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On March 8, 1972, "cheers of joy" emanated from the campus quad at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). Sally Wagner, a graduate student turned instructor and Women's Caucus member, led a rally in celebration of university's first observation of International Women's Day. The Women's Caucus, a feminist coalition open to all women on campus, organized the event. While women on campus celebrated the "ever-growing community of sisterhood" at CSUS, Caucus members announced that earlier that day filed a class action complaint against the university. The complaint listed the grievances of female students, staff, faculty, and administrators. Caucus members highlighted the inequalities in hiring, tenure, promotions, and treatment of female students. During the 1970s, the Women's Caucus members and their allies championed the women's movement on campus. Their activism places them squarely within the women's liberation movement that demanded women's equality in all facets of American society.

Many forms of feminist action comprised the direction of the movement during the Seventies. At CSUS four forms of feminism stand out: liberal, labor, academic, and anti-rape. Historians have researched and written about the stories of women who participated nationwide. The voice of the liberal feminist, women who demanded

---

1 Prior to 1972, California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) was known as Sacramento State College. For the purpose of this paper I will refer to the university by its later name, CSUS; "Class Action Suit Filed," State Hornet, March 10, 1972.

equality broadly, (often white middle-class women) has been covered in great detail. Works such as, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women’s Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* by Sara Evans and *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* by Nancy F. Cott focus primarily on white middle-class college educated women. These books provide a backdrop for my studies that allowed me to broadly situate CSUS within the national context.

CSUS women also participated in the labor feminist movement. Dorothy Sue Cobble defines the labor feminist movement as a movement focused on obtaining protections and legal equality for working class women. Labor feminists primarily utilized labor unions to fight for rights in the workplace. Viewing race and class as important components to sexual discriminations, labor feminists addressed the biological differences between men and women and forced employers to address the unique needs of women. To uncover the women who fought for legal protections as workers, I referred often to Cobble’s work. In her book, *The Other Women’s Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America*, Cobble challenges the “wave theory” and makes an argument for why labor feminism needs to be included within the narrative of

---


feminist history. Emerging in the 1940s, working-class women initiated a new movement “dedicated to making first-class economic citizenship a reality for wage-earning women.” Women staff at CSUS assumed a similar fight to end their second-class status as workers and in their struggle to create fair maternity policies.

Likewise, academic feminists nationwide pushed the university to address the proliferation of sexist ideas and practices in academia. Locally at CSUS, academic feminists challenged barriers that dissuaded female students from pursuing a college degree and pushed for academic equality. To understand the role academic feminism played within the movement at CSUS, I relied heavily on Barbara Boxer’s *When Women Ask the Questions* to trace the history of women’s studies programs that sprung up on campuses nationwide during the 1970s. In addition to her book, Boxer’s article “Unruly Knowledge: Women’s Studies and the Problem of Disciplinarity” helped to situate the creation of the Women’s Studies Program at CSUS. Additionally, I referenced Rosen’s *The World Split Open: How the Women’s Movement Changed America* to define academic feminism, as well as liberal feminism and the activism of anti-rape activists.

The works of previous historians allowed me to understand the women’s movement based on multiple feminist ideologies. These works provided the framework necessary to unpack how various forms of feminism influenced the women’s movement at CSUS. My goal in writing this thesis is to uncover the multiple ways feminist activism

---


6 Ibid., 3.
transformed the university and increased women’s access to equality in employment and academic freedom. I spent countless hours buried in archival folders at the Department of Special Collections and University Archives and read numerous articles contained in both the student-run newspaper The State Hornet as well as local papers, Sacramento Bee and Sacramento Union. Additionally, I conferred with women active in the movement on campus, via telephone calls, in-person meetings, and email. The women's voices helped shape and provide depth to my story.
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By the 1970s a dramatic shift in women workers and students occurred that changed the landscape of employment and higher education in America. In 1974, three-quarters of women graduated from high school. As a result of the increase more women continued onto college, and by the mid-Seventies women accounting for 43 percent of all college students. As the women graduated with baccalaureate and post-graduate degrees, they sought employment that would allow them to utilize the degrees they worked hard to earn. However, they found it difficult to break through the structural barriers that relegated even those with college degrees to the lowest rungs of the employment ladder. Overall, women accounted for 39 percent of the national workforce but their employment rights remained secondary to those of men. Women had always been a part of the workplace, but sexist ideologies engrained into American society allowed many male employees and managers to ignore their presence. Adding to the disregard of women workers, social norms and expectations of white middle-class women supported the unrealistic idea that a "women's place is in the home." However, the data show that in reality mothers accounted for 54 percent of women in the national labor force in.

---


2 Ibid., 72.

3 Ibid., 3.
The structural sexism existing in the 1970s was evident in workplace inequalities. In 1973, women's median annual income equaled one-third of men's income. The large pay-gap between men and women wage earners frustrated middle-class married women and especially harmed households headed by women. Of the 3.7 million families solely supported financially by women, 20 percent lived below the poverty level. Moreover, male coworkers constantly subjected women to unwanted sexual advances and made sexist comments as a result of sexist beliefs that objectified and sexualized women.

Women in academia faced similar challenges. Many Americans viewed college as a stop-gap for women: something to bide women's time between high school and marriage. Sexist social customs and mores hampered a woman's abilities to achieve her educational goals, and administrators did not view women as legitimate members of the university. The belief that many women attended college only to find a husband resulted in a campus culture that did not take women seriously. Men on university campuses often objectified and sexualized women. The prevalent sexism resulted in a university climate that accepted male professors who propositioned female students for sexual relationships in exchange for high marks as a customary practice. Structural sexism made completing college especially challenging for women. In 1973, female students accounted for 43 percent of the student population; however, by 1975, only 11 percent of all women, (compared to 18 percent of men), had completed four years of college.

\[\text{Ibid., 5.}\]

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
Subsequently, administrators ignored women's grievances and requests for equality. Women staff, faculty, and administrators fought uphill battles to obtain tenure, proper classifications, and the promotions they deserved. University administrators disregarded the unfair treatment of women employees on campus and made no attempts to rectify the inequalities they faced. Furthermore, the majority of male employees refused to recognize the integral role women played in academia. As the national women's liberation movement grew stronger, women in universities across the country applied the principle of women's equality towards demanding change within the university.

The academic feminist movement quickly spread in the late Sixties and peaked in the 1970s, and women at CSUS participated in the movement. Frustrated with the status quo in 1969, female students, staff, faculty, and administrators began to press for change. That year CSUS women formed the Women's Caucus. Though women of all races and ethnicities could join, the Caucus was predominately white. The discrepancy between the numbers white women and women of color involved within the group reflected the small number of minority students enrolled at CSUS. In 1973, ethnic minorities accounted for 9 percent of the student undergraduate population. Additionally, women of color perceived the Caucus as a white women’s group that inadequately addressed the dual


5California State University, Sacramento Student Retention Diagram, http://www.csus.edu/oir/data%20center/students%20special%20reports/long%20term%20trends/eth_ug.html (accessed August 26, 2016)
discriminations they faced simultaneously: racial and sexual discrimination. As a result, minority women activists often joined civil rights groups such as the Black Student Union or Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan, in addition to the Women’s Caucus. Similarly, white women participated in multiple social movements on and off campus independently from the Caucus. However, in the 1970s, the Women’s Caucus became the most widely known and active group on campus that propelled the goals of the women’s movement and academic feminism. Feminist activists challenged the structural sexism that existed at the university. From unequal employment practices to the objectification of CSUS women, Caucus members and their allies demanded change. Their efforts resulted in sweeping changes that reshaped the university and forced university administrators to address campus customs and policies that negatively affected women. Calls for change, equality, and recognition rang loudly at CSUS. By the late-1970s, feminist activism transformed the university. Women activists forced tangible changes, such as the creation of an on-site child care center and a Women’s Studies Program. Additionally, women challenged the objectification and sexualization of women on campus via protests, campus committees, and external legal channels to force change.

---

8 Delores Delgado Campbell, Interview by author, Sacramento, CA, March 11, 2015; Memorandum by Alejandra Delgadillo, May 22, 1974, Office of the President, Folder 27, Box 52, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, The Library, California State University, Sacramento (hereafter cited as DSCUA).
The majority of women on campus recognized how institutionalized sexism negatively affected women on campus. Feminist activists worked tirelessly to change the status quo and undo the structural limitations women at CSUS faced. This paper addresses three areas greatly changed by the women's movement. The first chapter "Equality in Employment: Balancing Paid Work and Motherhood," analyzes the fight for employment equality. Female employees pushed for "full industrial citizenship," with the intent to secure equal status within the workplace and their ability to balance paid work and motherhood. The second chapter, "Making the University Relevant: Transforming the University to Meet the Needs of Women," discusses the creation of the Women's Studies Program and the establishment of an on-site child care center. The third chapter, "Confronting the Sexualization and Objectification of CSUS Women," explores how feminist activists challenged the objectification of women on campus. The final chapter examines the participation of women at CSUS in the anti-rape movement. Caucus members demanded inclusion in all areas of academia, from curriculum to workplace equality and pushed university administrators to recognize their contributions as students and employees.

Campus Life in Seventies

Established in 1947, CSUS experienced a period of rapid growth in the 1960s. In spring 1960, the California legislature passed the Donahoe Act that established what

---

9 Memorandum by Austin, Hicks, and Wagner, April 11, 1973, Women's Studies, Folder 7, Box 10, DSCUA.

10 Cobble, The Other Women's Movement, 4.
became known as the California Master Plan for Education. The Master Plan expanded California's three-part educational system consisting of community colleges, the California State University system, and the University of California campuses. Furthermore, the act increased funding from 30 percent to 45 percent, maintained tuition-free education to California residents, and increased the Cal-Grant program that provided funding to students with financial needs. In addition to the Master Plan, those born during the postwar baby boom were graduating high school and ready to attend college. The Master Plan and the increased number of students graduating high school resulted in a statewide increase in college enrollment. At CSUS, from 1962 to 1972, the student body expanded from 4,251 to 14,670. The changes made by the Master Plan afforded students from blue-collar and lower middle-class families the ability to attend college; a group previously economically excluded. The strengthened three-tiered college system meant that the majority of students entered CSUS in their junior year, after completing lower-division requirements at local community colleges. Consequently, this meant that 45 percent of students were older than twenty-five by the time they arrived at CSUS, and 30 percent of undergraduates and 75 percent of graduate students had spouses and


14 Ibid.
children. In 1973, women accounted for 44 percent of the student base, only a small incremental increase from the 40 percent in the 1950s. At CSUS female students have always accounted for a substantial amount of the student population. The burgeoning women’s movement of the 1960s, however, meant that women pressed the university to recognize their presence as legitimate members of the campus community, which demonstrated that they would not remain submissive participants in academia.

To meet the growing demands of student enrollment the university ramped up the hiring of new professors. In 1966, Dr. Leonard Cain, a sociology professor at CSUS for fifteen years, described the new faculty as “young... with dramatically new perspectives on teaching, on their disciplines, on life.” The newer more liberal group of faculty changed the political climate of at the university. Faculty liberalism meant that faculty members often supported student protests for social causes. Furthermore, faculty members were more likely to support non-traditional academic courses. When the women’s movement exploded onto campus, feminist activists found allies throughout the university, including one female administrator, Peg McKoane who fought internally within the administration. As feminist activists began to verbalize their demands for educational, employment and social equality, they gained the support of students and employees alike. Women pushed for inclusion in all areas of academia, from curriculum

---

15 Ibid., 114,119.
16 Ibid., 120.
17 Leonard Cain, "Tenure at SSC- Decisions Make the Style," September 1966, Forum, Series 40, Folder 6, Box 1, DSCUA.
18 Craft, California State University Sacramento the First Forty Years, 134.
to workplace equality and pushed university administrators to recognize their contributions as students and employees. When the Seventies came to an end, CSUS women had radically transformed the university. Women, who had always been a part of the campus, made large advancements towards academic and employment equality at CSUS.
CSUS administrators implicitly and explicitly promoted sexist ideals. During the 1971-1972 academic year, various members of CSUS faculty, administration, and staff attended a city meeting held by the Sacramento Community Commission for Women to discuss the state of women living within the county. In one discussion, CSUS Dean of Arts and Sciences John C. Livingston defended a department recommendation to promote a male over a female employee. He justified the department's actions because, he argued, "the man had a family to support and the woman did not." Earline Ames, Professor of Education, questioned if he would change his opinion "if the man were single and the woman were supporting a family." Livingston responded that "he would not and realized, sadly, that he held a discriminatory viewpoint." Ames, a mother and primary financial supporter of four children, confronted him, stating that she "readily recognized that discrimination." Her story mirrored the experiences of multiple staff and faculty who faced similar challenges prior to the women's movement at CSUS that demanded the university address specific gender issues and discriminatory policies that affected employees.

19 Earline Ames to Committee Investigating Discrimination Against Women at CSUS, October 30, 1973, Margaret McKoane Papers, Folder 4, Box 107, DSCUA.

20 Ibid.
During the 1970s, female employees at CSUS engaged in a movement on campus that fought to secure equal rights as workers. This chapter analyzes the forms of activism that women pursued to change university policies in hiring, promotions, and maternity leave. The women’s efforts paralleled the actions of other labor feminists who fought for equal rights and labor protections nationally. The women demanded gender specific rights within the workplace that recognized the gender specific challenges women experienced while balancing work with childbirth and pregnancy can be considered part of the national labor feminist movement that grew out of labor activism during the 1930s and 1940s. The actions of labor feminists, as well as the women who may have not identified as feminist, activists forced employers to review and change discriminatory policies. At CSUS two examples highlight the advancement of women’s equality: the use of class-action suits and the use of university committees; these represent two different forms of activism that furthered women’s goals towards workplace equality. Some women took part in grassroots organizations that adopted self-help methods to achieve change, as exemplified in the push for a childcare center and a Women’s Studies department. Others worked internally on staff and faculty committees to bring about change in campus policies, which is evident in the transformation of the university’s maternity policies. Regardless of the methods taken, many women on campus saw the “institutionalized system of sexism ... as permeating the entire campus,” and worked tirelessly to change the status quo and undo the structural limitations women faced.  

21 Memorandum Elizabeth Austin, Maria Hicks, and Sally Wagner April 11, 1973, Women’s Studies, Folder 7, Box 10, DSCUA.
By 1972, 44 percent of all women of legal working age worked, accounting for 38 percent of the national workforce. Women accounted for almost half the workforce, but their employment rights remained secondary to those of men. In a 1958 address, Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell stated that “the fundamental job of the American woman remains what I consider to be the most difficult of all jobs: being a good wife, a homemaker, a mother. She is only secondarily an economic provider.” In the 1970s, women activists challenged Mitchell’s view, the dominant view of the 1950s, to achieve workplace equality. The perception of women as second class workers impaired their ability to obtain the promotions they deserved and their ability to earn fair wages. This discrimination led employers to hire fewer women into higher ranking positions. Casting women as secondary employees harmed all women in the labor force and heavily affected single women (including widowed, divorced, and separated women) and households headed by women. Over 40 percent of single women and widowed, separated and divorced women worked, and by the 1970s, 10 percent of women claimed head of household status. For these women, a second income did not exist; they were the primary bread winners in their families. In 1972, the CSUS Women’s Caucus disputed

---


23 Cobble, The Other Women’s Movement, 72.


their secondary status as workers and members confronted the proliferation of structural sexism. Women pushed for full citizenship as workers, and they demanded parity in the workforce that would allow them the same access to hiring, pay, and promotions as men. Many women pursued equality in employment not only because they believed it to be their basic right, but because their roles as financial providers necessitated they receive equal status and pay.

On May 8, 1972, the Women's Caucus publically submitted a class action complaint to the California Health, Education and Welfare Department (HEW). The complaint charged CSUS with discrimination against women students, staff, faculty, and administrators. The battle to change the status of women at CSUS did not initiate with the class action complaint, nor did it end with the suit. But the suit delineated a set of concerns, frustrations, and grievances of the women involved that placed them squarely within the debate about women's rights in academia. From 1969 and into the late 1970s, women across the nation strove towards "full industrial citizenship," with the intent to secure equal status within the workplace. The women's movement at CSUS, driven by female students, staff, and faculty, pushed for the university to recognize women as first-class workers while simultaneously advocating for changes and programs that allowed them to pursue their employment goals and support their families. A major focal point for faculty and staff was the push to end sexist hiring and promotion practices, which they

---

26 "Women's Caucus Class Action Complaint against Sacrament State College" 1973, Women's Studies, Folder 13, Box 1, DSCUA.

pursued through the HEW class action suit. In addition to their efforts to improve their class status as workers, women at CSUS demanded that the university adopt fair maternity policies.

"The Hand that Rocks the Cradle Can Indeed Rock the Boat" 28

In November 1970, frustrated with the status quo of sexist practices in employment that hampered women's abilities to provide financially for themselves and their families or their ability to achieve their employment goals, the Women's Caucus demanded that the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) confront the issue of sex discrimination. 29 The Caucus submitted eight "Recommended Action Steps," to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), which they argued could prevent incidences of sex discrimination. 30 The first seven points had multiple proposals, including a request for the Ombudsman's office to investigate claims of sex discrimination; a petition for the administration to create an Affirmative Action position dealing with women's issues; the call for more women to be appointed to the Academic Senate; an annual report on percentages of women who apply for jobs and were hired compared to men; the inclusion of the pronoun "she" on job postings and official publications; and a request for monetary support that would allow the women to establish a "Women's Studies Center." 31 The final

---

28 Bernice Sandler, "Women on the Campus and Collective Bargaining: It Doesn't Have to Hurt to Be a Woman in Labor" 1973, Ellen Rosser Smith Papers, Folder 1, Box 2, DSCUA.
29 "Women Charge... Sex Discrimination," State Hornet, April 21, 1971.
30 "Recommended Action Steps," Margaret McKoane Papers, Folder 2, Box 107, SCUA; "Women Charge... Sex Discrimination," State Hornet, April 21, 1971.
31 Ibid.
point requested that the FAC submit a report discussing the demands to the Academic Senate no later than May 1, 1971. Just weeks before the May 1 deadline, the FAC agreed to hear the Caucus’s demands at their meeting in April. Peg McKeane, Associate Dean of Students and Caucus member, presented the proposals to FAC members and a heated discussion followed.\(^{32}\) The meeting ended with the FAC agreeing to review the proposals once the semester resumed after spring vacation. Making a final point, the women threatened that if "the committee tried to ignore the significance of their proposals . . . an appeal to HEW for a funding freeze until the subject of sex discrimination is resolved," would be submitted.\(^{33}\) The women recognized the monetary threat that a HEW class-action suit presented to CSUS and identified it as a powerful tactic that they could employ in their battle for equality.

A year later, the Caucus maintained that university administrators did not provide adequate responses to the women's proposals.\(^{34}\) Though the administration created a Women’s Consultant position as requested in their proposal, the women called attention to President James Bond's failure to fill the position. Additionally, the women posited, that when presented with the opportunity to promote Peg McKeane, Assistant Dean of Students, who they viewed as "the most highly qualified candidate," to an open Dean of Students position, Bond appointed a white male from another university instead. The Caucus indicated that Bond previously called McKeane "the most important candidate,"

\(^{32}\) "Women Charge... Sex Discrimination," State Hornet, April 21, 1971.

\(^{33}\) Ibid.

\(^{34}\) Women's Caucus Press Release March 8, 1972, Women's Studies, Folder 7, Box 1, DSCUA.
and referencing McKoane’s endorsements from the Student Senate, the Black Students Union, and over 500 signatures collected on her behalf as proof of evidence of her competency. Additionally, the women contended that the administration’s reluctance to implement proposals made by the Affirmative Action Committee and the Caucus proved that “the administration is not seriously concerned with ending discrimination.” The absence of action from university administrators compelled the Caucus members later to adopt new forms of activism and they filed a class action complaint with HEW as originally threatened.

Legal actions at the national level paved the way for litigation at the local level, including CSUS. Prior to 1968, educational institutions had the legal right to discriminate against female employees and students. Then in October 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson issued Executive Order 11375 which amended Executive Order 11246 to include the term “sex.” Prior to Johnson’s new order, Executive Order 11246 prohibited federal contractors from discriminating against their employees on the basis of race, color, national origin, or religion, meaning sex discrimination remained legal. Issued without fanfare, Executive Order 11375 went undiscovered by women’s groups until late 1969 when Dr. Bernice Sandler, credited with spearheading the early efforts leading to Title IX, found it in a footnote of Executive Order 11246. Confident in her qualifications to be a

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
full-time faculty member, after years of working part-time at the University of Maryland, Sandler questioned a male faculty member as to why she thought she had not been offered a faculty position. He responded, "you come on too strong for a woman." Her colleagues answer and her employment rejections that proceeded, prompted Sandler to research discrimination laws. Once Sandler identified the law, she worked with the Women’s Equity Action League (WEAL), an offshoot of the National Organization of Women (NOW), to submit a class action complaint on January 31, 1970, that charged all universities and colleges nationwide with sex discrimination. Sandler and WEAL initiated a campaign that educated and encouraged women’s groups to use federal courts to fight sex discrimination. Using the presidential executive order, in 1970 women’s groups filed class action suits alleging sexual discrimination against forty-three colleges and universities, and by 1973 more than 500 complaints alleging sex discrimination had been filed with HEW. At CSUS, Women’s Caucus members understood the power of the HEW legal action to force the university to address discrimination. Mirroring national trends, they filed a complaint in 1972.

Inspired by the national filings of HEW class-action suits at the national level, campus women’s group aggressively pursued a suit as a solution to their grievances. On March 8, 1972, using the inaugural celebration of International Women's Day at the

CSUS campus as a platform, Sally Wagner announced that Caucus members filed a HEW complaint. In filing the class action suit the Women's Caucus fulfilled its threat to pursue legal action at the federal level. Caucus members spent months collecting first-hand accounts of discrimination and analyzing statistical data, to show how the university's sexist policies in "hiring, promotion, layoffs, job assignments, employee benefits, and wages," negatively affected women in academia and reinforced a system of institutionalized sexism. As early as 1940, feminist activist, lawyer, and co-founder of the National Organization of Women (NOW), Pauli Murray coined the term "Jane Crow" to illustrate the segregation of women into low status occupations. The HEW complaint illustrated how the "Jane Crow" system at CSUS "systematically shunted [women] into positions inferior in salary, responsibility and opportunity for advancement." While women employees at CSUS accounted for 60 percent of all white-collar jobs, 34 percent worked in clerical positions. In comparison, men accounted for 41 percent of white-collar workers; however, 29 percent of them worked as professionals or managers, and only

42 Dorothy Sexton, Austin, Wagner, McKoane, Brown, Moore to Moss, March 29, 1973, Women's Studies, Folder 7, Box 1, DSCUA.
43 "Women's Caucus Class Action Complaint against Sacramento State College for Violation of Executive Orders 11246 and 11375, Forbidding Discrimination on the Basis of Sex" September 24, 1973, Women's Studies, Folder 13, Box 1, DSCUA.
percent worked in clerical positions. Additionally, the HEW complaint charged the university with sex-stereotyping the jobs available to women. In the complaint, the Caucus estimated that “85 percent of all non-academic staff classifications are sex-stereotyped,” 15 percent higher than the 70 percent national average in 1973. The complaint noted that “many titles used to describe job classifications carry explicit designation of the sex of the person who is expected to fill the job, such as groundsman,” however, commonly held perceptions of labor divisions dissuaded women from applying for the positions traditionally considered to be men’s work. Furthermore, the Caucus argued that CSUS “salary scales are tipped in favor of the ‘male-typed’ jobs.” For women on staff at CSUS this posed a particularly frustrating situation. In a letter to the Joint Committee on Legal Equality, Senior Secretary Lou Dell Moore wrote, “our major complaint is not that women are not hired for staff positions, the complaint is that we are hired into low level positions and then entrapped.” At a California Legislative State Hearing of the Joint Committee on Legal Equality on Employment Problems of College-Educated Women, CSUS Women’s Advocate Kathleen Barry argued that females


49 Ibid.

50 Lou Dell Moore to Joint Committee on Legal Equality, October 26, 1973, Margaret McKoane Papers, Folder 4, Box 107, DSCUA.
constituted 42 percent of the 800,000 university graduates during the 1971-72 academic year. Of the 89 percent who entered the labor force in 1972, 14 percent of the women entered into the clerical field and 61 percent could not find employment in their preferred discipline. 51 Though college educated women found more employment in the white-collar sector than non-college educated women, Barry argued that “women are trapped into the female ghetto which closes the door behind them to the opportunities above.” 52 Once sex stereotyped into positions, women found it difficult to advance their careers.

Advancement opportunities remained largely out of reach for women employees at CSUS. The complaint identified a “preponderance of woman ... in the lower levels of most job series, whereas the opposite holds true for men, the preponderance being on the high levels of the same series.” 53 Women at CSUS, even those with “substantial academic achievements and work experience,” were denied high-level or professional positions, and offered clerical positions instead. The fact that women accounted for 152 of the 155 Clerical Assistant II positions (the position that earned the lowest salary on campus), proved a substantial point of contention for the women. Furthermore, in the complaint the Caucus presented the fact that women comprised 96.5 percent of those earning the second lowest salary at the university. Through these assertions, the Caucus illustrated salary discrimination against women. 54
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Statistically, the salary and employment positions of women at CSUS echoed the experiences of women nationally. Nationally, in 1970, when hiring college educated women, employers "offered starting salaries from 3 to 10 percent lower than those offered to men in the same field." As professional and clerical workers, women earned approximately less than half the salaries men earned in the same occupational groups. Barry called the subjugation of women into an "employment pattern of downward mobility after having prepared themselves through a college education for the climb upward" a "cruel hoax." Unable to obtain classifications that reflected their ability, CSUS women employees, felt discouraged, Barry asserted that this created employee relationships in which "she [college educated women] is the other woman behind every great man." Moore argued that the only times she saw "near equity achieved are those in which a strong male administrator has been willing to fight the battle for the woman employee." Women continually faced barriers to equality that prohibited them from realizing their full potential within the workplace. Those who managed to enter into the paid labor force remained trapped within the paternalistic labor system designed to reinforce "Jane Crow" and uphold the secondary status of women workers.
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Though the Ethnic Studies Department supported the goals of the women's movement, members of the faculty and staff questioned the Caucus's decision to file a HEW complaint. Ethnic Studies Coordinator, Robert V. Arellanes recognized that the complaint's threat to the university's federal funding and argued that "approximately 75 percent of all Federal funds . . . is slated for minorities." Arellanes stated that the Equal Opportunity Program received more than $800,000 in federal funds in 1971, of which "approximately 43 per cent has gone to Black students, 34 percent to Chicano students, and the remainder to Indian, Asian, and Poor White students." Additionally, he noted that Teacher Corps, a federal program designed to train students who wished to pursue careers working with delinquent and troubled youth, received $500,000 in federal funds in 1971. He understood that women needed to take action, but he argued the funding threats posed a great threat to ethnic minorities and he threatened to "re-examine [his] support of [the Women's Caucus] cause." The criticism addressed the complaint itself, not the Caucus member's goals. Once filed, the complaint made the university vulnerable to a federal investigation into the status of women on campus that threatened to end federal funds to the university. Recognizing the danger this posed to programs developed to benefit ethnic groups, members of the Women's Caucus responded to Arellanes's concerns, stating that "the cutting off of federal funds is the last step HEW resorts to . . .
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In the hundreds of cases of sex discrimination complaints, we are aware of only two campuses where federal funds have actually been suspended."64 The women perceived the validity of the threat, but saw the HEW complaint as the last remaining option in their fight to end sex discrimination at CSUS.65 The conflict between the Women’s Caucus and Ethnic Studies, illustrates tensions between groups fighting for equality.

Once filed, the complaint received little attention from HEW. United States California House of Representative Member John Moss first responded to the complaint on May 23, over two months after its filing date, writing that he called the HEW office and stated his intent to write again once he heard word about the complaint’s status. The women also found support from Senator Mervyn M. Dymally, a CSUS alumni and longtime supporter of women’s equality, who made notable attempts to push HEW officials to act on the complaint.66 In July 1972, he wrote to the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, Stanley Pottinger, questioning the department’s failure to respond to the HEW complaint.67 The HEW complaint received support from other women’s groups, including the Faculty Women’s Association at CSUS and the Sacramento Community

64 Elizabeth Austin, Maria Hicks, Sally Wagner to Robert Arellanes, April 11, 1972, Women’s Studies, Folder 7, Box 1, Women’s Studies, DSCUA.
65 Ibid.
66 “Dymally Introduces Several Bills to Halt Discrimination against Women,” State Hornet, April 15, 1970; For letters addressing his support see Mervyn M. Dymally to Stanley Pottinger July 7, 1972, Women’s Studies, Folder 14, Box 1, DSCUA and letter dated May 23, 1972, Women’s Studies, Folder 14, Box 1, DSCUA.
Commission for Women, each group urged HEW to investigate the complaint. Overloaded HEW failed to investigate each complaint and the support from outside the campus community did little to prompt a response.

Though angered at HEW’s failure to respond to the Caucus’s complaint, Women’s Caucus members recognized the changes that occurred on campus in the year following the complaint. The women endorsed the university’s appointment of Betty Chimaj, a notable professor of American Studies, as well as the radical feminist and author of *Sexual Politics*, Kate Millett. They both became Distinguished Visiting Professors. Additionally, they praised the administration for hiring a second female administrator, Sandra Barkdull, as Associate Dean of Arts and Science, and they acknowledged that Bond hired Kathy Barry to fill the Women’s Advocate position. Furthermore, the Women’s Caucus viewed the administration’s approval to allow the Women’s Studies department to grant students a minor as a positive step towards ending sexism on campus. Likewise, the women claimed a victory when Maria del Drago succeeded in establishing the Continuing Education Program for Women that focused on the needs of women who wanted to return to college later in life. However, the women argued that for the largest groups of women, staff and part-time employees, “the walls [were] as high as they’ve ever been,” and continued to push for HEW to investigate their concerns.
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The challenges staff women encountered initiated a reaction by labor feminists to address the barriers women of the working class faced.

In March 1973, a year after the Caucus filed the complaint, the group resumed its push for HEW’s involvement. Caucus members contended that “women at CSUS ... are appalled and outraged that the remedy for this discrimination has been stopped by alleged bureaucratic mismanagement.” Theories about why HEW failed to respond circulated within the Caucus. Wagner speculated that an “enormous back log must have impeded HEW’s ability to investigate the Caucus complaint.” Others argued that HEW was “avoiding the campus precisely BECAUSE the number of complaints is so great,” and Millet contended simply that “they don’t WANT to do it.” Millet further threatened: “We’re going to want to sue a government agency to force them to carry out the law.” This stand demonstrated the frustration of CSUS women and the lack of response to their HEW complaint.

While many theories dominated the women’s discussions, HEW’s lack of response can most likely be attributed to the high number of complaints filed with the department. In the two years following WEAL’s initial complaint “against all universities and colleges in the country ... [that] charged ‘an industry-wide pattern of discrimination
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in the academic community," over 350 complaints flooded HEW. WEAL filed over 250 of the cases, including one against California's state university and college system. WEAL's inaugural case generated over 300 letters from Congressional representatives nationwide, and in response HEW created a position solely to handle these letters. As organizations filed more complaints, it is safe to assume that the number of letters increased as well. In addition to the large caseload, HEW lacked the funds and staff needed to adequately investigate the complaints. Not giving up their fight, the women continued to pursue their complaint.

The women approached Senator Moss and requested his involvement for a second time. This time the pressure from Moss and other Caucus's supporters forced HEW to respond. On April 2, 1973, Moss reached department officials who "agreed to furnish a status report to the Women's Caucus within the next few days." While an investigation never materialized, the women's actions succeeded. The threat of an investigation prompted CSUS President Bond to pressure department heads to act.

Contacted by HEW officials, Bond addressed the threat of an investigation and requested that Heads of Schools, Divisions, and Departments give "immediate attention" to guidelines created by the University Affirmative Action Committee. Though the
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university administration had previously made positive steps to respond to the women’s demands, it took HEW’s response to force it to respond in a matter that was satisfactory to the Women’s Caucus. Bond deferred to Barry, who worked with the campus’s Women’s Advocate Advisory Committee to research the claims of discrimination and sexism charged in the suit. Though Bond and the Committee determined the direction of Barry’s position, she listened intently to the voices of the women who requested her help. While a HEW investigation never materialized, Barry’s work with female employees and students, combined with the whirl of energy from department heads and changes made over the past year, appeared to appease the Women’s Caucus. Though letters and charges of discrimination continued to circulate, the administration mitigated the largest grievances held by Caucus members who then moved on to address what they perceived as more pressing issues concerning women on campus and the creation of a Women’s Studies Department.

Left out of the HEW complaint, was a discussion of how sexism specifically affected women of color. The complaint demonstrated large pay gaps between men and women at CSUS; however, for women of color pay disparities also existed between them and white women. That men of color experienced racial discrimination relegating them to low ranking positions and low wages, compounding the necessity of a dual-income household for their female partners. Furthermore, minority women faced a second blow because racial barriers denied them the same access to higher education as white women.
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Because the “Jane Crow” system relegated college educated women to clerical and secretarial jobs, non-college educated minority women became trapped in the lowest paying and ranking positions. At CSUS, Affirmative Action reports demonstrated the gaps between male and female employees but also between minority and white employees. For example, in 1971 the School of Arts and Sciences reported fifty-five women staff members with only four of the five not working in the clerical field. Ethnic minorities accounted for only eight of the fifty-five women, three of who worked as Clerical Assistant Twos, the lowest ranking clerical position within the college, while the other two worked as Department Secretary Ones, the lowest rung on the secretarial ladder. Likewise, all but one ethnic minority male worked in the lowest ranking positions. Additionally, the report highlighted large pay gaps that adversely affected minority women. The majority of white women earned $700 monthly, $100 more than the majority of minority women. In comparison, the lowest salary earned by a male was $650 (only six out of twenty-eight men) with minority men accounting for four of the men at this salary. The majority of white males earned $950 monthly, whereas all four of the minority men in the department earned $650.83

The Affirmative Action reports illustrate the unique challenges minority women faced as a result of discriminatory hiring processes. Though statistical data about minority women and family arrangements at CSUS does not exist, nationally, in 1971, women headed six-million families with black women accounting for 27 percent of those
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families, and it is likely that black women at CSUS experienced similar family structures. The challenges resulted in 34 percent of female-headed families falling below the poverty line. The large disparities in pay and ranking made it arduous for black women to support their families; the Women's Caucus, however, did not cover racial or ethnic discrimination in the complaint. Unfortunately, statistics for other WOC groups does not exist, but it is likely that other racial minorities faced similar challenges. Noted by CSUS Senior, Alejandra Delgadillo, noted that "most white women have failed to recognize, and or, accept the fact that in this racist and sexist society, all of us are victims ... we the women of color must deal simultaneously with both sexism and racism." Professor Delores Delgado Campbell, who taught classes for both the Women's Studies and the Ethnic Studies departments in the 1970s, recalls a similar experience recounting she often felt like "an interloper" while working with feminist activists on campus. Professor Campbell remembers attending a Women's Studies meeting, and when she declined a request to introduce Jane Fonda to an audience on campus, another feminist activist accused her of "not being a feminist." Campbell acknowledged while some women accepted her within the movement, but others failed to
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recognize her as a feminist. Many white women did not understand the race specific issues confronting women of color and denounced the efforts of women, like Delgado Campbell, as feminist activism.

Women of color, like Delgado Campbell and Delgadillo, defined feminism differently based on their personal experiences with racism and sexism. Different cultural expectations and historical experiences between white women and women of color shaped how different groups of women interpreted feminism, the movement, and the role of activism created schisms within the women’s movement. While sexism was a contributing factor, women of color viewed racism as the biggest impediment to ending their second-class citizenship status. White feminists tended to focus on the broader issues of equality and women’s liberation, whereas women of color generally concentrated on issues that affected their ethnic and racial communities as a whole. Some white Caucus members, unable or unwilling to acknowledge how race or class influenced their views of feminism, adopted a narrow-minded view of feminism. Intentionally or not, the narrowly defined feminist view excluded many women of color. The women’s movement at CSUS exposes how perceptions of unity among women in the movement camouflaged deeper fractures when race is examined.

Though aware of racial inequalities, Caucus members did not always recognize their own racism towards women of color, and racial minorities did not always relate to what they perceived as a white women’s movement on campus. When the Women’s Studies Board failed to re-schedule the course “Race, Sex and Class,” due to low
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enrollment, Betty Eng approached the group. She argued that ethnic women felt excluded from Women’s Studies’ courses, citing that the courses did not represent their interests. The Board renewed the course and changed the class title to “Third World Women,” reaching a more racially mixed audience and demonstrating the ability of white women to confront their own racism. Theresa Corrigan, English and Women’s Studies professor admitted that courses focusing on women of color had been omitted from course offerings; however, she added that it was not intentional, but rather an oversight. White women in the movement did not see how their own racism shaped the priorities of the department; but when confronted with charges of racism, Board members attempted to correct their views.

“Secretaries Organize”: Motherhood and the Movement

The efforts of CSUS staff members to change the institution’s maternity policy also reflected the actions and viewpoints supported by postwar labor feminists. Emerging in the 1950s labor feminists fought for employment regulations that protected sex-specific issues women contended with, such as pregnancy. Though the issues presented affected women of all economic classes, they especially distressed working-class women whose families relied heavily on their income. Women at CSUS assumed a labor feminist stance when they challenged the university’s maternity policy. Prior to 1971, CSUS forced women to resign at the end of their seventh month of pregnancy without reemployment rights. Furthermore, policy dictated that women must reapply to their

positions after and prohibited them from doing so until their child reached six-weeks of age. Through the forced termination of employment, the institution, not the individual woman, asserted authority over a woman’s ability to balance work and motherhood. Additionally, the maternity policy made it difficult for women to advance their careers, further relegating them to lowest rungs on the career ladder and reinforced the second class status of female employees. In the early 1970s, CSUS’s policy aligned with the national employment policies of most private and public institutions and affected women across sex and class lines.

In 1969, six states had laws that prohibited women from working after a designated point in their pregnancy, and some also included regulations as to when a woman could return to work post-childbirth. Though these states removed the prohibitive laws by 1970, private employers enforced discriminatory maternity policies into the late 1970s. A 1970s poll of New York employers, done by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, showed that of 265 companies polled “56.6 percent ... had no definite policy ... 46.2 percent of the companies permitted women to work through the sixth to eighth month of pregnancy .... 22.6 percent made them leave after the third month.” Employers throughout the nation claimed that their policies, similar to the businesses in New York, protected mothers; however, labor feminists, argued that the policies affect the women who needed the income from working, hampering a women’s
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ability to pursue their career aspirations, and denied them autonomy to make their own
decision in regard to motherhood and employment. The women pressed for policy
changes at state and local levels within unions through collective bargaining. Likewise,
CSUS women pushed to change the maternity leave policies through the Staff Council, a
campus organization composed of staff members that advocated for policies that
benefitted staff employees.

In December 1971, secretaries Jo Anne Breese and Terry Taylor submitted a
petition containing 130 staff signatures requesting a change in the university’s pregnancy
policy. In addition to outlining the existing policy, the proposal argued “it also seems to
be the College policy (official or otherwise) ... to ask the prospective employee of her
‘family planning’ plans. In other words, the College wishes to know if the woman plans
to become pregnant.” Though the proposition only referenced one prospective
employee, a questionnaire distributed to 400 staff members with 204 responses found that
one-fourth of women surveyed believed interviewers asked them for “information not
relevant to the position” to which they applied. CSUS job interviewers routinely asked
women questions about their “marital status, children, stay in the community, birth
control pills, questions about husbands’ occupations, future plans—why returning to
work, reasons for divorce, and babysitting arrangements.” The interviewers did not ask
male applicants questions pertaining to their marital of family status, confirming the
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proposal's allegation of discrimination within the hiring process. In comparison to other California State Colleges, CSUS's policy was more conservative. California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo contained the same seventh month stipulation; however, it allowed for the institution to grant the women an exception with supervisor approval. While paternalistic in nature, it still provided flexibility and gave some authority to women in the decision making process. Long Beach State and Fresno State appeared to have the most liberal policy, permitting women with physician approval to work throughout their pregnancies, to use sick leave and vacation pay, and they did not require mandatory leave after childbirth. In lieu of the CSUS's restrictive policy, staff members argued that pregnant women should work as long as they so choose. Additionally, staff women requested that the university allow women to take a leave of absence and end the mandatory termination policy. They contended that women should have the right to return to their position. If approved, the proposed guidelines at CSUS would allow women to make their own decisions regarding how best to balance work, parenting, and childbirth.

Once Breese and Taylor submitted the statement to the Staff Council, a committee formed on December 16, 1971, to study the proposed changes. Three months later, the initial staff committee members claimed they found it too difficult to meet, disbanded, and a second was committee formed. Four months later after that the secretaries saw their proposal advance. The Staff Council committee approved the proposed pregnancy
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policy but amended it to include four months leave and then presented it to university President Bernard Hyink, who approved it. However, at an uncertain point, after the proposed guidelines had been sent to Hyink, a provision that precluded women from working beyond their eighth month of pregnancy appeared in the proposed policy. Taylor, speaking for staff members who originally pushed for the policy change, praised the changes but noted their displeasure with the eighth month restriction. Staff members wanted the policy to read: “a pregnant employee should be able to work up until the arrival of her child.” Staff Council leaders pushed back, arguing that a lack of communication from the originators led to a “misunderstanding of intent ... and since the Staff Council accepted this assignment in good faith, and since the President had already approved the pregnancy policy, the consensus was to accept the policy as approved.”

The members of the Staff Council refused to renegotiate terms and considered the matter finished. Five months after staff women advocated for a change in the pregnancy policy, they claimed a semi-victory towards returning the power of women to decide their employment status. The policy continued to force women to take leave at the eighth month mark of their pregnancy; however, they could now decide for themselves when to return to work after childbirth. The six-week mark in pregnancy remained an important date, but now the policy read “in any case no later than six weeks,” which was a critical change to the previous guideline that required them to remain out of work for six weeks. Moreover, the university no longer forced women to terminate employment,
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and CSUS guaranteed women who left on maternity leave the right to retain her position without loss of classification and pay. The Staff Council considered the matter finished, and staff women needed to pursue other channels to continue pressing for a fair pregnancy policy. The Women’s Caucus recognized the remaining discriminatory aspects of the revised policy and included them in their HEW complaint, further drawing attention to the inequitable policy.

In July 1977, the new Staff Employee Handbook contained a new maternity leave policy. Referencing the California State University and Colleges’ policy, the updated guideline granted permanent staff members a leave of absence without pay for one year “for the purposes of pregnancy, childbirth, and the recovery therefrom.” Furthermore, it allowed women to use accrued sick leave, and it did not stipulate forced time off prior to delivery. The prominent changes in policy from 1971 to 1977 predate the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 that amended Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to include the “terms ‘because of sex’ or ‘on the basis of sex’ include, but are not limited to, because of or on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions; and women affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions shall be treated the same for all employment-related purposes.” Moreover, it came before the arrival of the campus’s collective bargaining rights. It is likely that the staff members’ consistent activism and the inclusion of the discriminatory policy in the Women’s Caucus HEW
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complaint, which drew the attention of audiences off campus, played an important role in the policy's transformation. In just under six years, the pregnancy policy transformed from the forced termination of staff employees at the seventh-month mark of their pregnancy with no rehire rights, to allowing women the right to use sick leave, and added job security. The change initiated and actively pursued by staff women and men chipped away at the second-class status of women workers and gave women the power to balance work and motherhood for themselves.

Conclusion

The Women's Movement at CSUS made strides towards ending the secondary status of women on campus. The HEW complaint, initiated by the Women's Caucus and supported by other women's groups on campus, forced the administration to change discriminatory policies and practices in hiring and promotion. Caucus members sought changes that elevated working women's status and gave them full citizenship in the workplace, while positively affecting their ability to provide for their families and the ability to pursue career goals. The complaint moved women closer toward workplace equality, and women started moving up career ladders and into professional positions once denied to them. Finally, the direct actions taken by staff members to change the discriminatory pregnancy policy dealt an additional blow to workplace inequality. Using the Staff Council to advocate for policy change, staff members effectively gained control over their right to decide how long to work while pregnant and when to return. From 1969 and into the late 1970s, women's activism at CSUS resulted in women attaining the
power to decide for themselves how to balance motherhood with their employment or educational goals and their economic need to work.
The women's movement at CSUS expanded beyond ending workplace sexism. Many women faculty, staff and students on campus demanded that the university recognize that women played an integral role within the university. Their efforts are visible in two distinct ways. First, students desired an education that made women a subject worthy of academic inquiry and relevant to their lives. Second, students, faculty, and staff activists wanted the university to address the unique challenges women faced as they balanced work or school with motherhood. These two key aspirations materialized in a push for a Women's Studies program and an on-site day care center. Feminist activists called for CSUS to include women in the university's curriculum and acknowledge women's historical and continued contributions to academia. Similarly, the women demanded that the university establish a day care center that allowed women to attend classes, work, and concurrently granted them time to pursue other women's liberation goals. Both of the objectives challenged paternalistic structures that neglected women's issues and dominated the university prior to the women's movement.
Many women on campus, students and educators alike, believed that the traditional classes did not meet the educational goals and desires of women. As a result they designed the Women Studies program to "rectify the distorted view of women's past, to provide us [women on campus] with the tools to analyze our oppression, and to lead us to action that will end that oppression." Members and leaders of the movement at CSUS viewed themselves as the "academic arm of the Women's Movement." Built through grassroots activism, the Women's Caucus started its push for a program in 1969 and by 1972 the program achieved legitimacy when the administration and the Chancellor's Office approved the women’s request to offer students a minor in women's studies. The creation of Women's Studies in its own right publicly challenged the existing infrastructure in a university system that had been created and run by men. The Women’s Caucus became the most vocal proponents of the Women’s Studies program. Women activists regarded the program as more than merely just "a bunch of women talking about their problems." For these women, it became an active forum to discuss
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and propel the women's liberation movement.\textsuperscript{108} The formation of the Women's Studies program emerged as a community effort and a political force. Sally Wagner—Women's Caucus member and mother of two young children—recounts that the "Women's Caucus was a real politically active body, not an academic body, and the tone of Women's Studies was immediately set as a political action group."\textsuperscript{109} Similar to other universities nationwide, the Women's Studies program at CSUS originated in the early 1970s, and reflected the desire of students to obtain an education they deemed relevant to their daily lives and their experiences as students and as women.

In 1969, the Women's Caucus understood the need and ambition of female students who wanted to study women and women's issues. The Caucus acknowledged the interest of students in pursuing women's studies during an Honors program discussion about Betty Friedan's \textit{The Feminine Mystique}, led by Wagner, a graduate student at the time. Though \textit{The Feminine Mystique} resonated predominately with middle-class white women, the book's message interested women at CSUS who mostly came from blue-collar backgrounds. A group of women previously excluded from academia, but who wanted to elevate their working-class status through education and post-graduation employment. Women at CSUS not only sought to obtain a college degree, but they also wanted the opportunity to continue pursuing goals outside of the domestic sphere after graduation. The conversation continued beyond the class's designated time frame, leading Wagner and other Caucus members to discuss the
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implementation of women’s studies into the university’s course offerings. According to Wagner, it began with a grassroots feminist movement, supported by women on and off campus who wanted more “content on women in classes,” and argued that “classes should be taught in a more feminist way.” Caucus members and other CSUS students craved an education that helped them to understand the role of women in society as well as pursue their individual feminist goals. The classes eventually offered by the Women’s Studies Program, such as the first two courses, “Women in the Modern World” and “Women and the Law,” not only taught women about methods of oppression, but they also provided practical education students could use to challenge patriarchal structures at the university and within American society.

The Caucus members’ goals mirrored the sentiment of women studies proponents statewide. Marilyn Boxer, history professor (then junior lecturer) and leader of efforts to establish a women’s studies program at San Diego State University (SDSU), contends that women activists wanted to challenge the rigid patterns of thought and institutional structures that have excluded us and distorted understanding of ourselves and our worlds. We want to experience personal and professional identities that suit our sense of self, our intellectual pursuits, our purposes in life. We know that knowledge purported to represent the world misrepresents, as it also constructs; we want to intervene and change all that. And we must, to succeed, challenge the rules.

---


11 “Women’s Studies- Then and Now,” Sally Wagner Papers, DSCUA.

The founding of women's studies programs at dozens of universities, stemming from the women's movement and the scholarship it inspired arose with the intent to expand and include a feminist discourse within the university. Simultaneously, the programs demanded that the university recognize the role and importance of women within society. The founders the Women's Studies Program designed it to accomplish two goals. First, they wanted to educate students on topics, such as women's history and contemporary social issues of women, through a feminist lens. Second, they hoped that the students would then use their newfound knowledge to pursue feminist activism. Caucus members and women studies participants at CSUS argued that the university system "consistently degrades and ignores our [women's] history and culture. We also struggle to overcome race and class biases which have divided women in past women's movements." 113 Women at CSUS viewed "Women's Studies as a movement, not an academic field" they saw the program as a platform to incorporate feminism into the educational system and "act as the academic arm of a political movement." 114 The program's supporters knew that their efforts pushed against the status quo at the university and that their efforts to make the university more inclusive of female students faced an uphill battle.

In spring 1970, aware of the challenges, Caucus members organized the first two women's studies courses. The first two interdisciplinary courses, Sociology 196 "Women
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in the Modern World” and Social Work X196 “Women and the Law,” garnered a lot of attention from female students who enrolled. In Fall 1970, the burgeoning Women’s Studies program offered three courses one of which, “Liberation of the American Women,” had approximately 285 students. Cultural Programs and the Extension Division financed the expansive and expensive $5,200 course that “generated two 2-unit, part-time teaching positions to handle the enrollment overload.” Taught by Kirsten Amundson and Joan Wilson, professors who identified as feminist activists, the course was both lecture and discussion based. Additionally, the professors invited prominent feminist speakers to address the class. The speakers included Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, Florynce Kennedy, Robin Morgan, Aileen Hernandez and others. The course exemplified the direction women’s studies would later follow, as faculty, staff, and graduate students designed courses that allowed for feminist discourse between the students and the course leaders. Furthermore, the large number of interested students illustrated the desire of women who wanted to pursue an education that they believed to be most relevant to their lives as students and as women.

Proponents of the women led courses, benefitted from the political and social climate on campus. In the period between President Guy West’s retirement in 1965 and President Bond’s appointment in 1972, five different men had been appointed or
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temporarily assigned to the president position, weakening the administration’s power over many areas, including curriculum development.\textsuperscript{118} In the absence of a strong administration, academic leadership fell to department heads and faculty members, who in the 1970s tended to be younger and more liberal. In the mid to late 1960s, the university hired over 100 full-time faculty members a year to meet the demands of a rapidly growing student body.\textsuperscript{119} The large, younger faculty had a “sense of social and political responsibility” that had a “significant impact on course offerings,” in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{120} This same climate led faculty, when pressed, to approve classes taught by female graduate students that covered women’s issues; because, Wagner argues “there was no literature, no field of reference, women were the experts.”\textsuperscript{121} At CSUS, circumstances aligned in favor of the Caucus’s goals to compose and implement courses pertinent to female students.

While many faculty members supported the women's courses, the Caucus did encounter pushback from some department heads. Prior to the development of an autonomous Women's Studies program, the women and their supporters employed creative methods to secure the right to teach women's courses. Wagner and another graduate student proposed a women and psychology course, “The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm,” to the psychology department requesting it be included on the fall semester
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course list. Due to the sexual and controversial nature of the course’s content, the Psychology Department initially rejected it; however, John Doolittle, a male faculty member in the department, challenged the decision. He argued that the course’s subject matter was “very necessary,” and questioned that “if these women aren’t allowed to teach this class, then what if I want to teach a class that is controversial, does that mean I won’t have the right to teach it?” Wagner posits that Doolittle “realized that the loss of our [Caucus members’] freedom involved the loss of his,” and to appease department heads Doolittle offered to co-teach the class with Wagner and the graduate student. Wagner recounts teaching multiple courses using this method. When departments rejected the women’s course proposals, the women approached male professors who agreed to either co-teach the course, or act solely as a figurehead and let the women teachers assumed full teaching responsibilities. The department heads perpetuated a system that questioned a woman’s ability to teach controversial courses, but did not hesitate to permit male professors from teaching the exact same courses. When department heads approved a male professor’s requests to offer courses that they previously denied to a female professor the systemic sexism at CSUS in the 1970s is revealed, and the double standard female professors contended with becomes evident. Though the women battled department heads, many male faculty members tended to agree that women should be allowed to teach contentious courses. The liberal educational views of young faculty
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members, who tended to support the antiwar and civil rights movements, created an
environment that permitted Caucus members to teach women’s courses, even
controversial ones such as “The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm,” when department heads
did not approve.

The onset of Women’s Studies nationwide occurred during a pivotal moment in
United States history. In the 1960s and 1970s the areas of “American higher education, of
feminism, and . . . the lives of women brought up to believe in the reality of the
opportunities we were promised” all connected. While a national movement started in
the 1970s, the members of Women’s Caucus found themselves in the forefront of the
movement to initiate Women’s Studies programs on campuses and developed at CSUS
one of the earliest programs nationwide. Wagner states that the program was the second
in the nation to become university recognized; but, there is no known documentation that
confirms her assertion. However, Boxer affirms CSUS’s Women’s Studies as a
“pioneering program,” and notes that the first national conference on women’s studies
took place at CSUS in 1973. Moreover, Boxer argues that the interest in women’s
studies came “when student voices carried major influence in university forums . . .
especially in enrollment-budgeted state institutions such as the California State
University system where many ‘firsts’ in feminist education took place.” During this
period the number of women’s studies programs expeditiously expanded, from the lone
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program at SDSU in 1970 to 150 similar programs nationwide by 1975. CSUS's program was one of the first within this movement.

Boxer's works outlines three phases of academic feminism. She refers to an argument made by Florence Howe, Barbara Miller Solomon, and other scholars who contend that the development of women's studies programs occurred as "a third phase in American women's struggle for equal access to higher education." The first phase occurred when women during the suffragist and abolitionist movement prior to the Civil War, fought for a women's right to attend universities. The second phase, Boxer states took place in the nineteenth century when "women such as M. Carey Thomas called for admission to the 'men's curriculum,' both in new colleges for women that aimed to equal the private Ivy League institutions that educated men of the elite, and in state-supported, land-grant universities that promised 'coeducation.'" The third phase, Boxer asserts, arose in the "sociopolitical currents of the 1960s." The national women's movement inspired women at CSUS to form a "cohesive campus force" composed of women students, faculty, and staff members who fought to establish a Women's Studies program in order to "develop a field of study directly related to the academic, cultural and psychological needs and interests of women in contemporary society." Women at
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CSUS did not simply want to study women’s history and issues; they wanted academia to legitimize women as subjects worthy of academic study.

Nineteen-seventy, the year that Women’s Studies became a focal point for campus women, marked one of the most tumultuous years for CSUS. The tragedy at Kent State on May 4 outraged students who quickly organized campus protests as did other campuses across the nation. When Governor Ronald Reagan shut down all California universities after a group of CSUS students marched to his residence in Sacramento, students did not acquiesce. They organized multiple protests around the city. Upon the reopening of the campus, students continued to demonstrate their dissent. A group of thirty to forty students and campus employees, including Wagner, created what became known as “Strike City.” The students, some staff, and a few of their children erected a small camp of tents, with the intent to live on campus for the remainder of the semester. Though apprehensive, they spent their first night camped out on campus “drinking wine and singing songs” but no major disturbances transpired that night or any other for the remainder of the semester.133 The campus administration allowed the students to remain on campus, and when the semester ended, the students packed up their tents and returned to their homes.134

The antiwar movement at CSUS never became violent, but it did command the attention of CSUS’s administrators. When reflecting on the interaction between social activist on campus, Wagner recounts that “to a large extent, we were a united body - the
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same people demanding an end to the war . . . were the same ones that were demanding the changes in the infrastructure (child care, equal pay, representation of women equally in all areas . . . ). The issues were all connected and the people demanding them were largely the same - and supporting each other's issues."¹³⁵ Men on campus supported women's issues and it is exemplified in the fight for an onsite day care center, male professors acting as figure heads for women's courses, attending rape symposiums, and participating in other forms of dissent. The spirit of activism that spread throughout the university forced CSUS administrators to recognize and listen to the demands of campus activists, including the Women's Caucus's appeals for a women's studies program.

Alongside, and prior to the push to include women in academia, other groups on campus battled for inclusion within CSUS's curriculum. Activists from various social movements, such as the Civil Rights Movement and the antiwar movement felt that traditional courses lacked relevancy in the turbulent era. At CSUS students, faculty, and staff pressured university administrators to expand the curriculum. In 1969, the Ethnic Studies Department formalized offering students an interdisciplinary education in their choice of four areas, Pan-African Studies, Chicano Studies, Native American Studies, and Asian American Studies. The department, rising out of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, was led by students, staff, and faculty who wanted the opportunity to "study, research, and the advancement of public understanding in the life-styles, history, problems and prospects of American ethnic minority peoples."¹³⁶ Likewise, the Peace
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and Conflict Resolution Studies and the Alternative Education Program (AEP), and the Experimental College (EC) each evolved out of the spirit of activism that consumed many campus members.

Theresa Corrigan, a co-founder of the EC, faculty member, and social activist remembers the time as “one of the most alive times in [her] life,” recounting that many people at CSUS, viewed it as their “duty to change the world through education and demonstration.” The EC provided students an opportunity to pursue an education that they perceived as relevant to the changing American society. Similarly, the AEP, formed in May 1970, after the Kent State incident, as a reaction to increased levels of frustration with traditional American society. The AEP gave students options beyond traditional classes. No longer restricted to mainstream college courses, students chose from classes like “U.S. Imperialism,” “Drugs and Counter-Culture,” “Poverty,” and “Southeast Asia.” Students believed that these classes represented the larger issues of society that influenced their daily lives and reflected the changing American society.

The alternative classes attracted between 1,500 and 2,000 students who attended the classes held primarily on lawns across campus. The Caucus and women activists benefited from the spirit of activism that forced the university to expand its course offerings in multiple ways. From Ethnic Studies to Women’s Studies, groups disenfranchised from...
academic institutions traditionally superintended by white men, demonstrated their desire to obtain an education they believed to be germane to the changing American society.

The activism that permeated CSUS reflects Boxer's assertion that there also arose a "concomitant demand by students for courses they deemed 'relevant' to their lives. For feminists this meant seeking a useable heritage and useful ideology."\(^{140}\) The Women's studies program at CSUS fulfilled this need, and "the first new 'programs' augured a future which women would seek a permanent place in the curriculum and in virtually all aspects of university life."\(^{141}\) In 1980, Associate Professor of Psychology at CSUS, Joanne Harrow contended that "ten years earlier the women's liberation movement birthed the Women's Studies program at CSUS. This birth was midwifed by the students who claimed a right to its existence."\(^{142}\) The Women's Caucus, the largest women's liberation group on campus envisioned the program, but the students who attended the courses played an integral role in deciding the direction of courses at CSUS. Feminist activists and students wanting an education that spoke to their individual lives as women played a crucial role in implementing the Women's Studies program.\(^{143}\) While women of color were active in the program's creation, they also were heavily involved in the Ethnic Studies Department. Women from minorities immersed themselves in both programs,
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finding relevancy and trying to find balance between their experiences as women and as racial minorities.

In 1971, Women's Caucus members took critical steps towards the creation of a full-fledged women's studies department. In response to rapidly growing student interest, CSUS offered six women's studies courses during the spring semester, growing the program from four-units of part-time faculty to nine. During this year the Women's Caucus engaged in formal discussions about how to approach the development of an official Women's Studies program. As a "natural topic of discussion" at Caucus meetings and "seeing no other body on campus which one, so fairly represented the interest of all women on campus and brought together on a weekly basis all instructors in Women's Studies," Women's Studies participants and leaders affirmed a decision to let the Caucus enact and create the program's governing body. That April, Caucus members attended a women's studies conference at the University of California, Santa Cruz that drew attendees from multiple state universities. The conference allowed Caucus members to strategize with women from other universities about their efforts to implement women's studies programs. In 1970, San Diego State University (SDSU) offered one of the first women's studies programs nationwide, and the CSUS women attending the conference were drawn to SDSU's organizational structure. Returning to CSUS, Caucus members held a special meeting to form the Women's Studies Board. The Board, "an unofficial governing body" consisted of three elected faculty members, two elected staff members,
and three elected students, each member received one vote in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{146}

In 1971, the Women’s Studies program offered eleven courses in the fall. As the program grew in 1972 the Board took steps to make it official by allowing students to minor in Women’s Studies. Academic Vice President, Harvey Reddick, submitted the proposal to Gerhard “Gerry” Friedrich, CSUS Dean of Academic Planning, supporting its acceptance. Reddick wrote “You will note that this program has wide support among students and shows much promise.”\textsuperscript{147} The Women’s Studies Board’s proposal passed and CSUS offered the minor option beginning the Fall Semester 1972, making it one of the first state universities to do so.\textsuperscript{148} By Spring 1973, the program accorded students with the option to earn a Coordinated Major, meaning students majoring in Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Government, History, or English could “combine their work in their major with their interest in Women’s Studies.”\textsuperscript{149}

Caucus members fought diligently for the program’s creation and to form meaningful classes that furthered feminist goals of women’s liberation. The Women’s Studies program caused a “revolutionary change in courses in which women are the
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central and active participants. Not only did the courses teach students about the historical roles of women within American society, they also raised awareness about the methods of oppression that subjugated women to second class citizenship. As an early women's studies program and one of the first to offer its students the opportunity to earn a minor in the field. The Caucus members' succeeded in designing a program "to help women realize their oppression and to establish alternatives to that oppression." The feminist activism of women at CSUS in the 1970s forced the university to recognize that its women students, staff, and faculty mattered.

"Child Care Center! $50 Will Liberate Mothers"

In 1969, a strong push for a university child care center developed. The Caucus's goal of overcoming hurdles women in education faced materialized in an early demand for an on-site center. The women recognized the need of mothers on campus to have access to quality day care. In 1969, a Sacramento County Welfare Department survey of 1,300 working women with children living in Sacramento highlighted the challenges and child care needs of mothers who worked outside of the home. The survey revealed that women overwhelmingly relied on relatives and non-relatives to care for their children while they worked, and home and private day cares accounted for only 26 percent of
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child care arrangements. Many working mothers expressed a desire to place their children in organized community child care centers, but the majority of women found the centers’ cost prohibitive. CSUS students and campus employees shared similar concerns and issues about child care. A study done by the Social Work Department in 1971 determined that 43% of the students (17,000) had children; of this number, 72% indicated that they had children between the age of 0-11. It was further determined that 53% of all the children come from homes where the parents have monthly incomes of $250.00. Many of these students “found their present day care arrangements unsuitable in the areas of cost, physical settings, distance from home, reliability, and hours of availability.” Additionally, known as a commuter school, CSUS attracted an older student body, a percentage of whom had children or planned to have children during their college career. This led many proponents of the child care to argue that the need for a center would only increase over time. The members of the Women’s Caucus, many of them mothers, identified this need and began to organize an on-site day care center that would be open to students primarily with a few spots available for staff and faculty.
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The Women's Caucus initially found little support from campus administrators for the child care center. But later on was successful and established the center in 1971. Today, the campus child care center is a normal sight on campus, and one of the best childcare providers in the city. Children of students, staff, and faculty can be seen daily playing in the university quad as their parents work and attend classes. During the 1970s, the push for a center was still seen by many people on campus as being "controversial." Wagner remembers "pushing uphill" for the establishment of the child care center, stating that women were "forging new ground." Though popular with many students and employees, the center's founding faced opposition. Some faculty members, like Government Associate Professor William Dillon, questioned the need for a center when day cares already existed in the Sacramento community. Others challenged the role of the university in providing programs, like day care, to its students; however, in 1970 a strong movement organized to demand child care centers on campuses nationwide. In 1970, National Coalition for Campus Childcare Centers (NCCCC) was formed at the University of California, Riverside, which demonstrated the national shift towards the addition of campus day care centers. Prior to the 1970s, few,
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if any, universities offered child care on campus, and advocates at CSUS found
themselves on the forefront of the movement. The creation of an on-site day care run by
the university directly challenged the existing infrastructure of the university, which
previously remained isolated from the personal lives of its students.

In 1970, child care center proponents gained an important ally in their efforts. In
October of 1969, CSUS student Pat Collins requested help and funding from the
Associated Students of Sacramento State College (ASSSC) President Steve Whitmore.
Whitmore, “excited about the idea,” agreed to bring the idea to the student government;
however, early advocates for the center made little progress until Margaret McCoane,
Assistant Dean of Students, Activities and Housing, became involved in August 1970. 162
McCoane, worked tirelessly to build a child care center on campus. Also a member of the
Women’s Caucus, McCoane stated she refused to “let something get lost in red tape, not
without a fight anyway. I’m stubborn.” 163 McCoane, who Wagner identified as, “almost
always the only one in our corner,” viewed her work to organize an on-site child care
center as “an expression . . . in women’s liberation.” 164 Their public stance for on-site
child care was echoed by the National Organization of Women’s (NOW) position. NOW
similarly argued that,

> a basic cause of the second-class status of women in America . . . has been
> the notion that woman’s anatomy is her destiny . . . that because women
> bear children, it is primarily their responsibility to care for them . . .

163 Ibid.
164 Wagner, interview, November 29, 2014; "A Multi-Faceted Dean," State Hornet, October 27,
1971.
Women will never have full opportunities to participate in our economic, political, cultural life as long as they bear this responsibility. 

McKoane and other center proponents understood that the center provided women students and staff the freedom to pursue their academic goals in addition to their women's liberation efforts. McKoane's and Women Caucus members' argument for a child care center fit squarely into the demands of women across the nation who pushed for access to reliable and affordable child care.

With McKoane's involvement in organizing for day care, the movement finally made progress. McKoane, with the help of CSUS student Tina Saed, approached the Student Senate to asking for its support and approval for the creation of a child care center. The Senate "allocated $30,000 for the center's operation .... To go for the purchase of a building, facilities, and personnel," pending a feasibility study. The ASSSC agreed to become the official sponsor and financial backer of the child care center, and it became formally named the ASSSC Children's Center. The ASSSC, together with McKoane and members of the student body, staff, and faculty, formed the Children's Center Committee. Led by Saed, the committee worked collectively to "formulate a concrete proposal that provided the necessary educational program and day
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care service for a cross-section of the College community on College grounds.\footnote{168} With a committee firmly in place, the next step included defining the center’s goals.

The committee advocating for the center hoped it would fulfill three university needs. First, Caucus members who initiated the campus movement understood the importance of establishing a child care center on campus to ease the frustrations student parents experienced. Like many of the women surveyed in 1969, student parents at CSUS struggled to find quality affordable day care and juggled the need to attend classes with the difficulty of finding reliable child care. Twenty-nine percent of the students who responded to the Social Work Department’s survey admitted that “they were unable to take classes because of inadequate child care arrangements.”\footnote{169} Even students who managed to find child care, often found it to be unreliable. When sitters cancelled at the last minute, it forced them to decide whether they should skip class and place their academic career in jeopardy or bring their children to class. The choice to bring children to class became increasingly popular, which proponents of the center and others agreed was “totally unfair to the instructor and other students enrolled in these classes as well as to the child who is being subjected to such an unsuitable activity for his age level.”\footnote{170} The child care center hoped to ease these frustrations. Access to dependable and professional
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child care afforded female students the opportunity to spend more time focusing on

course work and increasing student success.

Second, advocates of the center highlighted the benefits it brought to various

majors on campus as a "laboratory for various educational departments which trains

students to work with children. Pat Collins, an early center organizer "envision[ed] a
time art majors would help little children unleash their creative impulses, and students

with other majors would be similarly doing their thing with the kids." Supporters of the
center supporters believed the center should serve the CSUS community by providing
faculty and staff the opportunity to give their students on-hand experience with children;
thus, making the center relevant to others on campus beyond the students and employees
who utilized the center for child care.

Finally, creators of the center’s program envisioned a place that focused on the
"well-rounded development of each child . . . designed for the social, emotional,
intellectual, and physical growth of each child as an individual." The committee
members successfully identified the ability of a center to fit the needs of student mothers
and employees while simultaneously benefiting the university by acting as a laboratory
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for a variety of majors, and providing non-parents hands-on experience applicable to their majors. 174

However, the efforts of the committee slowed as the center once again "run afool of bureaucratic red tape." 175 In December 1970, McKoane spoke with California State College Dean Vernon A. Ouellette, from the Office of the Chancellor, who informed her that the Chancellor's office had formed a task force to prepare rules for creating on-site centers and he requested that those working on the site at CSUS suspend their efforts until the Chancellor's office distributed official procedures. McKoane, acknowledging the task force, responded that she would "appreciate your [Ouellette] convening the Chancellor's staff task force, as soon as convenient, for establishing guidelines," and, true to her claim of stubbornness, countered "our program at SSC is moving ahead." 176

Ouellette, appealed to the Dean of Students, Donald Bailey, asking the university to prevent McKoane from pursuing the program until "guidelines have been distributed." 177 Though Ouellette repeatedly assured McKoane that the task force would "move as rapidly as possible" the request meant the center's planned opening for spring semester
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1971 "virtually impossible."

While many expressed frustration at the interruption in momentum, they also understood "that some amount of bureaucratic red tape must be endured." The Committee received the formal guidelines, and CSUS President Bernard L. Hyink requested that the Dean of Campus Facilities work with McKoane, recognizing "a good deal of interest in this program," and asking them to "do all you can in implementing this facility." Then, on July 21, 1971, the ASSSC led by Michael Hackard, and consisting of mainly male students, voted to finance and support the center.

The child care center officially opened in November 1971, launching the same time as other centers on CSU campuses statewide. Just before CSUS obtained permission for a center, California State College, Los Angeles (L.A. State) obtained permission from the State Department to build a campus center; and, by 1972 eleven California State Universities had centers in operation, and an additional eight colleges had plans to open centers. It took the Women's Caucus two years to see their vision for a center come to fruition that would liberate mothers so that they could pursue higher education, and feminist action made it all possible. The establishment of the Center
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alleviated the stress of balancing sitter schedules and the frustration of finding affordable care, things that consumed women's time, liberating them to pursue education and career goals. Women's Caucus members envisioned the center, and their tireless activism drove the movement towards its ultimate goal. The newly formed child care center allowed parents the ability to attend classes and work, while knowing that their child resided close by in a safe place.

Conclusion

The women's movement at CSUS transformed the university, physically and intellectually. When Kate Millet arrived on campus as a Distinguished Visiting Professor, others questioned why someone with her credentials would agree to work at CSUS. She responded that she "regards the Sacramento women's studies program as the best in the nation." By 1973, enrollment grew in "courses generated by the movement to well beyond 1,000." Students attended the classes because they filled a need other courses did not. The courses nurtured "the growth of women as independent and confident individuals," and made their challenges the subjects and focus of study. Likewise, the formation of the ASSSC Children's Center provided a physical space for women on campus that mitigated the stress of balancing sitter schedules and the frustration of finding affordable care, things that consumed women's time, liberating them to pursue education and career goals. Prior to its inception, the on-site child care center was considered "controversial," by those who argued that professional and academic spheres
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remain separate from the domestic spheres: but, it quickly became "essential," argued Dean of Students, Norm Better, who recognized that "a lot of married and single people ... need this service to stay in school." Women's Caucus members envisioned the center, and they drove the movement towards its creation. Today the Women's Studies program and the child care center both exist on campus. Their creation and current existence are a testament to the ways in which the women's movement transformed the university.
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CHAPTER FOUR
CONFRONTING THE SEXUALIZATION AND OBJECTIFICATION OF CSUS WOMEN

The structural sexism pervasive at CSUS in the 1970s hindered women’s ability to achieve their academic and employment goals. Sexist practices and customs created a complex web that strengthened the university’s patriarchal hierarchy, reinforced the assumption of female inferiority, and objectified women. The entrenched nature of sexism at CSUS made it difficult for feminist activists to dismantle. In response, feminist activists including Caucus members and others challenged three commonly held sexist beliefs on campus. First, they sought to end the idea that women are objects existing to fulfill men’s sexual desires. Second, the women argued that female students did not want the sexual attention given to them by male professors. Finally, they denounced the idea that women fantasized about rape. These three ideas, feminists argued, created a culture on campus that implicitly and explicitly accepted sexual harassment and violence against women. The fight to end the sexual objectification and harassment at CSUS manifested in strong pushes to make administrators address the objectification of women on campus, confront male professors who abused their power and exploited female students, and increase campus safety so that women could participate in university activities without fear. The women’s fight with the administration exposed a deeper issue within the university—that men on campus perceived women students and employees as objects meant to please them either sexually and aesthetically.
"Making the Absurdities Blatant"186

In September 1968, the New York Radical Women’s group publically protested the Miss America Pageant.187 The activists argued that the pageant judged contestants based on artificial standards that dehumanized and objectified women.188 Three years later the Women’s Caucus at CSUS led a similar protest against the university’s customary Homecoming and Camellia Queen Contests. Like women activists at the national protest, CSUS Caucus members maintained that the pageants sexualized women and promulgated the notion that “a woman’s only value is in the pleasure her body can give to men.”189 Contending that beauty contests negatively affected women, activists urged administrators to end such contests on campus.190

The Caucus’s protest mirrored the 1968 demonstration against the Miss America Pageant. Caucus members, like the national activists, used abrasive language and flamboyant actions. One CSUS student, Cherie Gordon, argued that during pageant festivities women’s loins, legs, and about everything except livers and bladders were surveyed by a team of carnal analysts who carefully examined the products before arriving at their decision of ... who has the shapeliest ass of the herd .... women appeared like ‘calfers’ were of service only to the bulls, for it is the calfer’s role to display and the bull’s role to play.191
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Likening beauty pageants to meat markets, using vulgar descriptions shocked pageant supporters, but did little to change their minds. Dick Laverne, CSUS student and Hornet staff member agreed that the “Homecoming queens are exploited for their flesh”; however, he used the feminist argument that the choice to participate belonged to the individual woman to justify the tradition's continuation. Similarly, Interfraternity Council Member, Bill Woods confessed that he viewed the pageants as “an organized form of girl watching.” Pageant supporters, aware that the contest sexualized women, disregarded any negative consequences of continuing the customary event. After verbal protests failed, Caucus members organized a demonstration to be held during the Homecoming Queen pageant.

In an attempt to “make the absurdities blatant,” Caucus members called for a “pinch-in.” Activists held their protest during the homecoming game in October 1971, calling it “sensitivity training” for men who perpetuate the meat parade.” Caucus members pinched the butts of male escorts and judges at the homecoming pageant. Turning the tables on the men, the women made them the contestants, the objects of the evening’s affair. The women sent a message to the men on campus their “ceremonies of supremacy,” would no longer be quietly accepted. The “pinch-in” drew sharp criticism,
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including Homecoming Chairman Larry Dale Miles who attempted to discredit the protests and called the women’s actions “immature” and “frivolous.”\textsuperscript{197} The reactions of men and women on campus against the pinch-in highlights the challenge activists faced in attempts to expose how traditionally held events and ideas reinforced the objectification of women. Caucus members intended to shock and enlighten pageant supporters by redirecting the sexual objectification normally forced upon the female contestants to the male participants. However, like the national Miss America Pageant protests, proponents of the events focused on the protestors’ actions and ignored their political message.

The pinch-in uncovered deeply held gendered perceptions about what it meant to be a woman. Pageant supporters, including fraternity members, professors, and others attacked the Caucus members’ acts. Proponents of the event claimed the women’s actions were “unbecoming to a member of their sex.”\textsuperscript{198} Those angered by the protests challenged the activists’ womanhood. Caucus members quickly realized that speaking out against sexist traditions broke the gender constraint of “remain[ing] a lady at all times.”\textsuperscript{199} The feminist activists responded by stretching the boundaries of dissent further and increased their use of aggressive language. Pushing back they sarcastically countered, “If one desires a concession from one’s Oppressor, one must go through proper channels of supplication so as to avoid any interference that you are demanding.

\begin{itemize}
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human rights from the son of a bitch, rather than beseeching, as required . . . If all else fails . . . Pinch said Ass, but tastefully please!²⁰⁰ Though many campus members denounced the protest, many students, faculty and staff supported the Caucus’s actions.

Caucus’ members had a strong ally on their side in State Hornet editor, Scott Burns. Prior to Homecoming night, Burns used his editorial powers to limit the exposure given to the contests in The State Hornet.²⁰¹ Then, following the pinch-in, Burns ran a full-page cover spread with the intent to make men experience the sexual objectification generally directed towards women. The cover pictured a photograph of him wearing only boxers and announced a “stud contest.”²⁰² The mock-contest had three requirements “(1) Minimum Age- Wet dreams; (2) Minimum Sex- Must be, of course; (3) Must submit recent testimonial to virility and clinical report on sperm count.”²⁰³ The hyper-sexualized language provoked a response from campus members. One objection came from Hornet staffer, Chuck Woodbury, who called Burns’s editorial a “disgrace to ‘MANHOOD,” though Woodbury may have intended for the words to read in a flippant tone they added to the trivialization of Burns’s and the Caucus’s efforts.²⁰⁴ Homecoming Chairman Miles also dismissed the political message of Burns’s spread. He argued that the female contestants did not have to provide their “menstrual cycle, sexual drives, and

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Miles to editor, State Hornet, October 29, 1971.


availability," therefore, the mock-contest that requested the men’s "sperm count, minimum sex, etc.," did not equally compare. Miles, like many supporters of the beauty pageant, failed to recognize that pageant judges who evaluated contestants on the basis of their looks, were also assessing a woman's worth based on her perceived sexuality, just as Burns attempted to convey in the mock-contest. Like Miles, many campus members did not comprehend the larger consequences of beauty contests at CSUS. The protestors unsuccessfully articulated the social and cultural ramifications of the beauty pageants. Instead, through newspaper editorials and campus forums students and campus employees debated the methods of protests used and not the danger of continuing sexist traditions that objectified women.

Unable to change popular opinion through demonstrations, Caucus members made an appeal to the university's Student Affairs Committee (SAC). After a debate, the committee passed a resolution that endorsed a ban of beauty pageants on campus.205 Once formally passed by students, the resolutions went to the Faculty Senate where members supported the student’s resolution by a vote of 27-10. The Faculty Senate’s vote and the resolution passed by the SAC prompted CSUS President Bernard Hyink to officially ban beauty contests on campus on February 7, 1972.206 The "pinch-in" and editorial drew awareness to the Caucus’s cause by turning the tables on male supporters of the contests, making them the objects of sexual scrutiny and the women the objectifiers. By forcing men and women to confront the double standard of objectification the women forced the
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university to end the campus tradition. Though their efforts led to the demise of pageants on campus, they failed to fully impart their message about the practice's broader social and cultural ramifications. The Women's Caucus failed to adequately establish how the pageants tacitly reinforced patterns of sexual harassment between male professors and female students at CSUS.

“A for a Lay:” Confronting the Sexual Exploitation of Female Students

In 1973, women activists at CSUS confronted male professors who harassed female students. While the term “sexual harassment” did not exist until 1975, when a group of women at Cornell University coined the term, the harassment of female students by male professors had been traditionally accepted at CSUS as normal behavior long before the terms existence. Theresa Corrigan recounts being sexually harassed by a male professor while pursuing her master’s degree at CSUS in the early 1970s. She states that the professor proposed a special arrangement when she missed a class and offered her an A in exchange for sex. She denied his requests and he dropped the matter, but she and other women on campus contended that professors frequently proposed similar arrangements prior to the women’s movement. Before the movement began, female students feared speaking out against the professors. Women worried that publically denouncing the harassment would harm their grade and accepted the unwanted attention
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The male administrators did not take disciplinary actions against professors who abused their power in the professor-student relationship, which implicitly supported sexual harassment. CSUS administrators and department heads viewed the sexual relationships between instructors and students as a private matter that concerned only the parties involved. Administrators accepted the sexual relationships as part of the university's culture, either ignoring or unable to recognize that male professors pressured the majority of women into the relationship. Frustrated with the status quo on campus, the Women's Caucus exposed the exploitation and made the once private issue public.

Caucus members used guerilla theater to make the professors' unwanted sexual advances public knowledge. Nationally, feminist activists engaged in guerilla theater demonstrations throughout the women's movement to draw public awareness to issues deemed private. The protests shocked unsuspecting bystanders through flagrant displays of dissent. On Halloween 1973, women at CSUS participated in a guerilla theater demonstration; that evening the women's actions commanded the attention of anyone who happened to be on campus. A handful of Caucus members, angered by the administrators who continually ignored the exploitation of female students protested, and no longer caring about the opinions of other campus members donned flagrant costumes. Wagner remembers that "Viola Weinberg wore a 12-inch dildo on her head, Claudia Viera and a second woman dressed up as Siamese twins wearing Weinberg's bra on their

heads." The women, Wagner states, "acted so outrageously making hexes on the doors of the university's worst offenders." The women, she argued decided to "hold the men accountable if the administration wouldn't... We blew keeping things quiet out of the water." Their actions brought public attention to the issue that campus administrators argued was a private matter between a professor and his student. Leading up to the protest, female students forced into sexual relationships began to slowly realize the commonality of their experience, that they did nothing to deserve the unwanted relationship, and that they had the right to attend classes without fearing harassment. Publicizing the issue, Caucus members forced university administrators to acknowledge the mistreatment of students.

The following month, the issue of sexual harassment at CSUS went statewide. On November 1, 1963, six women from CSUS testified at a Joint Legislative Committee on Legal Equality hearing on November 1, 1973. The women attended the hearing at the request of State Senator Mervyn Dymally, who wanted to reveal the systems of sexual discrimination present at many Californian universities. Christine Sullivan, a CSUS senior, disclosed an unspoken grading policy that women referred to as an "A for a lay." She testified that male professors offered female students "a good grade for little or no
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work in exchange for sex," and if a student declined the professor's proposal Sullivan states that she was required to work even harder to earn a good grade. 217 During her testimony Sullivan recounted her personal experience with harassment. She described how a male professor asked to meet outside of class to discuss a class project. Sullivan agreed to the meeting, and stated that the initial discussion focused on the class, but that the topic changed quickly and he asked her to stay the night with him, directly soliciting her for sex. 218 When she refused, he forced her to work harder to pass the class. Sullivan credited the women's movement on campus for creating a safe place for women to discuss their experiences, which eased the fear women felt about speaking out against the professors. The hearings officially unclotted the predatory practices of male professors. They also exposed the prevalence of sexual harassment at universities throughout California. After the hearings, the administration had no option except to respond to the women's charges.

CSUS administrators denounced the women's allegations. President James Bond condemned the accusation that professors offered good grades to students in exchange for sexual favors, calling it “outlandish,” and unsubstantiated. 219 However, in a Sacramento Bee interview, a previous Communications Depart Chair, Albert Kowitz, inadvertently validated the women's claims when he stated, “it is totally inconceivable . . . except for
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one or two of our professors. In his attempt to defend the moral integrity of the university’s Communications Department, Kowitz substantiated the validity of the unspoken grading policy “A for a lay,” with his admission that at least one or two professors harassed their students. Regardless of his concession, the administration continued to deny the charges of sexual misconduct. Even when publicly unmasked the administration continued to keep student’s charges “hush,” until officially forced by Office of the Chancellor.

Feminists on campus succeeded in exposing the once private issue into the public sphere. When the term sexual harassment entered national dialogue in the mid to late-seventies university administrators felt increasing pressure to acknowledge the problem. In the late 1970s, CSUS staff and faculty formed committees and drafted policies meant to halt sexual misconduct. The new policies established formal guidelines against sexual harassment and mandated sexual harassment training for university employees that later expanded statewide. As more women spoke out against professors who abused their power, the campus’s culture began to slowly change, and sexual relationships between professors and their students were no longer quietly swept under the rug. The predatory behavior that was implicitly accepted as commonplace in the university could no longer quietly exist. Members of the Women’s Caucus and students who bravely stood up to the professors and administration reclaimed power over their bodies and academic experience, allowing female students to attend classes without fear of exploitation. While
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incidents of sexual harassment discussed in the 1970s were largely identified as a heterosexual issue, it also affected gay and lesbian politics on campus.

The prevalence of sexual harassment revealed blatant discrimination against LGBTQ professors. Upon completing her master’s degree, the English Department offered Theresa Corrigan a teaching assistant position. Though out as a lesbian, Corrigan had not made her sexual identity explicitly known to the English Department hiring committee. Corrigan, a feminist and gay rights activist, participated in the gay and lesbian liberation movement that grew in the 1970s. Prior to the job offer, Corrigan delivered speeches and attended conferences on homosexuality that identified issues specifically facing Sacramento’s gay community. In 1973, students aware of Corrigan’s sexuality approached her and begged her to teach the Women’s Studies course “Society of Women,” a name used to hide the class’s true focus, the study of lesbianism. The previous instructor could no longer teach the class and if the position went unfilled the Women’s Studies Board would have to cancel it. Corrigan had denied multiple requests from the Women’s Studies Board to teach for the program but understanding the course’s importance, the student’s pleas changed her mind. The Board agreed to let Corrigan teach the course and Ellen Rosser Smith, the CSUS faculty member who acted as the official representative of the program, submitted their request to the dean of the department who approved her appointment.

However, Corrigan’s appointment to the position rested on two conditions. First, the Women’s Studies Board required Corrigan to co-teach the course with a Women’s Studies student. No other instructor had been required to co-teach their courses, exposing
the underlying homophobia of some women activists on campus. The second stipulation came from the administration. Corrigan could teach the course, but only if she signed a waiver stating she would not seduce her female students. Infuriated, Corrigan refused to sign and she fought back with the help of an openly male gay professor. The dean eventually relented and Corrigan taught the class without signing a waiver. The request illuminates a double standard held by the administration. Corrigan, who had no intention to use her power as a professor to engage in a sexual relationship with a student was asked to sign a waiver. However, university administrators never required male professors, who they knew sexually harassed female students to sign such a form. Both stipulations expose the underlying unfair treatment of lesbian instructors present in the 1970s. Furthermore, they highlight the dissension that existed between lesbian feminists and heterosexual feminists who required Corrigan to teach the course with a heterosexual assistant. Her experience demonstrated the challenges and discrimination lesbian women encountered, even within a feminist movement that fought for women’s equality, and when many lesbians were doing much of the work as activists.

“Wake Up Sleeping Beauty: Chances are One in Three You’ll be Raped”

In the Seventies, the women’s movement transformed how American society viewed and treated the issue of rape. In 1971, Susan Griffin wrote an article for *Ramparts* magazine titled, “Rape: The All-American Crime.” In which she argued that rape is a

222 “Wake Up Sleeping Beauty: Chances are One in Three You’ll be Raped,” *State Hornet*, March 26, 1974

crime meant to dominate and violently exert control over women’s bodies—that it is a political act of power, not a crime of lust perpetrated by sexually deviant members of society. 224 Though others before her, such as Kate Millet, raised the issue of rape, Griffin’s article further articulated how the fear of rape stopped women from reaching their full potential and participating in multiple facets of society. 225 She challenges the idea that rape is simply a part of human nature and posits that the threat of rape undermines a woman’s ability to move freely, both physically on the streets and figuratively in society. Women, she argues, are taught to fear the threat of sexual violence from a young age; thus, hindering their autonomy and freedom to pursue opportunities in areas such as education and employment.

“The All-American Crime” and other similar works sparked the anti-rape movement. Declaring rape a political act, activists initiated consciousness raising efforts to educate and draw attention to the serious threat it posed to women. “The All-American Crime” led to the first of many speak-outs that publically unmasked the substantial numbers of women who were sexually assaulted; discrediting the commonly held notion that rape was an uncommon event. 226 In 1975, Susan Brownmiller’s Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape struck a chord with women nationwide. Her pivotal work expounds on the history of rape and demonstrates the ubiquity of rape by exposing the
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existence of rape and sexual violence in cultures and events throughout history. Moreover, she conurs with Griffin and Millet that men use sexual violence and the threat of rape to dominate women. Feminist efforts successfully redefined rape as a crime about power and not sexual deviancy, as a violent act that reinforced patriarchal systems and restricted women’s mobility. Brownmiller forced rape into national dialogue and challenged women and men nationwide to “deny it a future.”

Mirroring the national trend, feminist activists at CSUS participated in anti-rape efforts. The Women’s Caucus and Women’s Advocate Kathy Barry, engaged in consciousness raising efforts, including formal forums, debates, and informal rap sessions on campus, to educate campus members on the prevalence and realities of rape. Activists on campus demanded that university administrators increase campus security to provide female students and employees with the same access to social and scholastic mobility as men. Finally, some campus activists took the fight off campus. Sally Wagner led rape symposiums at other college campuses and community events; Barry testified at legislative hearings to press for new state laws, and Corrigan and other CSUS community members worked within the Sacramento community to establish the Sacramento Rape Crisis Center (SRCC) and change local law enforcement protocols. When rape posed a threat to women at CSUS the administration either completely disregarded it or reluctantly responded to the women’s calls for action. Administrators did not take
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tangible steps, such as improving campus lighting or increasing the presence of campus security, to stem the increasing numbers of sexual assaults. The inaction of administrators reinforced structural sexism at the university. Men at CSUS, not all, but many believed that they could continue to trivialize the women’s demands. However, like women activists proved in their fight for equality in employment and their demands for an education designed by and created for women, they would not be quieted by the administration. Women activists at CSUS made lasting changes to how issues of sexual assault are handled both on the university campus and within the state.

In January 1972, the first official rape symposium held at CSUS took place one year after the first national "speak-out." In a Hornet editorial, CSUS Debate Team members Ken O’Brien and Michael Dues, publically challenged the feminist stance that rape was a political act. The men argued that “women are too involved with the act to remain truly objective.” The statement incensed many campus members, and “concerned men and women” organized the campus’s first symposium. Over 150 men and women filled the room in attendance of the inaugural event led by Sally Wagner and self-defense instructor Sandi Warden. Over the course of the week participants attended group meetings which included presentations from the Sacramento Police Department, a self-defense clinic, and a session led by men to instruct other men on how
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to help female victims assaulted by other men. The early consciousness raising efforts of feminist activists went uncontested and sparked the interest of students on campus, including many men, who attended the symposium. More importantly, the first symposium initiated a community dialogue that began to transform how people viewed sexual violence against women at CSUS.

Following the rape symposium, Caucus members drew attention to the instances of sexual assaults at local college campuses. In June 1972, Karen McKenzie, a student reporter for The State Hornet, wrote an article titled "The All-American Crime." In addition to using the title of Griffin's article, she made the same argument, but she addressed the issue on a local level. McKenzie noted that a high number of sexual assaults occurred at a nearby community college, Sacramento City College (SCC), reporting that eleven rapes had been reported within the period of three months. McKenzie stated that while no rapes had been reported at CSUS, two reports of indecent exposure and one report of a man in a women's restroom had been reported to campus security. Furthermore, McKenzie condemned the myths associated with rape. She criticized the idea that "women secretly desire to be raped," and the manner in which victims are blamed for their attack because of the "clothes she wore or a gesture she made." Her article reflected the growing awareness among campus members
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concerned with the issue of rape. Soon after the article, the Women’s Caucus and the Women’s Advocate Office protested the lack of campus security that threatened the safety of women on campus.

In 1972, the rate of sexual assaults, on- campus and off, increased. During that year, eighty rapes had been reported in Sacramento County. At CSUS, in 1973, three incidents of sexual assaults occurred between January and February, in January alone fifty men had been caught hiding in bushes near the dorms, and two sexual assaults were reported during the fall semester. In response to the growing threat, Women’s Advocate, Kathleen Barry, submitted the “Preliminary Report on the Physical Safety of Women at California State University, Sacramento” to campus administrators on March 29, 1973. The report, created by Barry and Caucus members, demanded that the administration take serious steps to stem violence against women at CSUS. Reflecting the stance of anti-rape activists nationally, Barry contended that threats of physical violence against women were “the single most factor which hinders and limits the physical activity of women.” In response to the growing threat of violence, female students began to drop evening classes and became increasingly reluctant to attend social events held in the evening. The fear female students and employees felt, Barry and
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Caucus members argued, restricted them from participating in campus events, a limitation not imposed on male students.  

The report proposed suggestions to reduce instances of sexual violence on campus. Barry worked with faculty, staff, students, and Caucus members to assess security issues. The report contained seemingly obvious fixes, like increased lighting and trimming trees and overgrowth and called for campus security to add two positions, filled by women, to patrol the campus. Barry also petitioned that she be allowed to coordinate campus patrols by work study students in the evening, and that instructors of evening classes remind students to contact the security office if they feel unsafe. Finally, the report asked for an increased amount of self-defense classes and rape symposiums. Barry boldly concluded the report with charges that university administrators had clearly disregarded the physical safety of women on campus.

Submitted in spring 1973, campus administrators did not formally respond to the report on campus safety until August 1973. In a letter to Barry, CSUS Vice President Darrell Inabit outlined the steps taken in response to the proposal. He stated that the university intended to make efforts to hire female security officers and that the security office changed campus procedures allowing security officers to increase the number of nightly patrols. Responding to requests to improve campus lighting, he affirmed that more lighting fixtures would be installed as new buildings and temporary parking lots

---

242 Ibid.
243 Ibid.
244 Ibid.
become permanent. However, the administration denied the request to leave lights on in buildings in order to illuminate areas outside, citing the environmental need to conserve energy. Additionally, the administrators argued that trimming shrubbery only happened at the recommendation of the Consulting Landscape Architect in order to remain "within aesthetic boundaries." Inabit's response revealed that little had been done, (or was planned to be done) to increase campus security.

A month later, Barry responded to Inabit's letter. She argued that the inaction of the administrators "suggests a tremendous lack of concern for the problems of women." She maintained that by giving priority to the completion of new parking lots, over the safety concerns for women on campus, validated charges of negligence against the administration. She referenced two sexual assaults that occurred in the residence halls that fall semester to illustrate the pressing need for increased safety measures. Barry countered Inabit's claim that turning off lights at night was a necessary response to an environmental crisis. Instead, she argued that the administrations preferential treatment of environmental concerns over the safety of women "suggests that it is perfectly acceptable to allow conditions to exist which limit the evening activity of women." Furthermore, she condemned Inabit's response that the campus's appearance took priority over campus security, positing that "Ground cover is necessary not only for birds and small animals..."
but also for larger animals such as are found occasionally around residence halls and on campus known as peeping toms, exhibitionists, and rapists!\textsuperscript{248} She concluded her response with a demand that the administration review their actions and come back with a more acceptable response. Similar to when women demanded equitable employment practices, inclusion within university curriculum, and for the university to curb sexual misconduct, the deficient response to increase campus security validated the women’s claims that the men did not value them as members of the university. The male administrators repeatedly refused to recognize that the needs of women on campus mattered until pressed to do so. An attempted sexual attack on campus the following year further exposed deficiencies in campus policies.

On February 6, 1974, a man attacked a woman in a campus bathroom.\textsuperscript{249} Unbeknownst to the assailant the woman he assaulted, Midge Marino was the self-defense instructor. When he entered the restroom she acknowledged him and asked if he was “looking for someone,” he responded with an “obscene comment” and threw his jacket over the stall’s door covering her head.\textsuperscript{250} Marino used the methods she taught in her self-defense courses to fight back. She pushed the door open forcefully, slammed him against the wall, and hit him repeatedly. Breaking away from her grasp he ran toward the Guy West Bridge, Marino chased after him and caught him as he approached the bridge.
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A police officer who happened to be nearby quickly arrested him. The consequent response of campus administrators and the security department enraged CSUS women and initiated protests led by the Women's Caucus and Barry.

Upon the arrest of the attacker, the police and campus security admitted that they knew about the existence of a sexual predator on campus. Prior to the assault against Marino, a man using the same modus operandi attacked two women in the same bathroom. Campus officials did not make the information public and cited the need to keep the criminal's methods secret. CSUS's Chief of Security, Donald Yelverton, reasoned that publicizing the incidents would lead the attacker to alter his behavior making him harder to apprehend. Women on campus challenged the department's explanation stating that it ignored women's safety. Barry and Caucus members countered, arguing that the university kept the matter quiet because the administration feared that announcing the incidents would damage the university's reputation. The women viewed the policy as just one more manner in which the university neglected the safety of its female students and employees.

Immediately the women protested campus procedures. Infuriated, Barry stated, "We can no longer accept the phony pedestal image of protected women," contending that the administration had no intention of protecting women; and, that the attacks on
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campus proved they did not. The Campus Safety Report submitted in 1973 highlighted many places on campus where women remained vulnerable to physical attacks. The report proposed steps that if implemented could increase campus security and in turn would allow women to participate fully in campus activities. Publicly the administration maintained it took proactive measures to secure the campus. However, the dismissive manner in which the administration responded to the Campus Safety Report gave evidence that women’s safety remained a low priority. Vice President Inabit’s response to Barry indicated that administrators placed a higher importance on campus aesthetics and energy consumption than it did on women’s safety. Likewise, Yelverton disclosed that the security department allocated 40 percent of the security department’s manpower to parking enforcement, and even in the aftermath of physical assaults on campus they refused to reduce that number in order to increase safety patrols. His admission demonstrated that parking issues superseded university’s concerns about women’s safety. The administration’s continued refusal to respond to the activists request reflected a campus culture that in practice did not value its women.

Barry and other women active in the women’s movement decided to take matters into their own hands. Using the Women’s Studies program, the women organized a class focused solely on making the campus safer for women. Students attending the “Women’s Movement, Advance Theories and Practices” course brainstormed ideas about how to increase security. The policy that restricted publically disseminating information about
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attacks to members of campus remained a major point of contention. The female students and the course instructors contended that not releasing information about attacks left women vulnerable. In response, the women submitted a petition to the Dean of Students and the Chief of Security. Signed by eighty staff women, the petition demanded that the university announce incidents of violence to women on campus. If made public, women on campus could protect themselves against possible attacks. Duane Spilsbury, a professor in the Journalism Department, concurred that incidents needed to be publically announced. He agreed to work with Caucus members and any other woman to transmit reports of violence on campus in news bulletins submitted to the local media. The university failed to respond to the Caucus members and their supporters' demands for increased safety. The informal network used *Hornet* articles and CSUS employee bulletins to publicize instances of sexual assault, formed groups that patrolled campus in the evening, and continued to educate women and men on the dangers women faced.

**Beyond the University: CSUS Women Activism off Campus**

The influence of women activists at CSUS extended beyond the confines of the university. In addition to her work on campus, Sally Wagner led consciousness raising efforts in Sacramento to educate the community on the issue of sexual violence. In early 1973, Wagner chaired a panel that examined rape laws and legal procedures at McGeorge Law School. In a manner similar to CSUS's rape symposiums, the event attended by students and non-campus members, included speeches by representatives from the District Attorney’s office, Sacramento Law Enforcement agencies, Public Defender’s
Office, and two rape victims. Wagner knew that drawing attention to issue on other campuses and to the larger Sacramento community benefitted women.

In consciousness raising efforts off campus, CSUS activists worked within the political system to effect change. Barry spent countless hours pushing for legislative reform and lobbied the California state legislature to address outdated rape laws. Barry's efforts are included within a movement led by many anti-rape activists in California, who alongside activists in Michigan, Iowa, Washington, and New York, championed the anti-rape movement. In 1974, Barry actively demanded that the state change laws that discouraged women from reporting incidents of sexual violence to legal authorities. She attended and participated in a California State Legislature debate over two key-legislations, each proposed to end the use of a woman's sexual history in rape trials. The first, Senate Bill 1678, known as the Robbins Bill, sponsored by State Senator Alan Robbins, prohibited the courts from using a victim's sexual history during trial. The second option presented to the California Senate was a series of Assembly bills, known collectively as the "Sieroty Package." Included in the Sieroty Package, Assembly Bill 3661 allowed the defense to request a video recorded hearing, at which a judge decided whether a woman's sexual past could be used as evidence during trial. Barry urged the state Senate to pass the Robbins Bill, and believed that AB 3661 as written left rape victims vulnerable to the "humiliation, invasion of privacy and psychological persecution


of a rape trial twice. She argued that judges had no objective methods to assess the validity of admitting a women's history into evidence. She asserted that "sexist assumptions about female sexuality" influenced the judges' decision-making process and negatively affected the female victim. Ultimately, the Senate voted twenty-five to one in favor of the Robbins Bill. Members of the state legislature credited the bill's passing to work of anti-rape activists within the women's movement. Barry's testimony, along with the efforts of other activists, changed state laws and paved a path for changes in other states.

Theresa Corrigan, like Wagner and Barry, participated in the anti-rape movement off campus. In the early-to mid-1970s rape crisis centers opened throughout the United States. As activists stepped up consciousness raising efforts and women increasingly spoke out about their experiences with rape, the anti-rape movement gained traction and crisis centers filled a void within local communities. Corrigan led a grassroots movement in Sacramento to create a rape crisis center. Opening in late 1974, the Sacramento Rape Crisis Center (SRCC) was a joint effort between two groups: Sacramento Women Against Rape (SWAR) and the Sacramento Women's Center (SWC). Prior to the opening of the SRCC, victims of sexual assault had limited access to resources that
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helped them effectively handle the emotional and physical distress they experienced. Furthermore, those who pursued legal action often had little or no support in navigating the legal system. Anti-rape activists formed the centers to compensate for the lack of formal support and services available to women. From its inception, the SRCC provided women with a safe place to obtain counseling and legal referrals, offered self-defense workshops, and its members participated in community events and rape educational campaigns. As a SRCC staff member from 1975-1980, Corrigan worked locally with the Sacramento Police Department and Sheriff’s Office to change law enforcement protocols. One important protocol change, she noted, required law enforcement to provide victims giving their statements with a private room and mandated that when possible, a female officer lead the interview. Previously, law officials interviewed rape victims in public areas that allowed anyone nearby to hear the women’s statements, which infringed upon the victims privacy and subjected them to further humiliation. Corrigan and other SRCC members challenged the legal procedures that subjected rape victims to further physical and emotional harm. In addition to advocating for victims’ rights, the SRCC made counseling and legal services accessible to rape victims and established a twenty-four hour hotline available to women who had been raped or assaulted. Corrigan’s activism, in conjunction with SWAR and SWC, resulted in the establishment of the SRCC and helped countless women navigate a confusing and traumatic ordeal.

263 SRCC Pamphlet
Conclusion

In the early 1970s, the women's movement challenged the culture of sexism and objectification at CSUS. Activists worked diligently to expose how deep-rooted sexist ideas and behaviors influenced campus traditions and policies, and ultimately harmed women students and employees. Women students and employees confronted three commonly held sexist beliefs: women are sexual objects, women desired the sexual attention given to them by male professors, and that women secretly wanted or in some way consented to sexual assaults. Activists who participated in demonstrations and protests, as well as utilized official channels to demand change, weakened the existence of sexism embedded in the university's culture; however, while the women succeeded in some areas, they failed in others.

The Women's Caucus' "pinch-in" caused the university to ban beauty contests on campus. Additionally, the Caucus and the six women who testified at the Joint Legislative Hearing brought attention to the sexual exploitation of female students by male professors, known as the "A for a Lay" grading policy. Women's Advocate Kathleen Barry, Caucus members, and Women's Studies students exposed the physical danger women on campus faced. Caucus members and students assisted Barry to submit a formal Campus Safety Report to university administrators. The report outlined unsafe areas on campus and provided possible solutions to increase campus security. But university administrators failed to act on the proposals. The inadequate response mirrored the administrators' response to previous requests made by CSUS women. Unless forced, administrators often ignored the women's demands.
Feminist activism, during the 1970s, changed how the university perceived female students and employees. The protests and demands that reverberated loudly across campus pushed university administrators to recognize the unique challenges women on campus faced. Those identified as labor feminists understood how the unfair maternity policies negatively affect female employees who wanted to continue working after the delivery of their child, and especially those whose economic situations dictated that they remain in the workforce. The women used campus committees to initiate and implement changes in the employment policy that increased women's autonomy over their decision return to work. Likewise, labor and liberal feminists fought for the creation of an on-site child care center. Activists argued that the center not only provided a much needed service to female students and employees, it also allowed women to participate in feminist activism. Child care resources on campus helped eased challenges that once hampered women from achieving their academic and employment goals.

The Women's Caucus exposed multiples ways that structural sexism reinforced patriarchal structures at CSUS. Caucus members challenged sexist ideology that dominated employment practices and treated women as second-class workers. Through the HEW class action complaint, the women forced university administrators to address issues of pay inequality, discrepancies in classification between male and female employees, and unfair tenure and promotional practices that hindered women.
Furthermore, Caucus members confronted the university traditions and customary 
practices that objectified and sexualized women. The Caucus led “pinch-in” of 1971, and 
the support of others, such as Scott Burns, led the university to ban the traditional 
homecoming queen and Camelia Beauty Pageants. Likewise, feminist activists exposed 
what was called an “A for a lay” grading policy that exploited female students. Anti-rape 
activists pushed for safer campus conditions as well as participated in self-defense 
practices and led important changes outside of the university. CSUS women spearheaded 
community efforts to educate members of larger Sacramento community, pressured state 
legislature members to reform rape laws that punished female rape victims, and 
established the Sacramento Rape Crisis Center.

While gender-based inequalities still exist today on campus, female students and 
employees enjoy increased safety and academic freedom. Women can now earn an 
interdisciplinary bachelor’s degree in Women’s Studies, a program that faced an uphill 
battle in its creation. Women are now included within academic studies, and a department 
founded on feminist ideologies and devoted solely to the study of women exists on 
campus. Caucus members forced the academic community to recognize the presence of 
women in the university and to acknowledge the significant historical contributions that 
women have made and continue to make in academic institutions.

Though sexual violence still poses a threat to women on campus, changes in 
policies and physical changes to the campus allow women increased mobility to 
participate in campus activities. Policies are now in place that publicize incidents of 
sexual assault that occur on campus and in nearby communities. However, the need for a
reporting system highlights that women are still vulnerable to sexual assaults on campus. Men continue to assert dominance on women through acts of sexual aggression. But, the efforts of feminists and anti-rape activists help women to navigate the aftermath of attacks. The university has established anti-sexual harassment policies, counseling services for victims of sexual assault, and requires new students to pass an anti-rape program online. Furthermore, the efforts of anti-rape activists led to important reforms in outdated laws that in practice placed the past sexual conduct of female victims on trial and ignored the actions of the aggressor. The Robbins Rape Bill championed by Barry, and gave rise to a host of “rape shield” laws, changed court procedures and banned the defense from using a woman’s sexual history as evidence during a court trials.

Today women account for the majority of the student base at CSUS. In 2015, 56 percent of all students were women, and they make-up 66 percent of graduate students. Likewise, the number of women faculty has increased to 48 percent.265 Though men still outnumber women in majors traditionally viewed as men’s work, women have increased their presence in fields such as mathematics and engineering. Additionally, great strides have been made in the fields of criminal justice and business, as women now account for almost half of the major’s student base.266 While much work is left to be done, feminist activism in the 1970s played an integral role in forging a path for women to break into male dominated fields.


266 CSUS, “Fact Book” 2015.
Women at CSUS had always been important members of the university community but paternalistic hierarchies that dominated academia silenced their voices and ignored their contributions. The feminist activism of the Seventies confronted the structural sexism deeply rooted in the campus culture. From its inception in 1969, the Women's Caucus spearheaded the movement for women's equality on campus. The ways in which feminist activists transformed the university are now so engrained in the campus life, that it is almost impossible to envision a time when things were different. Sexual harassment is no longer a quiet tradition and women no longer accept it as something that is simply part of the educational experience. Women are part of the university curriculum and for the most part are valued members of the university. The child care center is highly regarded within the Sacramento community and children of employees and students are regular participants at university events. The efforts of liberal, labor, academic and anti-rape activists altered the university's landscape, leaving prior structures unrecognizable to future generations of women. Women in academics are now viewed as legitimate members of the university and enjoy a mobility denied to women in previous generations.
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