

There is an implied, ~~ifxnxixexnxixy~~ question--in fact often an openly asked question--which has brought this panel before you tonight. That question is: "What do you women want?" The answer is both simple and complex. Simple enough to state in a few words which would be understandable to a woman, complex enough to require far more than an hour or two tonight to bring ~~all~~ most of you to an understanding of the answer.

In discussing how to present our position on this question tonight, we kept coming back to basic attitudes. What we are asking for, ultimately, is nothing less than changes in basic attitudes and presuppositions.

What do we want?
~~xxxxxxaskingxxxxxx~~

We ~~want~~ to be taken seriously.

--an immensely hard thing for many persons to do.

We are asking that women's rights, women's demands, women themselves be taken seriously. We are tired of being laughed at, we are tired of the sly dig, the humorous aside, the covert smile that accompanied the quip, "How are the women today." / ^{make clear} Sex discrimination is ~~the~~ ^{the} socially acceptable prejudice. We are told that there are serious issues--racism, urban blight, warfare. Of course, those are serious issues. ~~xxxxxx~~ Does that lessen the seriousness ~~of~~ of discrimination against 1/2 the human race? Perhaps there is a relationship between those serious issues and the inability of half of the human race to treat the other half as serious human beings.

We are asking that each of you re-examine traditional ideas of the woman's role. These ideas, which derive from a basically paternalistic society, value the woman who is supportive, sacrificing, inferior, and submissive. If you value a supportive, self-sacrificing wife at home, how will you relate to a woman student or colleague or ~~future~~ ^{potential} colleague who is strong or aggressive. To call a woman aggressive is the ultimate condemnation. To call a man ^{dynamic and} aggressive is a compliment.

We are asking for a re-examination of ~~the~~ the structures of this society in which women and men are relegated to sexually stereotyped roles. Our society socializes ^{girls} ~~a~~ women into nurturing and supportive roles. Do we, do you, ~~as teachers of young women~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ How does four years at Wooster, four years of sitting in your class rooms, prepare a woman for the fact that when she graduates, she ~~is~~ ^{will be somebody only then} ~~commencing a life of~~ being somebody's wife, somebody's secretary, somebody's nurse, somebody's mistress, somebody's mother, somebody's grandmother.

Are we teaching women to challenge those stereotyped roles after graduation? Is the college offering role models which challenge the stereotypes? Or does the college say, as most do: "We will educate you, but we won't hire you"

held out the Education has/promised of equality. But the strength of the women's movement on campuses testifies to the broken promises. Campuses, including Wooster, are clearly at a stage of legal reform--forced upon them by the federal government--of tokenism--"how many departments of more than four or five men would consider ~~it~~ hiring to hire more than one woman?--and of appeals to the women to improve themselves--"if you women were only better qualified." qualified women on the faculty.

We are asking for equality of opportunity, both as students and as faculty. We are asking ~~that~~ the academic community to re-examine the standards of professional excellence which are used as a smokescreen to deny equality of opportunity. The standards of professional excellence which the academic community espouses--certainly Wooster does--are based on career patterns ~~which~~ of the white male. To function excellently--or even ~~efficiently~~ competently--at Wooster, the faculty member must ~~essentially~~ make not only a full-time, but an over-time commitment to teaching, committees, etc. He must have moved directly from college, to graduate school, to teaching. This demands a life-style in which some-one else is bearing the burden: ^{children} working the way through graduate school, taking care of the house, meals, /supporting and freeing the man to function as a "full-time faculty member." Are these standards of full-time, ~~uninterrupted~~ activity really criteria of excellence in teaching? Or are they smokescreens behind which to maintain male dominance in teaching?

Bernice Sandler, executive associate of the American Association of Colleges, has written a statement about women in higher education which has been sent to the departmental chairmen. I commend the statement to all of you--copies are here on the table--. I would like to read several paragraphs ~~from~~ in which she comments on equal opportunity:

We are asking, finally, that you recognize that there is discrimination on campuses, in higher education, at Wooster. The 1972 edition of Current issues in higher education, published by the American Association for Higher Education says flatly "The two groups most discriminated against in higher education are women and blacks." Sandler reports that from 1970-72, formal charges of sex discrimination were filed against 360 colleges and universities and that none of those charges has been refuted by the Dept of Health, Education and Welfare? ~~The statistics show~~ Studies of recent years have shown that the position of women in the academic world is deteriorating.

Can Wooster possibly be an exemption?