologists in this country that group care does not meet the emotional needs of children under three. And a very many of the studies that I have recited, the results of which I have recited, deal with the effect of mothers' employment upon younger children, but not-not infants, actually.

[ER:] Is there a point you want to make, Mr. Secretary?

[Arthur Goldberg:] Yes, I would like to make one final point. That regardless of where we may be, in how to treat a particular problem of women in employment, or anything of this, I think we all ought to agree upon one thing. That prejudice ought not to be a barrier against any person--a man or a woman--realizing his full potential. And that basic to a discussion of our whole problem is that we ought to get rid of this prejudice and start from there considering what the problems are.

[ER:] Well, I think uh our time is nearly running out, and I have--will try to sum up what to me is very significant; namely, that I think we have practically said that in education we must face new things in the next few years. That we have new situations to meet and new problems to face, and that we may need to re-think our education in a number of ways. I like the idea that one could train faster, perhaps, at an older age--not too old--but a little bit more mature. And also, I'm enormously encouraged by the fact that it really seems to be the feeling that uh children are not really harmed by the fact that their mothers work. These two things stand out and, I think, are important things, and also that it's an international problem. And now, I'm sorry to say I have to thank you all. And this is our last program for the season, so I want to thank all of our faithful audience and say good-bye, and I hope we will have you all together joining us next year.

[Theme music begins 58:00]

[Credit sequence overlaid on *Prospects of Mankind* logo]

[Bob Jones:] [speaking while names appear on credit sequence] President John F. Kennedy appeared on a special introduction to this program. Arthur Goldberg is the United States secretary of labor, Agda Rossel is Sweden's permanent representative to the United Nations. Thomas Mendenhall is president of Smith College. Mirra Komarovsky is professor of sociology at Barnard College. This is Bob Jones speaking. For further information on the commission write to: The President's Commission on the Status of Women, 200 Maryland Avenue, Washington 2, D.C.

[Theme music ends 59:08]

[National Educational Television logo]

[Unknown Announcer:] This is NET. National Educational Television.

Transcribed from documents in the papers of Henry Morgenthau, III and from audio recordings available at the Library of Congress.

Transcription from document: Kellie Menendez
First Edit: Seth LaShier
Final Edit: Christy Regenhardt