

*"The Status
of Women
in America"*



1863 - 1963

*Addresses at the Bryant College
Academic Symposium and Convocation*

ESTHER PETERSON

*Assistant Secretary U. S. Dept. of Labor, Executive
Vice-Chairman President's Commission on the Status
of Women, Special Assistant to the President in Con-
sumer Relations.*

"The Status of Women In America"

JESSIE BERNARD

Professor of Sociology University of Pennsylvania.

"Sociological Aspects Of The Status
Of Women"

PAULI MURRAY

Senior Fellow Yale University Law School.

"Women's Rights As Individuals
And Citizens"

WILMA SOSS

*President of the Federation of Women Shareholders
in American Business Inc.*

"Women As Stockholders"

THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

United States Congressman from Rhode Island.

"The Woman's Stake In Health
And Welfare"

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND - NOVEMBER 18, 1963



Academic
Procession
Centennial
Convocation

Contents

	Page
DR. E. GARDNER JACOBS <i>President of Bryant College.</i>	Greetings and Welcome 1
MARION STEPHENSON <i>Vice President NBC and RCA.</i>	Symposium Chairman 2
ESTHER PETERSON <i>Assistant Secretary U. S. Dept. of Labor, Executive Vice-Chairman President's Commission on the Status of Women, Special Assistant to the President in Con- sumer Relations.</i>	"The Status of Women In America" 3
JESSIE BERNARD <i>Professor of Sociology University of Pennsylvania.</i>	"Sociological Aspects Of The Status Of Women" 7
PAULI MURRAY <i>Senior Fellow Yale University Law School.</i>	"Women's Rights As Individuals And Citizens" 11
WILMA SOSS <i>President of the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business Inc.</i>	"Women As Stockholders" 15
MARGARET ACKROYD <i>Chief, Division of Women and Children and Com- missioner of Minimum Wages, R. I. Dept. of Labor.</i>	A Summing Up
THE VERY REVEREND MONSIGNOR ARTHUR T. GEOGHEGAN <i>Superintendent of R. I. Catholic Schools; Dean, Catholic Teachers College of Providence.</i>	Invocation 19
JOHN F. KENNEDY	Message from the Late President 21
DR. CHARLES HOOVER RUSSELL <i>Vice-President Academics, Bryant College; Centennial Chairman.</i>	Greetings from the Mayor and the Governor . . 22
THE VERY REVEREND VINCENT C. DORE, O.P. <i>President of Providence College.</i>	Greetings from the Colleges and Universities . . 23
GUY HENRY <i>President, Providence Chamber of Commerce.</i>	Greetings from the Business Community . . . 24
THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY <i>United States Congressman from Rhode Island.</i>	"The Woman's Stake In Health And Welfare" 25
THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SEVILLE HIGGINS <i>Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Rhode Island.</i>	Benediction 27

"May this Symposium open up new avenues of self-discovery and high adventure."



President's Welcome

IT IS A pleasure to welcome you to our Centennial Symposium and Convocation.

You have come to share a great day in the history of this College. A day we have deliberately and carefully planned for you—the American woman of 1963. Many years ago Wordsworth paid this tribute to women; to him she was “nobly planned, To warm, to comfort and command.”

His definition is doubtless sentimental, but it still has its appeal. As I look over this platform and this audience, I am well aware that such women are with us today. In fact, as a mere man I am a bit overwhelmed by so much brightness and feminine charm so early in the morning.

Since 1863, more than 30,000 young men and women have graduated from Bryant College and scattered all over the country to live lives of usefulness. Many of them have strongly influenced the policies and actions of business and industry and made significant contributions in their community, religious and social lives.

Higher education for business was a revolutionary experiment in 1863, and even more revolutionary was the education of women for careers in business. Before this time, American women could only venture outside the home as missionaries, teachers or nurses. An early Bryant catalog justified this daring innovation with the statement, “as far as has been ascertained there is no inherent intellectual difference between men and women.”

Bryant is no stranger to the need for providing women with equal opportunity. We have proved that educated women in business *can* and *do* perform to the highest standards of executive achievement. They can and do make major contributions to the economic as well as to the social fabric of America.

President Kennedy said, “Women have basic rights which should be respected and fostered as part of our nation’s commitment to human dignity and democracy. It is appropriate to set forth before the world, the story of women’s progress in a free, democratic society, to review recent accomplishments and to acknowledge frankly the future steps that must be taken. *This is a task for the entire nation.*”

It is in happy agreement with the President that Bryant College has chosen “The Status of Women in America” as its theme for this major Centennial event. It is also in keeping with the pledge made when we raised our Centennial Flag last January, to dedicate this year to the enrichment of our community.

Some philosopher has said that we are equal to all that we can understand. May the understanding light shed by the luminaries assembled on this platform inspire you to exciting participation, and may this Symposium open up new avenues of self-discovery and high adventure.

DR. E. GARDNER JACOBS, *President*



The Symposium

Principal speakers left to right: Pauli Murray, Senior Fellow, Yale Law School; U. S. Congressman from R. I., John E. Fogarty; Wilma Soxx, President, Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, Inc.; President Jacobs; Esther Peterson, U. S. Assistant Secretary of Labor; Margaret F. Ackroyd, Chief, Division of Women and Children, R. I. Department of Labor; Marion Stephenson, Vice President of NBC.



An attentive audience of some 500 leadership women and men representing influential service organizations and educational institutions found the speakers deeply stirring.

Dr. Peterson, U. S. Assistant Secretary of Labor, gave the keynote speech at the morning session of the Symposium.



“THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN AMERICA”

By DR. ESTHER PETERSON — *Assistant Secretary of Labor, Executive Vice-Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, Special Presidential Assistant Consumer Relations*

I AM pleased to find a School of Business Administration, and a co-educational school at that, sponsoring a symposium on the question of women's status. I suppose you are concerned, as I am, as to how women will continue to fill their traditional roles of mother and homemaker and at the same time meet the demands made upon them by the world outside the home.

Much has been said on the subject in recent months, particularly since the President's Commission on the Status of Women issued its report. Some, who have not read the report carefully, are inclined to write it off as an attempt to lure women out of the home and place them in competition with men in a man's world.

This is a great pity, because in reality the report takes as its basic premise the fundamental American tenet—that the family is the core institution of our society. The Commission never lost sight of women's primary responsibility as mothers and homemakers nor of society's stake in a strong family life. But it also held that, “Great development of women's potential and fuller use of their present abilities can greatly enhance the quality of American life.”

The Commission examined the changing patterns in the American way of life and found that they have had a profound effect upon the functions of women in our society and the contributions they make to it.

We found, for instance, that women are marrying much younger than their mothers and grandmothers did. The average age of today's bride is

slightly over 20 years. This means that women have their children at an early age; and because modern science has been able to reduce the rate of infant mortality, today's mothers complete their families in a shorter span of time. Most women are still in their thirties when their last child enters school. By the time they reach their early forties, their children are in college or have left home.

A few decades ago, these women might well have been approaching the end of their lives—the life expectancy of girls born in 1900 was 48 years. However, for the young woman born at the end of World War II the figure was 69 years and today it is 73 years. Think of the added years today's woman has at her disposal once her children are grown!

Significant, too, are the changes that have taken place in the American household. Women have always contributed to the national economy, but until the turn of the century they did it in their homes, cooking, sewing, cleaning, caring for the sick and rearing the children.

Today, many homemaking functions have been taken over by private enterprise outside the home. An hour spent in the supermarket will supply the family table as bountifully and as nutritiously as did a whole Saturday given over to cooking and baking in great-grandmother's kitchen. A whole textile and garment industry has replaced mother's spring and fall sewing sessions. Laundries and dry cleaning establishments have taken over other chores; hospitals and rest homes care for a large portion of our ill and aged, and children who once learned at Mother's knee are now using mechanical teaching aids in the schools.

The chores that have remained in the home have been simplified by efficiently designed houses and furniture and an army of electrical appliances. Mechanization and automation have come to the American home.

Other changes have come about, too. Opportunities for education and employment are expanding for women, and more and more they are being invited to participate in community activities—often at policy-making levels.

In spite of these changes, the popular concept of woman, held by a large proportion of Americans, remains that of the wife and mother devoting most of her adult life to child-bearing and housewifely chores with little interest in the world around her. The facts of life—that home and family no longer fill up most of a woman's life; that nearly all of the family's material needs must be supplied out of earned income, and that community facilities are assuming responsibility for the education, health and recreational requirements of the family—are entirely overlooked.

Our attitudes have not kept up with changing times, and as a result there is considerable confusion as to what the modern woman's role should be. Our Nation can ill afford this social lag. As President Kennedy said, "Women are playing a significantly greater role in public affairs today. . . . However, in spite of their great advances and their great contributions in public life there still remain many areas where outmoded customs and practices prevent women, simply because they are women, from achieving full equality in our American life."

I realize that the term "equality" is also a source of confusion for many. What do we mean by it? That we should ignore the child-bearing function of women and treat them exactly as we treat men? Certainly not! The design which the Commission used on the cover of its report expresses our concept of the equality of men and women—equal but different. In the area of their physiological differences men and women complement each other. They can, however, undertake independently, but with equal effectiveness, intellectual, political and occupational activities.

The Commission took all these factors into consideration as it conducted its discussions. Its recommendations were tested against a philosophy which was felt to be central to the American way of life—that every American should have freedom to choose among different life patterns and that he be prepared to assume the responsibilities that go with such freedom.

There are limitations, however, on the extent to which women can exercise freedom of choice. For many of them, the need to earn a living, often for themselves and their families too, at whatever job can be found, is so pressing as to all but eliminate freedom of choice. Particularly in a population growing as rapidly as ours is, the chance to realize individual potential depends very directly on the extent of economic opportunity that actually exists at a given time. A rapidly growing economy, the Commission concluded, is a prior condition for the achievement of many of its recommendations.

But prosperity is not our ultimate national goal. If we look no further, we fall victim to materialism and a weakening of our values. "A society cannot claim greatness solely because a majority of its members are well housed, well clothed, well fed," the Commission warned. "In a great society, talents are evoked and realized, creative minds probe the frontiers of knowledge, expectations of excellence are widely shared." Women have the potential to contribute to a higher quality in American life, but to realize that potential we must make our American institutions more suitable to contemporary life.

The Commission gave top priority to education as a national need. Every child must have the opportunity for a good basic education with adequate facilities and dedicated teachers. Local, State and, where needed, Federal support should be made available to improve our educational system.

Expanded scholarship and loan programs, supported by private interests, the Federal Government and other public institutions, should bring higher education within the reach of every child capable of taking advantage of it.

I am sure you know of and are gratified by Congressman Fogarty's interest in the problems of education. He has introduced and supported legislative proposals which would not only provide better education for the average child but for children who need special education—the handicapped child and the exceptional child.

The tragedy of American education is that young women are not being prepared to cope with life as they will find it when they leave the classroom. I think it is safe to say that most high school girls cherish a belief that their future will be spent in a suburban split-level house, surrounded by a loving, indulgent husband and a brood of beautifully groomed, beautifully behaved children.

Tell them that 9 out of 10 girls in school today will work outside the home at some time in their lives, and each is convinced that she is the 10th girl.

How do we bring home to these girls that some day they may be called upon to support their families as nearly 2½ million women do today, or that in all probability they will have raised their families by the time they are 35 or 40 years old and may face another 35 or 40 years of vigorous life unprepared to make constructive use of those added years?

The answer lies, I think, in wise counseling that will help young girls realize the whole of their opportunities and prospects for the future; in guidance programs and education that will prepare them both for their years of intensive homemaking and their years of contribution to the society outside the home.

It goes without saying that young women need as much education as they can get to compete in the world of work. Opportunities for future jobs are greatest in the professional and technical fields. And yet, only 42 percent of college freshmen in 1962 were girls. Women are earning only one in three of the B.A.'s and M.A.'s awarded by our colleges and universities and only one in ten of the Ph.D.'s.

It is equally important for the potential mother and homemaker to have a good education. Because women provide most of the time and attention given modern family life, at various times in their lives, they should learn about physical and mental health, child care and development and family relationships. They should be competent to handle the economic and social responsibilities of homemaking as well.

The needs of the young are not our only educational concern today. In fact, continuing education for all adult women was given highest priority by the Commission.

Four million adult women in the United States have less than 5 years' schooling and are poorly equipped either to work or to give their children the care and preparation for life they need.

More than 11½ million adult women have started but failed to finish high school, and less than half of all women over 25 years of age are high school graduates.

Adult education should be available to women at whatever level they had reached when they discontinued their formal education.

Programs of continuing education are needed to meet many and varied needs, ranging from the woman who cannot read and write to the college graduate who wants to keep abreast of developments in her highly specialized field.

As women near the end of their intensive homemaking responsibilities, it is particularly important for them to have means of refreshing skills they may have learned before marriage, or of acquiring new ones, as they make their choices of entry or re-entry into the labor force or into volunteer work in the community.

Education, of course, is not the whole answer. The scope of a woman's choice of life patterns will be limited by the degree to which she can successfully combine her several roles. And this often depends upon the services offered by the community.

For most families, the ideal situation is one in which the mother can remain in the home as long as her children need her. But to be a successful entity of the community, the family, today, needs supportive services from the community.

In an earlier era the woman in her home usually had several female relatives to help her. Grandmothers, maiden aunts, sisters or sisters-in-law were often members of the same household and shared the homemaking responsibilities.

Today, the picture is quite different. Unmarried women, widows and divorcees are, for the most part, self-supporting. The younger sister, who once earned her room and board by sewing for small nieces and nephews, today may earn her own living operating a power sewing machine in a garment factory or designing clothes for the manufacturer. Grandmothers, still in their forties, are disinclined to share their children's homes and are more apt to get jobs and maintain their own homes. These are the choices women are free to make today. They represent drastic changes in our way of life.

The Commission has made some far-reaching recommendations designed to strengthen the home, keep families together, and preserve their health and well-being.

One need, of course, is for child care facilities. They should be available to families at all economic levels on a continuing or intermittent basis as circumstances require.

The child care center for pre-school children may best meet the needs of the mother who works outside the home.

On the other hand, the mother of a large family who finds that most of her time is preempted by several pre-school age children may find the after-school youth center most helpful, for it will provide her school age children with constructive and perhaps culturally enriching activities for which she does not have time.

Families in which there is illness and those in which there is only one parent may welcome the

services of a trained homemaker who will go into the home and assume responsibility for its management until the crisis is passed or other arrangements can be made.

Fees for such services should be scaled to the family's ability to pay or costs should be met by private agencies and public appropriations. Cost of child care for children of working mothers should be taken into account in taxing incomes, and provisions for tax deductions should be liberalized so as to meet the problem realistically.

There is great need, too, for family counseling in our complex society. The availability of trained counselors and social workers can be the deciding factor in preventing the disintegration of a family. Newcomers need help in adjusting to a strange community; inexperienced or inadequate housewives need someone to teach them to manage a household and children; the aged and ill, disabled or convalescent may be able to avoid life in an institution with the help of a part-time homemaker.

The community has a direct responsibility for the health of its citizens. Centers for health education, particularly for expectant mothers, and those with small children provide a vital service; so too, do provisions for the prevention of physical and mental disorders and the care and cure, and often the rehabilitation of those stricken by illness of mind or body. Most communities have barely begun to explore the possibilities of the sheltered workshop, the half-way house, and special classes or schools for children with special needs.

While many of the Commission's proposals were geared to strengthening the home, it was also concerned with strengthening the position of the woman who works outside the home.

It is in the labor market that women have the greatest difficulty in establishing their identity as persons. They are entitled to the same choices as to the type of work they will do. We are insisting that schools and colleges gear their curriculums to prepare qualified women for occupations in which the need for workers is greatest. We must prevail upon government and industry to open the way for women to use their skills and advance in their jobs to the peak of their competency. Further, women should not be subject to the inequity of pay discriminations.

We have made a start.

The Federal Government has removed the last legal barrier to hiring and promoting women in federal service on the basis of merit.

The Congress has passed the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which will benefit women covered by the minimum wage provisions of their Fair Labor Standards Act. While this does not meet the needs of a large segment of working women, it is a good beginning.

The United States Employment Service, at the behest of the Commission, issued a directive restating its longtime policy of referring job applicants on the basis of skills and merit only and urging employers to consider qualifications without regard to whether the applicant is a man or a woman.

In the field of private employment, the Commission recommended that the President issue an Executive Order proclaiming the principle of equality of employment opportunity for women and applying it to work done under Federal contracts.

While all these measures and suggestions are helpful, the core of the problem lies in the deep-seated prejudices and attitudes which resist the entrance of women into the work force or into particular occupations traditionally considered "men's work."

I think we will make our greatest progress in breaking down the barriers to employment for women by encouraging parents and teachers to prepare youngsters at an early age, to select their courses of study on the basis of their personal interests and capabilities, rather than on the basis of "girls' subjects" and "boys' subjects." We must make young women aware of the wonderful and exciting occupations which are developing in such fields as science, mathematics, medicine, commerce and social science. Perhaps it needs only the sparking of the imagination of a high school physics student to produce another Madame Curie. And finally, we must impress upon working women themselves the need to prove themselves, help them acquire attitudes and work habits suited to the business office or scientific laboratory.

Many employers have reported that they are finding women capable, steady workers and are opening more opportunities for them, especially if they are qualified to fill highly skilled jobs where there is a shortage of workers.

Not all of the Commission's recommendations will be adopted in the foreseeable future, I am afraid, but I believe their impact will be felt for generations to come. And I believe, much more will be accomplished under the continuing leadership of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women aided by its Citizens' Advisory Council.

"SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE STATUS OF WOMEN"

By DR. JESSIE BERNARD — *Professor of Sociology at Pennsylvania State University, Author and Lecturer*



MY TASK is to talk about the sociological aspects of the Status of Women, and I am delighted to accept it.

Sociologists are people who are likely to mention the unmentionable and to speak about the unspeakable, about sex and things like that. Usually, they do it, furthermore, in incomprehensible gobbledegook. I cannot refrain from talking about the unspeakable, but I'll try to speak in English. ● One thing sociologists do not do is scold or blame, defend or attack. We just try to see what is going on. This, in itself, is not as easy as you may think; in fact, a vast research apparatus is required to tell us what goes on in our complex society.

Many people are always reacting to a situation of a decade ago, or two. Some of you may have seen a television program last month called "Girls of the World." In it a group of Smith College alumni were discussing—well, what else—but the status of women; and one of them declared vehemently that something was wrong when all women she knew were perfectly wretched. Another woman replied blandly that none of the women she knew were wretched, they were, in fact, all happy, fulfilled women. Well, which woman was right?

To answer this question would require an enormous research effort. ● One such effort, limited to mid-Manhattan, reported that unmarried women showed the least mental-health impairment. Married women the most, confirming some earlier studies to the same effect.

A national survey of American mental health reported that women generally seemed to express more distress than men, but even so it is heartening to find from that report that 88 per cent of the women said they were either pretty happy—52 per cent, or very happy—36 per cent. But the gloomy Smith alumna wasn't wholly off-base because the proportion of women saying they were pretty or very happy was reported to decline with age. Neither, however, was the more cheerful alumna wrong, for evaluation of happiness improves with education. More educated than uneducated women consider themselves happy.

A recent book on the employed mother also illustrates how hard it is to keep up with them. By the time we have begun to get an idea of what maternal employment does to husband, children, and to the mothers themselves, the whole picture changes. In two decades the concept "employed mother" has changed its meaning drastically. Two decades ago the typical employed mother provided sole support for herself and her family. Then a little later her husband was employed or partially employed in the lowest income bracket. But at present her husband is employed, and she no longer fits this old stereotype. I have just introduced these complexities to show the fix sociologists are in just trying to find out what is going on here. It is a full-time professional undertaking just to keep up with the changes in our society. This doesn't leave us much time to find out whose fault it is, who should be attacked, and who should be rewarded. Please do not expect any such assessment from me as a sociologist. Everyone is to blame for everything; no one is to blame for anything. We can use our energies to better advantage by lighting the candle, rather than cursing the dark.

Status is another key word in my assignment. As a sociologist, my first reaction is, which status? Although the concept of status has been a major preoccupation of sociologists for quite some time, I'm sorry we can't give you all the answers. We do know that everyone occupies many statuses. We have marital status, employment status, draft status, educational status, class status, economic, legal, and so on. In addition, there is also the related, but not identical, concept which the psychologist has, of dominance-submission. This is an interpersonal kind of relationship. Status is an institutionalized relationship based on custom, tradition, law, and the mores; but it has to be distinguished from this interpersonal thing.

I am going to introduce only one item of jargon here—the concept of status-inconsistency, which sociologists have found interesting and useful. If all one's statuses are consistent, status problems are one thing. But if one has high status in one area, low status in another, a lot of problems may arise. The situation may become confusing. ● One of the commonest forms, which recognition of

this problem takes, is the question, "Why should I give up my seat in the bus to a woman who now has all the rights I have?" But it shows up other places, too. In my book on academic women I noted the fact that the status of a relatively untrained woman who is the wife of the department head is higher than that of a trained woman who is a professor herself. Any woman can illustrate cases in which her status as a woman was inconsistent with her status as a worker, or a student, or what-have-you. Nor is that the end of the confusion with respect to the concept of status.

The original connotation of the term was one of stability, fixity, immobility. It has the same root as stationary, state. The term first received wide recognition in the nineteenth century when Sir Henry Main contrasted status with contract. Our relations with one another, said he, used to be matters of status; our position was fixed at birth by the station in life we were born into. Now, he said we were relieved of this onus because relationships were now contractual, matter of reasonable give and take. They could change. At the present time, however, not the fixed and stable aspects of status, but rather its dynamic aspects are emphasized. Status is invidious, it is competitive, it can be changed. Indeed, we act as though it *has* to be changed. It's almost un-American not to want to improve one's position, to rise above one's origin. The race is very competitive, and we have to have lots of symbols to show just where we are at any one moment on the ladder. Look! We've arrived at the Oldsmobile level! Now we are at the Cadillac level! And now, finally, we are at the Volkswagen level! Status in this sense intrinsically involves levels. There's a concept of high and low. English people, not so long ago, used to speak of their "betters." And Southern Negroes "know their place." High and low are, however, relative. Our whole society is moving up. But this does not destroy all status differences.

Sociologists have the concept of relative deprivation. If you are going up, but someone else is going up faster, you may not be deprived; but, relatively, you feel you are. The pertinence of this point is that often raising one person's level means lowering another person's. A rise in status of one group implies a lowering of status of another, even though no absolute deprivation occurs. It is for this reason that even the most reasonable request for improving the status of women sometimes antagonizes men. It seems to them that the improvement of the position of women constitutes a threat to their own. Esther Peterson, vice chairman

of the Status of Women Committee, assured the world that she is for protecting everyone's rights. However, on Eric Sevareid's television review of this report, he concluded that he, "never would have thought it possible to write such a dull report about such an interesting subject."

The third key concept in my assignment is women. Now surely there are no difficulties with this word. A woman is a woman is a woman. Or is she? I think not. For what, in effect, constitutes a brand new female sex, a third sex in fact, is now emerging on the scene; and her status problems are not at all the same as those of the old female sex as referred to in Simone de Beauvoir's "Second Sex." In the past, when we spoke of the new woman, we meant the same old biological woman but one with new ideas, new attitudes, new demands; but otherwise, just like her forebears. But today we have literally a truly new woman, one never known before on land or sea.

These are women who have completed their maternal role, their last child is married, and who now have a second lifetime as measured by old standards ahead of them. They are a brand new human phenomena, vigorous, often still beautiful and alert women. In today's *New York Times* there is a little piece about Hildegard, who admits she's 57 and is still as glamorous as she ever was. We also have Marlene Dietrich, Joan Crawford, Claudette Colbert—not that we can all be that beautiful, but then see what's possible. There have always been some old women to be sure, but not in large numbers nor yet in such vigorous bloom. Illness and decay and/or bitterness were often their lot. Many were viewed as witches, feared, and hated. We have only recently discovered these new women, and how to prepare women for this second life is a major preoccupation of educators, as Mrs. Peterson just pointed out.

We are only just barely beginning to understand the nature of marriage in these years. We know that a brand-new relationship has emerged, about 10 to 15 years of post-parental marriage. Where it used to be that women were widowed before their last child was married, today the average woman won't be widowed until about 14 or so years later. Research on this new kind of marriage produces equivocal results. One study of industrial tycoons of some ten years ago, (and anything 10 years old is way out-of-date in this field) reported that they preferred their work to being with their families. John Cuber of Ohio State has also reported many empty marriages. For a long time we have known that marriage adjustment scores tended

to go down with length of marriage. Other studies do not always corroborate these findings. The national survey referred to above found that although the level of happiness in a marriage does not increase with age, there is a softening of the difficulties. This new marital status has changed some aspects of the relations between husbands and wives. But it has also introduced some strange distortion, in my opinion, in sex itself.

Sex, no longer imbedded and anchored in the production—reproduction matrix has escaped into an undisciplined, almost uncontrolled all-pervasive impact. No one seems to know quite what, if anything, to do about it. Lacking the old tie with production, the family cannot control it. Nor lacking the family-based unit of organization, can industry, nor the school, nor the church.

The transfer of women's work out of the home has repercussions on the status within the home. All the studies show changes in the division of labor within the home when the mother works. Men, in particular, assume more domestic responsibility. The women gain power in some areas—decisions about large expenditures for car, home, and insurance. On the other hand, they lose some of their power in decisions dealing with domestic affairs. But, and this seems awfully interesting to me, the wife's employment does not change the amount of influence husbands and wives have over one another. The dominance-submission pattern, as it has been for millennia, depends on the kind of people they are, regardless of sex. There's more quarreling, more conflicts reported in the marriages of working mothers than in those of non-working mothers. But other studies show this is nothing to be concerned about. Over all, the adjustment and satisfactions of the working mother are not less.

Now finally a word with respect to the status of women as sex partners. In the nineteenth century the sexuality of men and women was assumed to be fundamentally different. Men were beasts—women were ethereal angels. Frigidity was a much-prized virtue in women. At the turn of the century, a change took place. Women were now permitted, even encouraged, to respond sexually. If they did not, the partner was to blame. As time went on, not only were women encouraged, they were positively *coerced* into a highly sexual stand. The belief was fostered that women and men were identical sexually. This was one of the gravest wrongs, it seems to me, ever perpetrated on both sexes. There are sex differences; they add up to equality perhaps but certainly not to identity.

When men view women just like themselves, that is sexually, there is a loss of the romantic element. The relationship is not too different, and I know I am making

is provocative rather than truthful, the relationship is not too different from a homosexual relation. All the lovely fine points of sex differences are lost. The status of women as sex partners, then, has been denigrated by what, in my opinion, is the fallacious conception of sexuality in women. The young women I talk to would very much like to have a more idealized, a more romantic, more social relationship with young men.

Sexuality should be no more compulsive than Victorian frigidity. Sexual autonomy, as well as intellectual and spiritual autonomy, should be our goal. I speak of these unspeakable things because it is impossible to separate the several aspects of status and ignore the others. They are all inextricably related. We have to know what the status problems of men are in this day and age as well as those of women. It is as important for women as it is for men to protect them.

Impatient leaders sometimes express anger and contempt for women who refuse to compete with men. A woman on the Civil Service Commission once rebuked them for this. She said it robbed the Federal Service of top-quality female brains. We become furious with the girl who hides her light under a bushel. We frown on Longfellow's little girl who was so sorry she had spelled the word correctly because she hated to go above the little boy. There are ways of achieving by women which do not injure men. There are ways which do injure men. We are all familiar with the cliché of the so-called castrating female who destroys men in her drive towards success. She humiliates and denigrates them. I have seen one or two such cases, as you no doubt have also, but they're not typical. And I want to add parenthetically that you cannot win. After I had written this, one compassionate woman was told by a man who resented her helpfulness that her "patronizing motherliness" was as debilitating as the forthright competitiveness of other women. Like the woman in the TV commercial, he'd rather do it himself.

At this point I'd like to quote Dorothy Heights, president of the National Council of Negro Women, and let you determine the relevance. She said last Thursday that "the essential difference between white women and Negro women in America is that the white woman is struggling to achieve full equality *with* the white male, while the Negro

woman is struggling even more for full equality for the **Negro** male." It seems to me that we should always, as Esther Peterson herself always does, make clear that what we want for women is not for them alone, but for all of us. What is good for women is good for the country.

Instead of status, therefore, which has in our times such an invidious competitive conflict connotation, I'd like to think in terms of the welfare of everyone which, as we know, depends on the welfare of women. These are the things that have to be done in order for women to do well what they have to do. It isn't that women want certain things at the expense of someone else or that they want something that they have to wrench from a resisting, hostile force; it's rather that we want things we have to have if we are going to serve others at our best. Among the things that have to be done — (and a hundred years from now our descendants will look back and wonder why we had to "plead" to have it done, and at the Second Centennial of Bryant College, it will sound so "quaint") — is to organize industry to accommodate itself to the feminine life. These ideas strike many industrialists as absurd. Industry has its own logic. It can't be accommodating to anything as non-industrial as the feminine calendar. They view it with as much alarm and distaste as an old-fashioned Southerner views the first unthinkable proposal of desegregation. Little by little, however, as the new generation takes over the management of industry, it would seem logical for industry to accommodate itself to the life patterns of women. The only question will be, "What is the best way of doing it?" It will be viewed as absurd to ignore the fundamental function of motherhood as of no concern to industry. Maternity leave is already acceptable. The new pattern will be, in a manner

of speaking, an extended maternity leave of, say fifteen years. Women will enjoy the years of motherhood more when they know that it is not forever and that if they ever wanted to come back, they'll be welcomed in the outside world again as soon as they are ready.

The farm in a rural society cemented the interests of husbands and wives; they felt that they were operating a common enterprise, running a common establishment; both profited from the work of each. We can see that they did. And there was a nice conformance between the ways the sexes related to one another, both in the productive and in the reproductive process. The wife's contribution in the market, farm, or the small shop can be nicely fitted into her contribution as a mother. Indeed, a man and a woman make an excellent work team even today, as thousands of business and professional men who rely on their secretaries will testify, and as a large number of scientists and their research associates will also. Sir William Barry told us what every woman knows, that back of great masculine achievement, a woman often stands. And the same, of course, is true for great feminine achievements. Great achievements often take a two-sex team. But industry today is not organized like families — corporations, rather than families, run it. More to the point, there is little, if any, relationship between sex in the division of work.

Work is no longer immediately related to primary sex differences or to social roles or functions. A woman with a machine is equal to a man in strength. Either sex can do almost anything that needs doing. For neither men nor women does the old social conformance between work and family roles exist today in an urban, industrialized society.



“WOMEN’S RIGHTS AS INDIVIDUALS AND CITIZENS”

By PAULI MURRAY — Senior Fellow, Yale Law School, Attorney,
Teacher, Award-Winning Author



WHEN WE look at the history of women's rights in the United States, we discover that it is one of three parallel movements of great social reform. One is the emancipation of labor, which began in the nineteenth century

and reached a climax in the 1930's with labor's charter of rights, the National Labor Relations Act. The second is the emancipation of Negroes which reached a crisis in the middle of the nineteenth century and has reached another crucial turning point today. The emancipation of women followed a parallel line. I do not find it accidental, for example, that in 1963, with an intensification of the drive of Negroes toward equal rights we should also have the first comprehensive national report on the status of women published in half a century.

In my own personal experience, I find these two movements interrelated. But it is interesting to see what a distinguished foreign observer has to say about the parallelism between the rights of women and the rights of Negroes. Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, in his classic study of the status of Negroes in the 1940's *An American Dilemma*, made the following observation: "As in the Negro problem, most men have accepted as self-evident, until recently, the doctrine that women had inferior endowments in most of those respects which carry prestige, power, and advantages in society" . . . The arguments, when arguments were used, have been about the same: smaller brains, scarcity of geniuses and so on. The study of women's intelligence and personality has had broadly the same history as the one we record for Negroes. As in the case of the Negro, women themselves have often been brought to believe in their inferiority of endowment. As the Negro was awarded his 'place' in society, so there was a 'woman's place.' . . . The myth of the 'contented women,' who did not want to have suffrage or other civil rights and equal opportunities, had the same social function as the myth of the 'contented Negro.'

The parallel begins with the beginning of our history. In 1619, the first boatload of Negroes—

twenty of them—was brought to the Virginia Colony and sold as servants in exchange for food and water. In the same year a shipload of ninety women was also brought to Virginia from England to serve as indentured servants, "sold with their own consent to settlers as wives, the price to be the cost of their own transportation." From that time on both groups have been struggling to emancipate themselves from the particular disabilities which bound them. And often their struggle has been interrelated. For example, the woman's right movement paralleled the movement for the abolition of slavery. The early women suffragists got their first political experience working and lecturing in the anti-slavery movement.

A hundred years ago, none of us sitting on this platform would be welcome or safe here. We might be the targets of pepper, rotten tomatoes, prayer books, or anything which might be thrown at the head of an unpopular woman who dared to speak in public. During the early nineteenth century women had to fight for both the right to education and the right to speak on public platforms. They also had to fight against many legal disabilities, some of which were not unlike the disabilities of a slave.

The married woman was considered, in effect, her husband's chattel. During marriage her legal personality was suspended; she was "legally dead." As one New York judge said, she was "something better than her husband's his horse." She could not administer her own property; it was subject to her husband's control. She had no control over her own earnings, and she could not dispose of her own property without her husband's consent. She could not enter into contracts on her own behalf. She could not sue or be sued in her own name. She could not engage in a separate business, or act as a surety or a fiduciary.

By the mid-nineteenth century Married Women's Property Acts were passed by many states removing many of these disabilities. But since each state regulated its own marital and family relationships, a variety of approaches to these resulted. Instead of having a uniform legal status throughout the country, married women are still subject to vestiges

of the old disabilities which remain on the statute books of various states.

By 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment was adopted after a century of struggle and agitation, and women received the vote. When the President's Commission on the Status of Women, set up in 1961, appointed a Committee on Civil and Political Rights (of which I was a member), one of our functions was to examine the legal status of women from 1920 to the 1960's. We were compelled to conclude after our study that despite substantial gains since the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment, women have not yet achieved a role in public life commensurate with their numbers, skills, or abilities, or with the importance of their political contribution to the Nation.

Let us briefly review some of these inequities. First of all, the 1961 Census shows that in the adult population twenty years or older, there were 7,794,000 women and 54,169,000 men. Women outnumbered men by almost 4,000,000. If we believe in the concept of partnership of women and men in the home, at work, and in the community, we would expect some equitable representation of women in public life where the important decisions which affect all of us are made. How well are women represented?

In the present Congress, the Eighty-eighth Congress, as you know, there are only 2 women of 100 Senators. Of 435 members of the House of Representatives, only 11 are women. In the previous and Eighty-seventh Congress, there were 17 women members of the House, so we have lost six seats. In the executive branch of Government during the last three administrations, which includes both Republican and Democratic administrations, women have held less than 2½ percent of the high-ranking appointive posts. Only 2 women have held Cabinet rank in the Federal Government. Only 3 have served as ambassadors, and 3 as ministers.

When we look at the Federal Judiciary, we find that although there were 7,434 women lawyers in the United States in 1960, no woman has ever been appointed to the Supreme Court. Not a single woman serves in one of the 78 judicial positions on the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals, although one woman, Judge Florence Allen, appointed in 1934, has served in the past. She is now retired. As our chairman pointed out, of the 307 United States District Court judgeships, only two are women. Of the 92 United States Attorneys, only one is a woman. In fairness to the efforts of the Federal Government to begin to rectify this situation, it

should be pointed out that although women lawyers represent 3.5 per cent of the lawyers throughout the country, a little more than 5 percent of the lawyers in Government are women; and in the Attorney General's office, women represent a little more than 6 percent.

When we turn to state government, which brings the problem a little closer to home, we find that in 1958 women held 341 of approximately 7,700 seats in the state legislatures. By 1960, this number had dropped to 324 (290 in the State Houses and 34 in the State Senates). Of the various elective state offices, seven women were elected as Secretary of State.

The reasons for this low representation in government are familiar to most of us. One is the natural reluctance of the *ins* to let in the *outs*, a situation which prevails whatever the sex or political party. There is also the fact that married women are somewhat reluctant to engage in fulltime public careers which may interfere with their family life. Another important factor is the lag in women's advancement in the ranks of the political parties. Very often women ring the doorbells but do not make the decisions in the inner councils of the party. Moreover, women and men are not yet fully aware of the resources and potentialities of women with respect to public office. There are also state laws which impede women from taking a more active role in public life, such as the law of domicile which I will touch upon later. Finally, there is the factor of prejudice of which we are well aware.

Let us consider the participation of women in the important governmental process of jury service. Here is an area in which inequality is clearly apparent. We find, as our chairman said, that there are three states which still exclude women from jury service by statute. Significantly, these three states, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina, are states which have given the most resistance to desegregation of the public schools. I have sometimes wondered if the women of this country had won the vote in 1868, when it was granted to Negro men, and the women of the South had been politically emancipated so that they might use their political strength, whether we would have the same crucial situation in race relations in the South we have today. It seems to me no accident that states which are backward in relation to women's rights are also stubborn in resisting the rights of the Negro minority.

In only 20 states are women eligible for jury service on the same basis as men. In 27 states and the District of Columbia, women have exemptions

not granted to men. In 18 of these states, including Rhode Island, women have an absolute exemption. In states like Florida, Louisiana and New Hampshire, women are automatically exempted from jury service unless they make the effort to go to the office of the clerk of the court and file a statement of their willingness to serve. The Supreme Court has upheld this type of exemption for women.

We ought to think about this situation very seriously. If women want equality of rights as citizens, they should press for equality of responsibility as citizens. Once Mr. Justice Douglas said in a jury decision which disapproved a jury from which women were excluded that the two sexes are not fungible; that is, they are not interchangeable as grains of corn; that a community made up exclusively of one is an entirely different community from one made up of both.

It is important to stress that women today who seek fuller recognition of their rights do so not because they conceive of themselves as identical to men; they see themselves as having had a unique experience as women, and precisely because of this unique experience society is the poorer when it is not given opportunity for expression.

Bear in mind that in 1960 there were nearly 22,000,000 women over 45 years of age. Women marry earlier today and by the time they have reached their 40's they have completed the child-bearing, child-rearing segment of a woman's life. They have a whole new life of nearly 30 years ahead of them in which to make an important contribution to their community. Jury statutes which make distinctions on the basis of sex solely and not on the basis of function tend to rule out this rich community resource. It is relatively simple to draw a jury statute which provides an exemption for all parents having the custody of young children without blanketing all women within the exemption without regard to function.

As to federal juries, the 1957 Civil Rights Act made all women eligible for jury service in federal courts on the same basis as men. However, since prior to 1957 the federal courts followed state jury practices, not all federal districts today are as energetic as they might be in calling upon women to perform this public service. Because of this legislation has been recommended prohibiting discrimination in the selection of federal jurors because of race, color, sex, age, economic or social origin. Such legislation should be supported.

We have already discussed discrimination in private employment in the hiring, promotion, and the

wages of women. Among Negro women this is a particularly crucial problem. They carry a greater responsibility, proportionally, than other groups for the economic support of their families. And among Negroes there is a greater disparity of numbers between the sexes in the critical age groups 14-45 than among other ethnic groups in American society. In 1960, for example, there were 500,000 more Negro women in this age category than there were Negro men. Over 22 percent of all Negro women are single. They must be concerned with equality of opportunity in education and employment, for many of these women cannot look forward to marriage for their support and, of necessity, will be in the job market for all or the greater part of their adult lives.

There are states, including Rhode Island, which place restrictions upon women's right to obtain licenses to do business. Texas has actually denied women the right to attend a state-supported university—Texas A. & M. College. This discrimination was challenged in the Texas state courts without success, and the United States Supreme Court refused to review the state court decisions. These are areas of inequality which need further consideration.

In the area of personal and property rights, there are antiquated statutes which need to be repealed. In a few states, such as Kentucky and Michigan, I believe, a married woman still does not have legal capacity to become guarantor or surety. In Utah she still has only a limited right to act in a position of trust. In Texas she does not have custody over her earnings; her earnings become a part of community property and as such are subject to her husband's control. In California she has custody over her earnings only until such time as they become a part of community property. In five states—California, Florida, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Texas—there are sole-trader statutes under which a married woman cannot enter a separate business from her husband without going through a special procedure or getting court approval. In Massachusetts, if she wants to enter a separate business she must file a certificate with the clerk of the county court so that her estate will not be made subject to her husband's debts.

Then there is the problem of domicile. Except in four states, the common law rule that a woman's domicile follows that of her husband is still generally applicable. A person's domicile is generally the place which he intends to be his permanent home. Under the common law rule of domicile, married women living apart from their husbands

may be restricted in the exercise of their rights and obligations of citizenship, such as voting, running for public office, and jury service—since they lack the required domicile. Only four states—Arkansas, Delaware, Hawaii, and New Hampshire—recognize a married woman's right to acquire her own domicile, independently of her husband, for all purposes, without limitation.

There are other areas one might touch upon—alimony and family support, guardianship of children and inheritance rights—but I think I have said enough to indicate to you that there are still vestiges of inequality which should be removed from the laws of the states. How can these inequalities of which I have spoken be removed? First, there is positive legislation: equal-pay laws—Rhode Island has such a law, I believe—and laws to protect women against discrimination in employment on the basis of sex. Only one state today, Wisconsin, has included sex as one of the nonmerit factors which may not be used to discriminate in employment. Increasingly today we are of the opinion that such factors as age, sometimes disability, and sex should be included in our fair-employment legislation. There should be a repeal of restrictive sex legislation.

It would be a very good thing if all of the states set up commissions on the status of women, commissions composed of both men and women. One of the finest by-products of our own committee meet-

ings on the Status of Women was the mutual education of the men and women members of the committee. When we began our deliberations, very often we divided on sex lines with all the women voting one way and the men voting another way. By the end of those two years, after we had fought it out with one another and had come to understand more the men's point of view and they had come to understand more our point of view, we then began dividing on lines of approach or methods of procedure with men and women on both sides of the vote. I think this indicates the value of men and women working together on these problems.

There should be greater recognition of women in political parties and the political life of our country. The most discriminatory laws and governmental practices should be reviewed with an eye toward challenging their constitutionality under the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments in order to establish the principle of equality of status more firmly in our constitutional doctrines.

I would like to leave the following thought with you: a country can advance no further than the status of its women. If we are to meet the challenges of the space age, we need the total mobilization of our human resources. Women constitute a partially untapped resource, the neglect of which could well cost us our leading position among the nations of the world.



*The College
Library*

"WOMEN AS STOCKHOLDERS"

By MRS. WILMA SOSS — *President, Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, NBC Commentator "Pocketbook News"*



THERE is usually a man or two behind every successful woman, and that thought comes to me because of what Dr. Jacobs and Dr. Russell have done in bringing this great Centennial Symposium on "The Status of Women"

to you here. It, therefore, seems appropriate that this historic event should be held at a co-ed College.

A feminist, as I understand it, is merely one who inspires the political, social, and economic equalities of men *without losing her femininity*; or one who endorses these aspirations since some of the "feminists" I know are male. I venture to predict (after the revealing report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women and this Symposium) that feminism will return to fashion after being out of fashion for more than 40 years.

Some believe the time may have come to do away with segregated colleges, not only for color, but *sex*. Eight out of ten women in our society are employed gainfully outside the home. Also women now at work are destined to remain in the work force for 20 to 40 years. Hence, women's colleges will be doomed if they do not give girls the equality of economic and financial education they give to boys. This may be one reason why women's colleges get so few contributions from the corporations. I was shocked when the former woman President of one of our foremost women's colleges, who has become a director of an insurance company, told me she leaves *all* her investment advice to her broker. Her indifference to financial education may infect a whole generation of girls under her tutelage.

Yet, here is what Richard Paul, former Chief Counsel for the S.E.C. Study of Securities Markets, told the Women's Investors Clinic sponsored by the Federation of Women Shareholders in New York last week, and I quote:

"Remember, when you are dealing with the brokerage community, you are dealing with salesmen. It's very important to realize that they are universally compensated on a commission basis. They are not dispassionate professional investment counselors, though sometimes they assume that

pose. I would be doing you a vast disservice," Mr. Paul warned, "if I permitted you to believe that professionalism exists in the securities business today."

I think it is very important for every parent to realize the necessity of giving women and girls financial education. In fact, I will go a step further and say, in my opinion, if they don't do so and simply leave their money in trust in this day and age and in a period of inflation, that is parental delinquency! Being able to manage money should be a pre-requisite of inheritance, and training should begin in childhood, whether for male or female.

NO woman is free, NO woman is independent who does not exercise control over her own money. If her money is in the hands of a banker or if she depends on a trust fund, she is in a state of adolescence that is extremely profitable to banks, attorneys, and other males. I might also add that Bristol-Myers once did a research on what caused the most headaches, and it was troubles about money. Also, a Gallup Poll, revealed that the Number One worry was not peace nor war, but *money*. If women had better financial education, fewer first husbands would worry about second husbands, and fathers would not have to worry about their sons-in-law dissipating their hard-earned money.

Indeed, the Two-Year Study of the Securities Market by the S.E.C. should be required reading for every educator, even though it weighs thirty pounds.

I spend a great deal of time talking to heads of corporations, trying to persuade them that women are people. We suffer from being female when it comes to rising above the machine, the clerical, or consumer research level due largely to the fact that most of the history books are written by men. Mary Beard, historian, and the wife of historian Charles Beard, once told me: "Women have to know what they were to know what they can become."

Women were bankers in early Greece; women were the oracles. So much money flowed into the temples that it has been said, "If God had not been divinely inspired, he would have had to be

invented." For thousands of years, women were kept out of high places and synagogues and churches, largely because of the control they exercised when they were in the temples. Hence, Christian society became a male-oriented society.

In America, women were the *first executives*; the men were busy with hunting, fishing, and fighting. Women started agriculture until it was automated, and then the men took over. When work grew too much with the spinning, the dyeing, the weaving, the farming, and the tanning, women began to farm the work out; and so the villages grew. Women hid the money, but papa said it wasn't safe; so he took the money away for safe-keeping and formed a bank; after that, it was a couple of hundred years before mama could get an account in her name in a bank. I think the first to open bank accounts for women was the Bank of New York.

Today, we have 12,500 women who are officers of banks, including presidents and chairmen of the board. Less than 2 percent of high-level positions are found to be filled by women, including today's chairman, Miss Marion Stephenson who, as you know, is vice president of NBC. Even she, with her extraordinary contributions and obvious abilities and very special character, did not come by this alone. Years before the trail was blazed by militant women stockholders in annual meeting who asked for a woman on the board of RCA, of which NBC is a subsidiary, from the floor of the annual meeting. And from the floor of the meeting we nominated a qualified woman, the late Ruth Bryan Rohde*, who at the time was also vice-president of the Federation of Women Shareholders. She was, of course, defeated with management casting all its proxies and the proxies it held against it, but Mrs. Rohde received enough of votes from the floor to persuade General David Sarnoff, chairman of RCA, to put a woman on the board not only of RCA, but later of NBC. The first woman was an outside director and educator; it took years before a woman could come up through the ranks to be an officer.

The Federation of Women Shareholders has worked for women on boards since its inception, not as a "cause" but because it is good business for a company to open the door of opportunity for women in executive positions where I sadly relate that we can almost count them on both hands.

*Daughter of William Jennings Bryan, Congresswoman from Florida; first woman diplomat, U. S. Minister to Norway; alternate U. S. Delegate to the United Nations.

Fifty-one percent of the 17,000,000 stockholders in the United States are women; and, as such, you, the women of this country, are the employers of management and labor. The largest group of stockholders, nearly 5½ million, are housewives and non-employed women. They account for nearly 34 per cent of the share in the population, almost the same as their proportion in the nation's adult population. The 1962 New York Stock Exchange census showed that 123 billion dollars of stock was registered in names of female stockholders and only 108 billion in the names of male. That's not counting 6 billion in joint accounts of stocks or registered in the names of brokerage firms and bank nominees or judiciaries acting for individuals, most of whom are probably women. One out of six women shareholders is a widow; one out of forty shareholders is a widower. Twice as many women may inherit their first shares of stock or receive them as gifts than men do but the fact is, only 14 percent of the shareowner population acquired stock first through inheritance or gift; and women, as you recall, comprise 51 per cent of the shareowner population.

It will probably surprise you that the largest segment of employed shareowners consists of some three million clerical and sales personnel. (According to the report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, the largest concentration of women is in clerical work.) Three out of four shareowners, who work full time for publicly owned corporations, own stock in the companies employing them. In Sears-Roebuck, largely through the efforts of the Federation of Women Shareholders these employee stockholders have voted their own proxies; but most of them have to vote by open ballot instead of secret ballot. In some companies like Procter & Gamble, we have won a "confidential" vote. There the auditors receive and count their proxies.

As graduates of Bryant know, and I hope all of you do know, there are many companies who give employees stock-purchase plans, profit-sharing plans, or thrift plans in which the corporation matches a proportion of salaries that employees save and buys either Government bonds or company stock for them, as employees choose. Sixteen per cent of women shareholders, compared with 18 per cent of the men, have made their initial stock acquisitions through company-stock-purchase plans. But when it comes to lucrative stock-option plans, very few women get into those, chiefly because women do not have executive rank and status.

Stockholders are getting younger all the time. One out of eight stockholders are minors, but boys have a slight edge on girls in receiving stock as gifts. (I hope any grandparents present will rectify this.) It may surprise you to find that the incidence of share ownership is actually going up as the age goes down, taking into consideration the low national birthrate during the thirties. Also, for the first time since 1959, a majority of new shareowners are women; and I want right here to put into the record that it wasn't the women who panicked — no matter what they may say — during the break in the stock market in 1962. Men sold 720,000 shares on May 28, and women, 460,000 shares on that day.

You may also be interested to know that of 35,000 registered representatives of New York Stock Exchange firms, about 1,800 are women. Of 5,800 partners, women, however, hold only 59 general and 474 limited partnerships. But the overall growth rate in this field is 774 percent for women compared to 234 percent for men.

The largest increase among shareholders was in high school graduates who did not attend college. One out of 5 women shareholders are college graduates compared with 2 out of 5 men. In Rhode Island one out of 9 is a stockholder. The greatest proportion of shareholders to the total population in a single state is Connecticut. Vermont, on that basis, has more stockholders than New York State, which is gradually yielding its leadership in numbers of stockholders to California.

Here in Rhode Island, The Honorable Ralph Lewis, a Republican from Warwick is fighting in the State Senate to make cumulative voting mandatory in your State. I hope that the Democrats will support him. This is very important to women. Cumulative voting, through which you can bunch all your proxies on one candidate if you wish to do so, or split your votes, is mandatory in 22 states but only permissive in the favored states of incorporation — New York, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Now let me tell you why this is so important to you. American Telephone & Telegraph Company, which has more women stockholders than men, fought all my attempts to include a resolution asking for a woman on its board of directors in its proxy statement when they reduced the number of

directors while they were looking for a qualified man. This was contested before the S.E.C. during the Eisenhower administration. It was ruled that asking for a woman on the board of the corporation is a "cause" and, therefore, such a proposal cannot properly be included in a proxy statement and may be excluded by the corporation. By their ruling, the S.E.C. made it clear that the only relief which stockholders have to get a woman on the board is through cumulative voting under which you can pyramid your votes for a woman nominee, if you want one. But at AT&T we had to wait three years to reintroduce a cumulative voting resolution because the resolution previously brought by Mr. Lewis Gilbert had not polled enough votes for us to reintroduce it without a waiting period. Now you begin to see the enormous power women have as stockholders if they exercise their voting rights not only to protect their capital and income, but incidentally to improve the status of women. So read your proxy statements.

Remember, the function of the stockholder is not merely to make "a fast buck" as they say in Wall Street, but to use their voting rights not only to elect Directors but to act as a balance and check on matters for which Directors cannot act without shareowner sanction. Compared to these rights, utilizing your voting power politically and as the family purchasing agent is insignificant.

The corporate suffrage movement is the logical outcome of women's political suffrage in a country where women are said to own 70 percent of the privately held wealth and control so little of it. (Think of all those poor little rich girls in Texas who cannot buy or sell their own stock without their husbands' signature!)

More stockholders own 1 to 10 shares of such big companies as A.T. & T. and IBM than round lots (100 shares); so don't hesitate to be an odd-lot stockholder. More small capitalists and corporate democracy are our answer to Communism.

The 500 corporations which represent the economic concentration of power in the United States are publicly owned; and you have the opportunity, as stockholders, by voting independently, to preserve the capitalistic system which, with all its faults, can keep our country and your children free.



United States Congressman John E. Fogarty delivered the principal Convocation Address at the Centennial Celebration.

Rhode Island college presidents in the academic procession, left to right: Dr. William C. Gaige, President, Rhode Island College; The Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O. P., President, Providence College; President Jacobs; Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, President, Brown University; Dr. Francis H. Horn, President, University of Rhode Island.

The Convocation



Invocation

O God, in Whose image we are made, do Thou bless this Convocation and this College whose centennial we celebrate. In particular, help us to appreciate the initiative, the sense of responsibility, the fidelity, the moral strength and endurance evinced by modern woman and responsible for the new eminence she enjoys in today's society.

And with that appreciation, grant that we of the opposite sex rejoice in her ascendant and honored status. We confess it is not easy for us to accept many of the implications of her new status: of old, we had thought ourselves mentally superior: now we find her our equal in almost all disciplines and our superior in many; we controlled the wealth of the nation, but today she possesses the larger portion of our corporate assets; we had thought we were the stronger sex, but today she outlives us and enjoys priority in insurance ratings. Grant that we accept this new order, not grudgingly, but graciously and generously, encouraging her to greater heights of virtue and accomplishment, to Thy glory and this world's betterment. Amen.

Given by MONSIGNOR ARTHUR T. GEOGHEGAN
Superintendent of R. I. Catholic Schools
Dean, Catholic Teachers College of Providence

President's Message

IT IS A great pleasure to welcome you to our Centennial Convocation. I should like at the outset to express warm gratitude for the honor you pay Bryant College by your presence on this historic day. I salute you in the fellowship of knowledge and bid you a cordial welcome to these festivities.

Today, we gather here in a reaffirmation of the inestimable value of a professional education for business, an education that is considerably different from the specialization in business techniques of Bryant's early days. Half of the present curriculum is devoted to studies in the liberal arts. Education for business administration and the teaching of business subjects is still our purpose. But, we now provide an educational program that prepares men and women for the freedom inseparable from responsibility—one that reveals to them their latent powers and provides the means for their development and use.

We are celebrating the end of our first century and the beginning of the second. This is a good time to take inventory. We have always counted among our greatest assets the spirit underlying the College and the devotion of those associated with it. We take pride in our faculty of dedicated men and women whose talents in the teaching of business and academic subjects assure young men and women a purposeful education and the kind of citizenship which prepares them to act in useful concert with others without loss of personal integrity.

We are fortunate in our fine Board of Trustees and in our College officers who guide this institution and wisely administrate this campus of more than 2000 students.

Our alumni, more than 12,000 strong, are among our staunchest supporters. We take deep satisfaction in the service they are rendering on all levels of executive management and in their contributions to community life. A recent survey by the Providence Chamber of Commerce revealed 5000 of them serving this business community alone.

We point with pride to the teachers of business education in the high schools of this State and many other states, who are graduates of the Business Teacher Education Department of Bryant.

Since the reputation of a college rests mainly with its students, we take particular pleasure in our student body, representing 26 states and 9 foreign countries. Their serious pursuit of a degree that assures them a *life* as well as a *livelihood* gives meaning and purpose to this campus.

And it is in their name that we address ourselves to the future. We pledge ourselves to a steady progress, to a program of studies suitable to the dynamic changing society in which we live. Our development plan for the immediate future includes the addition of two new dormitories; a new student union; the expansion of our library so that it will not only serve our College, but also become a meaningful resource to the businessmen of our community; more classroom buildings; a larger dining hall; a more spacious auditorium. We also look forward to the establishment of a graduate school of business.

Standing here on the threshold of our second century, we face awesome responsibilities. Thus this event must inspire a rededication for the *future* as well as a celebration of the *past*. Be this as it may, we face this future with continuing confidence and with an abiding faith in our destined role.

Given by DR. E. GARDNER JACOBS, President of
Bryant College Since 1961 Formerly Vice-
President in Charge of Development for 33
Years

The White House, Washington, D. C.

November 18, 1963

DR. E. GARDNER JACOBS, *President*

Bryant College, Providence, Rhode Island

To educate men and women for social and professional responsibility has been the goal of Bryant College during its first century. Your sustained and effective pursuit of this goal has produced mature, intelligent, broadly trained graduates—well prepared to serve their communities and their Nation.

On the occasion of the Centennial Convocation, I am delighted to join such good friends of Bryant College as Senators Pastore and Pell, and Congressman Fogarty, in extending warm congratulations and best wishes to the faculty, students, alumni and to all those participating in this memorable event.

I know you will find the words of Assistant Secretary of Labor Peterson and Congressman Fogarty both stimulating and informative, and I am delighted that these outstanding representatives of our government are with you today.

With every good wish,

John F. Kennedy

Greetings from the Mayor and Governor

AS CHAIRMAN of the College Centennial Committee, I have been granted the honor of bringing the greetings of Mayor Reynolds and of Governor Chafee to this Convocation. In a message sent to President Jacobs, the Mayor conveys to the faculty, students, and alumni of Bryant College his congratulations on a century of outstanding success and service to this community. On behalf of the City of Providence he extends to President Jacobs and all those connected with the College a wish for continued progress in this second century.

The Governor has directed his remarks to the theme of the Symposium which many of you attended earlier today. He has sent the following message.

"I should like to take this opportunity to commend Bryant College for the effective leadership it is exercising in the fight to secure a more enlightened view of the role of women in today's society.

"Confronted with the problems of an ever-growing, complex social and economic order, we no longer can afford to adhere to ideas which have long become obsolete.

"If we, as a nation, are to continue our growth, we must realize that women are going to play a more active part in society. Accordingly, we should utilize every means at our disposal to insure a swift and orderly transition in our attitude toward the place of women in America.

"I look forward to the helpful effect this Symposium will have upon the well being of the State of Rhode Island."

DR. CHARLES HOOVER RUSSELL, *Vice-President
of Academic Affairs Bryant College and
Centennial Chairman*

Greetings from the Colleges and Universities

As AN honorary alumnus of Bryant College, I deem it a great privilege to have been designated as the representative of our sister institutions of higher learning and as the delegate of the American Council on Education to this 100th Anniversary Convocation.

In their name and in my own, I bring you the greetings and sincere best wishes of your colleagues in the realm of higher education on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of your founding.

All of us extend to Bryant College our heartiest congratulations on her 100 years of progressive achievement and nationally recognized accomplishment in the area of Business Administration education. We are proud and happy to be associated with Bryant College in our mutual endeavor to make Rhode Island and our nation a better place in which to live, through higher education, for all our people.

In reverent retrospect, our mind goes back to January 17, 1863, when Dr. Henry D. Stratton, a schoolmaster, and H. B. Bryant, a businessman, founded the National Commercial College, now known as Bryant College, "for the acquisition of an education in the world of commerce." The combination of college administrator and businessman was amalgamated in the person and under the presidency of Dr. Henry L. Jacobs, one of America's great educational administrators and truly one of God's great noblemen whose memory will ever be held in benediction. With the able assistance of his son, Dr. E. Gardner Jacobs, now President of Bryant College, and their dedicated associates, Bryant College has reached the summit of a century.

When an institution, particularly an educational institution, reaches its 100th year, there is certain reason to look backward with pride; but, there is even greater reason to look forward with hope, with resolution and with careful planning. Institutions of higher education, no matter what their age, live largely in the future: in the knowledge that is to be discovered, in the ideas yet to be formulated, in the tasks to be accomplished, in the generations yet to enter their halls and in graduates soon to take their places in the society of the future.

It is with this point of view in mind that Bryant College stands on the threshold of a new and challenging century, confident in her destined role in the growth of American business enterprise and in the education of her individual students for life as well as for a livelihood.

Your colleagues in higher education join with me on this happy occasion in extending our sincere best wishes, that Bryant College may continue to grow and prosper in knowledge, in wisdom and in grace before God and men. May the glory of the Face of God light your way, Bryant College; may the roads rise with you; may the wind be always at your back; may God love you and bless you and ever hold you in the hollow of His Hand.

By THE VERY REVEREND VINCENT C. DORE, O.P.
President of Providence College

Greetings from the Business Community

IT is a special honor for me as President of the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce to salute Bryant College during the centennial convocation. The business and professional community of Providence and Rhode Island is indeed richer as a result of the many contributions made by its alumni and faculty. By the Chamber's own survey, more than 5,000 Bryant Alumni are presently serving this state on all levels of executive assistance and management. The 2,000 students who today convene on this Providence campus from more than a score of states and foreign countries to pursue a college degree and professional education for business will soon be absorbed into the mainstream of American commerce where their talents will well mark Bryant's contribution to the nation.

As our community and our country surge forward into an era marked by fantastic technological advances, we look to our colleges and universities to supply us with educated men and women — educated in a new sense — educated to the pace and structures of an economy developing at an unprecedented rate; educated to respond purposefully to the pressures and stimuli of a world in social and political ferment.

Those whom we educate to assume the mantle of business and civic leadership must move in an ever widening spectrum of responsibility and capacity; but as the burden increases so does the opportunity.

I am here today, not only to bring you the greetings of the business community on the occasion of this institution's 100th Anniversary, but to offer a challenge. I ask you to be worthy and vigilant, to maintain and invigorate the nation's confidence in its business and industries. I invite you to participate meaningfully in this perilous and exciting century.

As Wendell Wilkie said, "Only the strong can be free, and only the productive can be strong."

It is you — professionally qualified for business and commerce—who must be the guardians of that productivity.

Bryant College now embarks on a new century. We rely on it as never before. We need your skills, your incentives, and your capacity for creative innovations. We know that educated men and women are the greatest resource — the largest endowment — of our community and our nation.

The 1,000 member firms and 17,000 members of the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce are honored to pay tribute to the founders, administrators, faculty, alumni and students of Bryant College on the occasion of the centennial convocation of its founding.

Given by

GUY HENRY, *President*
Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce

THE WOMAN'S STAKE IN HEALTH AND WELFARE

By THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY - *United States Congressman*
from *Rhode Island*



THE STAKE of women in the health and welfare of the Nation is a special one. This is not to say that every citizen does not have much to gain from a strong health and welfare program, but women have special interests and concerns because of the extraordinary responsibilities imposed upon them by their multiple roles in our society.

Wage earner, homemaker and volunteer worker in the community are all roles today's woman is likely to fill at some time during her lifetime, and quite often she fills two or more of these roles at the same time.

We think of the home as the basic institution of our society and of women as primarily mothers and homemakers. Indeed, the majority of married women, two-thirds, to be more exact, do concentrate their efforts and energies on the home.

They are the ones who are most directly concerned with the welfare of our children. They, perhaps more than anyone else, appreciate the need for better educational facilities.

They are concerned that our society meet the needs of every child—that our young children and our teenagers have the best possible educational facilities, and the best qualified teachers. They are equally concerned for the child who needs special education, the retarded, and the handicapped and the exceptional child as well.

And I think it is the women, the mothers, who feel most deeply the need for higher education for our young people. The day of the unskilled worker is fast waning, and young men and women must have the best possible education in order to fill the kinds of jobs which our new technology is providing.

Cost of education is high these days, and government must assume a greater role in seeing that every child has the opportunity he needs. This we can do by providing student loans, and scholarships. And we can ease the burden on the family, too, through tax deductions for educational expenses.

Our Nation desperately needs the talents of our young people, especially in the field of health and welfare. It is estimated that by 1975 we will need 3,600 more doctors a year—a 50 percent increase—just to maintain our present health coverage. And marked growth is also expected in other medical and health services. There is an ever present shortage of nurses, medical laboratory technologists, X-ray technicians, dentists and dental hygienists and physical and occupational therapists.

I think we all deplore the fact that many mothers cannot, because of economic pressure, remain at home with their young children. The number of working mothers reached 8.8 million in 1962. Of these, about 3½ million have children under 6 years of age.

Some 2.4 million of the 4.6 million women who are heads of families are the chief breadwinners of their families. We must provide some help for these women—give them some assurance that their children will have adequate care while they are at work. To this end, the Congress has provided Federal aid not only for child care centers but for tax relief for those families who must pay for the care of young children while their mothers are at work.

One of the great worries that hangs over every mother and homemaker is the health of her family. Medicine is making great strides, and we have reaped many benefits from our research programs to date. Years have been added to the life expectancy of women, for instance. In 1900, women averaged a life span of 48 years. The infant girl born at the end of World War II had a life expectancy of 69 years, and today it is even higher, nearly 73 years.

We have also been able to lower the rate of infant mortality. In 1900, of 1000 babies born, 145 died before they were a year old. Today, the comparable figure is only 25.

Medical research has helped us reduce the number of deaths due to such diseases as tuberculosis, nephritis, influenza and pneumonia. We are making progress in the field of cancer, but we have much to do in the area of cardiovascular diseases.

Nor is our ability to probe deep into the causes of and the cures for our physical ills of benefit only to our Nation. It is a real force for peace and free-

dom throughout the world. I have seen proof of this in the work of the World Health Organization. As we eradicate disease, suffering and malnutrition in all parts of the world, we destroy the breeding grounds for social unrest, Communism, dictatorship and the other social and political ills that are the barriers to real freedom.

At the turn of the century the care of the aged devolved for the most part, upon the wife and mother who combined the chores this involved with raising her own young family. But today our older citizens are in better health and they are more independent. Many of them want to continue working long after the age at which their fathers retired, and they supply a valuable resource for our economy, if we can utilize their skills.

And so we need programs to meet the special needs of these senior citizens. They need housing especially adapted to their way of life. They need retraining so that they can sharpen old skills or learn new ones, if need be. And they need special medical attention to keep them in good health, to protect them from the diseases that once made old age a time of misery.

When we think of the Nation's welfare program, I hope our imagination does not stop at social service work or the providing of the bare necessities of life. Our cultural development is part of our Nation's welfare too.

As we develop our technology, we find that we all have more leisure time and that we have a real need for cultural pursuits. That this country has never provided for our cultural development on a national scale is unfortunate, I believe. Perhaps it was necessary that we neglect this facet of national life as we pushed back the frontiers, first in developing our natural resources through farming, mining, and forestry and then in developing our technological skills in manufacturing and industrialization. But I believe the day has come when we can turn our attention to developing our human resources, our minds and intellects, by encouraging the arts and humanities.

We cannot expect the mothers in our Nation to develop our children to their highest potential, to instill in them the sensitivity to good and beauty which is part of a great civilization unless we provide the cultural climate for such growth.

My own feeling is that we should have a National Institute of Arts and Humanities which would en-

courage and advance artistic and cultural activities in our great Nation—provide programs of information and education, advisory services and financial assistance.

This is essentially what the Cultural Development Act, which I first introduced in July, 1962, would do. I have received an abundance of favorable response to the proposal from the educational community of the Nation and from citizens from every walk of life, from every part of the country. All feel that it would fill a critical need—assure perpetuation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments.

This Nation has undertaken some great programs to insure our scientific and technological advancement and this is good. It is necessary. But unless we give similar attention to the arts and humanities, we will run the danger of a serious imbalance in our educational programs. What is worse, we will relinquish an important opportunity for a richer, fuller, more meaningful life for ourselves and our children.

I have talked of the stake which women, generally, have in improving the health and welfare of our Nation. I would like to point out that they have much to gain as individuals, too.

Each new development in the field of health, each new innovation to assist some underprivileged or disadvantaged segment of our society brings a degree of freedom to the individual woman.

In the United States we pride ourselves on our freedom of choice, the freedom to choose the kind of life we will lead, the contribution we will make to society. But in order to have that freedom, we must remove the barriers of poverty, ill health, low levels of education and a wavering economy.

As our Nation has striven toward these goals, we have been able to provide greater opportunities for education for the individual woman. We have been able to open new fields of employment to her. We have been able to reduce the economic and political discriminations against her. And we have developed a greater appreciation for her capabilities, the contribution she can make to our democratic way of life, the gift she can give us through her healthy, happy, well-educated children.

This is the stake of the American woman in the health and welfare of America.

Benediction

The Lord bless you and keep you,
The Lord make His face to shine upon you
and be gracious unto you,
The Lord lift up the light of His counte-
nance upon you
And give you peace.

Amen

Given by

THE RIGHT REVEREND
JOHN SEVILLE HIGGINS
*Bishop of the Episcopal
Diocese of Rhode Island*



Rhode Island Symposium Committee

CHAIRMAN: MRS. MARGARET F. ACKROYD, Commissioner of Minimum Wage,
Division of Women and Children, Rhode Island State Department of Labor

MRS. BARBARA ARNOLD, *Junior League of Providence*

MRS. ELISABETH N. CHRISTOPHER, *President, Providence Chapter of National Secretaries Association*

MRS. ANNETTE

DR. KATHERINE K. CUTTS

MRS. ALICE DESAINT, *Administrator, Rhode Island Division on Aging*

MRS. THOMAS

MISS CLAIRE ERNSTOF, *Office Manager, Cadillac Textile Company*

MRS. ETHEL T. GILDEA, *Executive Secretary, Rhode Island Committee on Children and Youth*

DR. GRACE M. GLYNN, *Associate Commissioner of Education, R. I. State Department of Education*

MRS. AUSTIN HANDY, *President, Urban League of Rhode Island*

MRS. GERTRUDE METH HOCHBERG, *Director of Public Relations, Bryant College*

MRS. MARY JACKSON, *Republican National Committeewoman of Rhode Island*

MISS BARBARA A. JOHNSTON, *Co-chairman, National Conference of Christians and Jews*

MRS. ARLINE R. KIVEN, *Member, House of Representatives, Rhode Island*

MRS. MARGARET D. LANGDON, *Executive Director, Meeting Street School*

MRS. RALPH LAWSON,

MRS. LUCILLE P. LEONARD, *Vice-chairman, R. I. Committee on Children and Youth*

MRS. BEVERLY

MRS. MARTIN MILLER, *Co-chairman, National Conference of Christians and Jews*

JUDGE FLORENCE K. MURRAY, *Associate Justice of Superior Court of Rhode Island*

MRS. KATHRYN OWEN, *Junior League of Providence*

MISS MILDRED E. SCHWIER, *Director of Nursing, Rhode Island Hospital*

MRS. FRANK W. SKOOG, *Co-chairman, National Conference of Christians and Jews*

MRS. ELEANOR F. SLATER, *Member, House of Representatives, Rhode Island*

MISS MARY E. SULLIVAN, *Status of Women Chairman, R. I. Chapter of Business and Professional Women*

MRS. ROZELLA WHITE SWITZER, *Regional Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews*

DR. MARY T. THORP, *Director of Laboratory Experiences, Rhode Island College*

MRS. JOHN S. TOOMEY, *Director, League of Women Voters of the United States*

MRS. MARJORIE VINAL, *Director of World Affairs Council of R. I.*

MISS ALICE M. WADDINGTON, *President, American Association of University Women, Providence Plantations Branch*





BRYANT COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
PROVIDENCE 6, RHODE ISLAND