

257

the Effective Use of Womanpower

*Report of the
Conference—
March 10 and 11, 1955*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
James P. Mitchell, *Secretary*

WOMEN'S BUREAU
Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, *Director*

Bulletin 257

the Effective Use of Womanpower

*Report of the
Conference—
March 10 and 11, 1955*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James P. Mitchell, *Secretary*

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, *Director*

Women's Bureau Bulletin No. 257

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Foreword..... | v |
| MARCH 10, MORNING SESSION | |
| Welcome, by Mrs. Alice K. Leopold..... | 1 |
| Today's Challenge, by The Honorable James P. Mitchell..... | 2 |
| Horizons for Women—Panel | |
| Leo H. Bartemeier, M. D..... | 5 |
| Florence R. Kluckhohn, Ph. D..... | 10 |
| Marie Jahoda, Ph. D..... | 19 |
| Question period..... | 22 |
| MARCH 10, AFTERNOON SESSION | |
| The Woman Who Works—Panel Discussion..... | 26 |
| Winifred G. Helmes, <i>Presiding</i> | |
| Mrs. Gertrude G. Michelson, <i>Moderator</i> | |
| Virgil Martin | |
| Peter Henle | |
| James T. O'Connell | |
| Anne Gary Pannell, Ph. D. | |
| Mrs. Helen Berthelot | |
| Miss Louise Watson | |
| MARCH 10, EVENING SESSION | |
| An Address by The Honorable Arthur Larson..... | 48 |
| Question period..... | 60 |
| MARCH 11, MORNING SESSION | |
| Shortage Occupations: New Opportunities for Women—Panel | |
| Eli Ginzberg, Ph. D., <i>Moderator</i> | 63 |
| Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff..... | 66 |
| Irving H. Siegel, Ph. D..... | 69 |
| Roland R. Renne, Ph. D..... | 72 |
| Mirra Komarovsky, Ph. D..... | 76 |
| MARCH 11, AFTERNOON SESSION | |
| Mrs. Frances M. Lee, Introducing Mrs. Chaves..... | 81 |
| Welcome, by Mrs. Maria Concepcion de Chaves..... | 81 |
| Women in Today's World—Panel..... | 83 |
| Mrs. Elizabeth S. Carpenter, <i>Moderator</i> | |
| Olga Monsani, LL. B. | |
| Georgette Barbizet, LL. B. | |
| The Honorable Frances P. Bolton | |
| Susan B. Riley, Ph. D. | |
| The Status of Women Around the World, by Mrs. Lorena Hahn..... | 93 |
| Closing remarks, by Mrs. Alice K. Leopold..... | 99 |

APPENDIX

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Program..... | 100 |
| Biographies of speakers..... | 103 |
| List of organizations represented..... | 110 |

Foreword

The program of the Conference on the Effective Use of Womanpower, reported here, was planned to give an up-to-date summary of trends and directions in which our economy is moving, with particular reference to women's place in that economy. Held on March 10 and 11, 1955, in Washington, D. C., the conference brought together approximately 600 persons representing women's national organizations, civic and professional groups, labor and management groups, and our own and other governments.

We are indebted to the men and women, each outstanding in his or her particular field, who brought us their own sincere and challenging viewpoints. In response to numerous requests for this information, research, and individual opinion, we have reproduced the contributions as fully as space permits, rather than summarizing them.

At the conference, those things which women consider most important in their working relations were analyzed. The look into the future forecast new horizons for women who work which should broaden the scope of their employment opportunities. Such opportunities must be met, however, with a higher degree of skill since, as a Labor Department survey indicates, the skills of our work force, both men and women, have not kept up with our industrial technological development.

Therefore, it would seem that one of our objectives should be to raise the level of skill of working women until each individual has been developed to her highest potential. Some of the ways and means of accomplishing this were suggested by our guest speakers but many problems of demand and supply—of relating the need for skilled and professional women to the source, womanpower—are still unsolved.

Labor-force estimates for April 1955, released by the United States Bureau of the Census just as this report goes to press, underscore the urgency of the questions considered at the conference. Women in the labor force number half a million more, and men half a million fewer, than had been forecast. The number of women workers has again passed the 20 million mark. The trend toward employment of older women is accentuated, with a smaller proportion of women under 25 and a larger proportion of women over 45 in the woman labor force than was anticipated.

Responsibility for promoting the interests of these women workers is entrusted, within the Federal Government, to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, which holds a congressional directive "to formulate standards and policies which shall promote the welfare of wage-earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

But even this mandate does not encompass all that we want for women and for what they represent—families and homes. To meet this broader responsibility all of us, as individuals, and in government, private enterprise, and communities, can work together.

The Effective Use of Womanpower

Report of the Conference, March 10 and 11, 1955

MARCH 10, MORNING SESSION

Welcome

MRS. ALICE K. LEOPOLD, *Assistant to the Secretary of Labor for Women's Affairs*

We have asked you to meet with us today to help us plan the future work for the Department of Labor and for the Women's Bureau, particularly in the development of womanpower in the most effective and intelligent way possible. We meet in a changed atmosphere from the days when women first started to work because today woman suffrage has been in effect for many years. The right of a woman to work and the acceptance of her accomplishments are widely recognized.

By their performance in the political and community life of our nation, by their record of accomplishments as members of the working force, women have gained acceptance—individually and collectively—as people who perform to the limits of their considerable abilities, once given the opportunity.

Those of us who are here today, I mean in this year of 1955, know that we have departed from the traditional undervaluation of women. We are arriving at the day when we recognize that both men and women have something to contribute; that each has his or her special talents; each can excel; neither need be ignored nor cast aside in favor of the other; in fact, they can work together side by side.

Not only can men and women work together side by side, but in this era our Nation needs this kind of working partnership. The contribution of both men and women to the economy is necessary, if our Nation is to maintain its high level of productivity, its great capacity to use new methods, its high standard of living and of good working conditions, particularly at a time when the world is troubled by ideological conflicts which none of us, individually, can resolve.

I firmly believe that each of us can contribute to the resolution of those conflicts if we plan with vision and energy how best to use our human resources for the general good.

I think all of us here have accepted the premise that people—whether men or women—work for the same reason. They work for their economic survival. Hopefully, they work at jobs that interest them, that give them a feeling of accomplishment.

Women, no less than men, have family responsibilities which make their employment a necessity. Our latest data show us that in 1953 a woman was the head of the family in nearly 4 million families throughout the Nation—or about a tenth of all family groups.

In many instances, particularly with young people just starting out their married life, it is necessary for both husband and wife to contribute to the family income, either to maintain a decent standard of living or to permit the husband to finish an education interrupted by military service. These young people have certainly accepted the fact that a woman's place is not necessarily only in the home.

Women now comprise about 30 percent of all workers. Many of the women now in the labor force are members of professions. The employment of women is on the increase. They are constantly moving into new occupations—as bank tellers, as engineers, as medical technologists. They will be needed in other occupations as scientific advances and new discoveries bring those occupations into being.

We feel that these are extremely challenging times. We know that the future will always be uncertain, and yet I think we all look to that future with hope born of the conviction that the human resources of our great land will be equal to whatever test they may be put.

It was Marcus Aurelius who said that “everything is the result of a change . . . there is nothing Nature loves so well as to change existing forms.”

It is in the spirit of these changing times that we assemble here. We have a strong conviction that all of you, women and men, because of your interests in the mainstream of our national life, can help us to plan wisely for the best use of the enormous potentials of the Nation's womanpower. We assemble here therefore to bring your collective wisdom to bear on the future, in the light of the past, but not bound by it. It is our task to look, with all the vision we can muster, at the effective use of womanpower in a future which holds great promise for us all.

Today's Challenge

THE HONORABLE JAMES P. MITCHELL, *Secretary of Labor*

It seems hard for me to realize, as I stand before this opening session of the Conference on the Effective Use of Womanpower, that 40 years ago such a conference would have been considered a visionary dream.

It was not until March 4, 1913, that the Department of Labor came into being. And at that time the Department of Labor concerned

itself vastly more with the welfare of the workingman than with that of the workingwoman.

I am glad that time has brought change; that womanpower is now an essential part of our national planning. And I am glad that the Department of Labor seeks in every way that it can to consider the individual worth, as well as the individual contribution, which our manpower and womanpower constitute in our national economy.

A review of the growth of the status of women in this country is hardly necessary in a gathering of this kind. However, it is interesting to note that women received the voting franchise in 1920, and in the same year the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor was founded. Since 1920, women have entered more and more directly into the economic and political life of our country.

During the Second World War, when industry in this country was asked to produce more than ever before in its history, at a time when over 13 million men and women were serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, women entered the war plants and helped industry break one production record after another. I saw that work, firsthand, and women should be very proud of the contribution that they made to the war production of this country.

Today 20 million women are included in our labor force. They constitute approximately one third of our workers.

A woman is serving in the Cabinet of the President of the United States. Another is serving in the United States Senate. A number are in the House of Representatives, as you know.

A total of 304 women are serving in State legislatures, the highest number on record in our history. All but five States have at least one woman serving in their legislatures.

Moreover, it is estimated that in the executive branch of our Federal Government some 1,200 women hold positions of high importance and administrative authority. At the present time, there are 65 women in top-level positions. Of these, 44 are Presidential appointees.

Through the years, as women's employment grew, the Department of Labor has used every means at its disposal to improve their working conditions and to increase their opportunities for profitable employment. And over the years improvements have been made, especially in the field of labor standards, minimum wage, equal pay, safety and health, hours of work, and other conditions affecting the welfare of the woman who works.

In all of these fields, women particularly have made tremendous advances.

Our main object today is to seek ways and means of broadening the scope of women's employment opportunities. Of every 10 women in

the labor force, 3 are doing some type of clerical work, 2 work in industry, and 1 each is doing service, professional, private household, sales, and miscellaneous work.

Over the years, women have been going into new occupational fields and can be found in almost every kind of job. Most women, however, are concentrated in a relatively few occupations. It seems that one of the problems that this conference might well undertake to discuss is how that area of service may be broadened.

The demand for women's services has been growing in industry at a rapid rate, and it will continue to grow, very much, as our labor force strives to meet the increasing demands being made on it. Women will be asked in the future to fill new jobs, jobs they have little chance of obtaining today.

One of the interesting studies that we have been conducting in the Labor Department recently has been a survey of the skills of our Nation's work force, and we have been astounded at some of the results. The findings indicate that the skills of our workers have not kept pace with the technological improvements in our industrial processes. As we move into the age of the atom and of greater technological advances, a higher degree of skills will be required on the part of the people who develop a product, research it, and make it. And we feel that our Nation's workers, both men and women, will need more adequate training in terms of skills to meet the demand which is going to be placed on them.

It is there, I think, that women in industry, women in employment, can make the greatest contribution. Because, aside from a few dental and medical technicians, as distinguished from the professional people, there are very few women, percentagewise, in the skilled work force of the Nation. It seems that one of the objectives should be to raise the level of skill of the womanpower of this country so that as a national asset, as a national resource, we have developed each individual to the highest potential he is capable of achieving.

I think it is our duty to plan now for the wise use of womanpower in the future. In this respect, we must remember that in addition to the 20 million women now at work, it is estimated that there are some 11 million women between the ages of 18 and 64 available for work, in the event that our economy has to expand rapidly in case of a national emergency.

I believe it is our duty to perceive the contribution these women are capable of making and seize on them for the good of the country. This conference, I am sure, can make a valuable contribution toward that end. It can clear the air for the future, set new goals, and make the public more conscious of women's worth in our economy.

We in the Department of Labor have given women, we believe, the long-needed recognition that they deserve. The position of Assistant to the Secretary for Women's Affairs has been created and is now being capably filled by the head of our Women's Bureau, Mrs. Leopold. We have done this to emphasize the intention of the Department to give women equal consideration in all of its programs. Conferences such as this, sponsored by the Women's Bureau, can accomplish a great deal toward that end. I am happy to see so many people from the Nation's most distinguished associations and some of our Nation's most distinguished citizens here at this conference. Out of this meeting of minds can, and I am sure will, emerge valuable suggestions as to how we may best use our human resources for the general good.

I am sure that you will have a successful and worthwhile conference, and I want to assure you that the Department of Labor, all of us, Mrs. Leopold, myself, Mr. Larson, and all of my associates, are tremendously interested in what you do here.

We are conscious that you represent the potential for the development of one of our greatest resources, and that is womanpower in industry.

Panel—Horizons for Women

I

**LEO H. BARTEMEIER, M. D., *Medical Director,*
*The Seton Psychiatric Institute, Baltimore, Md.***

One morning this week I entered the dining room of a well-known hotel and was immediately ushered to my table by an alert and friendly hostess. As I sat there for a while, two well-nourished and apparently well-rested waitresses were leaning against a sideboard chatting with each other in a leisurely fashion. They were not more than 10 feet from my table and directly in my view, and they looked at me from time to time as they continued their conversation. After more time had passed, the hostess told one of them to take care of a customer. As the waitress approached my table, she said, "I wouldn't want you to think that I don't want to wait on you. I am not your waitress."

But the way she placed my plate on the table, and the way she spilled the coffee into the saucer, showed how she felt about having to do the work of another. The waitress to whom she had referred was hurrying about looking after the needs of a group of eight men at a nearby table.

When I returned to my room in the hotel, I noticed the March issue of a magazine called *Guidedposts* on my writing table. On the cover, I read the title of the leading article, "Life Without Marriage." And, in small type, "There are 11 million women of marriageable age in the United States, not counting divorcees. Let us face the fact that most of us are never going to get married. Why? Because there is a higher ratio of females to men in the world. Many of us aren't even going to get the chance to say yes or no."

Then I thought of the waitress. I recalled that she wore no ring. She had not looked unhappy while she and her friend were chatting together, but I did notice the change in her expression when she was ordered to wait on the customer. I remembered the excellent magazine article by Anita Colby. She is single, happy, and successful. She takes on work gladly, in contrast to the waitress who wanted to do only what she was supposed to do.

The waitress' attitude toward work is familiar and quite characteristic of all too many workers of our time. They are the people who work only under the influence of immediate direction. They are intelligent and know what needs to be done, but as long as they are not supervised they do not work. Many adults manifest the same attitude toward their foremen, their supervisors, or department heads in their employment situations. Their attitude has become so widespread that it constitutes a rather serious problem.

To explain my experience in the restaurant by assuming that the two waitresses belonged to a union organization and that their indifference to my need is typical of union workers is, in my opinion, quite unsatisfactory. That they may have belonged to a union is not only likely but perhaps even probable. But in every unionized restaurant there are the same differences in the attitude of waitresses toward customers that one observes in restaurants that are not unionized. It is so easy to blame the unions.

To say that the waitress was probably just lazy, or that her parents never taught her to work is also unconvincing, because it is too facile. Everyone would agree, however, that the experience which I have related is familiar and that its prevalence in our society is one of the great handicaps to our national effectiveness, and a frequent source of dissatisfaction in our personal and business relations.

We do not seem to know how to correct it, and perhaps we do not understand it as thoroughly as we would like.

In the light of my professional experience, it is a problem which originates in childhood and which may be described as an unconscious expression of resentment by children toward their parents, which is later transferred and expressed toward people for whom they work.

Much earlier in their development this same feeling of resentment is displayed by their inability to eat what is served them. Being too fearful of their own antagonistic feelings toward their parents, many children develop difficulty in eating what their mothers prepare for them. These children readily eat the same foods when they visit their grandparents or the homes of neighbors or other friends of the family. Toward these persons they are not hostile and therefore not fearful.

The problem of passive aggression toward persons in authority in employment situations represents an enormous loss of human energy which might otherwise be channelled into effective work. This loss of human energy is not due exclusively to those who fear dissatisfaction such as many children experience in connection with their parents. It is frequently provoked, for example, by the attitudes of employers, by the influence of fellow-workers, by low morale in the employment situation, or by other factors which are less discernible. It is a feeling which most men and women experience as a lack of interest in working, or a difficulty in fulfilling tasks assigned them, or as an inability to learn the procedures while in training to become skilled workers.

The workers are unaware that their dislike of working, their tendency to work as little as possible, their frequent forgetting to carry out the instructions, and their lack of a sense of responsibility, are expressions of antagonistic feeling toward their employers. Out of a sense of guilt they may unintentionally provoke someone to discharge them, or their services are so repeatedly unsatisfactory that they are discharged for this reason.

This widespread problem in our society can be prevented as parents develop a better appreciation of the emotional needs of their children and as they learn to accept the fact that, in addition to the love which their children have for them, all children experience angry, hostile, destructive feelings toward their parents. This is natural, and, in fact, it is instinctual in all. To permit a reasonable expression of these feelings without retaliating by threats, or by punishment, is one of the most difficult problems of parenthood; but at the same time it is the best preparation for later living and work. Children who are raised in this fashion tend to have a wholesome respect for authority.

It has been evident for some time that a rapidly increasing number of women with small children are trying to span the two worlds of motherhood and careers outside the home. For some, this may be dictated by the necessity of supporting the family, but the much larger number appear to be motivated by neurotic competition. They feel that they must have the luxuries which other women possess, and they manifest a similarly strong competitive attitude toward other workers in their employment situations. They rationalize their neurotic de-

mands by their belief that these material luxuries will be of benefit to their children, and that if their husbands earned more they would not have to work. They are satisfied to have someone else look after their children in their absence and they are proud to be able to augment the family income.

These mothers are quite convincing, but they are unaware that in their ceaseless efforts to gratify their competitive strivings they simultaneously deprive their young children of the basic emotional requirements, and thereby interfere with the wholesome development of their personalities. Examinations of many adults and adolescents who suffer because of their inability to adapt themselves to their surroundings and who are lacking in their feeling for others, frequently disclose that they are the victims of emotional deprivation in the early stages of their development.

There is an enormous amount of well-documented evidence that prior to the age of 4, children should not be separated from their mothers. Even after they have begun to go to school, they continue to need their mothers in the home. Every experienced school teacher in the lower grades has observed the striking difference between those children whose mothers are engaged in occupational pursuits and those who reflect the trust and the security of their mother's love and devoted care.

When a child is older and has begun to enter the world of other children and other interests outside the home, he needs to free himself gradually from dependence upon his mother and to become somewhat self-reliant. If at this period of growth and development the mother decides to divide her energies between family and career, she may be capable of fulfilling her responsibilities in both areas without harmful effect on her children.

The women who achieve this spanning of their lives most successfully are the mothers who know from previous experience that their children have learned to tolerate their absences on many early occasions, and that they are sufficiently mature for their respective ages to care for themselves and each other. Mothering always affords the satisfaction of being useful and provides a sense of being needed and of course worthwhile. When children have grown to be independent, and their interests are entirely outside the home, it is essential for the health and the well-being of mothers that they continue to be helpful and effective by contributing their energies to the welfare of the communities, in which their services are always sorely needed. They can contribute to the work of the professions, afford relief to over-worked teachers in the public schools, or secure employment in the business world.

Many far-sighted mothers make ample preparations for this period in their lives and thereby avoid the depression to which many succumb when their time of motherhood has reached its natural termination. Through years of experience with their children, they have attained a quality of maturity and stability which enables them to make valuable contributions to the lives of many individuals and groups who are desperately in need of their services.

If, perchance, mothers have paying positions in business or in organizations that serve the community, they may expect to meet with the reactions of executives or officials who, because of their own personal conflicts, feel threatened by having to work with them. In these situations, they need to recognize the insecurity of others and do what they can to dissipate it. If they react emotionally to the interferences which are aimed at their becoming effective, they are likely to fail in their objectives. They have learned how to cope with similar situations with their children and they need to realize that their personal relationship with men and women in the professional and business worlds is quite similar.

The subject of how to improve the effectiveness of womanpower can never be disassociated from a discussion of woman's relationship with her husband and his role as father. This basic problem has not been discussed because on this occasion I decided to devote my remarks to one of our great problems, the attitude toward work.

On another occasion, however, I pointed out that while it is true that a woman's attitude toward pregnancy, childbirth, and motherhood has been definitely molded and determined by her relationship with her own parents, it is equally true that her emotional need in her relationship with her husband is of major importance for her sense of well-being. How adequately or inadequately his relationship with her satisfies these needs determines very importantly how well or how poorly she functions as a mother to their children.

There are women whose needs cannot possibly be satisfied by their husbands because they are already too severely conflicted from their childhood. They are the exceptions. The women I have in mind are the ones whose conflicts are less deeply rooted and less intense. Their emotional security is improved by a good marriage.

To give consistently to her child the love he needs, a woman needs the consistent love of her husband and the certainty of his love for their child. From a psychological point of view, she and the child are one, and disinterest on the part of her husband toward their child is experienced by her as a lessening of his love. The father's influence on the mother-child relationship has been too frequently overlooked in our evaluation of the factors contributing to the dissatisfaction

that so many infants and little children experience at the hands of their mothers. It has been overlooked because it is too painful for men to admit that they may have indirectly brought about severe disturbances in the personalities of their own children. While it is true that mothers exert the most important influence during the first years of life, when the basic character structure is in the process of formation, it is equally true that the quality of their influence is determined very considerably by the husband's attitudes. It is no longer possible to blame mothers exclusively for everything that happens to their children.

To improve the effectiveness of womanpower, it is necessary that women have larger quantities of their psychic energy available for productive and creative work. So long as much of this energy is consumed in worries, in fears, and in efforts to maintain some degree of stability, this much energy is not available for effective living and working.

The fact that woman's entire physical and psychological development is more complex and therefore more difficult to achieve than is man's, contributes to this problem of energy distribution.

Many women, and men, are inhibited beyond their conscious control in both their thinking and their actions, in their playing and in their working. They are tied and fettered from within. They are not free within themselves. It is a tedious, painful, time-consuming, and expensive task to effect permanent improvement in the personalities that develop, and it is neither practical nor possible for the great majority.

What is possible, and what is available to all, is the prevention of distortions in character formation in the earliest years. This implies wholesome mothering and fathering during infancy and childhood. This offers the best hope for an optimum of adult effectiveness.

II

FLORENCE R. KLUCKHOHN, Ph. D., *Laboratory of Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.*

Perhaps I should state first that my approach to this problem is a little broader than the utilization of womanpower in industry and business. The role of the American woman in the society as a whole is a fascinating subject.

I come to it as a cultural anthropologist, mainly, and as a sociologist. As such, in analyzing the woman's role in the United States, I think I always have in mind the woman's role in other cultures. While there

is neither time nor opportunity at a meeting of this short duration to go into any kind of comparative analysis, I think we should always keep in mind that the problems we have are characteristic of our own culture; that other cultures do not have the same problems, but very probably have different ones that are just as bad.

The American woman has been a subject of controversy for a very long period of time. The number of individuals at a meeting of this sort is evidence of this fact. Mention the subject of woman and it is like hanging up flypaper for flies.

I do not need to give a great deal of evidence on this controversy to an audience of this degree of sophistication. I might just mention that there is a good deal of criticism of what women in the United States are doing, from newspapers and magazines and from pulpits and agencies.

Many people fear that 20 million working women—the figure quoted in labor statistics—is a danger mark; that it represents a feminine invasions of man's last stronghold. Two or three years ago, an article (supposedly quoting a social scientist) warned that within a generation or two, the society would be entirely dominated by women. Labor statistics were used as evidence, as was the fact that so much property in the United States is now owned, if not actually controlled, by women.

On the other side there are, of course, many arguments: that women still do not have equal opportunities with men; that wage rates are different; that women get bypassed on ladders of promotion and very often shunted off into types of jobs that men do not want; or that once a woman invades a field, it becomes defined as a feminine field, such as schoolteaching and certain clerical jobs.

A complaint of another kind and a very real one is that women feel the work they do in the home has much less prestige value than what men are doing in the occupational world. Finally, many complaints today have to do with the isolation that women feel in the home. It is a serious problem.

If we were not so entangled with even more serious international problems, there would be more agitation than there is about the definition of the feminine role, because it is a badly defined role, and a great deal of confusion exists about it. For a majority of women, there is some little doubt as to what they expect of themselves or what society expects of them.

But I am no alarmist, and I think the prognosis for the definition of this role in the future is good; certainly the problems women face today do not equal those of 100 years ago. In other words, progress has been made, when viewed in historical perspective.

I would like to approach this from three main tangents. I would like to separate the total feminine role into its components, because it is composed of a rather ill-assorted set of parts. Before attempting to straighten it out in the future, we must define this role within the context of the value orientations of the society in which we live. These values are different from the values of other societies. We must also look at the historical evolution of the several parts of the role and see what kind of sense they make.

There is not time to do all that this morning, so what I would like to do first is to break down these components, then pick them up in relation to the value system, touching only on the historical antecedents of aspects of the conflicting parts of the role. Then I would like to state some of the issues as I see them at the present time.

A number of years ago, Prof. Talcott Parsons at Harvard University analyzed the components of the role. I have made some emendations and changes, but the first component and definitely the oldest is the domestic one, which in the colonial period of American life was a total role of housewife, wife, mother. It was a unit. This has now been split, with mother on the one side (because it is as a mother that woman is idealized much more than as a wife) and, on the other side, the housewife role. The former has very high prestige, I would say almost sentimental prestige. The other, very low. Every time a woman says, "I am just a housewife," she is voicing her opinion of what she thinks is society's opinion of this role.

The second is the career component of the role, which has loomed more into prominence since the late 19th century and on into the 20th century. The conflict between these has already been mentioned.

Then there is what Professor Parsons labels the glamour component of the role. This is a fairly late addition to the role, in some part created by the "flapper" generation, but with antecedents in the 19th century.

There is then the aspect of the role which he has labeled the "humanistic" and which I call the "culture-bearer" aspect of the role. Here, women have been made the custodians of all those necessary aspects of life: the esthetic, the intellectual, and the moral, which businessmen in the market place feel are a fine thing to have, but for which they have no time. This was described brilliantly by Thorstein Veblen a long time ago.

The last, which also is a Veblen statement, is the definition of woman as a man's status symbol. As Veblen put it, woman became the symbol of the husband's ability to pay. And in herself, she became an item of conspicuous consumption. This aspect of the role cross-cuts the others.

The history of the feminine role is really the history of these component parts, and I assure you that it has not been an evolutionary development. It is not at all the kind of thing you can compare with the evolution in women's rights and political rights, where they have steadily gone forward. Women must never confuse legal and political status with social status and the more pervasive social customs.

Before going further, let me state what I mean by values. I am talking about the basic assumptions, the correct values of a society which underlie almost every bit of our concrete behavior. If there is a single thing that social science has taught us dramatically in the last two decades, it is that societies and peoples vary widely in the way in which they approach common human problems, and in the way in which they develop value orientations. There are definite limits to the range of possibilities of various ages between societies, and there is a good deal of variation within societies as well.

When I talk about our dominant values, I mean those that are characteristic of the typical middle-class citizen. There are many variations within this. As Dr. Bartemeier mentioned this morning, individuals have different attitudes toward working. This is because their basic values are different—it is not just neuroticism, in my opinion.

Peoples differ widely, for instance, in the way in which they demonstrate it to be right and proper for man to be related to man. They differ also in their concept of man's relationship to nature and the supernatural, the man-nature relationship. They differ also in the types of personalities and activities they value most highly. They treat the problem of time—the past, present, and future—very differently, and they differ again in what they define basic, innate human nature to be, whether evil, good-evil, or good.

Now, to take the core of our own value system, or basic state: There is an emphasis upon individualistic human relationships; a belief that natural forces are to be exploited, or at least harnessed by man for his own use; a great stress upon action, or the "accomplishment-type" of personality. In other words, we are an achievement-success-oriented people. There are many peoples in the world who are not, and many individuals in our own society who are not.

We have a concept of humanity as being in need of perfection through self-control, an evil-but-perfectible idea of humanity. We also have a firm conviction that it is always the future which one must look to and strive for. These, I think, form the solid core of our dominant value system. They are taken so much for granted by most of us, held at such an unconscious level, that we seldom call them into question. Since we do not call them into question, we do not stop to realize that there is a great deal of variation.

The feminine role in contrast to the masculine role can, when analyzed in these terms, be seen to be a variant role in some respects. I would like to pick up three of these orientations and analyze the differences they point to.

First, the individualistic type of human relationship. We are assuming that the most important type of goal structure is that of the individual as he works autonomously. This does not mean we are not cooperative. What it does mean is that a man in a business firm or in my department at Harvard University is in there to pursue his own goals of making money for himself and his family; increasing his prestige, doing his own writing. While he is there, we assume he will have a positive attitude toward the goals of the group, the goals of the organization, and that he will have a positive attitude toward cooperative work with his fellow workers.

That is as far as the assumption goes. If that man is offered a job in another firm, in another university, where the status is higher, the money return higher, research opportunities greater, most Americans would think him peculiar indeed if he did not move. It is a case of picking up one's individualistic self and putting it down in another collateral grouping. This is impossible in many societies of the world, where the group goal is what is essential, be it lineally defined or collaterally. In some societies, the individual's goal must be first the goal of the group as a whole.

Now, there is a real difference between the masculine and feminine role in regard to this value, a difference which is also discontinuous in time. The man is steadily the boy-child, trained for autonomy and individualistic behavior. The girl is also trained for this as a child, and through her school years. But when she marries, and starts to have a family, the assumption is that she now switches over, gives up individual autonomy, and accepts collaterally defined group goals—those of the family. Instead of being an autonomous individual, operating in terms of autonomously defined goals (which do not mean selfish goals, by the way), she is expected to put the interests of that collateral group always ahead of her own and act as a representative of the family in the community, in parent-teacher associations, and so on.

This is a terrific shift to ask anybody to make in a society that ideally predicates equality of the sexes. It is a clue, really, to a lot of confusion in the role, and to some of the reasons why women are insisting upon interests outside the home.

Another orientation relates to the nature of value activity, or of the valued personality type. As I have already said, we are a people who predominantly prize an action-orientation accomplishment, such

as success. Look at all the stock phrases: "Let's do something about it!"; "What has been done about it?"; "What does it do?"

Whenever you appraise an individual, almost always the first question is one of placing him in your orbit: "What does he do?"; "Where is he in the dominant system of our society, the occupational system?"

Yet in other cultures what I would call the being and becoming orientation, rather than a dogmatic orientation, is paramount. In such societies the emphasis is upon the intellectual, the esthetic. There you will find, not the businessman as the prestige figure of society, but the artistic individual or the intellectual type of statesman.

Still another type of orientation is the one I have found so characteristic of Mexico, a culture in which I am intensely interested. There, you do not ask what a person does; you do not even ask what kind of personality development he has achieved. You just ask who he is and take him as he is.

The ideal type in this dominant occupational system of ours is the successful businessman in the business world. During and since the 19th century, the feminine role has meant the custodianship of various interests deemed to be secondarily important in our society, such as intellectual and esthetic interests. These things were looked upon by businessmen as embroidery—necessary, but embroidery none the less. From a historical viewpoint, it is almost as if people had got together and come to a rational decision that this was what would happen. Obviously, no cultural change occurs this way. Women became the "culture bearers" of the Nation, but in so becoming they were chiefly appreciators and not creators. Our intellectual and esthetic achievement, compared with other cultures, has not been great even to this day.

As far as future time is concerned, there is one other difference. Our emphasis is upon the future, not the present, as is the case with Mexicans, nor the past, as is the case with many traditionalistic societies in the Far East and even in Europe. But that future and those goals of the future are defined primarily in terms of the masculine role, and apply to the girl only through her school years, which I think is a serious discrepancy.

Now the question is, "Why has this variance between the masculine and feminine roles been maintained so long in spite of many persistent efforts to break it down?" An analysis of history is essential to an understanding of this. The 19th century was the critical century for the formulation of the parts of this role and for the creation of conflicts in it. There were three different trends which, in different ways, worked toward equalization within the family, toward making the status of the wife equal to that of her husband.

One of these trends, which had a delayed effect, was industrial

development, which took many women outside the home for the first time. They happened to be women of the lower-income groups, who were not the prestige symbols for the society as a whole, so the dent made in the thinking of the times was not great and was slow in coming.

The second was the pioneer movement. As the frontier developed and the role of woman was defined in frontier homes, there was a very great increase in the equalization of women's status within the home. This went so far that some people feel we have feminine domination inside the home with a vengeance.

Third was the feminist movement, starting with greater rights for married women and finally creating what Ethel Howes called, in 1922, "The feminine dilemma of the time: marriage or career"—with the word *or* underlined.

But there were countertrends, pulling in almost diametrically opposite directions. One of them was the development of women's status as the symbol of her husband's ability to pay. We were a people becoming more engrossed in the affairs of the market place—mass production. There was a terrific increase in our production rate from 1850 to 1950. And here is where the man's interest was focused.

Women became leisure symbols. In most societies, a separated-out group of both men and women developed, who represented the leisure class, who went for refinements with a capital R—the idle window shopper and bridge player whose creative powers were unused.

There was also the 19th-century romantic ideal, and our interpretation in American cultural terms of the European romantic movement. We can use Pearl Buck's phrase for this development, "Angel on a pedestal," the idealization of woman as something too pure to have anything to do with the market place (which was growing ever and ever more dirty), too pure to understand or have any interest in sexual matters. This was the woman who fainted at the drop of a hat, who was terribly fragile. I have read many reports of that time which actually said that a woman was much more attractive and more desirable, if, for instance, she had a touch of tuberculosis.

These trends were pulling in opposite directions and still are, to a certain extent. Three wars helped clarify the situation, because women were called out on an emergency basis.

Here I would like to comment regarding something our Secretary of Labor said this morning. It has to do with a very critical problem: the way in which women in the United States are educated.

I will be bold and say they are educated on a contingency basis. They are educated very much in accordance with masculine patterns of education, on the assumption that they must be ready to look after

themselves, if they belong to the group mentioned this morning, who do not marry, or who are widowed; this is the group of 4 million women who are the heads of families—whether as the result of divorce or death or war. In other words, women must be ready for an emergency.

Interestingly enough, women are always good in an emergency. But whether it be a war or a family crisis, every time the assumption is: "We hope they don't have to do it; it is much better if they stay home, and just be ready to take over."

Woman takes up what is really her life career (which for the majority of the women in the United States still is motherhood) and then we tell her: "We are very sorry, but you can't go on acting as you were trained to act. You have to take up a different set of patterns"—for which she has not been educated, or has been very badly educated. This stems from the depreciation or devaluation of the realistic side of the feminine role.

I see some real evidence of a trend in the opposite direction at the present moment. I do not know how strong it is yet. The depreciation of the feminine side of the role which goes with motherhood began in the 19th century. "Mother" was separated from "housewife" in prestige terms. It was very much of an issue in the latter part of the 19th century to push all the housewife drudgery aside as something that you did only when you had to.

The education that many of our women have had, and that our young girls still are getting at home and in school is again instilling a negative attitude toward this kind of activity. One characteristic remark summarizes many I have heard on this subject. A woman came to me when I was talking in one of Boston's metropolitan suburbs on the feminine role. She said: "I have heard that you think women should be more interested in domestic affairs than they are, and be better trained for them. I share your attitude. I have a 16-year-old daughter and I am doing my level best to get her to learn how to cook. I tell her I hate it, but we do have to learn to cook and it is better to learn it now than later. But I can't get her in the kitchen."

This woman could not understand why her daughter was not the least bit motivated.

Much of the education we are giving in women's colleges seems to be a kind of negative appreciation of homemaking activities. I am not in the least in favor of turning college courses into domestic science or home economics courses. It is the attitude I am talking about.

This has been a very brief glimpse at some of the trends and counter-trends in the 19th century which are to me among the most fascinating aspects of United States history.

Now, let me rephrase some of the major issues. I think you will see that I have a somewhat different interpretation from that of Dr. Bartemeier. It is no accident that there has been constant pressure, from the 17th century right through into the 20th, for women in the United States to take a more active part in the economic occupational area of society. With our value system it was inevitable and it should have been predictable.

After every war, there is a definite increase in the pressure. The development of women's clubs after the Civil War was important, for it led into community work. Women recognized this as an area that is important, is exciting, and gives women the feeling of belonging and of prestige. When you consider the negativistic attitude toward the housewife, you could predict that this development would occur.

There is also the problem of isolation that the woman feels when her husband is away and her children are gone. This is one of the problems that women in the United States have been trying to solve by some kind of partial participation. There has been a rephrasing, in the last two decades, of what has been called the "marriage or career dilemma." Now women are saying, "How can we work this out so that we really have an integrated role?" I do not think I would use Dr. Bartemeier's expression of spanning it so much as of trying to integrate the two, of finding some way to have the outside interest play into the inside.

There is a problem as to whether this can be worked out satisfactorily for a great number of women. I rather suspect that, given the kind of genius in the household that we have in technological developments, it can. To me, it would appear to be a partial solution, in relation to our value system, because you cannot go on insisting that women play a variant role and participate variantly in all the main streams of life.

The education of women I would pose as another problem: the way in which they are being educated largely on a contingency basis.

Let me briefly mention one other thing. You will find many people saying, "Women should be able to find satisfaction in community work outside of the home, without having to push over into the occupational world." It is not the same thing, given the prominence of the occupational world. Women know this.

Furthermore, there has been a trend for some time for men to say, "Let the intellectual and esthetic things be taken care of by women." This has developed into a plethora of book clubs and lectures to women. It has become big business in the United States.

But there is something of a tendency for men to take the same attitude toward community work. "Let women go ahead and manage

this. Let them manage the committees. If the going gets rough, and things become difficult, then we will step in and put it on a businesslike basis."

This is all right, as the women do quite a successful job. But I am pointing out that here is one more place where the two roles become isolated from each other. To me, the serious problem in the family structure of the United States is defining masculine and feminine roles in such a way as to let us break through the tendency toward segregation and have a more satisfactory husband-wife relationship.

III

MARIE JAHODA, Ph. D., Associate Director, Research Center for Human Relations, New York University, New York, N. Y.

I think Dr. Kluckhohn has given you a valid analysis of the problem of the American woman, placed it in history, and shown you its various components.

Let me try to simplify the picture from one particular point of view. Unfortunately not all women know what Dr. Kluckhohn knows and what we can learn from her. They have to face their life problems without the realization of the particular moment in history at which they come into the picture. The conflicts that women experience today are colored by their knowledge of diverse patterns of living and by their particular position *as they see it*, which is not always identical with the way scientific analysis sees it.

It helps me in my simplification to refer to the entire past only in terms of the generation of the 1920's, that won for women the right to vote, the right to be elected. The psychological situation of women before they had won the legal right to equality in public life and public behavior was one of dissatisfaction with their prescribed role. The psychological problem of the woman now is completely different. The problem today lies in their lack of knowledge of what their role is. They no longer know what is considered to be the right and proper behavior of a woman in our society.

Even though subtle redefinitions of the female role, as Dr. Kluckhohn explained, are constantly going on, these redefinitions are not a part of the awareness of women confronted with the necessity of making various choices. They find no clearer-cut pattern for living.

You may think this is too much of an oversimplification, because, particularly in the smaller communities in this country, there still is a very clearly prescribed way of living: A woman ought to go to school as long as she needs to, she ought to get married, she ought to

have children, she ought to bring up the children, and she ought to lead a respectable life.

Now, the interesting thing about this is that none of us really leads such an isolated life any longer. The mass media of communication (movies, television, radio), speeches, and lectures provided a growing awareness that some women live differently; that, in fact, many women live differently.

"Why should I live this way?" women ask. "Is my way the right way? Is her way the right way? Am I missing out on life by doing what I am doing, and wouldn't life be much more wonderful and rewarding if I were not in my particular position?"

I think we should accept as a psychological fact this absence of a clear-cut yardstick for the behavior of women in our society. The next question, then, is how can one possibly understand what this means for women with a burden of decision on them, with no yardstick for what they really ought to do, with suggestions from many sources that other things, too, are worthwhile in a woman's life?

Again, it helps me here to simplify. We all realize that there is a tremendous variation in the patterns of life that women follow in this country. They can be put into about four overall categories, through the combination of two major functions: there is the dominant female sex function: being the mother of children, the wife of a husband. Secondly, women can function in areas of work interests and participation in community life, which have been traditionally more a male affair.

I am sorry that Dr. Bartemeier isn't here, because I would like to take exception to one phrase he used in that connection, namely, that functioning in areas in which traditionally men have functioned mainly, is by and large motivated by neurotic competitiveness. I do not think so. But I am sure we could come to an understanding if he were here to discuss this particular point. These two functions may or may not be combined, which gives us four possibilities: The mother and housewife; the career woman without a family; the working woman who combines having a family with her contribution to and participation in community life; and, perhaps the most tragic human relationship, the woman who does not make a contribution in any of these roles.

This last category is predominantly an age problem, as we all know. It covers the woman who is middle aged or a little beyond, who is now widowed, no longer has a family to look after, and who has not found a way into another situation where she can make a contribution.

It seems that these four types (with all sorts of variations) are the types from which women today have to choose, and that each of these

types has its necessarily inherent, inevitable, and serious conflict possibilities.

It also seems to me that each of these types has its necessarily inherent and gratifying rewards. The problem arises in the choice among these four types, to the extent that women have a choice (we know that women are very often, by life's circumstances, pressed into one of these patterns). However, in choosing they are not looking for inherent rewards and conflicts, if any, in the pattern; they are asking, "What is the right thing to do? What should a woman do nowadays?"

The burden of decision making could, under appropriate circumstances, really be regarded as something tremendously positive; namely, as the greater freedom of choice in the life patterns of women today, as compared with the past. But I am afraid it would be an overoptimistic and psychologically untrue picture to tell you that women have now grown up to be aware of the possibility of the wider choice; that they have actually in their own lives a greater degree of freedom than men, who do not have so many recognized possibilities to choose from. This is not true. Most women experience the choice as a difficult burden, as a terrible thing, mainly because they cannot find out what is the right thing for them to do.

To the value analysis that Dr. Kluckhohn has given you, I would like to make one addition: the need we have in this country for coming out with one right answer—something that we can all agree on without conflict, without controversy. However, I want to suggest that diversity, even if it means controversy and some conflict, is essential for living. This is exactly the idea that we have to emphasize in our culture with regard to the patterns of living for women.

The ideal picture (and I do not know how we can reach it) would be one in which the unmarried woman who fills a job successfully gets the same prestige, the same recognition, can feel as proud of herself in our society as the mother who has brought up six children and never has had much time to go outside the house.

I think that, in the ideal picture, we have a problem with the last type, the woman who does not make a contribution in any area. The problem is to help that woman, even late in life, decide to do something that she still can do to give sense and purpose to her life. But we are very far away from this at present.

It is necessary, if we want to have various patterns of living with equal prestige in our society, that we take up systematically one conflict after the other as it is inherent in these patterns; that we make it explicit; and that we think about how our culture can recognize the need for variety of living patterns. I would like to say that, even if

we do this, I am convinced conflicts will remain. Conflicts are here to be solved and dealt with; efforts to avoid them altogether are futile.

Question Period*

MRS. LEOPOLD—*Presiding*

QUESTION for Dr. Jahoda: Are young women more interested today in determining their correct niche, or in reaching for rewards in prestige and/or money?

DR. JAHODA: I did not mean to paint the hopeful picture that young women are looking for the absolutely right thing to do. But they are looking for outside approval of their choice, since they find it difficult to make up their minds among the four broad patterns that I have indicated. This is, of course, only true by and large.

There will be some women who look into themselves and for more lasting values when they make their decisions, but by and large it is a wish not to have the burden of choice on oneself but on somebody else, so that people will approve.

QUESTION for Dr. Kluckhohn: How do you suggest we go about getting our young women to embrace, not reject, the idea of being housewives; in other words, give the role prestige?

DR. KLUCKHOHN: There is another related question here: "Can a married woman do justice to a paid job when she has a family to attend to, with all of its problems?"

There are a good many people consciously concerned with the evaluation of the domestic side of the American home.

My students used to analyze advertisements for household gadgets in some of our papers, many of which did make the home sound like a mild variety of penal institution, which you ought to get out of as fast as possible and stay out of as long as possible. The ad on the automatic cookstove was the one that really hit me. It showed a woman putting on her hat and going out, and coming back to find the dinner all cooked. The advertiser did not tell you where she had been!

There is an interesting countertrend going on in our society at the present time, starting with the upper brackets of the middle class. The trend is toward a larger family, a greater interest in domesticity and the home. A part of this which it would be interesting to discuss is to what extent the husband is now being given a domestic role. This is in part related to technology.

Taking the other question: "Can a woman with a family do justice to

*Dr. Bartemeier, because of a previous commitment, could not be present for the discussion.

a job?" I think that—and let me phrase this cautiously—some women can; perhaps an increasing number. With the kind of technological development we have, there is no reason why running a house should be a full-time job. It will be even less of a full-time job if women are better trained for it, can organize it better, and have a more positive attitude toward it. I think these two things have to go on concomitantly.

I think we have only one way out of this problem, if basic values stay the way they are in the United States. A woman is going to have to have some stake in an occupation. I think for the majority of women it is going to have to be defined in limited scope. This cannot be done unless there is a more positive evaluation of necessities as they relate to the majority of women.

I agree completely with Dr. Jahoda that career women should be in the occupational world on an equal basis with men. If the counter-trend that I see coming up continues very far, we will have a change in basic values. This is speculative, but there is enough evidence for it to interest me as a fundamental system in the culture.

QUESTION for Dr. Jahoda: "The three speakers stressed the need for revising the education of women to include integrated programs of home and family living. Why ignore the education of men? Don't men also need to have functions and appreciations of this type of training as well?"

Dr. JAHODA: Yes, they need it. They are getting it nowadays and will get it in increasing amounts through their participation in what Dr. Kluckhohn has just referred to as the domestication of man.

The problem is going to get more acute because of what is happening to hours of labor. This will give more chance to involve the husband in problems of running the family life.

By and large, we now work shorter hours than we worked 20 years ago. There is some reason to believe that in the not-too-distant future the workweek will be about 30 hours. This will inevitably mean that both husband and wife—if she is working—will have a greater amount of spare time at home to try to solve some of the problems which the woman now has to face alone.

The right type of education for this is a real difficulty. We can see that the absorption of knowledge and ideas in our colleges for men takes up a terrific amount of time. It is not easy to fit courses on how to be a sensible husband and father into the usual college schedule.

The other problem is that most of the men really will not like it. This is something that they ought to learn about when they are in a life situation which makes it really meaningful. I do not think this is a real solution. I think it will probably come through the young

women having gotten in their education a better understanding of the possibilities for cooperation between husband and wife in the home.

QUESTION for Dr. Kluckhohn: Isn't the fact of wifehood and motherhood, and all its enriching experience, what pushes the girl from individualism into group orientation? Does she not find this group orientation much more satisfying than individual orientations? Do not men change, too, in their orientation?

Dr. KLUCKHOHN: This is raising the same issue that I was suggesting: Are we getting a change in value orientations? I do not know. I do not feel it is true, in any simple sense of the word, that the enriching experience of wife-motherhood pushes women into it. I think it is true that practically all women, in the United States, certainly all those who marry, expect to be mothers, and they have a positive attitude toward motherhood. I see no change in this.

But there are so many frustrations and disappointments that go with this that I do not think wife-motherhood can be looked at just as an enriching experience which throws a woman into a group situation. The lack of training, the isolation, when she faces many of her problems, makes for an awful lot of unhappiness on the part of the woman, and a wish to get out from under it, at least in part.

The increased family orientation of men, probably brought about both for the sake of the children and of the husband-wife relationship, is a good thing. I do not know how far this has gone through the culture as a whole yet. I do not know what the end result is going to be, if you attempt more equalization of these two roles. It is an interesting psychological problem. We were recently discussing the question of what kind of cultural process our children are going to have to go through to get into identifiable sex roles, if the roles are equalized too much. There is a real problem.

QUESTION for Dr. Jahoda: Will you please give educators some suggestions on helping adolescent girls to understand the choices they can make, to value college education for their own training and to resolve the conflicts in social status and social attitudes?

Dr. JAHODA: This is a tremendously important question. I cannot give you a definite answer. The efforts I have observed in this direction appear to be relatively fruitful in bringing to adolescent girls an increased awareness of these problems. Do not forget that unless you make it clear to them that these are real problems concerning them, most of their expectations and dreams about the future will probably be built by the literature, by better or worse novels, by something that makes the courting period in a girl's life the peak, the dream, the goal, the most important thing; followed by nothing, in

terms of a realistic description of how the lives of women look after this wonderful period is over.

I think that the American Council for Education, through its Committee for the Education of Women, is actually quite systematically working on these ideas. The only approach that I would feel safe in supporting now is that of making girls aware of what the situation is, of not letting them form a picture of what their future lives may be like from casual information in the culture.

QUESTION for Dr. Kluckhohn: You said that women are usually educated on a contingency basis, because some emergency has arisen. At this moment, the industrial nurses of the United States are desperately trying to open up avenues of education so that they may become more skilled in their daily jobs. Must we wait for another war, another emergency?

Dr. KLUCKHOHN: This raises a question about the whole American educational system. Most of our colleges emphasize the liberal-arts education. I, for one, would certainly hate to see a liberal-arts emphasis be replaced by vocational education, in training either men or women.

We do have developments in many fields of more technical professional training at a different level than college. In some fields there has been a lag, especially, I suspect, in some of the fields in which women are interested. I think we need more education for skills to meet the demands of women for the kinds of jobs that particularly interest them.

MARCH 10, AFTERNOON SESSION

Panel Discussion—The Woman Who Works

WINIFRED G. HELMES, Ph. D., Assistant Director, Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor—Presiding

This afternoon we are concerned with the topic "The Woman Who Works, As Others See Her, and As She Sees Herself." Three women who work and three men representing labor and firms hiring many women will discuss the topic.

Dr. Anne Gary Pannell is President of Sweet Briar College, and one of the few women college presidents in this country. She is currently the only woman among nine college presidents selected to the Scholarship Board of the Ford Motor Company Fund and is a member of the National Committee for Faculty Fellowships on the Fund for Advancement of Education.

Mrs. Helen Berthelot is the Legislative Representative of the Communications Workers of America, CIO. Mrs. Berthelot was the first Chairman of the Labor-Management Committee. She is also a member of the National CIO Legislative Committee.

Miss Louise Watson works in a relatively new field for women. She is an Investment Adviser for R. W. Pressprich and Company in New York. She was Business Manager of Bryn Mawr College and at one time was affiliated with the Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

Mr. Virgil Martin, Vice President and General Manager of Carson, Pirie, Scott and Company in Chicago, represents a firm which hires a good many women. He is a member of the Boards of the Welfare Council for Metropolitan Chicago, the National Health and Welfare Retirement Fund, and Illinois-Wesleyan University.

Mr. Peter Henle is the Assistant Director of Research for the American Federation of Labor.

During the war, he served as Statistical Officer for the Air Force and has worked with the Department of Labor as Executive Assistant to the Labor Members of the Labor-Management Manpower Policy Committee.

Mr. James G. O'Connell is Vice President of Publix-Shirts Corporation in New York where he is responsible for union negotiations and relations, industrial engineering, and personnel management.

During World War II he served on the General Staff Corps and was responsible for the direction and coordination of the program for the development of civilian personnel management by the United States Forces in the European Theater.

The moderator of this panel, Mrs. Gertrude Michelson, is Manager of the Labor Relations Department for R. H. Macy and Company in New York. She is one of the few Management Representatives in the labor relations field.

Mrs. Michelson has a law degree and has taught a course in employee relations at New York University.

The speakers have agreed upon the points of discussion. Necessarily they will not be able to cover the entire field, which will leave time for questions.

Mrs. Michelson, the rest of the afternoon is in your capable hands.

Mrs. MICHELSON: I am delighted to have the opportunity to be your moderator for this afternoon's panel, "The Woman Who Works." I am both delighted and impressed with my feminine colleagues on the panel, each a very distinguished woman in her chosen field, and the equally distinguished masculine members of the panel who will present their points of view on "The Woman Who Works, As Others See Her." All of us, I think, will learn a great deal from their insight into the problems that we encounter and perhaps do not realize that we encounter.

It is axiomatic that a moderator should have a moderate, tempered attitude toward the problems under discussion. If that is the case, I probably ought to disqualify myself, because I do not feel very moderate. A general forum such as we are having this afternoon to discuss the position, the problems, and the accomplishments of women as a group, may serve a useful purpose when we talk as a group. But I think by and large the woman worker does a greater service to herself and the career which she chooses to follow if she thinks of herself as a member of the working community and not as a career woman. I do not think that as a general rule a highly self-analytical attitude is a useful one.

Dr. Helmes has asked if I could give my definition of a successful career woman. In my opinion, she is not necessarily the prototype of the Hollywood fashions, in a glamorous, unusual pursuit; she is one who enters upon a course of aggressive achievement in any chosen field and who receives satisfaction from her contribution. That satisfaction does not necessarily stem from generous remuneration or from unusual recognition. A successful career woman may apply her efforts to a repetitive, straight-line production machine job or to a highly creative occupation.

I submit that the test of the success of any career woman should be the satisfaction which she receives from performing her job, whether as an executive or a member of a profession or a member of the general

working population. If a woman does her job well, likes what she is doing, is interested in continued progress on the job, and retains those qualities which enhance her position as a woman, she is my notion of a successful career woman.

The questions which I shall address to the members of the panel have been submitted by them, to serve as guides for our discussion.

I am going to address the first question to Miss Watson: "What are the characteristics that are most acceptable in a workingwoman? Does she like people and does she want to cooperate with both men and women? Is she willing to help other women advance? Does she ignore prejudice against her sex?"

MISS WATSON: Perhaps I should preface my remarks by saying that the financial world is still a man's world. Women entered this field during the First World War, and the Second World War gave them another boost. But the numbers of women who are vice presidents of banks or partners or heads of investment counsel firms can still be counted on the fingers of two hands.

In the financial world a woman works with the men in her firm and also with the public, both men and women. Next to being competent in her job, it is of the greatest importance that she like people and enjoy working and cooperating with them. This statement may appear obvious, but there is evidence that more people are fired for character traits than for lack of ability. For many reasons they can neither get along nor cooperate with other people.

When I asked one of the three women vice presidents of New York banks—and there are only three—what she felt a woman could contribute most in the field of finance, she gave me what I consider exactly the right answer: "To my mind," she said, "she must like people, for this field is one of the great service occupations. And what the woman can best contribute is the kind of service which complements that offered by the man."

For instance, recently one of the men officers and I were helping a woman client with the settlement of her husband's estate. She never had been trained to think along financial lines. But I knew what her special problems were and how to answer the questions that she was uncertain how to ask. The man officer was quite unaware of these particular problems. His approach was along different lines. Together I believe we sent her away with a feeling of security and a peace of mind that she would not have had if we both had not been on the job.

If a woman genuinely enjoys working with the men in her office, she usually has a degree of understanding and a sense of humor that enables her to combat prejudices. She has some appreciation of the average man's point of view. Just why should he make way for her

in his bailiwick? The fact that he often does reveals that he is fair and liberal.

The antagonistic reasonableness of his point of view and hers is understandable to her. When he cannot see his way clear to granting her request and says "Don't be difficult," she can laugh, even though it does not necessarily change her long-range objective.

When she encounters a genuine prejudice against her as a member of the feminine sex, on the part of either a man or a woman, she endeavors to overlook it. Here I should like to stress what we all know: that women, all women, can help raise their status as women, and especially the status of their working sisters, by backing them to the hilt.

Men will help other men get ahead. I have seen many a bright boy singled out and helped to advance by those higher up. They are always on the lookout for unusual ability, eager to train it for use in a greater capacity.

My experience has been that many workingwomen are very conscious of the obligation to help other women get ahead. This is not true of every woman, of course. But those who do help other women advance speed up a little the time when more corporation executives will search for bright young girls as they now search for bright young boys.

Mrs. MICHELSON: Mr. Martin, in your business do you find that women help other women to advance?

Mr. MARTIN: Not as specifically as men help other men to advance. I think that we are now getting into the area where there might be some disagreement. Miss Watson has outlined very well the methods whereby women can progress. And what she has said about the factors that make for progress of women in the financial world is true of any other kind of business, and it is equally true of men.

But it seems to me that women are more subjective and more inhibited in their relationships with each other. We have a number of women executives. And we have a General Management Council which reviews the people who are being proposed for promotion from within.

It has been my experience that women executives are more likely to keep their eyes open for the likely young male executive than they are for the likely young female executive. I am saying that from a purely impersonal viewpoint. It may be that they still feel too unsure of themselves. They are afraid they would bring greater criticism to themselves by proposing a young woman executive who does not succeed than a young man executive who does not succeed.

Mr. HENLE: Maybe that is a good thing, because maybe the women are sort of taking over anyway. If they really push themselves they would take over a lot sooner.

Mrs. BERTHELOT: I think probably one of the reasons women do not help each other as much as the men do is that each feels "Perhaps I am only here by mistake." The job opportunities for women at the top are so few that each has a natural fear that perhaps she is the only one who will be considered.

Mr. O'CONNELL: You think the problem is more one of unnecessary identification as to whether they are male or female, whether they are men or women.

I heard Miss Watson say that the male officer was unaware of the problems of the female. Maybe we are unaware, but we are not insensitive. In our business, practically all our employees are women, so it makes it rather easy to become an expert.

In talking to our women executives, I find they do not consider the male particularly prejudiced, so long as he can pay them less and get along better! They have no quarrel whatever with the way in which they are treated, except on Friday morning or the first of the month, whenever they get their pay check. Of course I maintain, as any good personnel man would, that we never notice in our wage or salary administration whether the person is male or female. Jobs are set up for what the person can do. If there are limits to what a woman can do, those limitations are on the job sheet; and, therefore, she gets properly paid.

Mrs. MICHELSON: I was going to ask you about that subject. This is one of your favorite subjects, I know: equal pay for equal work. Would you like to comment on that, Mr. Henle?

Mr. HENLE: This brings up a subject that has been a bone of contention throughout labor relations for many years. I think on the whole we have the issue licked. We feel that our unions have done a great deal toward eliminating any discrimination on the job against women. For example, in a recent issue of *The Machinist*, published by the International Association of Machinists, it says "IAM scores victories for woman job rights." The paper tells the story of a girl who had been refused a job as production tracer at a New York plant. The local union, of which she was a member, filed a grievance charging that she was passed over because of her sex. But the company refused to see it that way. The local union officials then processed the grievance through regular procedures and eventually had to take up the matter with the national officials of the IAM here in Washington, who were then meeting with the national company officials. After

hearing the case, the company executives agreed that the union was right, awarded the girl her promotion, and gave her back pay amounting to nearly \$900.

We do not like to draw morals on this panel, but we might draw the simple one that we feel women workers will be able to lick the problem of discrimination on the job if they join a union.

Mrs. MICHELSON: I think the point of view as expressed by the men who represent industries in which there has been a greater infiltration of women probably reflects a different sort of experience from that of Miss Watson because of the newness of women in her field.

Do you feel that there is any amelioration of the problem in the field of finance, Miss Watson, in terms of either prejudice or the question of acceptance?

Miss WATSON: Oh, yes. I think that we have made great strides in the last 35 years. And I think after these years of spadework, if young women come along who have more than usual ability and a determination never to let anything stop them, who refuse to see any stone walls, women will go further in the next 10 years in this field than they have ever gone in the past.

Mr. MARTIN: My general observation about women executives is that basically they are as tough minded as men executives. But, Miss Watson, your use of one phrase bothered me a little, because I have had quite the opposite experience. Perhaps it is a tipoff as to how more women can go higher and faster in the financial field. It is so seldom that anyone has to say to a woman, either an associate or on the executive level, "Don't be difficult." In fact, one of my quarrels with our female executives is the fact that they always get the better of me—but they are not difficult; they outmaneuver me.

A male executive will come in and meet me head-on in an issue and I don't say "Don't be difficult" to him. I just use a few choice mid-western adjectives and he understands what I mean. But generally the woman executive does not like to encounter head-on the managerial decision. In fact, she is inhibited by the possibility that someone might say to her, "Don't be difficult." And, therefore, she will take about 2 or 3 days to get to the point. We will ultimately do what she wants us to do. That always happens.

But my observation on women, both when I was working as a supervisor and in the executive group, is that they are not difficult enough. They do not understand a man's psychology. A man is a "head-on" creature. He wants to face the problem and get it out of the way. A woman is more subtle. Sometimes I think a male executive might pay more attention to the female executive if she would smack him

right on the chin, and he would have to say "Look, Susie, don't be difficult."

MISS WATSON: Ours is a field in which we have to be very independent and in which we have to fight for our point of view. We wouldn't get very far if we didn't.

MR. MARTIN: Could that be a reason why it has been difficult for women to establish themselves in that field?

MISS WATSON: I suppose in every field the psychology of the average workingwoman does not give her the courage to stand out against customs, prejudices, and the judgments of others.

MRS. MICHELSON: I have another question, for Dr. Pannell. "Does the average workingwoman have the courage, determination, and ability to accept herself at her own valuation rather than that of a man?"

DR. PANNELL: The average workingwoman is a very difficult object to define. I represent one of the great traditional service fields for women, the schoolteacher. This is a field where there are many openings today. We have a shortage of trained teachers, so that the average woman who is equipped to teach can certainly get a job in the classroom today.

This does not mean, however, that there are not intricacies and difficulties to be faced in the teaching profession as well as in other fields for the workingwoman. The classroom is open to the woman teacher. But certainly the woman educational administrator does not have an easy part. There are very few women superintendents of schools. There are very few women college presidents in the United States. There is, I believe, one woman president of a coeducational teachers college. So far as I know, there is no woman president of either a coeducational university or a man's college.

So, I still think there is a lack of opportunity for women to rise to the top in education. Certainly, I think that the average woman in education—and particularly in educational administration—has to be aware of the opinion of men. Just as in any other occupation, she has to work with men. She cannot regard herself as a woman working alone without regard for masculine opinion.

I am the head of a college for women. The young women who attend our college have fathers who support them, who pay their school fees. Our college has men professors, men members of the staff. And the young women who attend the college also have masculine friends in nearby institutions. So, their opinions of what goes on in the college are somewhat colored by the opinions of the men in their lives.

Men interested in ideas, those who are associated with colleges, I

think, are perhaps freer to accept new ideas, to work cooperatively with women, and to have respect for the opinions of women. But, on the other hand, men's opinions have to be respected, and men have to be consulted.

I would agree with the gentlemen who have pointed out that perhaps women administrators and executives do not like to face problems head-on. It is true that the woman administrator has to be more flexible, more sensitive, to the opinions of others, more flexible in approaching these problems. I am of the opinion that the woman executive generally has to have more preparation, has to bear more things willingly, and has to bow to the opinions of others more graciously in order to secure the cooperation that she needs for effective performance.

I think it is very difficult sometimes for women executives and administrators to pay the price. Now, look at the position of a man college president, for instance. He works in his office, while his gracious and effective and intelligent wife is busy at home entertaining his guests and supplementing his activities. The woman college president has to depend on her faculty and staff to be her "corporate wife" and to perform these functions in her absence.

I represent not only the "school marm" and the woman administrator who has a budget of a million dollars for the welfare and payroll for a community of 700 people, with a great many business functions to perform. I also represent another type of workingwoman, who I think is often forgotten in community planning; that is, the widow with dependent children.

I would like to emphasize the necessity for more concerted public attention to the problem of providing day care for the children of working women with dependent children. Community facilities, nursery schools, kindergartens, are needed to be sure that the children are well cared for while the woman worker is attending to the absolute necessity of earning the daily bread and paying the doctor's bills and buying the new shoes and schoolbooks.

These are very important facets to me of the special problems of the workingwoman. She is dependent, as I think she always has been, upon the cooperation, the understanding, and the loyal interest of men as well as other women.

Mrs. MICHELSON: Miss Watson, would you like to comment on this question? I know, having talked to you, that you have a special interest in some of its aspects.

Miss WATSON: I do agree fully with Dr. Pannell in her analysis of the situation. But I feel that times are changing and that women

should have what is almost a religious fervor in seeing that women of ability have equal opportunity.

All the women that I know in my field tremendously enjoy working with men. Maybe that is the chief reason why the field is so interesting.

I think a woman should go into any business or profession exactly as a man does, feeling confident that, as a woman, she is able to contribute a point of view different from a man's but equally valuable. She must have the ability to be herself and to stand on her own two feet mentally and spiritually as well as physically. If she wishes to be promoted she must acquire a more thorough knowledge of the subject than the man at the next desk and work much harder than he. She is interested in getting the job done. She learns how to be impersonal. Because of all the groundwork that has been done all these years, and because of the fact that the times are changing for women, I believe women are going further in the future.

Dr. PANNELL: Miss Watson, may I point out another possible dilemma and frustration of our times. An article in the *New York Times* very recently suggested that women today are marrying earlier and having more children earlier and closer together than a generation ago. (I have had prepared at the college a study of the comparative marriage age and child-bearing ages of our classes at Sweet Briar in 1930 and 1945, which I will discuss later.) If the *New York Times* is right, it means that often our young women today are seeking stopgap employment to furnish their homes, to help their husbands get an education, and to supplement their limited beginning income. Then later, after their children are grown, they are going to come back into the labor market younger than previously, with less professional experience and training.

Therefore they are going to seek easy jobs with easy working conditions. This may mean that a group of women, a large group of women, are less concerned with status and with the possibility of professional advancement into decision-making positions. There may be a growing movement toward women seeking blind-alley jobs, which makes for less seeking of training and proficiency.

I want to cite an example in this connection of a rather typical recent Sweet Briar graduate. She received her bachelor of arts degree, Phi Beta Kappa, summa cum laude. And she was given a rather good beginning administrative post at the college. She gave it up at the end of a year to marry a young man who was overseas with our Armed Forces in Germany. She joined him and began to work in a Government school in Germany. She had majored in sociology, but she took

a teaching job to be with her husband. She spent a winter in Germany. Then he came back and got the job that he always wanted, running a Virginia plantation. What did she do? She went into the State employment office and secured a caseworker job in the same town where her husband was located within 1 day after he got his job. Then within 6 more hours she found an apartment one block from their respective jobs.

She illustrates what I regard as both the virtues and the weaknesses of many of our contemporary young women; the need for flexibility in education. She is giving her primary devotion to her husband and his career. But she lacks permanency in her occupational choice. She has many distractions. She lacks opportunity for continued promotion, which must in the end decrease her job motivation and her interest in her work. Yet she is doing well in a socially useful occupation, and she is demonstrating a good work performance, good human relations, good social attitudes.

She illustrates what I regard as the most desirable education for women in the second half of the 20th century, the liberal-arts training, which makes women able to accept the distractions of our times and adapt their general training to the specific job situation that they find.

I do not think, for instance, that we need specific vocational training in dietetics or what-have-you to have better homemakers. I still think that the best training for a good wife and mother, for the creation of good homes, is for children to be brought up in good homes by good mothers; to help their mothers at the stove, in cleaning the house, in minding the babies.

The function of education is to develop critical thinking ability, to provide flexibility, to instill ethical and moral and intellectual values—those things which are absolutely essential for the preservation of our culture and civilization.

The Sweet Briar chart I mentioned earlier shows that the girls graduated in 1945 married sooner after college than those graduated in 1930. Among the more recent graduates, the largest number of marriages occurred during the first and second years after graduation; among the 1930 graduates, on the other hand, it occurred 3 years after graduation. Five years out of college, 80 percent of the class of 1945 were married, but only 55 percent of the class of 1930. This is very remarkable. At the present time 93 percent of the 1945 graduates are married, and 89 percent of the 1930 graduates are married.

Undoubtedly the war and the depression influenced both classes, causing the class of 1945 to marry earlier and the class of 1930 to marry late. Security is a big factor in the troubled world of today.

Another point is that the graduates of 1945 have already equaled the graduates of 1930 in the number of children per married graduate. The class of 1945 has had more children sooner after marriage. The older class had a much more gradual childbearing period.

Now, these are major factors for you to consider in the future role of the workingwoman. I think great changes are taking place.

Mrs. MICHELSON: Thank you, Dr. Pannell. Mr. O'Connell wanted to make a comment.

Mr. O'CONNELL: I just wanted to enter into this discussion about the question of married women who have homes and who have children. We do not like to be characterized, either as employers or as males, as prejudiced when we have to set up certain rules for continuity in jobs which might seem to discriminate against a child-bearing female.

It is more a matter of practicality than of prejudice. In American industry we are in business to make money. That fact establishes a need for continuity of jobs at the place where this money is to be made.

As I said, we do employ a great number of women. And we have a whole series of rules and regulations regarding them. We have rules about when pregnant women shall leave work, how soon they can be reemployed, what their rights to their jobs are, and what guarantees we can offer and cannot offer.

I know that the industry as a whole would not like to be characterized as disapproving of the idea of early marriage and frequent motherhood. All I ask is that the women try to understand the problems of the employer.

I would guess that well over 50 percent of our women employees are married—most of them have families and most of them take maternity leave. But we are not really prejudiced—at least we do not think we are—when we cannot afford to hire them or when they do not feel they get an equal opportunity to advance. Sometimes they have no chance for consecutive training which will enable them to acquire the ability of the male who started with them but whose employment was not interrupted.

Mrs. MICHELSON: Mr. O'Connell, I do not think any of the women members of the panel would disagree that in a business such as yours continuity of employment is important. And if it is broken, the woman cannot have the same aspirations for advancement as a man who stays with the job.

I have a question for Mrs. Berthelot, who through the unions she represents, has to do with a great many women who, from my limited knowledge, leave their careers in the telephone companies and later often come back to work. Assuming the premise that women work for

economic reasons, how can they be stimulated to more job satisfaction by feeling that they make a definite contribution?

Mrs. BERTHELOT: Well, I am particularly interested in this question, because, as a widow left with two small children, I found it essential to work. Had there been a nursery school, my problems certainly would have been lessened.

I come from the telephone industry. I grew up with the telephone union movement. When the Wagner Act was passed, I happened to be working for the telephone company, and I became interested in the union movement and have been with it ever since.

My union is composed for the most part of women, approximately 65 percent. That means that the industry also is composed of that percentage of women. However, it is very interesting to note that there are no women in executive positions in the telephone industry higher than an assistant to a district manager. Believe me, there *are* many other jobs having higher titles and corresponding pay! The union has done considerably better than that, but not nearly enough, considering the number of women we have in our organization; I am not sure whether it is the men's or the women's fault. We do have a woman on the executive board, and we have some women in the international office, of which I am a member.

One of the first things that a woman has to do is to learn to view her work as a commodity. If her work is a good product, then she can demand a high price for it. If her work is shabby and inefficient, certainly she cannot expect top pay.

Another thing she has to recognize is that competition is a work factor and not a personal matter. This is one of the great weaknesses that women have, particularly when they are trying to break into a new field. If there is a job opportunity open and they compete for it unsuccessfully, they view their failure as a personal matter, and they become discouraged more easily than they should.

One of the prime considerations, of course, is an improvement of the monetary compensation for a woman's work as it relates to the labor force in general. And one of the things that the woman should do is to refuse to accept a lower rate of pay than a man would be offered for the same job.

It seems to me that a woman should be encouraged to improve her own work and inspired to improve her own opportunities through self-education and through analytical thinking.

One of the prime work hazards in my estimation is poor work orientation on the job, which creates a feeling of insecurity. This is true of both men and women and is particularly true at the managerial or supervisory levels.

Many times there is no clear-cut employment policy regarding women, and I am sure that women still suffer from the myth that a man can do a job better than a woman.

I do not know the answer to my fellow panel member's problem in getting women to work the late shifts. We have that same problem in the telephone industry. And in many instances the late shift in our particular industry is the desirable shift, particularly for the married woman. They are shorter shifts with higher pay. I think the older women are more interested in that type of shift. The schoolgirl wants to work in the afternoon, possibly, after she gets out of school.

Mrs. MICHELSON: You wanted to make some contribution to that, Dr. Pannell?

Dr. PANNELL: I wanted to ask the opinion of the gentlemen members of this panel how they think we really can get at the problem of educating women for the second half of the 20th century. How can women be motivated to increase their efficiency and train themselves to the fuller use of their powers? The content of the women's education is still largely masculine dominated. Most of the textbooks, most of the curricula, are set up by gentlemen. Most of the heads of educational institutions, even women's colleges, are still men. I would like to have the comments of the men on the panel on how we should go about educating women to achieve these kinds of motivation.

Mr. O'CONNELL: I do not know whether Dr. Pannell means the extent of the education or the type of education.

I would say, that, first, all women should be educated, as should all men, up to the limit of their capacity to really benefit from education. That does not always mean the same level for everybody.

Second, I think that women, since their outlook is more varied, cannot plan quite as accurately as men. Their education should be in broad and general terms so that if they are "channeled" into particular careers, they can then complete the technical and vocational education necessary after that time.

Going back to that question of part-time work, and also to something which Mrs. Berthelot said: I am going to take the risk of a generalization on feminine psychology here. I think there is a very definite trait in a woman of subjectiveness and possessiveness in her employment.

We have a very peculiar block on shift work or part-time work. Every girl regards her machine as her personal property. She has a right to move it. She is careful which mechanic she lets work on it. And she resents very strongly having it turned over to any other girl for another shift. We tried all the means of education, and we get a certain amount of acceptance. But we get the same degree of ac-

ceptance as we used to get from our children, or that my mother got from her children, when she offered them castor oil. They take it, but I am sure they have never gotten to like it. It seems to me that possessiveness is a part of the subjectiveness of women; they are unable to separate themselves personally from their employment. The male does not have this possessiveness to the same extent.

Actually that, to me, is one of the problems which we face in training a girl for supervisory jobs. We do not find the same thing in high-level administrative professions or technical jobs. Where a woman deals with things, or where she even deals with people in a way that does not affect her personally, she tends to be not only as good but in many cases better than a man under the same circumstances.

However, where she herself enters as a person in the discussion with an employee, often as a supervisor, she does not assume that same degree of objectivity. I do not say she cannot be trained to have that approach. I merely say it is harder to train her.

MR. MARTIN: I think you girls who work have to worry more about what other women see in women working than what men see in women working.

A number of centuries ago—more centuries than I like to think of—I was dean of men on a college campus, Dr. Pannell. I worked under a very great president who said that he believed that the purpose of education was to create adulthood in the lives of the youngsters who came to the campus. His definition of an adult was a person who was more interested in solving problems than in creating them.

I have listened to this side of the panel, and it seems to me as an amateur psychologist that there have been several Freudian slips. Miss Watson said in a part of her statement that as a woman she can bring a woman's viewpoint into a business. I would like to say that I think she should go into business as an individual with the added advantage of bringing the woman's viewpoint.

Now, I feel the same thing about the college tests which are written by men, the colleges which are dominated by men, all of those areas of higher education and secondary education which seemingly are dominated by men. That is not good altogether. But if you were to ask me what kind of training a young woman should have for the second half of the 20th century, I would say that liberal-arts training is pretty fundamental, whether it is on the college or the high-school level. But of prime importance is the injection into the individual's thinking the idea that what is being achieved on the campus is simply a way of approaching a problem—that liberal arts training deals with a general body of knowledge about our society, about our culture, and about our economy that is going to be helpful to the individual.

I am not particularly concerned as an employer of women that a woman comes to us as a specialist. Certainly, she must come to us as a well-rounded, matured individual; we can make the specialist out of her, fortunately. But if she comes to us as a well-rounded, matured individual interested in the solving of problems and not in the creating of problems, then we receive her just as we would that same kind of man. We have men who create problems, just as often as we have women who create problems.

In fact, again, one of the rare virtues—and here I am swinging over to your viewpoint—one of the rare virtues, I think, of the average woman executive is the trait criticized earlier. That is the way in which she will not meet the situation head-on but will in ways devious and wondrous to behold, solve a problem which a man just is not able to solve because he does want to batter his balding head against that brick wall.

Mrs. BERTHELOT: That brings up another point: It was mentioned a little while ago that women resent other women getting ahead. I think that they do not resent another woman getting ahead if they are absolutely sure that the woman has been chosen for her actual ability and for her production rather than, perhaps, her attractiveness only.

Mrs. MICHELSON: Miss Watson, I think, wants to make a comment.

Miss WATSON: I would like to say a word on the subject of liberal-arts education from my experience in business.

A businesswoman is much more apt to be a well-integrated human being if she has a liberal-arts education before any degree of specialization is attempted. It used to be said that women could be wedded to jobs, that they had no special interests outside; that they were narrow in their outlook, and consequently were fairly uninteresting as people. With this kind of background, of the liberal-arts education before specialization, the woman can have not only a better perspective from which to view her problem, but her leisure life is bound to be much happier and richer. And her opportunities of success in her work and as a human being are definitely furthered by such a background.

Mrs. MICHELSON: I want at this time, while we are waiting for your questions, to thank the members of the panel. I do not know whether they feel that they have learned something today or not; but I, as the moderator, certainly feel that I have learned something from the divergent points of view which proved to be not quite so divergent as they seemed at first.

I think they can be very easily reconciled: The women members of the panel are convinced that the opportunities and the prospects of

the future are bright; the men on the panel are both tolerant of and interested in welcoming women into the business world. And I think with those happy attitudes it is a fairly compatible situation.

Question Period

QUESTION for Mr. Martin: Can you think of any good reason why a company anxious to hire more women should not set up its own day nursery?

MR. MARTIN: I think that is a fair question. I can think of several good reasons why it should not. And I can think of probably twice as many good reasons why it should.

Let's put it very bluntly. Number one: The liability on such an operation is terrific. We have ceased to run our public nursery for children of the shopping public because of the tremendous liability and our inability to get nurses and skilled people with teacher backgrounds to run the nursery.

I think the second, and probably the most important, reason is that our competition does not do it. If you are not forced to do something, you do not do it—probably it is just sheer inertia. But I think it might well be done.

QUESTION for Mr. O'Connell: Would a different attitude toward employment of older women help meet the problem of part-time employment?

MR. O'CONNELL: We do not have any problem with regard to the employment of older women. We have very productive employees in our industry who are past the retirement age of 65. Our only stipulation on age, as far as women are concerned, is that we do not like to start training them after they have turned 35. We do it; but they are not quite as adaptable as the younger women. Actually, I do not know to what extent there is prejudice against women workers over a certain age. We do not have it, so I can not talk from experience.

MRS. MICHELSON: I do not know whether anybody is interested in a moderator's point of view on that question, but I do have a point of view. I think, particularly in retailing, that middle-aged and older women are a useful source of womanpower. And they very well meet the needs of our business.

But one of the problems, whether through collective bargaining, or management institution, is the greater emphasis which is placed on long-range security, on pension plans, and long-range thinking. These considerations make it harder if you are going to be very practical about integrating an older person into your business organization from the starting point. And I think that as more emphasis is placed

on fringe benefits and social gains, these difficulties will increase. We have to find a way of reconciling those two objectives if we are going to be practical.

Mr. O'CONNELL: That is true for older men too.

Mrs. MICHELSON: That is right.

QUESTION for Mrs. Berthelot: Why don't you pick up Mr. Henle on his statement that the A. F. of L. licked the problem of equal pay through collective bargaining?

Mrs. BERTHELOT: I am sure Mr. Henle will agree with me that not only the A. F. of L. but the CIO—and the labor movement in general—is untiring in its efforts to see that the women get equal pay wherever possible. Sometimes the grievance machinery is even more effective than the collective bargaining. Through usage, provisions are written into a contract that you might never be able to get across the bargaining table.

We are not resting on our laurels in this matter. We also are attempting through Federal legislation to bring an equal-pay bill into being. You might be interested to know that a group of women here in Washington representing many divergent groups have agreed on the text of a bill. We have worked with the Women's Bureau here, and they have been of great assistance to us. I think that this bill will be introduced very shortly.

Mr. HENLE: It is not any one group in the labor movement, but the whole labor movement, that has been working for a long time not only on the question of equal pay but on the question of protective legislation for women, and going back even further, the suffrage amendment. The whole achievement over the years can be viewed as a result of efforts made by many, many groups and by all the labor movement.

Now, there is, I must indicate, one slight difference of views on the question of equal pay between some of the people within the labor organization. We in the A. F. of L. feel that the problem of equal pay can be licked, and is being licked, through collective bargaining. We see the value of legislation to set a floor, a minimum, for wages for women, but we do not feel it necessary to have legislation establishing an equal-pay principle for wages above the minimum.

Our experience in negotiating agreements has been that the problem involved in collective bargaining, the problem involved in industry, more often is a question of comparable pay rather than equal pay. By relying on the standard of comparable pay, we are able to eliminate wage differentials because of sex and remove the opportunity that many employers would have to quibble under a complex and difficult administration of a specific law.

So, we say we are getting the job done. The women are helping us.

The women, both in the labor movement and out, are helping us. And we think that the job can be done, and most effectively done, through collective bargaining.

Mrs. BERTHELOT: I think possibly this might be a subject for a debate between the A. F. of L. and the CIO panels. We will not go into that here, however.

QUESTION for Miss Watson: Since World War II, when women came into banking, the number of officers has risen to 6,000, out of a total of 80,000. There are 225,000 to 250,000 women employed in banks—more than 50 percent of the entire staffs. In the brokerage houses, how many women are working as brokers, and has the number multiplied as it has with women in banking?

MISS WATSON: The women who are presidents of banks and chairmen of the boards are outside of New York City. There are a great many women on the clerical staffs in New York banks, but few who are vice presidents.

In the brokerage houses of New York City there are very few women partners. There are a few, but it is outside of New York where you find them in large numbers. There are only 4 or 5 women investment counselors in New York firms. The number is still very small.

QUESTION for Dr. Pannell: Should not the education of women for the second work period—and that is defined as 32 years and over—become the responsibility of adult education, leaving to the junior and liberal-arts colleges the function of guidance, planning, and motivation to engage in a lifetime career of living and working?

DR. PANNELL: I agree with parts of those implications. It is the duty of the undergraduate college to instill a lifelong interest in the things of the mind and in real achievement—in other words, to instill motivation if possible.

I would likewise agree that the adult-education movement is tremendously important. I think that organizations like the American Association of University Women are extremely important in providing pathways in community activity of a most worthwhile kind for women and providing a union of career women and homemakers. But I think, to answer the basic point there: I have often been asked by widows who have come back into the labor market after a considerable period of absence how to go about reorienting themselves. I think neither the undergraduate college nor the adult-education movement is entirely the answer.

It is my belief that when a woman returns to the labor market after a long period of absence, it is basically important for her to get a maximum amount of training of the most highly specialized kind, of the most recent vintage that she can, so that she has something extra to

offer in the labor market. She must not take the little job created for her by some friend or the lowest thing that she can get at the poorest salary. I would advise her to seek the graduate school or the technical school or the vocational school that offers something extra.

QUESTION for Miss Watson: You had talked about the advantages of a liberal-arts education. How will a liberal-arts education help dressmakers, gloveworkers, and so forth, in the labor supply? Or make them available?

MISS WATSON: I do not know that it will make them available in the labor supply. It will just make their lives far richer and give them more imagination in their work. One of the best-read men I know is the hired man on an Arizona ranch. He also plays the piano with professional skill. Why should not the gloveworker have the tools with which to enjoy art and read? At 60 she is apt to be much happier and much more successful.

MR. HENLE: The question of a liberal-arts education for the dressmaker and the other occupation that was mentioned, it seems to me, raises this problem: It is all very well to say that these occupations and the individuals who want to go into them would be helped by a liberal-arts education. I think we are all agreed that any person would be so helped. But there is a question of what education we provide for those among us, men and women, who cannot afford to go to college, who have to hit the employment trail directly after high school.

And for this group which, if I might point out, still constitutes the majority of people in the United States, we have to look pretty sharply at our educational and our training curricula. The labor movement, of course, does its part in taking an interest in the vocational schools and in apprenticeship programs and things of that sort. But we want to do more than we have done to make sure that our young people are channeled toward pursuits in which they can find a happy life and a fairly remunerative one.

MR. O'CONNELL: The question, it seems to me, also has a social connotation. It goes back to part of the original philosophy that education is solely an end to material advancement, the earning of a living, in dollars and cents, forgetting what we call the dignity of labor. It seems to me that every individual, whether through circumstance or not, has to earn a living no matter at what level, and he is still an individual with human dignity and, therefore, an individual to whom education is most important.

The liberal-arts idea was not necessarily at a college level as I understood it, but it was a general training of the individual for living. All education is a course of training for living, not just a course of

training for making a living. To consider only the college level would distort the issue. I know many people who are, let us call them, shirt-makers, whose job used to be considered low-paid employment, but many of those people are thoroughly educated individuals, not formally, but they are thoroughly educated. They are good people, and they are good citizens. That was what I meant when I was discussing liberal education. And I think it is all that the rest of the panel meant: not something formal, but something complete in the development of the individual.

MS. MICHELSON: I think from the comments that I hear that that is the case.

QUESTIONS for Mr. Henle: (1) Why are there so few women in top-level trade-union executive posts? (2) As long as there is unemployment and fear of its increase, do you really think that industry will adjust to noncontinuous employment of women?

MR. HENLE: Actually, there are quite a few top trade-union people in the labor movement who are women. There are a number of instances where women in the labor movement have been given recognition according to their ability.

The other question on the subject of unemployment is, of course, a very vital one. It certainly is true that when unemployment is at a relatively high level, as it is today, there is less incentive for the employer to arrange special work schedules, stagger hours, fix up the job requirements, and so forth, to attract women. This is a hazard that the economy puts in front of us. Right now we are a little concerned about the direction in which the economy is going. We still have a fairly high level of unemployment. But we are certainly hopeful, because we do have employers, like the two on either side of me here, tackling the problem.

QUESTION for Mr. Martin: Regarding the trouble in getting workers for short shifts, have you opened those jobs, such as clerks, inspectors, and so forth, to Negro workers? Many times employee shortages reveal that this portion of the population either is not considered or is restricted to service, semiservice, and semiskilled jobs in very limited numbers. Can Negro workers be hired for any position you have?

MR. MARTIN: We have no FEPC law in Illinois. About 6 years ago we, as a store, individually, because others did not wish to join us, adopted a completely nondiscriminatory hiring practice. This was not to fill so-called traditional jobs for Negroes. At first we employed only skilled Negroes, as secretaries, machine operators, and so forth. We have utilized every available labor resource in the community. We have a number of Nisei. We hire on the basis of what an individual can do, not on the basis of color or religion. We have found it an

eminently satisfying practice. This has been a real source of good employees for us. It has worked out very, very nicely, and we are very happy that the other stores, within the last year or 18 months, have joined us.

QUESTION for Dr. Pannell: Does the earlier marriage and earlier and more frequent childbearing of young women today imply less interest on the part of women to work outside the home? If so, does this suggest a beginning of modification of our value system as it was described this morning?

Dr. PANNELL: This is a question that I simply am not wise enough to answer. I would suggest that perhaps it means considerably more flexibility in the pattern that women are going to follow. I do think that there is definitely developing a pattern of early marriage and more frequent childbearing at an earlier age. And I do think that possibly there is less specific seeking of the job and of advanced training which will train women best for the executive, administrative, or other top posts in the field.

I think women are far more likely to seek the job where the pay and the hours suit them, even though I think that many very able young women are seeking and accepting jobs beneath their ability.

QUESTION for Dr. Pannell: In what ways can American working-women aid those women in other countries who are newly entering into the professional and business worlds? And how are they doing so at present?

Dr. PANNELL: Well, I think that depends very largely at present on the organization in which they are effective and what programs they support. There certainly are any number of organizations. Again I cite the one that I know best, the American Association of University Women, which has an affiliation with the International Association of University Women.

I presume that a great many organizations in this country, like the General Federation of Women's Clubs, belong to a larger international association. Most of the organizations of this kind have educational committees both on the national and the international level. I, myself, believe that probably women can best meet these needs by providing more scholarships, fellowships, graduate-training opportunities.

I know that to meet the needs of the postwar world the American Association of University Women initiated a very interesting and worthwhile program—the international study program—to which the women of the American Association of University Women contributed voluntarily. This program originally was launched to provide retraining opportunities for professional women in the formerly occupied countries. For instance, a woman physician who had been in

a concentration camp, or a dentist or a social worker who had not had an opportunity to read the latest scientific or professional journals, who had not had an opportunity to work in a good hospital or laboratory or technical program, needed to be retrained. They were brought to this country and given the money and the free time to retrain themselves in the use of those services.

I am sure that there are numerous programs of this kind.

QUESTION for Mrs. Berthelot: If one woman refuses to work at a salary lower than a man would receive for the same job, isn't there another woman who steps in and accepts the job? How can this be controlled? Is it possible?

Mrs. BERTHELOT: There is no control over anything like that. But I do think that if women in general would demand equal pay, we would no longer have the problem of a woman being offered a job at a lower rate than that which a man would be offered. There is no real solution except through education and evolution.

Mr. HENLE: And unions!

QUESTION for Miss Watson: What steps can this conference, the organizations represented, and/or the individuals that are here take to prevent the present groundswell of discrimination against employment of women in government and industry from becoming a flood such as engulfed women of the late 1920's and the early 1930's?

Miss WATSON: What happened to women in the late 1920's and the early 1930's was due to the great depression. Now, I have said that in the financial field I think doors are being opened to women in increasing numbers and that they have great opportunities in the next few years, assuming that we do not have any depression.

I was not aware that there was a tremendous groundswell of discrimination against employment of women in industry. I think I should turn that part of the question over to the gentlemen of our panel.

Mr. HENLE: I think that the individual who wrote the question—and those who feel that there is a terrific resentment against women in industry—should get rid of their inferiority complex, because I think that it is not so. Although there are special problems, particularly at the higher career levels, nevertheless there is a place in our economy for women who want work and who are qualified to work. And if there is no place for them, it is not the result of prejudice, but of serious economic difficulties.

MARCH 10, EVENING SESSION

Address

THE HONORABLE ARTHUR LARSON, *Under Secretary of Labor*

In the conduct of human affairs, there is no more sinister disease than the urge to herd people into categories instead of treating them as human beings. Of all the contrasts between our traditions and the traditions of the Communists and the Socialist countries, there is no more conspicuous contrast than this. To us, a person is a person. To them, he is a unit. He is a component part of a mass or a class or a category with certain average or minimum characteristics or requirements for subsistence or survival.

Although we pride ourselves on judging everybody on his own personal qualifications and on giving every person the just rewards and privileges and prestige that he deserves, we too must constantly be on guard against this proclivity to categorize and dehumanize.

This tendency is apt to be most pronounced in government. We would not dream of saying that all the members of the proletariat are honest and sturdy and long suffering, while on the other hand all of the members of the bourgeoisie are effete and mean and decadent and ripe for extermination. But if we do not watch ourselves we are apt to do things like this.

We say, "Well, labor thinks this" or "Management says that." Or we might say, "The consumer believes this." "On the other hand, agriculture is of this opinion." Or we might say that teenagers are all juvenile delinquents or Texans are all rich, Norwegians are all coldblooded or bullheaded, or older workers are unreliable and slow, or professors are impractical, or advertising men all have ulcers.

I have one very simple message tonight, one very simple theme to my remarks. And that is this: The way to achieve the effective use of womanpower is to train and employ and pay women on the basis of their individual merits, and eschew as far as possible all differentiation and exclusion on a categorical basis.

It seems to me that the time has come when, with a third of the work force made up of women, it no longer makes sense to think of

women as a kind of separate segment of the work force or for that matter a separate legal or political category.

If you are going to put people, human beings, into categories for distinctive legal or political or economic treatment, you first have to be able to describe with some precision the characteristics and qualities of that category. Otherwise, you cannot justify setting up the category in the first place. Or even if you do, you don't know what to do with it when you have it. You don't know what privileges or disabilities or special rules that category warrants.

Now, you can make a separate category, say for the blind. We know what their special problem is. And you can make special rules for them. You can deny them automobile driving permits and so forth, because you have this very clean-cut category which you can define and for which you need a very special rule. But when it comes to women, can we describe the occupants of this category with such precision and with such assurance that we can defend this separate set of rules for them?

I sometimes wonder if our surest source of wisdom on the subject of human traits isn't the sociologist. But perhaps the novelists and playwrights and poets who all down through the ages have been analyzing for us the subtle characteristics of human nature have left us a very considerable body of data on the characteristics of this category which we may take as a guide.

I know that not only all day today but perhaps all of your lives you have been hearing sage quotations about women. I am going to give you a few, but not for the usual reason. In fact, I can tell you in advance that the net effect of this is going to be to cancel them all out.

First, are women essentially good or bad?

Blackmore, in *Lorna Doone*, said:

Women . . . are, beyond all doubt, the mothers of all mischief.

In the education of Henry Adams, Henry Brooks Adams says:

Women have, commonly, a very positive moral sense; that which they will, is right; that which they reject, is wrong; and their will, in most cases, ends by settling the moral.

We are off to a bad start with our category obviously. You cannot have in the same category the mother of all mischief and the fountain-head of all morality. Let's try again.

Are women wise or foolish?

Says James Stephens, in *The Crock of Gold*:

Women are wiser than men because they know less and understand more.

But Thomas Moore, in his poem, *How To Make a Good Politician*, suggests:

Ask a woman's advice, and, whate'er she advise,
Do the very reverse and you're sure to be wise.

Here are two Irish poets disagreeing on a matter of the utmost importance, so far as employment or political or property rights are concerned: wisdom and judgment.

Perhaps we should resort to the French, who always understand this subject so much better—and there I am categorizing myself. André Maurois says:

Learning is nothing without cultivated manners, but when the two are combined in a woman you have one of the most exquisite products of civilization.

You cannot ask for anything more exalted than that, but, on the other hand, George Meredith wrote

Woman is the last thing which will be civilized by man.

Are women courageous or timid?

We have all sung "Ben Bolt," with those touching words by Thomas Dunn English, about Sweet Alice,

Who wept with delight when you gave her a smile
And trembled with fear at your frown.

But this same writer penned these lines:

Though little dangers they may fear,
When greater dangers men environ
Then women show a front of iron . . .

William Bolitho carried it even a bit further, when he says:

Contrary to male sentimentality and psychology, the confrontation of a hostile crowd, to a woman, is like a tonic.

Do women get along well with other women?

Euripides remarked, in the fifth century B. C.:

Woman is woman's natural ally.

But more recently, James Stephens observed:

Women and birds are able to see without turning their heads, and that is indeed a necessary provision, for they are both surrounded by enemies.

Is woman dependable, or inconstant?

The poet, John Clare, says:

The winds, the clouds, now here, now there,
Hold no such strange dominion,
As woman's cold, perverted will,
And soon estranged opinion.

In rebuttal may I offer William Shakespeare:

For, boy, however we do praise ourselves,
Our fancies are more giddy and unfirm,
More longing, wavering, sooner lost and worn,
Than women's are.

I hope you realize that we are covering, one by one, most of the qualities that determine whether a person makes a good employee or voter or professional worker: intelligence, morality, courage, dependability, ability to get along with others, and so on. But we do not seem to be getting anywhere in delineating a clear-cut category, by quoting different authorities. Actually, you get no more agreement even if you quote merely the different utterances of a single writer. For example, in *Venice Preserved*, Thomas Otway exclaimed:

O woman! lovely woman! Nature made thee
To temper man: we had been brutes without you.

But in the poem "The Orphan," we find this outburst:

What mighty ills have not been done by woman!
Who lost Mark Antony the world?—A woman!
And laid at last old Troy in ashes?—Woman!
Destructive, damnable, deceitful woman!

I have always been curious to learn what happened to Otway between these two poems.

Finally, what about the fundamental question of the proper sphere of women's activities?

On this, I shall quote, for the first time, a woman—Kate Field:

They talk about a woman's sphere as though it had a limit:
There's not a place in earth or heaven,
There's not a task to mankind given,
There's not a blessing or a woe,
There's not a whispered "yes" or "no",
There's not a life, or death, or birth,
That has a feather's weight of worth
Without a woman in it.

Of all the quotations I have given you, this one, I think, comes the closest to being completely true.

My purpose, in this literary roundup, has not been to present a description of the salient characteristics of women. On the contrary, it has been to show that you cannot set aside women as a class, define their strengths and weaknesses, and then proceed to construct a system of special legal and business and employment rules and practices to meet these peculiar qualities. You cannot do it for the simple reason that no one can agree on what those qualities are. And the reason they

cannot agree is that they are talking about individual persons, not composite abstractions. (After all, you could take practically any of these quotations, turn them around and apply them to men and have them come out just about as true.)

When you begin to make practical application of these pronouncements, you soon discover how silly most of our ancient legal and economic differentiations were.

Should women sit on juries, or become judges or lawyers? Well, if they have a "very positive moral sense," what could be more appropriate? And so we have not only almost universal jury service for women, but also any number of outstanding lawyers and judges who are women.

Should women be allowed to handle their own property and make their own contracts and handle business matters of great importance? You have heard the testimony that women "are wiser than men" because they "understand more." This view seems at last to have gained considerable currency, since during the last one hundred years most of the old property acts have given way to freedom of property holding and contract.

So we could go down our list of individual characteristics and find an application for each. If it is true that confrontation of a hostile crowd is like a tonic to a woman, and that she can detect her enemies on all sides without turning her head, there are obviously great opportunities for women in such activities as politics, teaching—and working for the Labor Department.

And if it is true that a woman of learning and cultivated manners is the most exquisite product of civilization, and that it is she who keeps men from being brutes, then it follows that women can range up and down the whole scene of our arts and letters and theater and entertainment and music and journalism and pedagogy, with an unlimited charter to raise it from its present state to what it ought to be.

So far as the Department of Labor is concerned, the tangible consequence of this way of looking at things is a new emphasis of the idea that women are no longer to be thought of as primarily a sort of special problem group. They are an integral and indispensable part of the work force. Everything we do, every program we have, every statistical series we run, every statute we enforce, every income insurance system we deal with, is concerned with all working people, whether men or women. Whenever one of these programs or statutes is weak, women workers are hurt as much as men; whenever one of them is perfected, women workers are the gainers along with men.

Let me review with you the objectives, activities, and plans of the

Department of Labor, so as to provide some feeling of the sweep and range of what we are trying to do for all workers, whether men or women.

It is a good idea, whenever one embarks on an assignment, to start by asking the simple question: what is my objective? One of the best ways to put the question is this: if I could have my way in every respect before I have finished with this job, what would the state of affairs be when I left it? Of course, we know that no one ever perfectly achieves such a goal; but unless the goal is known and constantly kept in view, one's activities will be aimless, routine, and uninspired.

Our beginning point is the recognition of the aspiration of all American men and women "to give, through their work, the highest and finest expression to their God-given abilities and talents."

This sentence could stand as the text about which the whole story of the struggle of workingwomen has been written. To be admitted to professions on the strength of ability, to be admitted to crafts on the strength of skill, simply to be allowed the ultimate human satisfaction of feeling that you are exercising your capacities and potentialities to the full—this has been the goal of workingwomen throughout the years, and it is our first great objective. We put it ahead of material reward, and in this we are not being sentimental or rhetorical. A factual survey of workers not long ago turned up a significant fact: when asked what they considered the most important thing about their jobs, they listed size of wages not first but third. Heading the list was the satisfaction of doing good work that gave a feeling of self-expression.

Our second general objective, "To maintain the dignity, the pride, and the freedom that rightly belong to all free men and women," is similarly of particular interest to women. For once more, in the struggle for equitable treatment in those areas where this is still denied, is not the consideration just as much recognition of rightful place as it is dollars and cents? Is not the right to be accorded ungrudged and unquestioning freedom of access to all varieties of activity, reward, and prestige solely on the basis of individual merit perhaps a greater stake even than the financial?

Of course, we also recognize, without apology, that the aspiration to a decent standard of living is an important one, because it provides the setting for "a good and useful life"; and here again our objective tallies with that of the countless women whose efforts and talents have brought good and useful lives both to themselves and to families and others who otherwise would have been denied them.

Now, let us look at some of the specific objectives.

The provision of an effective Employment Service is one of the most fundamental. In aiming toward this objective, we have lately been pressing for several kinds of improvement. We hope to put the entire calculation of allowances for administration on a different footing so that hereafter the employment offices will be allotted a larger sum for making more difficult and specialized kinds of placement.

This may sound like a technical change, but its effect will be that people with special individual talents and skills will receive greater attention than in the past, since it obviously takes more time and effort to find the right place for this kind of person than for one with some routine occupation. We also hope to step up our counseling and aptitude activities, and give more particularized attention, with the aid of special personnel, to such people as older workers or the physically handicapped. In our Farm Placement Service, and with the aid of the new Cabinet Committee on Migratory Labor, of which Secretary Mitchell is chairman, we intend to perfect and extend our annual worker program, under which migratory farm laborers are provided with a consecutive schedule of engagements as they move from crop to crop, and are relieved to a considerable degree of the greatest nightmares of the migrant—uncertainty and unemployment. Through the Cabinet committee and the member agencies, and in company with States, communities, religious groups, and others, we intend to press an active campaign for improving the housing, transportation, health, safety, education, and security of migrant workers, as well as systematic programs within the communities where they temporarily live to make them feel welcome and at home.

As we know, unfortunately there are times when employment is not to be had, and at this point there must be an adequate unemployment insurance system ready to go into action. We stress "adequate" first, because our greatest single problem right now is the extent to which, largely because of fixed dollar limits on weekly benefits, unemployment compensation has not kept pace with increased wages and living standards. The simple underlying theory of unemployment insurance was that, since unemployment is a mutual misfortune, its cost might be shared roughly equally by employer and employee. This meant that the unemployed worker ought to get about half of his average weekly wages. But our latest figures show that what he is getting is more like one-third.

President Eisenhower, both last year and this year, urged the States to bring their standards up to this half-of-wages level; and, although it is too early to tell how widespread the response will be, it is gratify-

ing to note that the number of bills introduced and the number of governors' messages directed toward this kind of improvement are far beyond those in any similar legislative season for many years.

The other respect in which adequacy must be watched is the duration of benefits. The President has called upon the States to pay benefits for a period of up to 26 weeks to anyone who qualifies.

Of all the people who come within this system, none have a greater claim upon our concern than those who exhaust their benefits because the period allowed is too short to cover their span of unemployment.

May I say, in passing, that we do not content ourselves with exhorting the States; we also try to work toward our own standards in the District of Columbia, where the Federal Government has direct responsibility; we got the maximum benefits raised by 50 percent and the potential duration extended to 26 weeks in the last session of Congress, and in this session we hope to remove an alternative limitation on duration which deprives some claimants of the full 26 weeks when needed. We also, last year, extended unemployment insurance coverage by Federal action for the first time in history to 4 million more workers, including Federal civilian employees.

Our second specific objective relates to work injuries. Clearly the best thing is to prevent accidents. Of all the things we do, surely nothing is so thoroughly rewarding as the promotion of safety campaigns and the training of safety experts, as a result of which we are constantly seeing dramatic reductions in accident rates where these methods are applied.

We have seen the laundry industry of South Carolina reduce its accident rate by 79 percent. Oregon witnessed a reduction in the injury-frequency rate of its food-processing plants by 31 percent.

Not the least of our concerns is safety for Federal employees. One Federal establishment cut its accidents to one-sixth of what they had been, with the help of five courses in safety fundamentals given to their supervisory personnel. The number of disabling injuries per million man-hours worked in manufacturing industries fell from 13.4 in 1953 to 11.5 in 1954. The 1954 rate was the lowest on record, but with over 1,800,000 such injuries recorded for the year, there is still a lot of room for progress. We have some plans for an even more determined onslaught on this problem in the future. For example, we have a bill in Congress which, by the use of grants-in-aid, will build up systematic modern State safety programs in States that now lack them.

Just as you must have unemployment insurance where your employment efforts fail, so you must have workmen's compensation where your safety efforts fail. This is largely a matter for State legislation and administration, but the Department has traditionally served as a

clearinghouse for the dissemination of ideas on how the State acts can be bettered. We are in the midst now of preparing a model workmen's compensation law, into which we are trying to merge the very best features of all the very best State laws, on the theory that, if we do a good job of it, the model act will be studied and accepted on its own merits. Here, too, our first effort is to persuade the States to improve their standards, some of which are pathetically low.

I know of one case, which is not particularly atypical, of a young woman, a graduate chemist, who has been bedridden for several years, has already run up \$11,000 in hospital bills, is apt to be bedridden for life and continue to run up more bills—and even if she wins her case, she will get only a total of \$7,500 for both lost wages and medical expense.

The inadequacy of workmen's compensation in such jurisdictions is no joke; it is capable of producing tragedies and injustices of appalling proportions. Here also we try to live up to our exhortations; our Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, will, we hope, have its maximum benefits raised from \$35 to \$50 under a bill recently proposed by the administration.

At the same time, we are trying to stress rehabilitation of the worker, rather than merely paying him off for his injury. We have legislation pending that will help us finance more rehabilitation, and, of course, we were all extremely gratified by the success of the administration's bill, passed last session, which will multiply the number of people, including those on compensation rolls, who can be rehabilitated.

The third specific objective is to provide a framework within which employers and employees can conduct their affairs and fairly work out their differences with a minimum of government intervention; but where practices exist that offend American standards of decent wages or hours or working conditions, to blot out these substandard conditions by vigorous enforcement of labor standards legislation. This involves a dichotomy; we recognize the basic American tradition of freedom of the parties to make their own wage bargains and work out their own agreements and disagreements without Government interference as far as possible; and both labor and management have responded to this policy of nonintervention by displaying great understanding and maturity in the conduct of their relations, with the result that we have lately had less time lost by strikes than in any comparable period in history.

Yet, we also recognize that this freedom, while it has extremely wide range, cannot be absolutely unlimited. Our American traditions of decency draw a line as to wages and working conditions and say to

the employer and employee: Beneath this you may not go, even by agreement. The line has been drawn lately at 75 cents an hour in covered occupations. We have proposed an increase to 90 cents, which we believe to be the figure at which the purposes of the legislation can be served without undue disruption and dislocation in areas where wages are relatively low.

Fourth, in the extremely important realm of training, we are giving a "new look" to our program, by broadening our conception of the job beyond the conventional apprenticeship training into all kinds of training on the job at all ages. At the same time, we continue to press the promotion of apprenticeship through State apprenticeship councils, industry committees, employers, unions, and communities. The demands of our expanding economy and our swift-moving technology, not to mention national defense, place on us a grave responsibility to accelerate the building up of essential and flexible skills, and it is obvious that much of this skill will have to come from women workers.

Our fifth specific objective, to provide needed factual information, is one on which no informed person has to be "sold." Any person who might harbor the notion that statistics are, after all, only a plaything of economists would be quickly disabused if he could spend a few weeks trying to find hard, practical solutions to even our most elementary everyday problems. How can we effectively attack unemployment if we do not have adequate facts about the composition of the sum total figure of the unemployed? We watch the total national figure rise and fall, but how much better it would be to know the character of the people who make up that figure.

What happens to people who exhaust unemployment insurance? Can people really live on their benefits? What are the causes of work injuries, and the trends in these causes? What exactly is going on in residential construction, housing vacancies, family formation? We know some of the answers, of course, but it frequently happens that the quality of your policies and the success of your solutions will be in proportion to the adequacy and accuracy of your facts. I am glad to say that the prospects seem to be quite good this year for a strengthening of the statistical activities in these and other crucial fields, both within the Department of Labor and in other departments.

Our sixth category is a series of special concerns for such groups as older workers, young workers, the physically handicapped, minority groups, and veterans. For the first, we have our special committee on the older worker, which has drawn up a program of action with which we hope to make a really tangible advance in this area.

Our special province is not retirement and the general problems of aging—within the Federal Government that is the concern of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Our task is to combat unjustified age barriers to the hiring of qualified workers at any age where the barrier might be raised. Our job orders show that it is quite common to specify “under 45” for men, and sometimes even “under 35” for women. One of the specific plans we would like to carry through is a study of the performance, attendance, dependability, judgment, speed, and efficiency of older workers, for if such a study shows the older worker to equal or excel the younger and if it is sufficiently convincing and authoritative to persuade the business man to “put his money” on the result, then we are well on our way to a solution, since in the last analysis the only real solution is to convince the employer that hiring older workers is good business.

Another part of our attack is to try to disentangle the awkward problem of the relatively high cost of private pension plans for older workers; it is no small paradox that these plans, which were meant to help older people, sometimes have just the opposite effect, by adding a pension-cost obstacle to the other obstacles the older worker already faces.

For younger workers we have (in addition to training, safety work, and the like) the enforcement of child-labor laws—and there is more child labor in this country than most people realize; it is not something that went out with the age of Dickens. Notable improvements have been made recently, particularly as to children working on farms during school hours, and the corresponding increases in school enrollments have been most gratifying.

For the handicapped, we have the constantly accelerating activities of the President’s Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the stepped-up rehabilitation program, and the new techniques being used by the Employment Service to maximize the utilization of their abilities.

For minority groups, we have the President’s Committee on Government Contracts, in which the Department plays a leading part, and which in a quiet way is making real progress in eliminating employment discrimination based on race, with the aid of research activity carried on by the Department.

Finally, for veterans, we have the job of helping them get employment or assert their reemployment rights and we also are responsible for the special unemployment insurance system for veterans.

Our last specific objective calls for promoting international understanding among working people of all countries. One forum for this is the International Labor Organization. Russia last year decided

to exercise its right to join this organization, which is unique among international bodies in having, in addition to government delegates, representatives of private employers and labor. The opportunities for furthering good will and common understanding among representative and influential people of all countries are thus more direct in this body than in any other on earth. So are the dangers of Soviet propaganda and machinations directed to the invariable target of Soviet activity: the working people. Among our many other international interests, I shall mention only one more which to me, coming from a background of education, is one of the most exciting and promising.

This is the exchange program, under which students, workers, employers, Government officials, and technicians from all over the world spend extended periods in this country, studying our methods and laws and plants and administration, traveling all over the country, and generally finding out more about ourselves than sometimes we ourselves know.

In connection with this program, the Women's Bureau last year planned and directed individual programs for 94 women leaders from nine countries, and programs for three teams—a labor-management and government team of 10 women from France, a trade-union and government team of 12 from Italy, and a team of 4 trade-union women from Germany. They visited small towns and communities, many of which had never had a foreign visitor under government sponsorship, and they were greeted with the kind of hospitality that will give them a true and enduring picture of what American life is really like.

I have given you this overall survey of what the Department does in order to bespeak your aid in support in all of these highly essential activities, and also to underline my thesis that the major task in improving the lot of women workers and the effective use of womanpower will involve the utilization of not just one bureau but of all the resources of the Department. Of course, we recognize that there are still discriminations to be combated, anachronistic laws and practices remaining to be put right, and other inequities that call for actions pertaining to women as a group. But I think this roundup of our programs will indicate that we have passed from a phase in which the greatest gains for women were achieved by ad hoc legislation for women as such, into a phase where the greater part of their gains will be achieved in common with men, through overall strengthening of our safety activities, our training work, our income insurance, our employment service, our special programs like that of promoting employment of older workers, or laws or wages and working conditions, our efforts on vocational rehabilitation, our international labor activities.

our general statistical and research work, and our continuing exertions to contribute to the achievement of maximum employment and business growth.

Secretary Mitchell's organizational expression of this concept is seen in the creation of the position of Assistant to the Secretary for Women's Affairs, whose able and vivacious occupant, Mrs. Leopold, is now so situated that she can participate in high-level policy discussion on the Department's work as a whole, and also multiply the effectiveness of all our activities by funneling into one stream the related exertions of the Women's Bureau and the other bureaus of the Department.

We are confident that, with this marshaling of forces, we shall not only be more effective in doing such special jobs as still remain to be done of exclusive or particular interest to women, but shall also continue to raise to the greatest heights in history our standards of working conditions and earnings, and our opportunities for a rewarding and meaningful life, to the common benefit of all.

Question Period

QUESTION: I would like to address a question to the Director of the Women's Bureau in Japan: Do you have special labor legislation for women similar to what we have in the United States; for example, minimum-wage laws, equal-pay laws, and limitation on hours? And if so, which law do you think is most important or of greatest benefit to the women workers?

MISS TAKI FUJITA: We do have special legislation for women. Women are not allowed to work at night. And also we have various protective measures for mothers; for instance, maternity leave 6 weeks before and 6 weeks after childbirth.

As to the equal pay for equal work, we do have it written into our labor standards law, and this is really beyond what some of the other countries have. But the wage system in Japan is somewhat different from yours. As duration of service increases, workers get higher wages. And also if they have dependents, they have higher wages. And if they are older they get higher wages. Therefore, almost always, men receive higher wages than women, because they stay in jobs longer, and because they have dependents, and also, most important, because they have more training than women. On the average, women receive only 45 percent of men's wages in Japan. So I do not think you would say in Japan we have equal pay for equal work when you look at it that way.

But if it is proved that a man and a woman are doing equal work,

and the duration of service is the same, and if they have the same number of dependents, they do receive equal pay.

I know very little about your country's laws. But in Japan we are in the stage where we do need various protective measures. And I think that since the end of the war, because of the labor standards law in Japan, women workers have advanced in their way of living. What we in the Women's Bureau in Japan have to do, is to make all these regulations reality in actual practice; and we are working very hard on that.

QUESTION: I would like to ask a question about the equal-pay law. Many of our States have equal-pay laws at present. Some that are working for equal-pay laws. Is the Women's Bureau still interested, and should we still work for a Federal equal-pay law?

Mrs. LEOPOLD: To whom are you addressing the question?

QUESTIONER: To Mrs. Leopold.

Mrs. LEOPOLD: It is a pleasure to be able to tell you that we are still interested.

We have been meeting with various groups in Washington. We have been working; other organizations have been working. We have Members of our Congress—our women Members of the Congress—who are interested in equal-pay legislation.

We feel there is a very definite place for a Federal equal-pay law, and you can be assured that this will be one of the things the Women's Bureau will continue to work for. I would like to say that I believe some of our delegates to the United Nations also have this on their agenda.

Any other questions?

QUESTION: Since we are on the subject of equal pay, may I ask Miss Royce what they are doing in Canada in this field?

Miss ROYCE: Madam Chairman, in Canada, in three Provinces, we have equal-pay laws; in the Provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia. According to the terms of the Federation in Canada, working conditions and laws governing conditions of work are under provincial jurisdiction, and therefore, one would hope that in the future there will be more progress in the provincial field.

A number of women's organizations in the trade-union movement are working in that direction.

Federally, we have the question of equal pay before the Canadian House of Commons. A bill was introduced by the opposition party which was voted down a few weeks ago, but I think we have come to a time in history when no political party wants to be counted against the issue of equal pay. The Women's Bureau has been asked to take on a very special assignment in this connection, to find out

just what is the differential between men's and women's wages in industries under Federal jurisdiction. Perhaps I ought to say that the industries under Federal jurisdiction in Canada are somewhat like your industries in interstate commerce. About 75 percent of the women who are employed in these industries are under collective agreement.

Most of the agreements recognize the rate for the job, which is tantamount to equal pay for equal work. In our civil service, we have a small residual group of unorganized women workers under Federal jurisdiction, among whom there is a considerable differential varying from one industry to another, and it is our job in the Women's Bureau to find out just what that amounts to in order that we may know what we are legislating for.

MARCH 11, MORNING SESSION

Panel—Shortage Occupations: New Opportunities for Women

I

ELI GINZBERG, Ph. D., *Director of Research, National Manpower Council, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.—Moderator*

I am going to take a very few minutes of this panel's time, because of my pedagogical background, to try to set the framework for the panel's discussions.

I want to raise with you just two points contained in the title concerning the words "shortage" and "opportunity." First, I want to comment briefly on types of shortages. And then I want to tell you a few things that are being uncovered by the National Manpower Council at Columbia University as it progresses in its studies of women in the labor force.

One point about a shortage is whether it is recognized or not. The real heart of the question is whether industry knows it has a shortage and does something about it, and whether the individuals who are preparing themselves for life recognize it and do something about it. During the past years of the discussion of the engineering shortage, I have been impressed by the fact that the very people who were talking about shortages failed to do anything to facilitate the training and employment of women in engineering or in associated work. Either the shortage was not so great as the proponents thought it was, or else their behavior was mighty erratic.

Next, we heard much yesterday about the contributions of the major wars to opening up new employment opportunities to women. This raises the question of whether a particular shortage is of short duration, such as occurs in a war, or whether it has more persistent qualities. The opportunities opened to women in a major short-term emergency are not necessarily always carried over into peacetime. This is true not only for the United States, but for Great Britain where, after having made tremendous use of womanpower

during World War II, there was a loss, especially of top positions, when peace returned.

The third comment I want to make about a shortage is: Does it relate to general manpower or are we talking about demands for specific types of trained manpower? I think the great opportunities that women have had to increase their participation in the labor force since 1920 occurred as a result of changes in the demand for manpower as a whole. That is, women really gained, I believe, in this country because, among other reasons, large-scale immigration was terminated.

I do not mean that the number of women in employment would not have increased had immigration continued. But women do represent a great reserve supply of labor. Just as I believe that people on farms have had new opportunities in industry because of a cessation of immigration, so, too, in the case of women did it provide a boon. This appraisal does not make me, of course, a proponent of our rigid immigration laws.

So much for three aspects of the shortage question. What about opportunities? Let us approach that in terms of asking which women work—and for what part of their lives.

At the present time I think it is probably correct to say that some 8 out of every 10 young women, at the completion of their schooling—at the end of their sophomore year in high school, at the end of high school, in the middle of college or at the end of college, or after graduate school—enter the labor market.

But most of them enter, I think, with the idea of leaving. This is the crucial point. They plan to leave upon marriage or more particularly with childbearing. Only a few who enter the labor force have planned to remain.

But plans are not immutable. What happens is something quite different. First, there is a group, about 10 percent, who do not marry, and in our society today the unmarried woman is expected to, and does, remain at work. Secondly, there is the woman who marries but who has no children. This is a much larger group than most people realize. It is one-sixth, roughly, of all married women. By and large the childless tend to remain in employment. If you add the single, plus the married women who have no children, we already have about one-fourth of the total womanpower of the country permanently attached to jobs.

Next, are women who start to work with no intention of remaining in the labor force, but who find employment desirable and become attached to working, although they may marry and take time off to

have a baby or two. We see that in the civil service. We see it in teaching, and in other occupations where having children no longer fundamentally interferes with a woman's career. I am not interested in why these women stay at work. There are a thousand reasons. The fact is that many of them do stay at work.

The next group is one about which there was much discussion yesterday: Women who encounter calamitous situations in their lives and who have few options but to seek employment. It is the young widow, the young divorcee, women whose husbands have been stricken with illness. At the present time, most of the women with children under 6—representing about one-sixth of all the women at work who are or have been married—belong to this group.

So, now we have four groups of women more or less fully attached to jobs: The single person, the married woman without children, the married woman who takes leave to have children but who really does not leave the labor force, and the married woman who is in the labor market because of calamitous conditions.

There are two additional new groups emerging: Married women who come back as soon as their last child is at school, and the group that comes back when their children are somewhat older.

This leaves two remaining groups: Those who are in and out of work all of the time; and, finally, a diminishing group of those who never enter the labor market or who leave it early, never to return.

In statistical terms this is what it adds up to: I believe that about one-third of all women in the United States today can be called regularly attached workers. I think that about one-half of all women are either full-time workers or at least attached for part-time work.

I would say that, so far as the future is concerned, women will probably only be out of the labor market during the periods when their children are young; that "young" may extend all the way from 2 to 6 or 14 years of age. But even those who will stay out, let us say, for 10 to 20 years will spend most of their lives in paid employment.

This, I think, is my suggestion of the framework in which our discussion ought to proceed.

We have probably moved a much greater distance than we realize from a situation in which women were by and large not in paid employment, to a situation that is emerging where women will be in paid employment all of their lives except for those years when they have young children at home.

II

BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID SARNOFF, *Chairman of the Board, Radio Corporation of America, New York, N. Y.*

I am told that this panel proceeds on the assumption that women are persons, that they are members of the human race, and that if given an opportunity to do work, they can do a useful job.

I am not here to challenge these bold assumptions. I am here to give you testimony of the validity of these assumptions. So far as the industry and the company with which I happen to be associated are concerned, the facts substantiate all the claims that have been made for the competence of women in industry. I am speaking of the electronics industry as a whole, and under the term "electronics industry" I include communications, broadcasting, television, and all the fancy things that you hear about and read about these days. And I shall have a word or two to say to you about this thing called the electron.

That industry is less than 10 years old, because, while there was broadcasting and radio communications and so on before the war, it did not represent any sizable industry. But following the war, the advance was very great. You may be surprised to know that in 1954 the volume of business of the electronics industry in the United States alone equalled a little over 10 billion dollars. That is a lot of money even in these days.

In that industry, there are now employed approximately 1 million people, in manufacturing, broadcasting, service, and all the occupations that go with the industry. Of that total, approximately one-half, or 500,000, are women.

In my own company, the Radio Corporation of America, we have a total of 70,500 employees. Of that number, more than one-third are women. In the manufacturing end alone, between 37 and 40 percent of all those employed in making radios, television sets, phonograph records, and so on, are women. But that is not all. We have women engaged in key positions, managerial activities, supervisory activities, and as executive secretaries.

We also employ women in research and engineering. We believe that women are capable, if trained, to do engineering work and research work, and even to make inventions. For example, we have women on the research staff in the RCA Laboratories at Princeton, N. J., where we employ many scientists, physicists, and engineers, whose sole business is to deal with the unknown and the new things to come.

For instance, we are working on a new system of electronic cooling, as we call it; the idea being to see if we can produce a refrigerator or an air conditioner that will work noiselessly and electronically without any motors or blowers or moving parts. One of the research workers in our Princeton Laboratories, in that very fascinating new field, is a woman and she is doing an excellent job.

In the broadcasting business, women are all around us. In the field of production, direction, script writing, continuity, and, of course, in acting, women have not only an important but in many instances a predominant role to fill. We even have a woman on our board of directors, a lady whose name you have undoubtedly heard before. She is Mrs. Mildred Horton (formerly Miss Mildred McAfee), Director of the Waves in World War II and a former president of Wellesley College. She takes her place with the 12 other directors on the RCA board, holds her own very well indeed, and gives us the benefit of the woman's point of view.

As to the future, I would like to touch briefly on some of the points that our chairman has indicated for our discussion.

First, shortages. I do not know of any reason why more women cannot be trained in the skills necessary in so-called shortage occupations such as engineering, research, and development. The growth of technology has been great and it will be greater with each passing day. This is a field I would strongly recommend for women's attention. I do not think there is any resistance that would prevent their employment. That not many women are employed in this field is of course traditional. Women have not taken up engineering in the past to any great extent.

The second point that Dr. Ginzberg made was with reference to the continuation of employment in war industries. It would be a sad commentary on humanity if we had to have a war in order to stimulate an industry.

But be that as it may, wars have given rise to new industries. These new industries sometimes have expanded since the war, and they have provided opportunities for employment. As I have indicated, the electronics industry is one illustration.

The war itself stimulated the electronics industry immeasurably, because communications, aviation, transportation, and many other activities are dependent upon electronics. After the war was over, those developments were applied to industry. It is perhaps interesting to observe that following the First World War, broadcasting was born. There was no radiobroadcasting before the First World War. Following the Second World War television was born. There was no television, except in an experimental way, prior to the Second World

War. Both of these industries, of course, are today very large and very important.

So far as the future is concerned there is one thing on the horizon which, it seems to me, is likely to have an influence upon the matter of employment, and particularly the employment of women. That is automation. No doubt you have heard or read a good deal about "automation." I have no doubt that automation is on the way. Incidentally, it is largely electronic. I believe that the automobile, the business machine, the radio and television manufacturing industry, and related industries, all will be affected in one way or another by the development of automation. Naturally the question is asked: "What is going to happen to employment?" "Will the substitution of machines for human hands cause great unemployment?" And so on.

That is a pretty sizable subject. I will give you my own opinion, which is that while there will be uncomfortable periods of transition when adjustment and readjustment will be necessary, in the end automation will increase rather than decrease employment. It will enable production to be developed at a lower cost, and, therefore, more things will be produced. That means more consumption. That in turn means more jobs.

There may be a shift in some employment from the production area into the service area. A great many people are employed in the service areas. For example, in television and in radio at least as many people are employed in advertising, selling, broadcasting, and servicing as are employed in manufacturing; perhaps more. There are some 50,000 dealers handling equipment, and there are many thousands of service men who enter some 40 or 50 million homes equipped with a radio or television set, at some time or another during the year.

Automation will increase the area of employment in the service field and will, I believe, take up whatever slack may be temporarily created in the manufacturing field. Making allowance for the new types of skills that automation will require, I think that automation will prove to be the same kind of boon to humanity that other technical and technological developments have proven to be.

Women are also becoming interested not only in being employees, but stockholders. My company, for example, has roughly 175,000 stockholders and some 50 million shares of stock outstanding. More than half of them are owned by women. Women will have a larger voice in industry as time goes on and will be able to influence the course of events.

I have been asked whether we have women officers in our establishments. It is all very well to talk about large numbers of women employed at the bench and in the offices. But how about a couple

of vice presidents? I am going to make an honest confession. We have no women at the vice-president level. If you were to ask me to give you one good reason why we haven't, I couldn't.

It is just habit and tradition, as well as the fact that women are not looked upon as permanent in their positions, for some of the reasons Dr. Ginzberg has given here. We seem somehow to feel when an officer is appointed to the position of vice president, he is a permanent fixture around whom an organization is built. And we do not want to be faced with the possibility the next day or the next month that the lady has found more glamorous employment. But that is rationalizing. The answer is that there are no women in vice-presidential positions because there are no women in those positions! I think that there will be, and I think that there should be. As we go along, I think we are going to learn to forget some past habits. When 2 or 3 or 4 women arrive as vice presidents, others will follow.

In the technological developments of the present age, there are two little things called an atom and an electron, which undoubtedly came to us at the time the world was created. The building blocks of the universe are composed of these little things. Nevertheless, man knew nothing about the atom until about 150 years ago, nor about the electron until about 60 years ago!

I have never understood why these secrets of nature have been kept from man all of these years. But we now know about the energy that is locked up within the nucleus of an atom, and about how the electron can be used to control the energy released from the atom.

These two little celestial relatives, the atom and the electron, are going to revolutionalize everything in this world—our way of life, our political outlook, our military activities—and our industries. The electron is the tiniest particle of Nature known to man. There is nothing smaller in the universe. Even an atom, which you cannot see, or taste, or feel, or smell, is larger; for when we split the atom, we find many electrons and other particles inside the atom. Now, these very tiny particles of nature have the power to change the whole aspect of our life on this earth! And a woman certainly ought to be able to do to an "Adam" what an electron is able to do to an atom!

III

IRVING H. SIEGEL, Ph. D., *Economist, Senior Staff of Council of Economic Advisers, Washington, D. C.*

I have been asked to talk about the opportunities for women in the "humanitarian" and in the "shortage" occupations. Although I can-

not explore all this territory in the time available, I should like to define it and to operate within it selectively.

I consider humanitarian occupations to include all those which minister directly to the arts of consumption or which directly affect the quality of living. They relate to personal services; education, health, welfare, housing, and general government. They include the shortage occupations of teaching and nursing.

Opportunities for women in the humanitarian occupations would seem to be especially plentiful in the years immediately ahead. I include, not only the traditional occupations (office, sales, teaching, etc.), but also occupations typically staffed with men and occupations newly defined.

Among the favorable factors are:

1. The general maintenance of high-level employment.
2. Vigorous population growth.
3. The continuing trends toward home ownership, suburbanization, and new community formation.
4. An increasing public concern over health and education needs.
5. The preponderance of women in the working-age groups, 14 years and over.
6. The general availability of women at lower pay and for part-time work.
7. The improvement of the educational qualifications of women.
8. The eligibility of males for military service.
9. The limitation of new entrants into the labor force by the low birthrates of the 1930's.

Some factors will tend, of course, to work in the opposite direction. The adoption, for example, of electronic accounting systems, robot typewriters, and other high-speed and high-volume office techniques will probably have a much greater impact on jobs typically performed by women.

The same is true of self-service retailing and of automatic vending. But the introduction and spread of laborsaving methods will most probably release women *to* other jobs, frequently of higher grade, rather than *from* employment.

Perhaps only twice in our national history—in the 1880's and in the 1930's—did the notion of widespread and persistent “technological unemployment” take hold. Our experience has shown, instead, that extensive technological change increases the variety and educational qualifications of employment and provides work for an expanding labor force.

The fields in which opportunities for women are expanding include:

1. Teaching in primary and secondary schools—especially mathematics and science in the latter.
2. Nursing, physical therapy, and other “paramedical” occupations.
3. Atomic medicine—including the administration of radioisotopes and the protection and treatment of industrial, laboratory, and other exposed workers.
4. Pediatric and geriatric medicine, as the age distribution of the population changes.
5. Psychiatric medicine, as the mental health problem becomes recognized as urgent.
6. Public health, including control of air and water pollution.
7. Research in medicine and the life sciences.
8. Manual and mechanical office work incident to the growth of voluntary prepayment health plans, and industrial pension plans.
9. Social work, including a new emphasis on juvenile-delinquency programs.
10. Television and other entertainment.
11. Sale of children’s and infants’ wear, housefurnishings, and “do it yourself” materials.
12. Sale and management of real estate.
13. Tourism and staffing of resorts.
14. State and local government, including progress from PTA and community political experience to candidacy for elective office.

Shortages of personnel are already being experienced or are anticipated in many of the areas listed above. The shortages of nurses and technical assistants to doctors, surgeons, and dentists were noted and authoritatively discussed in the report of the President’s Commission on Health Needs of the Nation.

President Eisenhower’s health message of January 31, 1955, recognized that the supplies of trained personnel for individual and community health services are “critically short.” Accordingly, he proposed (1) a 5-year program of grants to State vocational education agencies for training practical nurses; (2) public health service traineeships for graduate nurses in administration, teaching, and research, and (3) traineeships in all public health specialties, including mental health.

The President also recommended grants to States for strengthening juvenile-delinquency programs and for further encouragement of the construction of hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers. Women, as leaders as well as subordinate members of health teams, will evidently be needed in increasing numbers.

Another prominent shortage area is education. The President’s

message of February 8, 1955, on the building of schools, concludes with a reference to the shortage of teachers as "less obvious, but ultimately more dangerous than the classroom shortage." Presumably the State conferences on education which are now in progress will provide new incentives to enter the teaching profession.

The National Science Foundation has pointed to the need for better high-school science and mathematics courses to assure maintenance of a desirable rate of technological advance.

The third well-publicized shortage concerns professional scientific and engineering personnel. Unlike the health and education fields, the scientific and engineering professions traditionally have not included large numbers of women.

But the barriers to the employment of women here, as in other professions, have been crumbling. In conformity with their historical "humanitarian" role in society, women who go to the universities still concentrate on degrees in education, the humanities, and the social sciences. But the statistics begin to show a rising interest in the natural and biological sciences.

IV

ROLAND R. RENNE, Ph. D., *President, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.*

I have been impressed with the very realistic accounting which is being done here in terms of the characteristics of women, the situations, the forces which play upon their employment, and the bright prospects for the future.

I have been asked to discuss ways in which women can increase their contribution to our economy through the application of new techniques and new knowledge in such traditional professions as teaching and nursing. I feel somewhat at home in this field, having spent most of my life in preparing to teach, teaching, or educational administration, and in our own institution we have a school of nursing. The problems which we face in administering that school have brought me in close touch with some factors that may be of interest to you.

It is important, I think, to get an overall picture of the national prospect. I am sure most of us in the last few years have gotten the impression that the population is growing. Yet I think very few of us realize how tremendous is its growth. This past year there were slightly more than 4 million births. Our population may be not 163 million, as at the present, but roughly 220 million in 1975, just 20 years from now. In other words, there may be an increase of some 60 mil-

lion people, an increase of 40 percent. If present trends continue, this means that in our population there will be a much larger proportion in the age group over 65 and the young group under 20, and a smaller proportion in the working age group of 20 to 65.

So we can say without any fear of contradiction, barring an atomic catastrophe in terms of destructive warfare, that there will be a very high demand for those who are in the working-age group and particularly a very high demand in those professions which serve youth and the aged.

Now, in teaching and nursing women have, I think, reigned supreme. Our present shortages in these two fields are somewhat cumulative: the low birthrates of the 1930's, the current earlier marriages, higher birthrates, larger families—all are contributing to make our present situation one of very acute shortages. Even more acute shortages are in prospect.

The increase in the amount of service demanded, particularly in terms of medical care for the aged; the improvement in the quality of service which is now regarded as standard, particularly in education and training for the professions, but especially for nursing and teaching; and the larger numbers that must be served in the next 15 to 20 years all point to a tremendous demand for workers in these fields.

I think the increased efficiency of womanpower in our country is vital to anything like a satisfactory solution to these very high demands. In my own State, Montana, we have only a little over half a million people, but this past year we found ourselves in the fall more than a thousand teachers short for the grade and high schools. We have had to issue this year more than 800 emergency certificates.

Almost half of all the teachers in our State at the present time are not college graduates. I am not saying that they all should be college graduates. But in many States, minimum requirements now emphasize at least 4 years of college work.

The shortage of qualified teachers and nurses is serious. The one real area where we can make a sizable improvement in the supply is in the field of "limited occupational employment" (or part-time employment). For the next two decades, I would place first and foremost this matter of limited occupational roles. I think the development of laborsaving devices in the modern home makes much more time available. Also, most women with a college education or with professional preparation need an intellectual and an economic outlet. The acute shortages which we now face and which we will face indicate that it is not possible for us to fill the demands with full-time qualified people. If we cannot get a whole person, so to speak, perhaps two halves will in some ways do the job as well or better.

There are some fields that lend themselves especially well to limited employment. We find in our State, for example, that many of our married graduates in some fields like health and physical education do have time to teach a part of the time. And many schools that were not in a position to finance a full-time health and physical-education teaching staff member have been very pleased to employ one teacher on a part-time or, we will say, half to two-thirds time basis.

There are many opportunities for limited occupational roles in the field of physical therapy and occupational therapy. Individuals who need and desire treatment, particularly in physical therapy, often are not able to take time off during the working day but would be free in the early evening hours. The same applies in the fields of recreation, photography, sports, music, drama, camping, folk and square dancing.

There are some concurrent adjustments that we must make. A great deal of attention has been focused upon the adaptations that industry and business would have to make in management and in operations to fit in with the limited-role employment or the part-time employment of more and more women. But most of us, I fear, have not emphasized adequately the adaptations which must be made in terms of better time management.

I was somewhat alarmed to read in Washington papers about efforts to reduce appropriations for research in the fields of home economics and home management in our Department of Agriculture. Now, it seems to me that if we are going to make more effective use of womanpower, certainly our home-management specialists, our home-economics research workers, will need to speed up and do more work in this field rather than less. There must be effective time management by the woman who does two jobs, one as a homemaker and one as an employee in a profession or occupation, perhaps halftime. Job analysis studies would seem to be very much in order.

Educational institutions, particularly those which train women in traditional professions, should develop institutes on brushup courses as well as regular academic offerings to help women prepare for employment. In this way the older woman who has been away from professional employment, as well as the younger mother who has had inadequate preparation, will gain confidence and competence to undertake employment in the professions.

The Extension Service in each of the States, I think, could very well organize workshops. They could emphasize factors and conditions of better time management, using local people who have demonstrated unusual ability as managers and efficient operators.

I have only one comment on some of the aspects of danger in this situation. I agree fully with the statement yesterday that a happy

mother available for a part of the day in the home is better than a dissatisfied, unhappy one at home all day, and that the old connotation that child-delinquency and unsatisfactory child welfare is associated with working mothers is not valid. I do think that mothers with young children, except in very unusual circumstances, should probably not consider full-time employment too soon. But that is quite different from limited-role employment and the early preparation for more effective service when the children are in school.

Another adaptation is the cultural environment. We need to do much more to change the cultural pattern in terms of attitudes toward workingwomen. I hope we can develop soon a much more general and prevalent notion that it is as proper for wives of business and professional leaders and prominent men to work as it is for other women.

The Women's Bureau, the United States Department of Agriculture, our home-economics divisions of colleges and universities, our extension workers, our service clubs, our PTA's, our AAUW's, many other organizations that I could mention can do a great deal in the next 2 or 3 years to help develop a proper cultural environment.

Now I will mention briefly other techniques and new types of knowledge: Nurse aides and teacher aides to increase the proficiency of the professional nurse and teacher. Nursing has led the way in this, but I think teaching is catching on very fast. The use of mothers to supervise homerooms, playgrounds, and study halls, and the use of local persons to take some of the community-service responsibilities of teachers, will perhaps enable teachers of special subjects such as home economics to serve 2 or 3 schools in larger communities or in rural areas where distances are not too great, though the out-of-class responsibilities of these teachers would be increased.

We must find ways to make a limited number of qualified teachers serve a much larger number of students. But certainly keeping a ratio of 20 or 25 students per teacher and expecting to get the number of teachers we will need in the next 15 years is not a very realistic approach. However, I do not think we have even begun to scratch the surface in this field. We are going to have to make adaptations, develop new techniques in teaching. I suppose in many cases it will be necessary to develop larger classes, as well as more classroom aides, assistant teachers, better clerical assistance, and all the techniques that will make a superior teacher.

In fact, the use of specialists in some fields like the fine arts, music, and drama might be much more effective than some of the certified teachers who are not particularly adept in these fields.

Television, I think, offers many possibilities. I wish I had time to go into those.

In the nursing especially we find a very great need for mature, balanced women who are interested in acquiring administrative experience and who are willing to take administrative responsibility. For example, in one of our hospitals in Montana which is affiliated with our school of nursing at Montana State College, we have had nine different directors of nursing in the last 10 years. That kind of turnover, excessive though it may seem, is indicative of the problem in finding qualified women who are willing to remain on the job and make effective hospital administrators.

I think that we should keep in mind laborsaving devices in homes, new fabrication that will reduce the time of ironing and related work, prepared foods and frozen foods which are timesaving, and all types of work-simplification adaptations in the home to reduce the time necessary for housework and release more time for remunerative employment outside the home.

I think the matter of incentives is one which we should not overlook. In the traditional professions especially, I am quite concerned over the fact that the floor and the ceiling in terms of wages and salaries are so close together. And I have been alarmed in recent years with the tendency of some of our bargaining associations, teachers' groups, to set up salary schedules in which the mediocre teacher, the one who just gets by, gets practically as much, and sometimes more than the really superior teacher. While I realize that in the professions remuneration is not the major incentive, nevertheless, I think we are tending to emphasize mediocrity when we work out such salary and wage schedules.

I hope that we will have the courage and the finances to make a more realistic schedule which puts a premium on the superior teacher and recognizes merit when it develops. I think we must appeal to the service motive. One of my good women teachers in Montana said, "You find out at this conference the ways in which we can increase the professional incentives, especially those in teaching and nursing, and come back and tell us."

Summary

MIRRA KOMAROVSKY, Ph. D., *Chairman,*
Department of Sociology, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Siegel has forced my hand with regard to a pun. I was not going to pass it on to you. I did not make it, and I disclaim any re-

sponsibility for it. A gentleman in the audience who is related to me passed it on to me after General Sarnoff's speech. He said that General Sarnoff, pioneer that he is in the electronic industry, should develop a department of The Guided Misses!

Our speakers have given us an incisive and realistic analysis of opportunities for the economic services of women. The import of their presentation is clear. There is no dearth of opportunities. Indeed, in many occupations the phrase "critical shortage" seems more appropriate.

Opportunities exist and so does the potential supply of labor, and yet, our speakers have made one further thing abundantly clear: it will take vigorous leadership, imagination, and a good deal of skillful social engineering to bring the supply and the demand together.

I thought it might be fruitful in our general discussion to focus precisely upon this problem—how to bring the potential supply and the demand together, and to analyze the resistances, the obstacles in the way.

First, I should like to sketch for you certain facts concerning the occupational pattern of married women, and I should like to concentrate my remarks upon the problems of married women.

Bear in mind the following life cycle of a married woman with regard to occupation. The facts for the current situation are given to us by the Women's Bureau and the Bureau of the Census.

At the present time, about 40 percent of married women are gainfully employed the first year after marriage. The proportion declines to 30 percent the second and the third year. Apparently marriage no longer stops the gainful employment of the woman.

Childbearing does. Only 15 percent of women with children under 6 are gainfully employed. About one-third of all married women 35 to 54 years old are employed, but after 55 years the proportion declines rapidly.

The demographic changes of the last 50 years have produced a revolutionary change in the family cycle. They have given us a new stage in life—the "empty nest" stage.

The woman of 1950 can expect to be about 48 years old when her last child leaves home to get married, and on the average she can look forward to some additional 14 years together with her husband, at which point death, usually the death of the husband, breaks up the marriage. There is the further melancholy fact that a woman today must look forward to about 13 or 14 years of widowhood.

Now, the import of this is as follows: As far as the married woman is concerned, the main reservoir of labor is women 35 and over. And now for the more recent changes: the early marriage, the larger

family, the decline in the proportion of childless couples. These changes have occurred largely in the educated classes. Will these changes among the educated, who are the potential source of professional personnel, as Dr. Pannell yesterday suggested, cut down the proportion of college graduates going in for advanced training? So far no change has been observed. From one-fourth to one-third of college graduates go on to professional and graduate training. My impression is that marriage, as such, early marriage, has not made much of a difference, but early child rearing has already, I think, made some difference.

Before I left for Washington, a brilliant student of mine, a college senior, came in to inform me of her change of plans. She had gotten married a year before, at the end of her junior year, and she came to inform me that she became pregnant and that her plans for graduate study have been postponed indefinitely.

All this brings me to my first point. In the light of these facts, and in the light of everything that has been said today and yesterday, it seems to me that there are two major social policies which will determine the effective use of womanpower, two foundationstones of a sound policy. I think it is safe to say that only in so far as we are successful in solving those antecedent problems will we attain our goal.

I am afraid that you will experience a certain disappointment when I tell you what these two areas are. We have heard them before, and yet, what is there to do but to repeat and repeat until words begin to lead to action?

The Women's Bureau has already pointed the direction in which we are to go. I refer for one thing to the need for increased and better use of women over 35. What we need is something beyond mere education, beyond mere propaganda, important as it is.

We need a systematic study of the structural and attitudinal resistances to change. Then we will know how to locate and deal with each specifically. For example, apparently one resistance to the use of the older worker, and that applies to men as well as women, is the matter of pensions. Instead of just carrying on the propaganda about greater job opportunities for the older workers, could we not meet that problem head-on and discover what compromises and what adjustments could be made in this area?

Again, we know that to a certain extent the discrimination against middle-aged workers is based on nonrational grounds, but social science is beginning to tell us something about how to change stereotypes and we can look to some help in that area.

The second main cornerstone of effective policy I need only mention,

because it has already been discussed, and this is part-time employment.

The third point that I would like to make deals less with the need for new community resources such as new training institutes, new refresher courses, or more jobs than with desirable changes in public attitudes. It is an eloquent commentary on the strides women have made that we have heard so little this morning about discrimination against women; properly so. Nevertheless, some unfinished business remains on what I might call the ideological front.

The course of social change, as the course of true love, never runs smoothly. There are currents and countercurrents, and it is ironical in the light of the progressive attitudes expressed by our male speakers today that some of the countercurrents come from women. I refer to certain new trends in women's education, certain changes in climate of opinion, so far represented, I think, by a minority.

There has been, I believe, a trend for which I have coined a very clumsy term, "neo-antifeminism." Because of the strains and the tensions brought about by social changes in the status of women, which have disturbed the old equilibrium without as yet creating a new one, many find themselves nostalgic about the past and think the solution will be to return to our rigid former definition of what the woman's and the man's role in society is.

One prominent writer, in fact two, have written recently urging that public opinion proclaim some fields to be peculiarly suitable for women and others not desirable for them. Biology, psychology, sociology, the nursing fields, ought to be the feminine fields, and engineering, electronics, law, industry, mathematics, technology, all these fields in which recent opportunities have increased, these authors proclaim to be the masculine fields. They feel that nothing but disaster will come of blurring these differences and stressing that women can do everything.

Now, a comment on that. Of course, a delicate balance must be maintained between short- and long-range policies. In the immediate future, it is obvious that out of 100 coeds, the overwhelming majority would better enter the feminine fields, i. e., social work rather than physics. There are many reasons why this is the case. May I suggest one very subtle one. It may be as subtle and minor as the reasons reported to me last week by a former student of mine who is specializing in physics. She reports that the reactions of her male friends upon being told that she plans to become a physicist vary from a sudden aloofness to a frank, "Why should a nice girl like you enter physics?" She finally decided that a certain reserve with reference

to her occupational plans was called for on the first date with a new male acquaintance.

I could, of course, mention other reasons why physics is not today as "natural" an occupation for women as some other fields, but what long-term objectives or policies can we infer from this? In the long run, it would be desirable, I think, to urge a lesser segregation of men and women in special occupations.

As it is, the segregation is very great. May I remind you that women constitute 90 percent of all librarians, 60 percent of all welfare workers, and 80 percent of teachers? I believe that many a first-rate male teacher is lost to teaching because it is a feminine and underpaid occupation, and many a woman scientist would be more competent than the man who takes her place in the laboratory because science is not a feminine field.

In the long run, I think we can urge with full confidence that a greater spread in women's occupations is a good thing for society as a whole; we can urge women to enter all fields and proclaim no talent to be unfeminine.

This is especially important in the next decade or two, because with shortages in educational institutions, shortages of facilities in professional schools, it is not impossible that in the light of limited resources, we will have a renewed discrimination against women.

May I conclude by saying again that it is quite clear that bringing the opportunities and supply together will be a complex problem, but of one thing we can be sure: Its solution holds great potentialities for individual and family happiness and for social welfare.

Dr. GINZBERG: I really believe that Dr. Komarovsky helped to pull together and make explicit much of what was below the surface, giving it point and direction, and that I think has given increasing meaning to the presentation. I would like to say to my panel associates that I hope that we gave Mrs. Leopold some help this morning.

Mrs. LEOPOLD: Thank you, Dr. Ginzberg, and thank you very, very much, members of the panel. I feel that we have received very interesting and very wonderful direction.

We seem to have agreed that these are changing times. We have tried to give you a collection of wisdom from the members of our panel both this morning and yesterday, and I want to assure you that the Women's Bureau, and I am sure many of you here, will continue to work for better understanding and better techniques in this interesting problem of the essential use of womanpower.

MARCH 11, AFTERNOON SESSION

Women in Today's World

MRS. FRANCES M. LEE, *United States Delegate, Inter-American Commission of Women*

As the delegate of the United States to the Inter-American Commission of Women, whose home is in this beautiful Pan American Union building, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Mrs. Maria Concepcion de Chaves, who is the Chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women.

Twenty-one members compose this Commission. One delegate is appointed from each of the South American Republics, and since its creation at the Sixth International Conference of American States, held in Havana, Cuba, in 1928, the Commission has worked steadily to improve the status of women in this hemisphere.

The Commission is an official body in the Organization of American States and works for the extension of civil, political, economic, and social rights of women in the American Republics.

Mrs. Chaves is an educator and is outstanding in the literary field in her country, the Republic of Paraguay. She has written many textbooks that are used in the schools today.

MRS. MARIA CONCEPCION DE CHAVES, *Chairman, Inter-American Commission of Women*

As Chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, I have been given the honor of welcoming you to this building, which is a symbol of American justice and solidarity. Rarely have I had a more pleasant mission; rarely have I been happier or more eager to carry out a mission than I am at present, as I appear before this group of eminent women who have taken over the duties required of them by these new times.

Your presence here is evidence of the heights that have been reached in the new fields of work and culture by women in this country, with its complex and productive way of life. Even before coming here, after listening to the experiences of travelers and reading descriptions and thousands of facts concerning your country, I was imbued with great admiration for the women of the United States who "are in the posi-

tion of a privileged class," to quote Keyserling, one of the keenest observers of our Americas.

It was here, in this marvelous city, that I realized the direct role women play in determining the destiny of the community and the nation. What is their essential power? It is a tremendously important unknown quantity, of which they themselves have not yet become aware.

Some time ago, I met a United States friend of mine who had lived for a while in Paraguay.

"And how is your daughter? I inquired of him.

"She is working. She is 17 years old and enthusiastic about life."

That reply was a revelation. One could summarize the true values of United States women in these inseparable concepts—work and enthusiasm about life.

Enthusiasm about life, which is not always radiant in Latin America, is a state of spiritual grace. It does not permit one to turn toward the past; instead, it makes one look toward the future, it inspires faith in change and in the ability, through work, to make the change effective.

The enthusiastic person is not an inactive onlooker. He is a person gifted with a passionate curiosity, conscious of the role he is called upon to play and the duties he must perform. He does not know what tomorrow will bring, but he does know that the world will be more beautiful and happier if he gives to it an example of work, of justice, of altruism, and of goodness. Without hesitation, he brings his thinking and his work to the thinking and work of others, so as to achieve fellowship between men and women, and between peoples throughout the world, just as the government officials and the leaders of this immense country are doing, and just as you, the workingwomen, are doing. It is a trait common to young and old—the 17-year-old daughter of my friend and the incomparable 76-year-old Helen Keller. Miss Keller has just started on a trip to India, where, as she has said, she wants to communicate her "joy of living to the unhappy ones who have not seen the panorama of the world outspread before them."

This spiritual grace, which is a basic trait of the women of the United States, is what has helped them above all else to bring about the true era of cooperation between women and men.

In the civilization of the United States the idea of complete spiritual equality of men and women manifested itself for the first time in the concept of the universality of values, an unprecedented victory for all the people of our time. The conference you are now holding is a step in the direction of that progressive development.

The agenda show the validity of the specific hope of this moment;

namely, "to raise the standard of living of workingwomen." This is likewise the goal of the Inter-American Commission of Women, which will carry out a campaign this year on behalf of the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, giving special attention, as you do, to the basic aspect of education.

Friends, in the name of the Inter-American Commission of Women, I take pleasure in paying you a tribute of admiration, and through you, to the workingwomen of the United States—who enjoy spiritual freedom, who are working side by side with men, who are laboring as men do, and who are enriching the lives of the people with their experiences.

Women are laying the foundation of sound relations based on conviction and practice rather than by the imposition of contractual or legal rights. They are helping to create an admirable material culture, without the militant and argumentative approach, and they are participating with men in preparing and adapting the economic system of this country for the immeasurable possibilities that lie ahead. May you be successful in all your endeavors!

Panel Discussion

MRS. ELIZABETH S. CARPENTER, *President, Women's National Press Club, Moderator*

MRS. CARPENTER: I am Elizabeth Carpenter, your mistress of ceremonies for this afternoon. Our subject is "Women in Today's World." That must be the reason I was chosen to preside—I am unquestionably a woman in today's world!

One of my favorite feminists used to say she hoped when she died her epitaph would read, "Born a woman, died a person." Women have made great advances since the turn of the century. I think that holds true throughout the world. It is time to take stock to see where women are now, so we can better see where we should go, how we can best use our skills and our families and homes and ourselves to make the future that civilization deserves. How can women best be used in an age of energy unlimited to assure this future? What can we do to make our brains keep up with our brawn?

This afternoon we are going to have viewpoints from four fabulous women from both sides of the Atlantic. Two of them are here today as the first of 80 women from Italy and France who will be coming on visits to our country this spring. We are delighted to welcome you both.

From Italy, comes Dr. Olga Monsani. She is an outstanding lawyer of Florence and a leader of professional women throughout Europe.

She was president of the European Federation of Soroptimist Clubs and is an expert on international law.

From France, we welcome Mme. Georgette Barbizet, who is an outstanding leader in women's organizations in her own country. She has been chairman of the Children's Section of the National Council of Women of France and she has an imposing record of work with children and with juvenile problems in France.

Our two American counterparts are known to many of you in this room. The Honorable Frances P. Bolton is a Member of Congress from Ohio. You ladies from abroad will be interested to know that her State, Ohio, has furnished so many presidents of the United States that it is known as the mother of presidents. Mrs. Bolton, like her native Ohio, has a special distinction as a mother, too. She is mother of a Congressman, and she and her son, Oliver, are the only mother-and-son team ever to serve in Congress at the same time. She is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and has been a United States Delegate to the United Nations.

Dr. Susan B. Riley is the national president of the American Association of University Women, which has been and is making a wonderful contribution to international understanding in grants and hospitality. She is an expert on southern folklore and is professor of English at a college for teachers in Nashville, Tenn.

To open our question period, I shall start with a few questions of my own. First, I think it will be well if we find out what the typical working woman in each of your countries is like and how she has changed in the last 25 years.

Dr. Monsani, will you speak for Italy?

Dr. MONSANI: I do not believe there is in Italy a typical working-woman. According to the law, all careers are open to women in Italy except three: Army, judicial careers, and diplomacy. These three fields are regulated by special laws. We have had a new constitution since just after the war, in which women and men have the same rights in everything. But the special laws for these three careers have not yet been changed, and men do not want to change them and allow women to enter these fields.

Some women's associations have had public meetings about this subject. Men at first had many objections, but now even the men's opinion has begun to change. They are accustomed now to seeing women going into all the careers, not in big numbers, but if the woman has the qualities to do her job, she can advance in a career to a very high level.

I can give you some examples. We have many women in the universities who have responsible jobs. I know a woman who was a

manager in an insurance company. We have in an Italian Soroptmist Club a wonderful woman who has a very important business as a builder.

In Italy there are many unemployed persons. In a country where we must find work for hundreds of thousands of men, you can understand that women who are looking for a job are regarded as intruders. It is more difficult for women when there is general unemployment, but they can get along when they are well prepared and are efficient.

Another thing I must tell you: The larger number of workingwomen in Italy is composed of housewives, in rural places and even in towns. They have been housewives all their lives, but I say they are workers, because many of them are at the same time agricultural workers. Our Business and Professional Women's Association for 2 years has studied the problem of these women to try to get some assurance for their old age. In Italy, the father has generally all the money in the family and, if he dies, the widow remains at the mercy of sons and daughters. Sometimes they are good—sometimes they are no good; so it may happen that these old women, who have worked all their lives for the benefit of their family and of all the nation, may not be provided for. In the little town of Bolzano, when housewives go shopping, they receive a premium—stamps—and put the stamps in booklets, as a form of old-age insurance, to be collected after a certain number of years. Our government is interested in the problem and it is now under study in Rome.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Now, we will hear about the workingwoman of France from Mme. Barbizet.

Mme. BARBIZET: You asked me to speak on career girls. My own mother was a medical student. Her family was quite against it, but at last her father consented; for many months, however, he accompanied her to the *École de Médecine*. It just shows the progress made in 60 years. Many people do not realize how things have changed and by this personal anecdote I am trying to illustrate it.

Now, we have thousands of girls who have been going to schools and universities, and for whom all doors are open. In France, women can be judges; one of our very well-known women in France is on the Supreme Court. We have teachers, doctors, servants, and so on.

It is difficult to realize that the percentage of workingwomen has remained the same for half a century in our country. In 1900, according to the official statistics, the number of workingwomen was 4½ million, as it is now. The only difference is that now women get better jobs. They have shifted from the category of domestic servants to better posts.

Our nation was one of the first to provide for equal pay and, until

this is adopted by other countries, it may be a dangerous gift for women to receive equal pay. People say that, in our economy today, prices are very high because women have such high wages. Wages are 35 percent higher for French women than for English or Dutch women. It makes a very dangerous position for our exports. At a conference of women on employment about 6 weeks ago, in Paris, the experts who came were pessimistic because they thought that there were so many people at work that women would soon not be able to find all the employment they needed. After 35 years of age, it is difficult for a woman to get any work unless she is very well trained.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Now, we will hear about ourselves from Congresswoman Bolton.

Mrs. BOLTON: It is a very great pleasure to be here and a delight to have the opportunity of hearing firsthand what two other countries are doing about the problems that are our problems, too. Granted, we probably have more opportunity. Still, we have not yet caught up with the menfolk.

Two days ago, one of our labor people, a man, needless to say, told me that women should not work at big machines. They were not built the right way. They should not do the heavy jobs. They should not do various things. He said he had even found a woman up a telegraph pole as a lineman.

We still have that very interesting group of men who say gruffly, "If those millions of women that are taking up the jobs would only get out of them, we would not have any unemployment." I say to them, "What about the 4 million women who have to be responsible for their families? Who is going to do it for them? Are you willing to carry two families—yours and a woman's?"

This group would not think of doing that, but they do not think women should be holding jobs. I would say, "You know, some States have laws that say women in a factory must not lift more than so many pounds. Have you ever thought about what a nurse in a hospital has to lift? It is often a great deal more than men in a factory are usually expected to lift. In extreme instances, this has resulted in cracked vertebrae and invalidism for the nurse, who has utterly forgotten herself to help her patient." Yet no one suggests that women should not become nurses.

In the early years of the century, nursing was one of the few occupations open to women. Now, women can go into almost any occupation, and women nurses in the Armed Forces are commissioned officers. But men with nurse training are not ranked as commissioned officers. I have a bill in Congress to get a few equal rights for men.

Equal pay is very close to my heart and always has been. There are

13 States and Alaska, that have equal-pay laws. [As of May 15, three more States had enacted equal-pay laws.—*Ed.*]

Some of the union officials have written me that they believe that equal pay should not be taken up by the Federal Government at all, but through union organization contracts. I got one of those letters from a very eminent man. But I had just had a letter telling me of a contract in which there was a differential of from \$2 to \$4 a week between men's and women's pay rates.

It seems to me we need to give the country a deeper sense of what equal pay means. We need to understand what it is. The people need to know and they should want it for us.

For instance, what is the result of discrimination? Does it affect the morale of the workers? If we can pull together in solving this, then perhaps next January we will be ready to introduce something vital, alive, dynamic, that Congress will understand and will want to put through.

You know that it is no trouble at all to get a bill through Congress if people want it. There was no hesitation on the part of Congress about the act that created the Cadet Nurse Corps and paid tuitions for the administrative and postgraduate group.

I would like to see us as women use our opportunities so that men would realize we are not working at cross purposes with them; that we want to go along with them, side by side, each of us doing our share of the work of building a new world. For that world is not going to be built if the men do it alone, or if we try to do it alone. We must work together to bring about a world that is strong, that is true, that is honorable, that is peace loving.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Before I ask Dr. Riley to summarize the significant points of what women are doing in today's world, I would like to ask if her experience with the American Association of University Women has given her a picture of how the workingwoman in the United States has changed in 25 years.

Dr. RILEY: I do not know whether it is my association with the American Association of University Women which gives me a few ideas on this or the fact that I am a woman in the United States.

I think if I were an artist I could best depict this by a series of four pictures: The first would be a picture in black and white, of a woman sitting on the front seat of a covered wagon, with a rifle across her knees. I would call her "Woman, the Partner."

The second would be an oil painting of the woman in a Victorian parlor, to which she has been relegated because her husband is economically more prosperous and the industrial revolution has lightened

the necessity for her to be an economic asset to her husband. That woman would be called "Woman, the Possession."

The third would be a series of snapshots of women in violent commotion, parading, waving banners, knocking on doors, with a few mournful Melisandes over in the corner giving the impression that they know they are cornered and that they are definitely meant for better things. I would call that "Woman in Revolt."

The fourth would be the woman of today. Using motion-picture techniques, we could show her in action doing a lot of different things—but with one emergent figure: A woman in the home surrounded by her children, but with her hat on, because she is likely to go out somewhere any time. I would call her simply "Woman."

I think that the word "career" is not in our vocabulary today. I work with young women, as do many of you. They no longer desire careers. Marriage is the goal of life for them; a suburban ranch house is their idea of heaven; four children are needed to complete the family circle. They envision that home as a part of their community, of the Nation and the world. They are, therefore, interested in everything which affects the life of women.

This is the woman on whom we must focus our attention when we speak of efficient use of womanpower.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Now that we know something about ourselves as workingwomen, I think we might inquire into women's influence on both sides of the Atlantic. I would like Dr. Monsani to tell us how women in Italy try to influence national affairs. Are many women in higher offices in your country?

Dr. MONSANI: Women influence national affairs only by their votes. I have an idea that the most important thing to be done now in Italy is to teach women to vote. We have had the right to vote only since the last war, so you can imagine that in many cases, women vote like their husbands. It is not a real vote. Some women vote as a political party tells them to vote.

Every woman should contribute to society with her own thought. She must know what she wants. She must not have another group of persons tell her how she must vote. Until women have learned this, I do not believe they can really enter national affairs. Perhaps it will come soon, because the Italian people are rather quick to learn.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Are there many women who hold public office?

Dr. MONSANI: Oh, yes; we have many women deputies and senators. And we have many women in public office and public administration.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Does a woman who is running for office in Italy come under criticism because she is a woman?

Dr. MONSANT: Generally not. Sometimes they say she has succeeded because she is good looking, but very seldom.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Mrs. Bolton is the most experienced among our panel in politics, so I would like to hear her say something about women in politics in the United States and what some of the outmoded charges are that she knows about from her own experience.

Mrs. BOLTON: Running for public office is a very interesting experience. I hope a great many of you women are going into the political field, both in the United States and in the other countries.

We have 17 women in Congress, one of whom is in the Senate—Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. We do not work as a women's bloc. That would be rather foolish, but we like to feel that we perhaps have more influence than any 17 men. I have never found that the men will not listen to me because I am a woman.

In State offices, women now have a lieutenant governor, many secretaries of state, and many women in municipal offices. We do not have enough women on school boards and on library boards. Those are places where any mother could serve. She should know what her children are being taught, she should be an influence on these boards; she should also have a great deal to do with the recreation in her particular area. It may be a tiny village, or it may be a great city like New York, Chicago, San Francisco, or my own Cleveland, but her influence is important.

Had it not been for the influence of women, we would not have had our child-labor laws, nor such growth in housing legislation. Women have a real influence because they believe that babies must be strong and well, with their minds clear; they must come into homes that are not just little holes in the wall; they must come into places where there is wholesome recreation available, and into areas where the schools are adequate.

Over 300,000 additional teachers and 600,000 new school units are needed. If we built 107 a day, or something of that kind, we would not catch up with school needs for some time, because the birthrate has not fallen, but increased.

In the health field, I know from my own experience that we would not begin to have what we have today in protection of health if it had not been for women, so that I am a rank enthusiast for women who make the men understand that what we want is a shoulder-to-shoulder process; that we are willing to carry our share.

The increase in number of women in the political field, and in all phases of government, is helping the men to realize that we are their partners. We earn that responsibility and that opportunity by our day-to-day methods and our day-to-day actions, and by our vision.

Mrs. CARPENTER. I wonder if Madame Barbizet would like to explain the situation in France on the birthrate. I understand it was declining a few years back, but that the government has made having babies profitable.

Mme. BARBIZET. It is not profitable for the government; it is profitable for families! We had a very low birthrate in France, as you perhaps know. Our population has been on the decline. After the war, the government gave families a new allowance.

The new allowance means that an unskilled worker earning 30,000 francs a month will have his salary doubled if he has three children. If his wife stays at home in order to look after the children, her family allowance is increased. As soon as she gets work outside the home she loses that *extra* family allowance. But it is a very heavy burden for the government and for the employers, because the employers pay a share of this family allowance. There are two sides to this question.

Mrs. CARPENTER. Dr. Riley, would you like to say anything about the influence which women's organizations have on politics?

Dr. RILEY. Do you mind if I give it a little twist, and say what women's organizations are doing about developing potentialities for womanpower in the labor force? In the first place, let me say this: Women in the United States have a great urge to join. It does not make much difference what we join or what we do after we join, but we have to join and we have an unbroken record of joining since about the 1780's.

We are inclined to make fun of women's organizations. Many of us are still haunted with the satirical picture which Sinclair Lewis drew of the Thanatopsis Club. We are still trying to live it down. On the other hand, there are many constructive outlets for women's organizations. Instead of deriding them, we should be proud of them, particularly since all of us here belong to a great many and we are not trying to indict ourselves.

One thing which women's organizations do for their members is the very thing that you are talking about; they make women politically effective. Another goal which we hold up for women through our various organizations is that a woman should be economically productive, that she should have a sense of social awareness, a sense of obligation to her community, and that she should have a continuously growing type of education. Many of our women's organizations are, after all, organizations in adult education. Another value of women's organizations is the experience they give women of working together. One reason why women have not gone farther is because we have not always supported each other. Working together in organizations

does, I think, bring us more psychological willingness, and also a technique, for working with other women.

Mrs. CARPENTER: There are some questions from the floor at this point. How do the working mothers in France and Italy cope with the problem of taking care of children?

Dr. MONSANT: We have no schools for children under 4 years, but there are nurseries near some modern factories. We have what are called the garden schools, for children 4 to 6 years; and then the other schools from 6 years on.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Mme. Barbizet?

Mme. BARBIZET: Young mothers can leave their children in day-care nurseries provided by the management of factories or by municipalities; but they are often obliged to send their babies to foster homes, and we all know that it is not a good thing for a small child to be deprived of his mother. Women who get high wages, such as women doctors and lawyers, can still find more help than you do in America.

Mrs. CARPENTER: The question now is whether social legislation stands a better chance if a male legislator sponsors the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON: What I have found very effective is to have a man sponsor a bill identical with mine, over in the Senate.

Mrs. CARPENTER: To wind up this discussion I am going to give each of the four panelists exactly 60 seconds to discuss their favorite cause. What ax do you have to grind or what do you like to promote? Let's begin with Dr. Riley.

Dr. RILEY: My favorite talking point would be based on three premises: The first, that women's potentialities are greater than their achievements. Second, the opportunities for service are going to be greater in the future than they have ever been; in other words, we are going to have to live up to our potentialities. The third premise would be we must be ready for this. How do we get ready?

We can do this through preparation in general education and in specific skills. We must be ready also in experience. It is necessary for us to have the opportunity to better ourselves. Too often doors are closed to women on the lower levels, and therefore they never have the chance to build up experience so they can get to the top-level jobs. Finally, we must prepare ourselves psychologically, by moving away from the idea of a privileged class which has immunity from certain general responsibilities, and by determining very definitely that we are willing to pay the price which men pay for comparable success. Until we are willing to go in for job concentration, and long expensive training, we must be satisfied with lesser achievements.

The fight to open top-level positions to women after all these years gives every evidence of being successful. It would be highly ironic

if we find now that we do not have a sufficient number of qualified women to hold the positions which we have fought so long to open. My challenge is to women themselves, because so many of the discriminations practiced against women originate with women.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Mrs. Bolton? What 60-second cause do you have?

Mrs. BOLTON: I think mine dovetails with Dr. Riley's. I think that women are very reluctant to take the big gamble of entering politics. They do not seem to realize that the minute they step out of their front door to go and tell the schoolteacher something about their child, or to go to the town council and say "We must have more lights on my street," they are in politics.

It is the machinery of our free way of life. Women seem to balk when they come to the point of actually accepting a job with responsibility, even in the libraries or on the school boards.

I would like to challenge all the parent-teacher associations. I want to know what they are doing. I would like to see education, not instruction, in our schools. To me this is an essential that we do not have. We are instructing our children. We are teaching them a lot of things out of books. Out in Painesville, Ohio, there is a college for about 500 or 600 girls. They have recently reorganized their whole plan and method. A girl must know three things when she leaves there: She must know about herself as a physical, mental, and spiritual being, and about the universe she lives in. She must learn something with which she can support herself; a woman must be able to take economic responsibility for herself and others. And she must know that there is a responsibility of citizenship, and how to meet that responsibility.

I learned many years ago that in some of the Indian teachings there are three areas of living: preparation, citizenship, and consultation in the wisdom years. My goal is to see this country's children well taught in the living of life—not just knowing the English Kings and the Presidents of the United States. I am trying to point everything I do toward the end that women shall be leaders in all those areas which mean the teaching of the living of life.

Mrs. CARPENTER: Mme. Barbizet.

Mme. BARBIZET: The main problem, it seems to me, is the problem of young women who have received a good training and have left a job because they got married and had babies. How can a woman reconcile her obligation to her home and children and her desire to work? It seems a great waste to train women and then not utilize their training. Many girls after the first years of motherhood feel frustrated and dissatisfied, and we are trying to find methods to allow

them to come back to their work when the children reach school age by doing part-time work. I had hoped very much to see how you dealt here with this situation, as we know we must find an answer. Mrs. Myrdal, who is writing a book on this particular subject, thinks that young women should give up their work for a few years, remain interested in their training, and come back to it later. We have to see how this can be worked out.

Dr. MONSANI: Once after the war when I was traveling by train I met a man from one of the Asian countries. We spoke about America and he explained to me that in the United States the woman was up *here*, and the man down *there*. In his own country, he said the man was up *here*, and the woman was down *there*. He then asked me where the woman stood in Italy, and I answered, up and down, up and down!

After the war and the adoption of our new constitution, we passed many laws giving women equal rights but in practice they are not all being applied. We know that you American women have more protection than we have in marriage—in your lives as wives and mothers.

I want to know all about these things so that I can go back to my country and tell people there about them. I cannot say that we will follow your example but even if some of the things that I see here cannot be applied in my own country I think it will be useful to know about them.

The Status of Women Around the World

MRS. LORENA HAHN, *United States Representative, U. N. Commission on the Status of Women*

The greatest experience in my recent 4 months' visit to Africa and Asia, was the vivid contrasts between old and new civilizations. Through them one glimpsed the progress of man and within them one discerned a growing respect for the individual.

It is a serious undertaking to attempt to portray the feelings and lives of people in foreign countries. There are so many contrasts, so many contradictions. All are products of their past, as are we.

The oldest civilizations known are in this part of the world. Their ancient, medieval, and modern customs are struggling together to give birth to a new society. It is not my intention to build a case for or against any country, but rather to mirror to you as best I can the present conditions and the hopes of the people in action.

My first stop was in Liberia in West Africa. It is a fascinating country, comprised of modern, educated people and gentle and fierce

tribes. The majority of people in Monrovia, the capital, are educated in excellent missionary schools and in their university. There is an agricultural experimental farm, sponsored by the United States under Point 4. They have the same problem there that all countries have, including our own. It is to induce the tillers of the soil to exchange old methods for new.

The project director understood people. He did not try to tell them what to do. Instead he went out amid them and built his hut. He planted corn and beans and raised chickens as they did, only his corn grew tall and the ears were well filled out. There were many beans on his vines. His hens laid huge eggs; compared to them the eggs of the tribesmen looked very much like birds' eggs. Occasionally the natives came over to inquire; then they began to sprinkle on the magic dust that we call fertilizer and to plant the new seeds.

Today this is a greatly expanded and flourishing experimental farm, and the tribesmen move in and out freely. This has been a great factor in breaking down the caste system between the tribesmen. The last day that I was there, the seven women's organizations banded together for the first time and gave a farewell public tea. This was their thanks to the United States for having sent the first official woman visitor.

As I stood in the pavilion I could see the only railroad in Liberia, just a spur, that led to their only iron ore mine. I could see in the distance the fishing crews of the tribe, and I rejoiced to see on the shores the framework of a refrigerating plant, the only one in Liberia. This is to preserve the fish of the tribesmen against the day that fish do not run. The threat of starvation for the shore tribe will be whipped.

There is a deep feeling of kinship between the people in Liberia and the United States. It was with a touch of sadness that I flew away.

In Asia, I visited India, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and Turkey. I spent 5 weeks in India, and I shall touch on about three cities: New Delhi, Calcutta, and Bombay.

India, as you know, has been conquered again and again. She has been a subject nation through the ages, with the conquerors squeezing out of the land all that was there, and leaving in the people a feeling of resignation, hopelessness, and an acceptance of their fate. With the passing of the mogul emperors and the coming of the English, a new system was instituted. Many Indians were educated and given positions of responsibility. This grew until there was one stratum of society with know-how.

When India received her independence from England, she had this know-how to depend upon. They framed the constitution and

they began to attack their problems. The new and the old city of Delhi are exactly what their names imply. New Delhi is a modern city. To my delight there was an air-conditioning unit in my bedroom—and to my surprise there was a pigeon in the unscreened bathroom!

It was quite a sight to see the laundry of a city of a million population being done alongside the riverbank. These conditions can not be materially changed until power has been created. They are building dams for power, but this must be used for the new factories. India must be industrialized if she is to improve living conditions for this vast population.

In Calcutta, I visited a rural area, a community development project, which is just adjacent to the city. It contains 270 villages. Here they attack the whole problem simultaneously—farming, health, education. They have a farm a good bit like the one I spoke of in Liberia, only larger. They train midwives, who in turn go into the villages and train midwives there. There are a number of trained social workers who go into the villages to teach reading, writing, sewing, and a bit of cooking.

The major problem of these women is to gain acceptance for themselves and their program, because the caste system is strong here. One of the workers told me that she had seven identical classes in the same village because only certain people will attend together and they certainly would not be willing to go into a hut of another caste.

The sanitation advance was intriguing. Many had copied a sample stove that was rectangular, made of clay, with a bamboo stovepipe which took the smoke out of the hut. Anyone could make one. Can you imagine what it means no longer to live in a smoke-filled room? Their eyes are no longer bloodshot. In one village I all but wept for joy. Each hut had the stove and the bamboo pipe. They had covered a large pit on each side of the hut, and the water from the streets could run in it. By their own initiative they put in a trash can. As a final touch, they showed me flowers all in blossom. They were learning!

Bombay is a delightful international city on the ocean. The people look well dressed. The streets are clean and no livestock is permitted on them, no beggars, no horns. But there are the same congested areas, and the same basic shortages. The women's organizations there are few. They are organized on a city level—not as we have them here, on a national, State, and local level. This will come, I am sure, but it will take time. They do civic and social work, but most of their efforts are trained toward welfare. They take over whole orphanages, hospitals, health clinics, and manage them all with volunteer help.

I visited the industrial school for boys and one for girls. I was de-

lighted. Instead of being locked up in cells, as they are in some places I visited, the boys and girls here received academic training, as well as training in the skills and handwork. The problem of the rehabilitation of the child is approached as a whole. The superintendent was a young man and as I visited with him he said, "You know, I went to the United States on one of your grants to learn penal methods, and now my institution is the one where all of the other superintendents come to visit and learn the new methods." I was grateful to the United States.

Education in India is progressing. They have a missionary school; many of the governmental schools have expanded and the government is starting new tax-supported schools throughout the country. You will find education, insofar as literacy is concerned, is provided for the women as well as for the men.

There are great bulwarks of hope in India. They have a democratic constitution. They put the individual first—not the State. There is religious freedom, and untouchability is no longer legal. The spirit of Gandhi is deeply rooted in the whole Indian population and it is a powerful influence for stability, freedom, nonviolence, and human understanding.

It is my impression that Mr. Nehru is reflecting the feeling of the people. They know that if war comes, this program will be wiped out and they could fall again into slavery. I am convinced that this is not a reflection of partiality, but a desperate attempt to keep the program from being interrupted.

I shall speak of but two cities in Pakistan—Dacca and Lahore. Dacca is the capital of East Pakistan and it would be a depressing city if it were not for the enthusiasm of the people. They are tearing down squalid centers, widening streets, and getting something done.

I visited a jute mill. It is the largest and most modern in the world. I talked with a labor representative. He told me that many of the labor people were determined to start their own unions and develop their leaders from within, but that the mill and factory owners were determined to begin the unions themselves. Hence, much of the labor movement in Pakistan is under cover. They are very careful to escape the methods used in some countries, where the various political parties head unions.

There are missionary schools, private schools, and the beginning of a fine network of government schools throughout Pakistan. In East Pakistan there are 13 boys' schools to 1 for girls. Pakistan, like almost all Moslem countries, sends boys and girls to school together only through the primary grades. Then they attend separate schools until they reach the university level.

In West Pakistan, Lahore is a cultural center. The legislature was in session and there was a whirl of social activity. No veils here—the women in the Parliament were debating on the floor.

We drove to a place called Lullapur, to speak at a college that was owned by the government. Lullapur is just 25 miles from absolute desert. En route, its canal system came clearly into view. This is the best canal system in the world. I noticed several canals that were bone dry, nothing but shifting sand in them. I came to know that this was one of the contentions between India and Pakistan—water rights, the same thing our Western States have struggled with in connection with the Colorado River.

The obstacles in Pakistan are tremendous, but despite them, there is an atmosphere of invigoration. They speak freely of the help they get from the United States and other countries and say how much they appreciate it.

The countries of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon are so closely associated in their past and present that I shall describe them together. They are, as you know, Arab countries, and are of the Islam or Moslem faith, excepting Lebanon, which is half-Christian. Iraq was made an independent kingdom in 1932. Syria and Lebanon became republics in 1941.

My first stop was in Baghdad, Iraq (formerly Mesopotamia). This was the only country which I visited officially where women do not have the vote. One of the leading women told me that when the United Nations sent a questionnaire relating to women, the government had to consult lawyers to see just what their position was. When the constitution was framed no one had ever given a thought to the status of women.

The people there are conservative and nonvocal. I had an opportunity, through a friendly contact, to meet a noted poetess. She belonged to the religious conservatives, and I was told that her husband had been approached first to see whether or not she might recite some of her poems over the radio. He gave his permission after he had gone to the station, surveyed the rooms, inspected the curtains over the windows, guarded the door so no one could enter, and brought her down in a guarded car. She did a beautiful job and was whisked straight home again.

This woman spoke freely to me about the situation that prevailed. I asked, "Would you like to have a radio program weekly?" "Oh, yes," she said. "Would you mind if your daughter went into public life?" "That is my hope." "How do your women associates feel about this seclusion?" "We are just waiting for the day for this cruel seclusion to be lifted from us."

That night I met the poetess' opposite. It was at a social function. The Minister of Education said 15 percent of the men and 7½ percent of the women in Iraq were literate, but he was against women voting. Like a flash this woman challenged him. She said, "Mr. Minister, how can our country afford to lose half of its intellect in running its government and public affairs?" As the debate continued, I felt certain that in time—but it will take time—women will be voting there.

There are a number of women's organizations there; they do magnificent welfare work.

In Syria the people were warm, enthusiastic, and vocal. Damascus is a lovely city. Here the women headed many schools and colleges. Here, too, women take over orphanages and hospitals on a voluntary basis and needle their government to get money so they may further them. They work frantically in the Arab refugee camps.

The last day that I was in Syria, I walked the street in Damascus that is called "Straight." I wondered what were the thoughts of St. Paul as he rode over it so long ago? I went to the little church where he was let down through the window in a basket to escape torture and death; and I wondered how much longer man must suffer, individually and collectively, before he is ready to accept the way to peace and health.

In the little country of Lebanon, the capital, Beirut, is a humming international city. This is the first place I visited where the roots of the women's organizations go down into the village. They have a national council of women that meets twice a year. The 105 women's organizations are so diversified in character that they touch practically every field relating to women. I did not see women wearing the long veil here, but occasionally I would see a woman dressed in a smart Parisian gown or suit, with a black veil covering her face and draped over her hat.

My next visit was in Israel, the modern new city of Tel Aviv. You cannot imagine such fervor in a whole country. The care they give the children is outstanding. There are several social systems of living here. One of the most unusual is called the Kibbitz. It is a complete socialist community. Here everybody works and the money goes into a common fund. They have a common dining room, where all eat. The clothing, the doctors bills, are all paid out of this fund. When a child is born it is immediately placed in a nursery and has scientific care. None of the children stay at home but they do go home daily from 4 to 6 to visit their parents. The rest of the time they live in the children's centers and go to model schools.

I asked the supervisor, who happened to be a woman from Cali-

ifornia, if there were any drones in the community. She smiled and said, "We call them artists."

The glowing reports that I had heard about Turkey were merited. You will recall that the Turkish General Attaturk formed a republic here in 1923. This is the first Moslem country where church and state have been separated. There is no polygamy here, no system of arranged marriages, no separation of boys and girls in schools. Women have absolute equality with the men; they are exceedingly active, and the men are inordinately proud of them. They boasted to me that they are the only country in the world that has a woman on the Supreme Court. There are an unusual number of women in the court. The dean in the University of Istanbul is a woman, elected to this office by the faculty, which is largely composed of men. The women in the Parliament are most effective.

The women of Turkey have military service, just as men do. Attaturk's daughter heads the women parachute jumpers in the army.

My official tour had ended. As I flew over the majestic city of Istanbul toward home, the import of what I had seen swept over me. Throughout Asia, there is a growing demand for progress and improvement, a demand far outdistancing the government's capacity to fulfill. The breaking down of old established customs is accompanied by weakening and disruption of the social structure. The old must be replaced by something new, or these areas may fall to foreign domination.

It is glorious to know that the United States, Great Britain, the United Nations, and practically every one of the countries of the free world have sent help to these overpopulated countries. It is the first time in the history of mankind where people have moved in, not to get but to give, not to conquer and destroy, but to build and to help.

The colossal stone ruins of the era of man's slavery are being replaced with new monuments—not in stone, but in the health, the welfare, and the dignity of man. You are helping to build these monuments.

Mrs. LEOPOLD: I would like to tell you that the Women's Bureau is here to serve you always, individually and thoughtfully. As we do in some of our legislatures, shall we adjourn this meeting without date, meaning that we will meet again in the very near future.

Appendix

PROGRAM

Thursday—March 10, 1955—9:30 a. m.

Interdepartmental Auditorium

- INVOCATION**----- The Reverend John F. Cronin,
S. S.
Assistant Director, Department
of Social Action
National Catholic Welfare Con-
ference
- WELCOME**----- Mrs. Alice K. Leopold
Assistant to the Secretary of
Labor for Women's Affairs
- "TODAY'S CHALLENGE"**----- The Honorable James P. Mitchell
Secretary of Labor
- "HORIZONS FOR WOMEN"**----- A panel.

Florence R. Kluckhohn, Ph. D.
Laboratory of Social Relations
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

Marie Jahoda, Ph. D.
Associate Director
Research Center for Human Relations
New York University
New York, N. Y.

Leo H. Bartemeier, M. D.
Medical Director
Seton Institute
Baltimore, Md.

DISCUSSION

March 10, 1955—2 p. m.

Interdepartmental Auditorium

PRESIDING----- Winifred G. Helmes, Ph. D.
 Assistant Director
 Women's Bureau

"THE WOMAN WHO WORKS"----- A panel.

Mrs. Gertrude G. Michelson
 Manager for Labor Relations
 R. H. Macy & Co.
 New York, N. Y.
Moderator

AS OTHERS SEE HER

Virgil Martin
 Vice President
 Carson, Pirie & Scott
 Chicago, Ill.

Peter Henle
 Assistant Director of Research
 American Federation of Labor,
 Washington, D. C.

James T. O'Connell
 Vice President
 Publix-Shirts Corp.
 New York, N. Y.

AS SHE SEES HERSELF

Anne Gary Pannell, Ph. D.
 President
 Sweet Briar College
 Sweet Briar, Va.

Mrs. Helen Berthelot
 Legislative Representative
 Communications Workers of
 America (CIO)
 Washington, D. C.

Miss Louise Watson
 Investment Adviser
 R. W. Pressprich & Co.
 New York, N. Y.

DISCUSSION

March 10, 1955—7 p. m.

Dinner

Pall Mall Room
 The Hotel Raleigh

PRESIDING ----- Mrs. Alice K. Leopold

INVOCATION----- Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, L. H. D.
 Minister of the Washington
 Hebrew Congregation

"WOMEN AND THE LAW"----- The Honorable Arthur Larson
 Under Secretary of Labor

DISCUSSION

Friday—March 11, 1955—9:30 a. m.

Interdepartmental Auditorium

PRESIDING----- Mrs. Alice K. Leopold
 INVOCATION ----- Rt. Rev. Angus Dun, D. D.
 Bishop of the Episcopal
 Diocese of Washington

“SHORTAGE OCCUPATIONS: NEW
 OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN”----- A panel.

Eli Ginzberg, Ph. D.
 Director of Research
 National Manpower Council
 New York, N. Y.
Moderator

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff | Irving H. Siegel, Ph. D. |
| Chairman of the Board | Council of Economic |
| Radio Corporation of America | Advisers |
| New York, N. Y. | Washington, D. C. |

Roland R. Renne, Ph. D.
 President
 Montana State College
 Bozeman, Mont.

SUMMARY----- Mirra Komarovsky, Ph. D.
 Chairman, Department of
 Sociology, Barnard College
 New York, N. Y.

March 11, 1955—2 p. m.

The Hall of the Americas

Pan American Union

INTRODUCING MRS. CHAVES----- Mrs. Frances M. Lee
 United States Delegate
 Inter-American Commission of
 Women
 WELCOME ----- Mrs. Maria Concepcion de Chaves
 Chairman
 Inter-American Commission of
 Women

"WOMEN IN TODAY'S WORLD"---- A panel.

Mrs. Elizabeth S. Carpenter
 President
 Women's National Press Club,
 Washington, D. C.
Moderator

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Olga Monsani, LL. B., former President, European Federation Soroptimist Clubs, Florence, Italy</p> <p>Georgette Barbizet, LL. B., Chairman, Children's Section, National Council of Women of France, Paris, France</p> | <p>Susan B. Riley, Ph. D., President, American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.</p> <p>The Honorable Frances P. Bolton, U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs</p> |
|---|--|

"THE STATUS OF WOMEN AROUND THE WORLD."

Mrs. Lorena Hahn
 United States Representative
 U. N. Commission on the Status of Women

BIOGRAPHIES OF SPEAKERS

Mme. Georgette Barbizet

French participant in community leaders' program visiting the United States, March 3-May 3, 1955. She is a volunteer leader of the National Council of Women of France, and a member of: Committee on the Daily Work of Employed Women, Committee on Hospitality for Foreign Visitors, Liaison Committee of Women and Family Associations, Committee to Welcome Young Aliens. She has been president of the Soroptimist Club in Paris, vice president of the Women Social Workers Group, member of the International Commission for Assistance to Defective Children, president of the Women's Resistance Movement, and has organized a center for the rehabilitation of delinquent youth. From 1917 to 1919 she worked in the office of the French Resident-General of Tunis. She has participated in the International Congress of Women meetings in Vienna, Edinburgh, Philadelphia, and Lugano, representing the National Council of Women of France. She is a former staff member of publication, "The Moslem World." Mme. Barbizet is a Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor.

Dr. Leo H. Bartemeier

Medical director, Seton Institute, Baltimore, Md. Holds degrees from Catholic University of America and Georgetown University Medical School. He has received postgraduate training at Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic, Johns Hopkins Hospital, and the Institute for Psychoanalysis in Chicago. He has been president of the American Psychiatric Association, and of the International Psychoanalytic Association. He is chairman of the Council on Mental Health of the American Medical Association and a member of the National Manpower Council. He has been consultant of the World Health Organization to the Government of Ireland and lecturer in psychoanalysis to psychiatrists in Havana, Cuba. He is

a charter member of the Cornelian Corner of Detroit—a multiprofessional organization for the promotion of better relationships between children and their parents.

Mrs. Helen Berthelot

Legislative representative, Communications Workers of America (CIO); member of National CIO Legislative Committee. Helped organize union in 1937-38. In 1942 became secretary of the Traffic Statewide Organization, later secretary-treasurer. She was vice president of the Amalgamated Michigan Division of Communication Workers for 2 years, later becoming international representative. Mrs. Berthelot was the first chairman of the Labor Management Committee of the Telephone Division of the United Foundation Drive in Michigan.

The Honorable Frances P. Bolton

Represents the 22d Ohio District in Congress. She was United States Representative to the 8th Regular Session of the U. N. General Assembly and has been, for 13 years, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. She has served as chairman of its subcommittees on national and international movements and on the Near East and Africa. Her subcommittee on national and international movements compiled a monograph, "Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," which is an acknowledged authoritative treatise on world communism. She was the first woman Member of Congress ever to head an official congressional mission abroad (1947), when her subcommittee went for inspection and study to the Near East and Africa. She introduced the congressional resolution which invited Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, heroine of Dienbienphu, to the United States—the first time Congress ever formally invited a foreign citizen to visit this country. She is now serving her eighth successive term in Congress.

Mrs. Elizabeth S. Carpenter

President, Women's National Press Club. Native of Texas. Graduate in journalism from the University of Texas. For the past 10 years has been a member of a husband-wife newspaper correspondents' team furnishing Washington coverage to newspapers in the Southwest, including the Houston, Tex., Post the Arkansas Gazette at Little Rock, Ark., and the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune. Mrs. Carpenter is a member of the White House Correspondents Association and of the House and Senate Press Galleries.

Dr. Eli Ginzberg

Professor of economics, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University; director of research of the National Manpower Council; and director of the "conservation of human resources" project at Columbia University. He is consultant to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Labor, and the Surgeon General's Office of the Department of the Army. He has served as director of research, United Jewish Appeal; special assistant to chief statistician, War Department; director, Resources Analysis Division, Surgeon General's Office, War Department; member, Medical Advisory Board to Secretary of War; chairman, Committee on the Function of Nursing; representative of the United States to Five-Power Conference on Reparations for Nonrepatriable Refugees; director, New York State Hospital Study; consultant, United States State Department Technical Cooperation Administration, Israel. Among his published works are: "Economics of the Bible," "House of Adam Smith," "The Labor Leader," "A

Program for the Nursing Profession," "Agenda for American Jews," "A Policy for Scientific and Professional Manpower," "Psychiatry and Military Manpower," "A Policy for Skilled Manpower."

Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn

United States representative on the Status of Women Commission of the United Nations. She has just completed a 4-month tour sponsored by the Educational Exchange Division of the State Department, visiting Liberia, Africa, India, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and Turkey. Following World War II she served for 14 months in Germany under Gen. Lucius D. Clay, to aid women in reestablishing their position in a free government. She has been a member and chairman of the Board of Control of the State of Nebraska and has been national president of the American Legion Auxiliary. Mrs. Hahn has served as a member of the National Broadcasting Co., Republican Postwar Policy Committee, National Board of Wild Life, Forum on National Defense, and is currently serving on the board of the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania. She was decorated by the French Government with the Medal of Legion of Honor for unusual service to veterans.

Peter Henle

Assistant director of research, American Federation of Labor. He received degrees from Swarthmore College and American University, where his principal field of study was economics and labor relations. During the war he served as statistical officer for the Air Force. He has been with the Research and Economics Departments of the American Federation of Labor since 1946, and worked with the United States Department of Labor as executive assistant to the labor members of the Labor-Management Manpower Policy Committee in 1952.

Dr. Marie Jahoda

Associate director, Research Center for Human Relations, New York University. She received her Ph. D. from the University of Vienna in 1932 and served as director of the Social Research Institute affiliated with that university from 1933 to 1936. In Great Britain from 1937 to 1945, her activities included a study of unemployed miners in South Wales; work with Cambridge University on social-psychological problems of factory life; a wartime social survey with the Ministry of Information; a study of national income consumption with the National Institute of Social and Economic Research. In the United States she has served with the Scientific Department, American Jewish Committee, and with the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University. Her publications include: "Some Socio-Psychological Problems of Factory Life" and "Toward a Social Psychology of Mental Health in Problems of Infancy and Childhood." Her most recent publication is a collaboration with R. Christie, "Studies in the Scope and Methods of the 'Authoritarian Personality.'"

Dr. Florence R. Kluckhohn

Lecturer in the Department of Social Relations and research associate in the Laboratory of Social Relations, Harvard University. A graduate of the University of Wisconsin, she received her Ph. D. from Radcliffe College. Has taught at Wellesley College, with year's leave of absence to serve as research analyst, Far Eastern Division, Office of War Information. Has collaborated with Dr.

John Spiegel, psychiatrist, in the work of the Committee on the Family in the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. Presently, Dr. Kluckhohn and Dr. Spiegel are developing a research project for a comparative study of "well" and "sick" families. Has made substantial studies in family structure and comparative culture, particularly in Spanish-American and Mexican groups, and in generalized United States culture. Dr. Kluckhohn is the wife of Clyde Kluckhohn, who is in the anthropological field at Harvard.

Dr. Mirra Komarovsky

Professor of sociology and executive officer of the Department of Sociology, Barnard College. She formerly was an assistant professor of sociology at Skidmore College, university fellow at Columbia University, research assistant at Yale University, and research associate at Columbia University. Professor Komarovsky, in private life Mrs. Marcus A. Heyman, is a member of the American Sociological Society and the American Association of University Professors. She is the coauthor of "Leisure, A Suburban Study," and author of "The Unemployed Man and His Family" and "Women in the Modern World: Their Education and Their Dilemmas."

The Honorable Arthur Larson

Under Secretary of Labor. Former dean of the University of Pittsburgh Law School; professor of law, Cornell University Law School; associate professor of law, University of Tennessee. During World War II he served as division counsel, Industrial Materials Division, and then acting price executive, Lumber Branch, OPA. Later, as Chief of the Scandinavian Branch, Foreign Economic Administration, he planned war and postwar supply and trade programs of Norway, Denmark, and Finland. He is a native of South Dakota and attended Augustana College, the University of South Dakota Law School, and was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University. His publications include "The Law of Workmen's Compensation" and background documents used by the American Assembly for discussions on economic security for Americans.

Mrs. Alice K. Leopold

Assistant to the Secretary of Labor for Women's Affairs. Former secretary of state in Connecticut and member of the Connecticut General Assembly; personnel director with Hutzler Bros., Baltimore, and B. Altman & Co., of New York. She represented the Department of Labor as adviser to the United States delegation at the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva in June 1954. In October 1954 she headed a mission to France and Italy to survey women's economic problems and their effect on family life, for the Foreign Operations Administration. She is a member of the Inter-Governmental Relations Commission.

Virgil Martin

Vice president and general manager, Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., Chicago. Former dean of men at Illinois Wesleyan University, executive director of the Indianapolis Community Chest and Council of Social Agencies, director of finance for Community Chests and Councils of America, Inc., executive director of the New York City War Fund, general superintendent and personnel director of the Wm. H. Block Co., of Indianapolis. He is a member of the boards of the Welfare Council for Metropolitan Chicago, the National Health and Welfare Retirement Fund, the Chicago Theological Seminary, the Cook County School of Nursing, and Illinois Wesleyan University.

Mrs. Gertrude G. Michelson

Manager, Labor Relations Department, R. H. Macy & Co., New York. Mrs. Michelson holds degrees from Pennsylvania State University and Columbia University, where she specialized in industrial psychology. She has taught a course in employee relations at the New York University School of Retailing.

The Honorable James P. Mitchell

Secretary of Labor. Former Assistant Secretary of the Army in charge of manpower and reserve forces affairs. During World War II, he was director of the Industrial Personnel Division of the War Department. He also served as a member of the National Building Trades Stabilization Board and as an alternate for the Under Secretary of War on the War Manpower Commission. In 1948, he was a member of the personnel advisory board of the Hoover Commission, and in that same year, at the request of the United States Army, he went to Germany to study the military government's civilian-employment program. In 1950, he was called upon again by the United States Army, this time to study and report on combat-pay problems. He has served as personnel relations adviser, director of industrial relations, and operating vice president for several large industrial concerns. He was appointed to his present Cabinet post as Secretary of Labor on October 9, 1953.

Dr. Olga Monsani

Italian participant in community leaders' program visiting the United States March 3-May 3, 1955. An international lawyer, she is vice president of the Italian Federation of Business and Professional Women. She founded the Business and Professional Women's Club in Florence, Italy, and from 1950 until the present time has served as its president. She is former president of the European Federation of Soroptimists Clubs and has traveled extensively in Europe in that connection. She spent some time in England studying the work of women's organizations there. Dr. Monsani has been active in a great many community organizations, including the Red Cross and relief agencies for war orphans and invalids.

James T. O'Connell

Vice president, Publix-Shirts Corp., New York, where he is responsible for union negotiations and relations, industrial engineering, and personnel management. Mr. O'Connell holds A. S., B. S., and civil engineer degrees from Columbia University. From 1930 to 1940 he was a construction engineer and superintendent in New York City. From 1940 to 1945 he served on the staff of Gen. Brehon B. Somervell in the Army Service Forces, where he held the rank of colonel. He was assigned as Deputy Director, Industrial Personnel Division, ASF. In 1945-46, he served as a colonel on the General Staff Corps and was with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's staff with the United States Forces, European theater, in Germany. He was responsible for the direction and coordination of the program for the development of civil and personnel management by the United States Forces in the European theater. Mr. O'Connell has been awarded the Legion of Merit.

Dr. Anne Gary Pannell

President, Sweet Briar College. Dr. Pannell was previously academic dean and professor of history at Goucher College, and associate professor of history and chairman of freshman history at the University of Alabama. Since 1934 she has been an active member of the American Association of University Women, serving as secretary, vice president, and president of the Alabama State Division. She is a member of the Council of the International Federation of University Women and is currently serving on the relief committee of that organization. In 1953 Mrs. Pannell was one of 14 American educators chosen to make a month's study tour of Germany to visit German schools and confer with German educators. She is a member of the Board of Trustees of Chatham Hall, Chatham, Va., and holds memberships in the American, Southern, and Alabama Historical Associations.

Dr. Roland R. Renne

President, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont. Dr. Renne holds degrees from Rutgers and the University of Wisconsin, specializing in agricultural economics. He has been visiting professor of economics at the University of Chicago and of local government at Cornell University, and was Price Administrator for Montana for the Office of Price Administration. He is the author of "Land Economics," a college textbook, and is senior author of "The Montana Citizen," a textbook on government for Montana schools. He has been a member of the National Forest Advisory Council, the National Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs, and the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. In 1951-53 he served as Chief of the Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines. Since 1951 he has been active on Columbia University's National Manpower Council.

Dr. Susan B. Riley

Professor of English, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn., and national president of the American Association of University Women. Dr. Riley has taught at Blue Mountain College, Hillman Junior College at Clinton, Miss., Mississippi Women's College at Hattiesburg, and Western Kentucky State Teachers College at Bowling Green. Her special field is American literature, and her chief interest is Southern folk literature. She was president of the Tennessee Folklore Society from 1942 to 1944. Dr. Riley received the Cross of the Commander of the Order of Merit for AAUW, awarded by the Federal Republic of Germany. The presentation was made in recognition of the aid given through AAUW international study grants to German women, the hospitality shown by AAUW members to German award recipients during their stay in the United States, and the support by AAUW branches of six demonstration kindergartens in Germany and of a dormitory for women of the Free University in Berlin.

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff

Director and chairman of the board of Radio Corporation of America, RCA Communications, Inc., National Broadcasting Company, Inc. General Sarnoff entered the communications field as a messenger boy at the age of 15 and became president of the corporation at the age of 39. He has achieved international prominence in radio communications and broadcasting, and recognition as a

pioneer in the development of virtually every phase of radio, television, and electronics. General Sarnoff's interest in military and naval radio dates back to World War I, when he played a prominent part in helping to equip our fighting service with wireless. During World War II he served in the office of the Chief Signal Officer in Washington, D. C., and later as a special consultant on communications at SHAEF. He was awarded the Legion of Merit for his military services overseas and was promoted to the rank of brigadier general. He has been decorated by France, Poland, and Luxembourg, and has been honored by 14 universities and colleges in the United States. In 1945 the American Nobel Center selected General Sarnoff as first recipient of its "One World Prize" for "contribution to international understanding through radio." In 1949 he received a citation from the United Nations for his "notable cooperation in the development of public understanding."

Dr. Irving H. Siegel

Economist with the Council of Economic Advisers. Native of New York City, educated in New York public schools. Holds degrees from City College of New York, New York University, and Columbia. He is director of American Technology Study, Twentieth Century Fund. Former lecturer in political economy and director of Russian productivity study, Johns Hopkins University; chief economist, Veterans' Administration; assistant chief, BLS Productivity and Technological Developments Division; National Bureau of Economic Research; and statistician, WPA National Research Project on Reemployment Opportunities and Recent Changes in Industrial Techniques. His publications include: "Production, Employment, and Productivity in 59 Manufacturing Industries, 1919-36," "Concepts and Measurement of Production and Productivity," and "Soviet Labor Productivity." He is currently working on a report for the Twentieth Century Fund on "Tomorrow's Technology: Its Shape and Meaning."

Miss Louise Watson

Investment adviser R. W. Pressprich & Co., New York City. She is a graduate of Bryn Mawr College, and was the business manager there for 6 years. She became affiliated with the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and later conducted her own investment counsel firm. She is a vice president of the board of directors of the Spence-Chapin Adoption Service, New York, and a member of the Byrn Mawr Club the Cosmopolitan Club of New York and the Women's Bond Club. Miss Watson is active in women's finance forums.

Dr. Winifred G. Helmes

Assistant Director, Women's Bureau. She received her Ph. D. from the University of Minnesota where she held a teaching assistantship for 3 years. Her doctoral thesis, a political biography of one of Minnesota's governors, was published by the University of Minnesota Press in 1949. For 8 years, she was a member of the faculty of Bradford Junior College, Bradford, Mass. From Bradford she joined the executive staff of the American Association of University Women, and from there, in September 1954, she came to the Women's Bureau as Assistant Director.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

In addition to Members of Congress and representatives of Federal and State agencies, foreign embassies, individual business firms, the press, and national magazines, conference members included delegates from the following organizations:

Altrusa International
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO
American Academy of Ophthalmology & Otolaryngology
American Association of Industrial Nurses
American Association of Medical Record Librarians
American Association of Medical Social Workers
American Association of School Administrators
American Association of Social Workers
American Association of University Women
American College Public Relations Association
American Council on Education
American Dental Assistants Association
American Dental Hygienists' Association
American Farm Bureau Federation
American Federation of Government Employees, **AFL**
American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs
American Home Economics Association
American Korean Foundation
American Labor Education Service
American Library Association
American Nurses' Association
American Occupational Therapy Association
American Patent Law Association
American Personnel & Guidance Association, Inc.
American Physical Therapy Association
American Red Cross
American Society of Medical Technologists
American Society of Women Accountants
American Vocational Association
American Woman's Society of Certified Public Accountants
American Women's Voluntary Services
Association of American Colleges
Association of Land-Grant Colleges & Universities
Association of Stock Exchange Firms
Bard College
B'nai B'rith, Vocational Service Bureau
Bryn Mawr College
Camp Fire Girls
Canadian Women's Bureau, Ottawa

Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund
Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems
Catholic Labor Alliance
Catholic University of America
Chamber of Commerce of the United States
Cincinnati Public Schools, Division of Counseling
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, N. J.
College of William and Mary
Columbia University Teachers College
Committee on Careers in Nursing, National League for Nursing
Communications Workers of America, CIO
Congress of Industrial Organizations
Connecticut College
Cornell University
Council of State Governments
Democratic National Committee
Drexel Institute of Technology
General Federation of Women's Clubs
George Washington University
Girl Scouts of the U. S. A.
Goucher College
Governmental Affairs Institute
Hampton Institute
Hannah Harrison School, Washington, D. C.
Hood College
Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, AFL
Howard University
Indiana University
Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO
Institute of International Education, Inc.
Institute of Life Insurance
Inter-American Commission of Women
International Association of Machinists, AFL
International Association of Personnel Women
International Association of University Women
International Association of Women Lawyers
International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers, AFL
International Federation of Business & Professional Women
International Labor Office, Geneva
International Labor Organization, Washington, D. C.
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL
Jack & Jill Clubs of America
Labor Education Association
Labor Ministry, Japan
Laundry Workers' International Union, AFL
League of Women Voters of the United States
Lynchburg College
Minimum Wage & Industrial Safety Board, Washington, D. C.
Montana State College
National Association of Bank Women
National Association of College Women
National Association of Colored Women

National Association of Colored Women's Clubs
 National Association of Deans of Women
 National Association of Life Underwriters
 National Association of Manufacturers
 National Association of Negro Business & Professional Women's Clubs
 National Association for Practical Nurse Education
 National Association of Women Lawyers
 National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools
 National Committee for Careers in Medical Technology
 National Congress of Parents & Teachers
 National Consumers League
 National Council of Administrative Women in Education
 National Council of Catholic Women
 National Council of Jewish Women
 National Council of Negro Women
 National Council of Women of United States
 National Education Association
 National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs
 National Federation of Licensed Practical Nurses
 National Federation of Republican Women
 National Jewish Welfare Board
 National Manpower Council
 National Restaurant Association
 National Scholarship Service & Fund for Negro Students
 National Secretaries Association
 National Social Welfare Assembly
 National Urban League
 National Vocational Guidance Association
 National Woman's Forum
 National Woman's Party
 National Woman's Christian Temperance Union
 North Carolina State College
 Pembroke College
 Peninsula General Hospital, Salisbury, Md.
 Pennsylvania College for Women
 Pennsylvania State University
 Pilot Club International
 Purdue University
 Quota Club International
 Radcliffe College
 Republican National Committee, Women's Division
 Richmond Professional Institute
 Rutgers University
 Scientific Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.
 Service Bureau for Women's Organizations, Hartford, Conn.
 Simmons College
 Society of Women Engineers
 Soroptimist International
 State Teachers College, Towson, Md.
 Stephens College
 Sweet Briar College

United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America,
CIO
United Cerebral Palsy Association
United Church Women
United Nations Commission on Human Rights
United Nations Commission on Status of Women
University of Chicago
University of Connecticut
University of Delaware
University of Maryland
University of Pennsylvania
University of Richmond
University of Wisconsin
University Women's Club
Virginia State College
Women's Bar Association
Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania
Young Women's Christian Association, National Board
Zonta International

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1955

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C. - Price 40 cents

