Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Judith Worell

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
San Francisco, CA
August 16, 2007

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Worell, J. (2007, August 16). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. San Francisco, CA.

For permission to use this interview in published work, please contact:

Alexandra Rutherford, PhD
Project Director, Psychology's Feminist Voices
alexr@yorku.ca

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Judith Worell
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
San Francisco, CA
August 16, 2007

JW: Judith Worell, Interview Participant
AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer
TB: Tera Beaulieu, Interviewer

AR – How and when did you first develop a feminist identity?

JW – When and where did I get my feminist conscious? My feminist identity, is the term you used and that goes way back to contextualize it in my childhood. The interesting thing is that I've been asked that so many times in my long life. I think what starts to happen with oral history, too, is that you repeat it and you repeat it, and there are certain stories that you retell. And your kids will come to believe that those are the truth, of course after you tell it a couple of times, it becomes the truth.

AR – Right. It has a way of having a life of its own. Well, tell us a bit about it, if you don't mind repeating that story about how your feminist identity began and then emerged more in your work.

JW – So the whole question of identity, we can discuss 'what is identity?' Steward, she uses the word consciousness, which I don't really like. Identity, to me, is calling yourself something. You don't call yourself feminist, then you're not really feminist. But when I was first asked about that, going back to my childhood, it came very early and it's all enmeshed in other things in my life, which is probably true of everybody else.

Growing up, my father was an orphan, raised by a rabbi in Russia so he came here very Orthodox and with very European notions of what a good family should look like and how proper wives and daughters are supposed to interact. And so I observed very early on this patriarchal—and he wasn't cruel, not at all, I think that in the Jewish patriarchal, any patriarchy where there's no violence or verbal abuse, it's just you do this, and you do that and they expect you to do it. So I could see my mother sort of creeping around and doing what he wanted. And he gave her a salary, so much a week. It was an allowance, it wasn't a salary, and the word allowance is very different from a salary. A salary is for work that you perform. An allowance is 'I will allow you to have this much, and if you spend too much, and if I see anything frivolous around the house you obviously have too much to run the household, so I'll take some away.' So it's that power assertiveness that I saw very early. And I don't remember what age it was that my parents took me to the synagogue—it was an Orthodox synagogue—and we went upstairs, I didn't know from nothing, I was maybe six, seven, eight, somewhere in there. And we sat upstairs. I don't

know if either of you have been in an Orthodox old-time Jewish synagogue. Some of them are still like that, of course I haven't gone…

{2:53}

AR – I don't think I have. Gender segregation?

JW – Not only gender segregation: the women are upstairs, behind a screen, so if the men looked back, they couldn't see us. And we're sort of screened. But we could look out through the screen. If you've ever seen women in burkas, I mean they didn't put us in burkas, but it was the metaphor a burka, if you will, that people couldn't see us, but we could sort of look through this little screen. And the men were downstairs, so I said, "Mama, why are we up here and they're down there?" "Ask your father." Ask your father—because she didn't want to evaluate it, I guess. "Well, the women distract the men." I said "I didn't say anything, I was a good girl." "No, you distract, the men can't study while the women are near them because, well anyway."

So that was the beginning of ending my Jewish identity for a long time. That was one of the things you asked about, discrimination. Of course there was a lot of anti-Semitism, there still is. So my feeling that women were somehow less-than in the Jewish, and I didn't know of any other Reformed religion at the time, there weren't women rabbis. Women were not allowed to sit in the Rabbi's seat—"Why not, Mom?" And they weren't allowed to touch him, either. Because you might be in the wrong time of your month, and therefore you might be unclean. And this whole concept of women being unclean, I just didn't accept it.

My mother, I think, could have been a feminist, if there was such a thing in those days. We lived, I grew up, in Greenwich Village, which was her idea; went through a very progressive school called The Little Red Schoolhouse, where girls and boys, everyone was equal. There was one bathroom, we all used it. And I would get out of the stalls and see the boys in a pee fight. And I grew up with, at home with one construction—looking at patriarchy and religion, if you will, that's the only religion I knew, although I went to church with some Catholic friends, so I saw all that male hierarchy, so you kind of grow up with that. Then I'm going to this progressive school where girls and boys are equal, using the same bathroom, and then I'm living in Greenwich Village where men and women, it's the center, the only place where if they cross race couples, you saw a lot of black and white couples walking around. They couldn't find a place to live anywhere else in New York, but I didn't know that at the time, it was just common, it was a part of my life. And my school had some black kids and white kids, cause we were all very middle class, since it was a private school. So I grew with this change between what I saw as what I saw as a patriarchy and this very open, Greenwich Village**,** anything goes. Gays and lesbians were pretty open in the street, though it was illegal at the time and there were these, um, pogroms is the word I want, but that's not right. The police would raid the gay bars. They would let them go for a while and then raid the gay bars.

So we were very aware of discrimination, not only against blacks and whites who were co...—whatever it is, there's a word for it that's very unpleasant, so I won't use it—who were together, and for gays and lesbians. So I grew up in this very open, artists—artists lived there…

{6:55}

AR – This was in the '40s? Late '30s? When was this?

JW – I was born in 1928, so I am now 79. I'm not ashamed of that at all. Women like to hide their age; I'm proud I'm still kicking! Playing tennis four times a week, and whatever. So it was in the '30s and early '40s. By the '40s I was already going to high school.

AR – So how did you negotiate this…

JW – I turned off being Jewish, I didn't want to be Jewish. Even though you couldn't get away from it because we had Passover Seders and all our friends were Jewish. I couldn't get away from it but the only part of it that I saw was "Thou shalt not." You can't eat ham, you can't eat bacon, I never tasted seafood, lobster. All of that was "You're not allowed." And I didn't see, I don't think my father knew how transmit the joy of Judaism, and the beauty of the whole thing, which I now love. It was an identity that I totally changed once I got away from it. So…

AR – So that was part of rejecting that part…

JW – So seeing the unequal relationship, I kept saying to my mom "Why don't you get out of it? Why don't you divorce him? Why don't you get a job?" "He doesn't want me to work" that kind of thing, etc. I just felt it was very unequal. So I said, "Well, I'm not going to do that. When I grow up I'm going to get a job, not sit there and be someone's slave." My father never stepped foot into the kitchen, that was all women's work. That just didn't seem right to me.

AR – So you were inoculated pretty early in that way…

JW – So to me that was my feminist identity. And then my school was very radical, there were a lot of very politically radical people there. So I became pretty politically radical as well. And when I say politically radical I mean rejecting the status quo, rejecting Republican… well of course Roosevelt was coming in at that time, and we totally adored him because he was also for downtrodden people. So that was my whole childhood: wanting to help downtrodden people. When I went to high schools in the summer, my mother… I went to the high school music and art because I was a very good pianist but I decided not to become a concert pianist at one point because she sent me to a camp called the Encampment for Citizenship which was run by the Ethical Culture. It's a humanist…it's not religious but it's on the edge of being humanist, secular humanist group. If you can think of secular humanism, I know it's a bad word…

AR – It's like a Chautauqua arrangement? A Chautauqua Institute?

{10:00}

JW – It's a humanist movement, what they're stating is that ethics don't necessarily come from religion, ethics, moral behavior, being a good person, all ethics and morality can be trained, can be a part of you, their part of our whole being as human beings. So I got immersed in that and went to a camp one summer, I was 16 maybe, called the Encampment for Citizenship where they were trying to train us as leaders, community leaders, and they took us around to all these place. That's a long story but they had Eleanor Roosevelt come. I've still got the picture of all of us sitting around—I'm not in there because I was taking the picture of some of my classmates and Eleanor Roosevelt sitting and talking to them. And I was like that [*mouth hanging open*] with Eleanor Roosevelt. She was just…I'd never heard of a woman being so political, out in the open. She was just my idol, absolutely.

AR – Well, how did your father, or your family more generally, react to this?

JW – Well, my mother see, this is her rebellion, if you will…

AR – Through you?

JW – Yes. "Do this without telling your father." Oh yes. I didn't like it that either but if you wanted to get what you wanted in life in a patriarchy, you didn't rebel because then you got disapproval and your allowance cut, so you just did it anyway. I mean I had a mother who took me out for bacon and tomato sandwiches—don't tell your father. We would go on a Saturday; He would go to the temple, we would go for bacon and tomato sandwiches. So I learned this kind of subversive rebellion…to unjust rules. You can rebel against unjust rules. So I think these were all the seeds of rebelling against patriarchy. But I didn't have the word, of course, I didn't think of myself as rebelling, as much as having a good time.

So the Encampment for Citizenship, they sent us to one place, to something called the Wiltwyck School for Boys, which was someplace in upstate New York. It's very famous now, there's a bunch of books written about the psychiatrist—Family therapy started there, as I learned later; I used to teach family therapy. And they brought us little boys and we talked to them. These were little boys from New York City who were incorrigible, presumably. One little boy, eight years old, tried to commit suicide by jumping out the window, so just these awful, heartbreaking stories. So that was a life changing; maybe it was the whole encampment I don't know. Just the notion of being a community leader, and doing moral, good things for people. Of course now that I'm more Jewish than I was, this is the whole basis of Judaism!

AR – It's amazing how many feminist psychologists are Jewish.

JW – It's to repair the world, doing the good. So I do a lot of that now!

AR – Well, tell us about your education in psychology, what attracted you to psychology?

{13:26}

JW – So that's it, right there. "I'm going to spend my life helping little children in pain. This is wrong." So the next year I started college—Queen's College in New York. I applied to a lot of colleges but my father wouldn't pay. In those days all the city colleges, and there were five of them, were free. So I went to Queen's College. And I wanted to help little children, so what to you do? It's either sociology—there was no social work—or psychology. And I shouldn't say this in front of any sociologist listening to this but the sociology then was so vapid and bereft of research. And in the psych department we had a very famous psychologist named Gregory Razran, who was a student of Pavlov. And he followed Pavlov's little bell and dog research with …he was doing that kind of research with people, he would put a piece of cotton in your mouth to detect the GSR. It was very, very interesting, and he was fascinating and he loved psychology. He was this kind of wild Russian, if you will, but he was so exciting. And it was all research! He made fun of Rorschach, he said "This is a bunch of…" I just loved him. He and I really connected. And he pushed me through, in a sense. Or it was a carrot, a stick, more a carrot, to follow this brilliant man, as I thought. I said, sociology, that's a waste of time, I want to be a researcher and I want to help children, and that was going to be my career and that's how I got into psychology.

And so I decided, at the time I also married another student.

AR – Another psychology student?

JW – Yeah. No, he was actually a math student, but I was so excited about psychology and that was all I would talk about, so he decided to switch. So the two of us went to Ohio State both got our Ph.D. from Julian Robert.

AR – Well, it looks like, from your CV, and from what you're describing, that indeed, your initial turn on to psychology was research based. So how did you connect up with the….

JW – with the clinical? Well these poor little children, I wanted to help them. So I thought I'd be a child therapist. But then I had this brilliant experimenter, but we also had a really, really good clinical, a guy named Berchard, I forget his first name, who taught clinical. Very, very obsessive kind of guy, beautiful notes, and he really connected me to how you could help people. So later on I did some clinical research and tried to combine the therapy, the counseling or the helping part with research orientation. Not just helping but 'what's your evidence that it's any good?' Now a days evidence-based is the is the big word now, but it should have been the big word 50 years ago. It needs to be a bigger word.

AR – And you've worked, I saw from your CV, with Paul Mussen, who did work in child development.

JW – Yeah. Yeah. And I thought I was going to do something with children at the time. I did my masters with him and then he left.

{17:21}

AR – He went to the West Coast, I bet.

JW – UCLA, I think.

AR – Yeah. They had a couple of institutes for child development out there and I think he ended up at one of them.

JW – Yeah, I can't think of any… you're asking about discrimination, just to tie that to Paul. Paul was also Jewish. He told us stories, that when he first came, he couldn't—he looked very Jewish, too—he couldn't get an apartment. He was turned down all over. Columbus, Ohio. They would just say "We don't rent to Jews." It wasn't illegal, you could just say it. I think he said there was only about ten percent of the city—over here—so we, or they were segregated. Neither of my husbands was Jewish, so that's probably a statement.

AR – Well, tell us about your experiences in graduate school being a woman, being Jewish. What was that like? This was the '50s, right? Early '50s?

JW – Julian Robert was Jewish, too. So I don't know, maybe I gravitated to these two Jewish men. This department and my other department, and the four or five other departments that I worked in, never had a woman faculty. In my entering class, what Ohio State would do was take 20 people, all pretty high scorers, and all that. They would have what they called a fish fry once a year and they'd week them all out. Half of them it was just "Goodbye, you're not smart enough." It was terrible. At the end of the year everyone was worrying. So out of 20 I think eight or nine of us survived.

I think there was one other woman Jean Baker, she came out with me, she got her degree with me. All the others, and there were only two other women, out of twenty. So they didn't take women students. "Well Judy, we just had to take you because your scores were so high. But we don't think…" And this another favorite quote that I've repeated, I've repeated it to my kids, too "We don't think you'll ever do any research. We think you'll just go home, get your Ph.D. and go home and have babies and take care of the house." I love to tell my kids, I think I spent my whole life trying to prove to Julian Robert that I was not just, "just" a housewife. I don't mean to put down housewives but I think of my mother spending too much of her life being clean about everything. You know, scrubbing the carrot, a lot of nonsense people don't have to spend their time at. Ironing my father's underwear…I mean, I got married thinking I had to iron my

husband's handkerchiefs, his sheets, his underwear. And I did it! I didn't know. I didn't know what a wife was, outside of my mother was.

AR – At this point…so, when did you marry? Before grad school?

JW – Yes.

AR – So you were being a grad student, being married. How did that work out?

{20:33}

JW – Believe it or not, besides that…I was trying to be a wife, but he wasn't making me. I didn't know how to be a wife other than what my mother was doing. He was very egalitarian, he really was. He encouraged me to go to graduate school, I said "I just want to get a master's and then come home and have kids." "No, no, you're too smart." He encouraged me to get a doctorate. Actually Boyd McCanless was the one who encouraged me to get a doctorate.

AR – Did you have any other mentors at that time?

JW – I had good male mentors: Boyd McCanless, Paul Mussen. Jules Rotter was not a mentor, he was a tough guy who…I loved his theory, I admired him, I thought he was brilliant. But he was not a mentor in the sense of… he would criticize, he was not constructive. If you did not work on his theory… all the students, if you worked with him, then you had to work on his theory. And the other bee in that department was Kelly, who was a construct, role construct and didn't believe in reinforcement. I was big into reinforcement. I would think if you just reinforce these little kids and don't punish them, they'll all be okay. You know, a very naïve kind of at the time.

AR – This is a bit of a diversion, a bit of a tangent. Did you observe Kelly and Rotter interact at all?

{22:00}

JW – They didn't like each other. I don't know if I should say this for the public. They didn't like each other, they didn't respect…Jules didn't respect Kelly. It was like two different worlds in that department. Two different worlds. And aside from counseling, counseling was…I think we were very obnoxiously elitist in thinking that we were the top of the world. We were told that we were just the best.

So I worked with Jules because I loved that theory and it really fit with helping little kids to value themselves—he had a value expectancy reinforcement theory, which I still to some extent. Till I read Al Bandura, and added on the mirroring or the imitation kind of stuff. That really grabbed me. One trial learning, I loved it. So I integrated it. I think I was an early person with Meichenbaum, people like that with the cognitive social

learning theory, integrating cognition and social learning theory. And that is the way I do therapy. My books pretty much reflect that.

AR – Well, tell us how the process of bringing feminism to psychology occurred to you.

JW – So none of that… so you asked about mentors, all my mentors were men. And Boyd McCanless was a wonderful mentor, even though I didn't work with him. He was very supportive and always promoted me. My first book he threw my way. "Oh, Judy could do it." And no one had ever… who was I? I was nobody at the time. Anyway, feminism. We were giving papers, and I was doing research on… I had got very interested in children's self control, self regulation. And that was very much a kind of cognitive-social learning, not just someone reinforcing you from the outside but you being able to tell yourself "I can do it". Using positive expectations.

{24:29}

We did a piece of research and reported it at the Southeastern Psychological Association because we went to Kentucky and that was our area. And somebody came up to me, it was Barbara Wallston, and wanted me to get involved in AWP. And so I said "What's that?" And then Annette Brodsky came, so we had a bunch of feminist women down there. Ellen Kimmell was there, and the guy who was president-elect of SEPA at the time, I can't remember his last name, his first name was Ray. At the urging of some of these women he had set up a commission on women of the Southeastern Psychological Association. We were the only association in the country that had that. And we started making trouble! They asked me if I'd be a part of it and I didn't know any psychologist women. I didn't know any!

We didn't have any anyplace I went. My husband's first job…every job he went to, he first taught at Reid College, and then University of Iowa, and then Oklahoma State and Kentucky when we came, none of them ever had a woman in their department. When we were in Iowa there were several wives who had Ph.D.s—we could not teach anywhere in the university, they had a rule. They couldn't teach.

AR – You weren't allowed to teach either?

JW – No. So I met someone, Jane Noff, who was a psychologist working over in the psychiatric hospital—offered me a job as a research associate over there, and I did research with kids. One of my early publications on anxiety and Meprobamate something like that.

AR – Oh, I noticed that one.

JW – Oh my Lord! It was okay, you didn't have IRBs or conformed consent, and we were trying to look at the effects of Meprobamate on reducing anxiety in patients. And I was working on dependency. I was very interested in dependency at the time, I forget

why. Oh! The social psychology, if the first person says "No, this stick is longer than that one" and the next one says…

AR – Yeah, the conformity studies.

JW – Yeah, the conformity kind of things. I was interested in that as it related to dependent personality. But anyway, the theory would be that after someone saw everyone else disagree with them, they would get very anxious. And how would giving them Meprobamate reduce that anxiety. As I recall it was something like that. It was shocking! Good grief!

AR – Well, how did you react at the time, do you remember, when you would encounter these situations where you couldn't teach simply because you were the wife of a …I mean, how did that impact you at the time, what were your thoughts about that at the time?

{27:40}

JW – I don't think I was as angry about it as I was later. What feminism did for women like me was raise our consciousness about the personal is political. Not that they used the word at all. But what was happening to me in five places was not that Judy wasn't smart, which after a while you think "Gee, I guess I'm not good enough" right? In five places they weren't hiring me? Not that I wasn't smart but that there was a structure, there was something going on. What was it? So that's when we began to use the word patriarchy. And then when I joined the Commission on Women then we began to look at, and I was a part of a study, I think we published it somewhere or other, I can't remember anymore, on looking the percentage of women on university faculties of the South. And it was minuscule everyplace. Very, very few women anyplace. Here and there would be *one* woman. I think that was a beginning.

Let me get back to that. Coming into the group, there was a second thing I learned. Coming into the group one day eating lunch with this group, I think there were eight of us. And they started telling stories. And I think three or four of them started telling rape stories. I had never ever heard a woman say she was raped. And it just hit me like a ton of bricks, here are all these intelligent, brilliant women who they let some guy into fix the laundry machine and before you know it they are getting raped. And they were talking about it.

I don't publicize it but I was an incest victim from the age four on till I was14, and I had never told anyone. Ever, ever. Except telling the person I who was doing it, to stop it when I was 14. So listening to these women talk about it made it, number one, made it awareness that this was rape, this wasn't just playing around. And number two, you could talk about it, it was okay. And number three, that it wasn't your fault. So all the things that we now know about healing following sexual abuse I began to learn there. And that was one of the most empowering things that happened to me.

And all women SEPA Commission on Women. I got very close to some of those women, I just met Jackie Reznick when I got lost coming here, and Jackie was on that too. So just a bunch of wonderful women. So that was my first association with women psychologists and they were all doing feminist things. We did not use that word, we were talking about 'gutsy women.' Annette Brodsky was there, she was at the University of Alabama when Ray Fowler was chair. And Annette came up to me and said "How would you like to be the Midwest coordinator for feminist therapy?" And I said "What's that?" And that was maybe, I'll give you a date, maybe 1972.

Now I did something feminist before that but I didn't have a name for it. And that was with my first husband, we were sitting at the table 1968-69, some time around there, when the ERA amendment first came up. And I said "Wow! Look at this! This is what we need!" And I got very angry and very excited about it. He was a very smart man, but also argumentative, so he was let's start an argument about this. "Women have more rights. More men get executed than women in the United States." And I would say "That's true but it doesn't make it…" Anyway, I said. "Let's prove…" whatever, I forget what we were proving. But we did a study, a large study on women and men who either

{32:02)

supported or opposed the Women's Liberation Movement. And he was very supportive of it. And we developed a bunch of scales, authoritarianism and we devised a scale of "Do you believe that women should do all the childcare and men do the work…" Kind of early kinds of things, those kind of questions. And low and behold, the only difference of women supporters from nonsupporter was that they were more autonomous, more independent. That was on a PRF, a personality research form. And so I decided we're going to politicize this. And so I got an attorney, a Civil Rights attorney friend of mine, and then we got Barbara somebody, I can't remember her name, a very well known economist. Someone gave me her name, and she was at University of Maryland at the time. And then Al and Bernice Lott, since we knew them. We said "How would you like to be discussants on this?" They had already moved to Rhode Island, they used to be at Kentucky. So they did a little study of their own. We gave this wonderful symposium—filled the halls. This was one of the early symposiums on looking at Women's Liberation.

And then I got interested in the ERA, of course. And then we tried, SEPA commission tried very hard to get the states—there were 11 states in the Southeastern Psychological Association—to get them not to meet in any state that had not ratified the amendment. Well, number one, 99 percent of them men anyway, at the time, and two, "We just can't find a place to meet that's big enough for us all." Now it was 3,000 at the most, I'm sure they could have found someplace.

So that was the beginning of the first time I heard 'feminist' combined with 'therapist.' So I asked Annette, so Annette gave me something to read that she'd written and maybe she and Rachel Hare-Mustin, I can't remember. I became really close friends with them.

So I went home and I did little studies, and I got myself on the board of the Kentucky Psychological Association. I said "I want to start a commission on women here." And I started that. And we did a study, very interesting, asking, we didn't even say "Are you feminist?", I said "Are you a feminist supportive?" And got some really nasty returns from men. Nasty comments. Oh yeah, oh yeah, a lot of backlash. Susan Faludi, wasn't she the one who wrote the book *Backlash*?

AR – What about your evolution as a feminist therapist? Tell us about…

JW – So that was the beginning of it. And so then I started…there was a Women's Center starting at University of Kentucky, very early about that same time, early '70s sometime. So I joined it and I said "I want to start a feminist counseling referral service here." So some woman wants a woman to be her therapist, and someone who understands feminist—woman centered, I wasn't even using … no, I *was* using the word feminism. I was. So then we found some women Louisville who actually came in and I had meetings once a month. And of course feminist therapy was evolving. As I understood it at the time, it was acknowledging women, and the personal was political. So it was those early consciousness-raising groups that were evolving as they went, and developing "What does feminism mean? What is feminist therapy?" And of course it is still evolving and changing, and by now there's not just one feminist therapy, there's many. But over time I think I developed, I integrated my tenets of feminism as I understood it with my cognitive-social learning approach to develop the package that was finally the book that I wrote with Pam Remer. And she's not anywhere near cognitive, she's got psychodrama, which is…if I say this publicly, she wouldn't like it. I love her dearly but…

AR – It was far away from your comfort zone…

{36:56}

JR – Thank you. Thank you. It was very far and it's not as research based as I would like. And of course what appeals to me about cognitive and social learning theories in general is that they are amenable to research. So it was easy for us to trash psychoanalysis in those days because they were not very research-based, but I didn't feel psychodrama was either. But Pam's a very, very good clinician, so that's where… I feel I did more of the research base for that book and the whole research base of feminist therapy, and she's very good at developing exercises to do. Well, that's what psychodrama's about. I'm not good at that kind of thing. But she's good at it. So the two of us our minds just clicked in an interesting way, it's like opposites in a marriage. Like my current marriage, I'm pretty radical and my current husband's a very traditional accountant-banker. How do we ever get along? I don't know. But we balance out each other's whatever.

So it evolved, it evolves, the more that you read, the more that you meet people… But culling out what I did and didn't agree with. And the Stone Center stuff did not appeal to me, in the least. I didn't see any research base of it, and my life, as I grew up, relationships were not the cornerstone of everything. I was taught to be a thinking, activist person and weigh—there's a famous saying: 'Every time there's two Jews

together, there's three opinions.' If you're not Jewish you may not have heard that, it's a very famous sentence, you know, they love to argue. It's "On the other hand look at it this way…" that kind of thing. I really like that approach not as a Jew but as a way saying there are many different ways to look at almost any question. So that's my training. So this everything's relational just didn't connect to who I am. So that's not my kind of theory. Psychoanalytic theory was obviously very, penis envy and that kind of stuff. I was told that by somebody, that was their opinion of women who wanted a career, we just wanted to be another man. I didn't want to be a man.

The other thing that feminism brought to me, going back to SEPA, was meeting absolutely wonderful women. Because before that, the only women that I knew were faculty wives, and none of them could teach, certainly. So they were all non-working wives. When I first came to Kentucky, I found another job in counseling psychology, and in my husband's department, my first husband's department in psychology "Well, what do you do with your children when you work?" and all this kind of stuff, and they didn't connect to me. So here come these women psychologists, and I begin get another view of women, and love women more. That's part of my feminist therapy, to teach women to love themselves and love other women.

AR – So you got really connected to a community of people that you hadn't been connected to before, through your…

JW – Oh, absolutely! These feminist women became my family, if you will. So then how I got into 35 was Barbara Wallston, bless her heart, she died so young, it was really tragic. But she was president of 35. I was living in Kentucky and she was at Knoxville, at Peabody. And she asked me if I would come down and chair a task force, I wasn't active in 35, but we'd she'd met me at SEPA, at the commission on women. Would I come down and chair a task force on *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, the journal? She said it's not doing well, and we can't sell it, and people aren't buying it. What do we need? And so I said "We need a committee." And I didn't know many women, I just knew a few famous names. At this point I can only think of one and that's Martha Mednick, she was one of the early, early people. Anyway, so I got this group of people and we went down there. And right away it just seemed to me clear, why don't why tie the journal, which was really, really good, tie it into membership? This is your reward for being a member. So that I'm very proud of, you ask me the things I'm proud of. I'm very proud of what we did with that journal. And we elevated it, I think, to the leading journal for research on women, well, one of the leading, I think there are some other good ones. I'm very proud of that journal. And of course I eventually got to be editor, but that's another story.

AR – Well, that's what I was going to ask next, it seems connected. Tell us about your term as editor, what you wanted to see happen, what your mandate was. But I also want you to maybe put it all in context, in terms of where you see the journal now, where you want to see it go. Anyway I'm going to leave it pretty open, but your term as editor, what did you want to do?

JW – Well, I had been editing before. Because I was the associate editor of the Journal *Consulting and Clinical* and I took all the clinical things, I was the only associate editor, so it was a very heavy responsibility. And at the end of his term, Brendon Maher, who was the editor, asked if I could recommend people in each of our major areas who would write a summary article of the field as it was. And in the area of sex roles or gender, I said "I don't know anybody" and he said "How about you?" So except for Janet Spence and Sandy…

AR – Tangri?

JW – Isn't that awful? Now this is what happens, pulling names…Sandy Bem! And Sandy if you ever watch this I'm sorry I couldn't remember your name. They were two of the few people who were doing research on gender. So I wrote an article on the relationship between sex roles and mental health basically. I called it well being, I didn't like the word mental health. I still don't, because health is not just mental, we're a whole body of everything.

{43:58}

So that gave me a lot of experience with editing. And then in one of the meetings I became friendly with other people editing. I said "I just don't see how I could do all that." Oh, Nancy Henley. I said "I could never do that." She said "Sure you could." I didn't feel I could run a whole journal, it just seemed so intimidating to me.

AR – To kind of be the steward of the journal, or…

JW – Well, I saw when they came to the EC and gave these reports, and it just seemed like more than I could deal with, and do all of my teaching and take care of my three—I have three children. That's one of your other questions, but yeah, I was dealing with all that at the same time. Anyway she said yes, and then Ellen Kimmel asked if I would be on the search committee to get a new editor. And I guess Ellen must have been president at the time, as well as I can remember. And of course I had known Ellen from way back on SEPA Commission on Women, which she chaired. So I said sure and I must have asked twenty people and nobody wanted to be the editor. And so I called Ellen and just said "I can't do this, nobody wants this." And I'd asked women who had at least published enough that they would understand the publication process. And I asked a lot of women who were on the editorial boards, as a matter of fact. And she said, "Judy, why don't you do it?" And I said "Oh, I couldn't do it!" Long story short, she says "Sure you could." So I think I needed a lot of encouragement to go ahead say I'm good enough to do something like that. So I said yes, and it went on from there on.

I made a lot of friends and some enemies when I took it over, because in good New York style, I tend to be pretty blunt. I don't think that's a good word—I'm direct. I'm not the Southern kind, I mean I meet this a lot in the South. "You all come see us sometime."

AR – Yeah, it's all very indirect.

JW – Absolutely, absolutely. "Darling, I'm so glad to see you!" Well, maybe they are, maybe they're not. But I don't ever say that unless I mean it. I say 'hi' if I don't like a person. I'm not going to be rude. But I don't put on things that I don't feel, let's put it that way. So I took some people off the board who thought they should be on the board. And it had to do, maybe, with their feeling of entitlement. Now these were all women, at that time, but I used the ratings, all the associate editors, we had a rating system, and I forget what it was right now, but it had to do with timeliness—how quickly did the board reviewers get things in and how good the reviews were, I don't know there were three or four things. And if they didn't at least get a four out of five, whatever the rating system was, I can't recall, I just decided to rotate them off. And these are people who had been on a long time, and that's what I mean by entitlement. You're there you think you're supposed to stay there. And I was raised with competence is what matters, it's not privilege, it's competence. Of course later I learned, as the culture started to change, that I had white privilege, which I never knew. So I began to learn about that privilege; I always knew I had middle class privilege. And I suppose I always know I had white privilege in a sense, since my high school was in Harlem, with an obvious divide between blacks and whites. But using privilege appealing to myself, that was quite a learning experience.

AR – Well, how did that happen, that awareness of white privilege and the way it was enacted in your own life?

JW – Well, I think it began with women of color in psychology saying "Hey, look at us! Who do you think you are? You're leaving us out of the picture!" At the time I had a number of women of color on the board, on the editorial board, and one who had never ever reviewed an article, maybe because it wasn't her area. And she'd been on for years and years, and I just took her off, and that's what got people angry. But I wrote a nice letter saying "We're just rotating people off, we've got to get new blood in here…" So somewhere in there I began to get the awareness, I guess from people talking to me. Being outraged and confronting me with it. So you get confronted and you have to think about it. If someone thinks I am, it doesn't mean I am, but trying to understand it and coming to terms with that.

So I began to institute various things in the journal, that they couldn't use the word subjects, so I began to integrate a more feminist approach into what we understood at the time. But I was still pretty empirical, if you really had very qualitative research, like ten people in a group and you did… "I saw four themes in here and this is what it all means." That didn't fly for me, at all. So I think I got some people angry at that, too.

But going back to wanting to be more feminist in terms of treating the subjects as participants, rather than subjects, changing the terminology, I had everyone change that. Being more sensitive to cultural difference, and so they had to report how many of minorities were in the samples. And I think that was a consciousness-raising thing, because "Oh my goodness! We just don't have any blacks in the sample! We have maybe two blacks." Making people aware that this is a *white* middle class sample, and they

should say it, that's fine. If that's what you have, just mention it. But then what are the implications of that? So I would have all my associate editors ask for implications of—you can't generalize to other samples. So I think we were one of the first journals to push that. I subsequently got on, after I stopped being editor, the Publication and Communication, the P&C board, and I was eventually chair of that. I tried very hard to even get people to put more minority reviewers on—"Oh, we just can't find any." It was just like how they couldn't find a qualified woman when I couldn't get …[intelligible]

So I really did try to find…I didn't have a very good network, minority women didn't have a good network at the time, or if they did, I didn't know about it. So I met them, I heard about people, I would send them an article to review, and I did get some more on. Probably not as many as I could have if I'd had better networks at the time, but I think it was just the beginning of awareness.

I changed the whole—if you take the inside cover, of what the journal's about, I changed 'Journal of Women' to 'this is a journal of feminist psychology.' I didn't change the name of it because we're the division Psychology of Women.

AR – Were you at all involved in the decision making around that name or was that before you were involved in 35? The choice of Psychology of Women, as opposed to, say, Feminist Psychology?

JW – I heard about it but…I know they never would have gotten it through if it had been Feminist Psychology. Never.

AR – So they wouldn't have gotten it through APA council?

JW – [Shakes her head no]. Or the Board of Directors. Because they were trying to be *scientific*. And feminism is not sci…

AR – It's political.

JW – Well, it is. But look at the council now, look at all the social activism. That's what we are, political. I was reading the Annual something and all the amicus briefs that we put out. And they're all political. They're all in defense of some minority kind of person. And that's social activism. That's political. Of course they use science to support it, but even so.

So what did I try to do with the journal? I looked back at the special issues to see what hadn't been dealt with. So my first special issue…there was nothing on 'Women at Midlife and Beyond.' I didn't call it older women, because I was middle life and beyond, so okay. I see Joan Chrisler just put out a nice book on women at fifty. It's an interesting transition period. So we did that and there was very little. I put out a call, there was just no research on that. With Division 20…I don't think Division 20 was very organized in terms of women's aging. It was *aging*. Now this recent book that I published, that's one of my proudest accomplishments. The one that I put out with Carol Goodheart because

we have a section on older women. It's got eight chapters on older women, having to do with health and safety, wellbeing and taking care of yourself, women as caretakers, a lot of good stuff like that.

So then what are your social issues? What is important to you? Another one of my mentors, you asked me about mentors, I had mentors once I got involved in SEPA. I mentioned Barbara Wallston, Annette Brodsky, Ellen Kimmel, I think were three primary ones in terms of their thinking. Then I also met Rhoda Unger and for me, Rhoda, she didn't mentor me so much as we're friends and I admire her thinking tremendously. I've told her this, but I just think she's brilliant in terms of how she conceptualizes feminism and political, like she's got a book called *Feminism and Politics*, something like that, that's just Rhoda, and she does it so well. And she became a mentor to me as well. So I said "Rhoda, why don't you do a special issue, what would you like?" And she had something, it was culture.

{55:44}

And the final special issue, now these are the things that I liked doing, besides moving the whole feminist…keeping it to what I thought in those days was good science, at the same time moving it in the direction of feminism, was to deal with issues that hadn't been dealt with, and the special issues can do that. The final special issue was on what I called transformations. And I think I did invite each associate editors to choose their area and write a summary piece about where, how feminism has transformed that area of psychology. Joy Rice did one on motherhood, as I recall. I honestly don't remember all of them. And then I had a little article on transforming research with gender and I had like forty things we could change in terms of how we do research that integrates and considers gender. And I consider that very important. I didn't invent most of these ideas and none of us do. We stand on the shoulders of somebody else and we walk in their footsteps or we walk alongside and we listen and we learn. And then we add our own little piece, and each of us has a genius inside of us that adds something on. Hopefully, at least all the women I know, they all have a little bit of genius and they go on and they add something. I integrate; I'm a good integrator.

AR – I've noticed that in reading some of your work, you bring a lot of different things together, and put it together in a way that both organizes it and maybe sheds a bit of a different light on it.

JW – I'm glad you've observed that. I like to do that, it's fun. I'm not a detail person, I like to pull things together and find commonality and disparate things.

AR – You keep referring to, I've noticed a few times, "What I thought then was good science" I'm curious, you've described yourself as…traditional is too strong a word maybe, but someone who was trained in a very traditional experimental tradition in psychology, but then you kept saying, that's what I though of as good science…

JW – I used to defend a positivist…

AR – Positivism. Which doesn't leave a whole lot of room for values and…

JW – And I just reviewed a book for SPSSI called *A Handbook of Feminist Research* by a woman named Hesse-Biber, who's a sociologist, and it's something like forty, twenty to thirty chapters going over various types of research and how they integrate feminism and a lot of it is positivist and empirical but of course a lot of it is qualitative and talking about different kinds of qualitative research and talking about how you can use qualitative. I've just learned more about qualitative research and I'd say the last maybe 15 years ago or so I've started doing more qualitative research with my students. If they would collect a survey or something I would say, let's talk to some people or get more of an interview approach to connect to that so I started moving in the direction of integrating them both.

AR – Why did you feel that that was an important thing to do?

{59:28}

JW – Because you're looking at women's experience and not your own. Not all the questionnaires that I developed in my life I'm that proud of, because I developed them from the outside, rather than…

AR – From your vantage point without…

JW – Like I have a parent behavior inventory that's still used, that I developed with my first husband, 30-40 years ago, that's been in a lot of use. But we did collate parent behaviors that were mentioned in the research, the clinical research: what do parents complain about? But we didn't actually interview any parents right now although I was a child therapist for a number of years, and so I had a lot of that stuff in my head, but I didn't directly go to a group of parents and how about parents from different ethnic groups, that just never occurred to me at the time. So I became more interested in how culture and identity interface. My more recent book, Pam and I revised that book, and it's almost…I just said to her, it's five years, let's revise it. But the second one is almost an entirely new book, it's entirely different. The publishers wanted the same title, so we just left the title on, but we added diversity, because it really is diversity.

AR – Well, tell me about the empowerment model that you've put forth. Why empowerment? How did that come to be that kind of a term?

JW – Interesting question. I don't know. I don't know where it came from…my presidential address, when I was president of 35, was on empowerment and I've done a lot of research looking at what everyone says about empowerment. So someplace along the way I picked up the notion of empowerment and I can't tell you where I got it from. Obviously I did not invent the word. The closest I can come way back when Bill Clinton was president, they set up Empowerment Zones in Los Angeles after the … I think they started up the word mostly, when I started looking up the history of it, there were

Empowerment Zones, and they used it for poor people, African Americans, people disenfranchised, in a sense. And with people in mental facilities, or disabled or mentally challenged, if you will. You don't just give them the rules, you empower them to develop their own rules and therefore they aren't going to throw trash out the window, that kind of notion, if they own it, then they're not going to trash it, they're going to take responsibility. So someplace along there we must have picked up the notion of empowering women, that women didn't have any power.

But of course it clearly comes from feminist theory about what's the matter with society. And that is patriarchy, has all to do with power. And you never dislodge power without a revolution. So I really think that feminism is a revolution. It has been, little by little. Revolutions go undercover for a while, after they either maybe get squelched and discouraged, or if they get a little bit of what they want, like women got the vote. "Oh, oh, look we're all wonderful now, we have everything we want!" But then we discover we don't. So then we have to build up our dissatisfaction again until it all erupted with Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem and those people coming out and reminding us that we don't have the power yet. If you recall that, it wasn't a lot written about power, it wasn't

{63:48}

Jan Yoder talking about power. It's power over, it's power to do things for ourselves. So that's when I began to thing about feminist therapy as a way to empower women, to believe in themselves to not integrate all the messages—therapy has to deal a lot with the messages you got as a child. Who told you you couldn't do anything? You hear me say, at many points in my life, and I suspect many of us do that "Oh, I couldn't do that." One of the very proudest things—I'll get back to this, but I have to digress for just a moment or I'll forget it—the proudest thing I have done, I think, was to encourage and empower women that they could get a degree, that they're smart, they could get a Ph.D. You can not believe how many women would come in "I just want to get a master's so I can get a job." I saw myself 40 years before saying it. But I had men to tell me "Oh, yes, you're smart, you can do it." But women are still believing this, 40 years later! So convincing women, that yes, you can do it and I'll support you, and the nice thing that we were able to do in empowering students now, is to help them understand that their lives are important and not doing someone else's research, or following something that I read in *Psych Bulletin* or *Psych Review*, that's really important, I think I should be doing that. No! Should you be doing Judy Worell's research? No, not unless it really grabs you. You do what's relevant to your life. So then you had women doing things related to their life: sexual assault, domestic violence—we use the word domestic loosely, male violence against women—things like this, because they could tune into their own experiences and relate to what their own experiences were, and they did better work because of it. So that's part of empowerment.

So the model came little by little, reading and thinking. Pam and I wrote that first book, the second one too, we met every week, for lunch, for two years. To talk, just talk. And what do you think of this, and we drummed ideas back and forth. But then the empowerment model just came to me, I don't know, it developed gradually, as ideas do, I

think. And I never really tested the whole thing. One of the greatest griefs of my life is that I'm not going to live long enough to go ahead and test the whole thing. We tested part of it; I developed a scale based in part on it but the scale is very rudimentary and really needs a lot of work. One of my doctoral students took it and factor analyzed it. And she said, "Okay, Judy, we need three more items for each one of these subscales." and Judy never did that so… well, because I don't have doctoral students anymore, it's very hard to work on your own, if you don't have any resources. No university behind you, you don't have doctoral students, I guess I could do it if I were very, very resourceful, which I'm not feeling like doing anymore.

AR – Well, you've got a few other irons in the fire, too. But tell us about your experience of training students, teaching and to be counselors. There's been a lot written lately, and Tera actually knows more about this than I do, about the backlash against feminism, the reluctance of young women today—and by young women I'm referring to Tera, and to some extent people just a bit younger than me—who are really unwilling to adopt the label feminist to describe their identities. What has been your experience working with some of these young women, and mentoring them, about their relationship to feminism and what your role has been in maybe mentoring that?

{68:09}

JW – Well, Pam and I taught in the same department for many years and feminist is emblazoned on her forehead. I really feel that you have to work with… and that's one of your questions, I never advise anyone to put themselves in a risky place from which they can't extricate themselves comfortably, or cope comfortably with what's there, without taking too many risks. That has to do with what do you do with a woman who is experiencing partner abuse at home? How does she deal with it? What are you going to help her to do? So it always has to do with what are the risks in your life, what's of importance to you. And if it's really important to you to be a feminist and to say you are and to do feminist kinds of research, maybe you had better get out of that department. I mean that's what I would tell somebody, this is not the place for you. I had a lot of students early on coming from psychology, I was on a lot of psychology committees early on. And I of course encouraged them to do real research, with real people out there, not testing some social psychology theory—and I'm not making fun of theory, because I think that has to be the basis of everything—but not just testing theories, but how does that affect real people? Doing a survey, they didn't like that in psychology, so little by little I stopped getting students from there. They were not encouraging their students to come with me. But for each student I said, and particularly this one who was lesbian but wasn't out in her department, she was wanting to do something on lesbians coming out at work and at home, at school and family, and things like that. So I asked her if you're going to do this, and your asked "Are you a lesbian?" in your department, are you going to be comfortable saying this in your department. So that's what I'm talking about. What happened was that little by little in that department gay and lesbian people did not feel comfortable doing that. So I try to work with people with what they feel comfortable with.

I'm very nonplussed, and I would say discouraged, with that. But I think that women now days think they have it all. And the difference between women who have it all, a good job, dudda dudah, is that they're more likely to be queen bees, not helping other women. And a hallmark of feminism is helping other women to get to where you are. If you're so good help other women to get there. And so being a good mentor. One of the most important things in my whole professional life was being a mentor of women. I was mentored by Barbara Walston, and I would say Annette Brodsky in a way, I don't know if Annette knows she mentored me. But I was in the sense of them opening my eyes to things I hadn't seen before and supporting me. And I think that's really important for women to do. So for young women, I believe that they think they can get a good job and as good a salary as anyone else. And I'm here to tell them that some of them can't, and I think most of them can't still. If you look at women's salaries at the University of Kentucky, still, women are paid less than men. Or that highly paid areas, like engineering, for example. They've struggled to find women engineers and I had a women do her doctorate with me who used to be an engineer. "Why aren't you an engineer anymore, Jan? What got you out of that?" She said "I'd get into the worksite and all the men would be making dirty jokes. Then I'd go into the trailer on the worksite and it'd have all these pictures of naked women in it. I just couldn't deal with that kind of atmosphere." So again, making choices about what you're comfortable with. I really think most women think that they can get a good job and have everything they want, or,

{72:40}

"I can stay home and find a rich man." There's more of that now, that in women; that does bother me. But I really think that has to do with reality, I don't fault those women at all. Till the workplace…if you ask me where feminism is going, I think we have to work on the workplace and make it more flexible and family friendly, or you're never going to encourage women, or minorities either, to feel comfortable there. And women just say, "Why should I put up with this? Why not just stay home?"

AR – Right. Well, tell us a little bit about how you've balanced—some people don't like that word—how you have negotiated your personal responsibilities, family responsibilities and being professional, being a psychologist. You've had three kids, two marriages? How have you been able to negotiate that?

JW – Probably three words, but I'll start with the two and get to the third. The first word is a lot of compromise and not in a good way. Second word: a lot of difficulties, and the third word is a lot of giving up of myself. Rather than saying 'I'm as important as you. I'm going to go get the job." I didn't do this and that pretty much began to lead to my divorce. He was always dissatisfied with every job and that's true, in a sense. Every job has good things and things you don't like about it. And he couldn't tolerate the 'I don't like' part. And in the '40s, somewhere in there, he said "I'm going to go to Arizona" or someplace, and I said "Well, you can go without me. I'll go get my own job." And that was the first time I had ever said anything like that. That I'm as important as you, and I'm not going to follow you anymore and pick up the piddling little job. Because what was happening was simply reality: they were not hiring women. When we first went to the

University of Kentucky, he went as chair, and I was allowed to teach one class. And when I got my paycheck, it was what the graduate students were getting. I had a Ph.D. and five or ten publications already! So I just said 'forget this' and went around in other departments and finally found jobs other places, that also had never had another woman. So it was a lot of struggle. Bernice Lott and her husband, Bernice was in the same position and Bernice went out and got a job at Kentucky State College, which is about 30 miles away. So she had a lot of traveling to do, and it was not a highly esteemed place the way University of Kentucky was, and it was almost an all black college, so it had almost no prestige at all, if you're thinking about prestige, if that's important to you. But Bernice always takes it and runs with it and of course she was very egalitarian in those days. I learned a lot from Bernice, too. Anyway, so Bernice went there and I went here and so we kind of worked around. And she has three also, we both did the same thing, kind of worked around it and then when our kids grew up we could finally get a grown up job.

And also my first husband, although he encouraged me initially to get a doctorate, when it interfered with his… because I could help him, be a helpmate, we worked together, we did research together, we studied together. But then if he's going to go off and be a professor, and I am going to stay at home with the kids then "That's your job, you just go do that." Or "We'll get a grant together" –which we did, we got a couple federal grants, large ones—"and you'll do the research and help me write it and I'll get the grants since I'm at the university." Well, that didn't …I did that for a while because I didn't have any

{76:59}

choices. I also had a private practice, 'cause I was a clinician. And I discovered that private practice was not evidence-based. I didn't use that word at the time, but it was very dissatisfying because I would see these families, and "I think you ought to do this with the kid" and I had worked at a children's hospital when I was at Ohio State. And you send them out and you don't know whether what you told them had any effect, and they don't come back and you call them up and they didn't want to talk about it, whatever. I wasn't satisfied with that, that's really when I really decided I needed to go into research to find out what's going on, not just tell people what to do or help them. And that's the way I supervise students also. "How do you know she's less anxious?" "Well, she says she is." "How does she know she is?" Even students just dug their heels in and didn't want to be more empirical, as I would see it, about their research. Give her a scale, give her an anxiety scale every other week, see what's happening, that sort of thing.

So negotiating this, I think that Bernice and I and many women of that ilk…and I remember, my kids asked me, do you ever regret that you had children? And in my head there are times when I did. I would never tell them that. I didn't regret that I had *them* but looking at a few women—I won't mention their names—who were very big in the field, who I admired very much, who never had kids, and I think in those days, things being the way they were, having children a liability unless you really had egalitarian parenting, egalitarian house work, etc. Which is still a struggle for many people. I don't think many marriages, including most that I know of psychologists, where the male, even though he

believes he's trying—can I put it that way?—and maybe he does try, but there's just a difference and women are just socialized to feel guilty when they go off to work and men are not socialized to feel guilty when they go off to work. It's as simple as that. And it's not just a Jewish mother's guilt, it's every mother's guilt. I worked hard with students to help them not to feel that way, but they do anyway. So getting back to why women don't want to call themselves feminists, there's a lot of negative to it. Other women, what ever reason, other women look down at you, they get a little bit scared. You're going to be an angry woman.

AR – Tell us…I want to make sure I cover some… so I'm going to jump around a bit, but I am going to make sure we answer some of the questions we've been trying to ask most everyone for this project. What do you think, in your view, what has feminism psychology accomplished and also what remains to be done, or what do you see as the future?

JW – I think feminist psychology has changed the face of psychology. I'm very, very proud of that. Not me proud, but proud of us that we have opened the door for so many people to come in. We've invited people in who were not part of the party and we've made them legitimate. The Office of Women's Affairs, Gwen Kadith did a fantastic job on that, insisting with the Women's Caucus, always putting women's names up, that's been a constant, constant in APA, so by having more women's names up…I tried, when I was a chair, when I was on the P & C Board, to get more women editors and it was hard. And I was the only woman on that board for seven years, until we finally got Nora Newcombe, I think. Until then I was the only woman, and when I

{81:21}

mentioned some women's names the men would say "Ugh! She's too this or she's too that." So they would thumbs down on it. But getting women into APA changed the flavor of what men believed about women, what's to be studied, we're now studying all kinds of different things than we were before. I'm not sure how much we helped with other cultures and other sexual orientation, but I think it's there because I remember asking some women in 35 why they belonged here, instead of in 44 or 45, and one person said—and I won't say that is true of 44 and 45— one person said "well, it's not woman-oriented, it's about *them* and not about us." And so I just think the psychology of women…

[First Tape Ends]

So by bringing women into the pipeline, we give other women hope. And hope is one of those things that sustains everybody. It's a very, very important concept to me. So we bring other women hope, that they too could be somebody to get someplace. We've opened up topics that were not allowed, like rape, like incest, date rape, sexual harassment. I started, because somebody else told me about it, I started the first sexual harassment code at the University of Kentucky. And when I went to the Dean of Students' office and said we need a sexual harassment code, because students were

coming to me complaining, he said "No one ever complained to me." And I said because there's no word, no one uses that word because it's okay for men to have a stable of females—I didn't say it like that then, I'm saying it now—we need use that word to define that word, define what it means and what students can do if they think they have, and set up… And he said "Well, I'll look into it." He went to a dean's meeting subsequently and discovered that ten other universities had codes already. He started asking, he comes back with all these codes. "Ok, we're going to set up a committee!" And I was very, very pleased with that. So that's the kind of thing we've done. We've made people aware of things happening to women that don't happen to men, well, they do happen to men, that's not fair, but they happen to women at a higher rate.

{2:32}

Feminism has certainly changed people's attitudes towards women at work, in universities getting more women in the pipeline. The fact that I was the first and only woman in five departments is not right, it's not good. And I think it has stopped. I think more women are getting jobs that are not just secretaries. I don't mean that in a demeaning way, I mean that in a limiting way. If that's what you want to do, fine, but if that ceiling is right there, we all know the glass ceiling. So I think we've upped the glass ceiling a little bit, the more that we have to do is we have to change things at work. And we've opened up research topics that were never opened up. Look at this whole thing on violence that Jackie White is doing and Alan Kazdin is running with it and this is going to be a big thing, now it's his presidential initiative. Oh my goodness Alan Kazdin, were you ever interested before? And I admire Alan tremendously, I used to use his books when I would teach therapy, but where you ever interested in women before? No. And violence? No. But now that Jackie brings it up and you see the importance of it…So I think that we have done that much and we I think we have changed men tremendously. We've changed women in many, many ways, we've opened women's eyes to the possibilities in life. Whether they want to take it or not, that's their choice, but they are possible. We've changed men in that they now have to look at

{3:21}

women differently, hopefully. Using certain words to women just isn't acceptable. And I hate to say this, this is political: all political candidates are named by their last name, except the woman, who is always called by her first name. And we just saw it last night, I was saying "When are they going to call her Mrs. Clinton?" or Clinton did this, Clinton did that, instead of "Oh, *Hillary*." And it's a total put-down. We haven't changed all men. But we've changed the men in psychology, certainly. Do you think there would be a Division 51 if it weren't for us? No. You take someone like Ron Levant, who I asked to write a chapter on my book on psychology of men, because all of a sudden they don't have to be macho, they can be nurturing, and they are changing the face of masculinity. And I see hypermasculinity as one of the most damaging things in the whole world, look at all the bloodshed in the world. If we could just change all that hypermasculinity…so it's changed psychology in that way, and I think its changed men in other ways too, there are other men who are adapting, not just in psychology, that feminism, because they

demanded that they be people along with all the other people, have changed the way in which people interact with one another. So it's been a revolution, that's all I can say. I can't think of anything it hasn't changed, except it hasn't changed enough. It hasn't changed the workplace enough, so it's not family friendly yet in many, many ways, I can't go into all that; we still make less than men. It hasn't changed the violence, I mean, there's still trafficking in women and children, just unbelievable. Rape, isn't necessarily a reproductive strategy anymore, it's a war strategy, it's a violence. It's just getting worse and worse. I don't know when we are ever going to change some things. Are we ever going to change the cultures around the world that put women down here and cover them with burkas? That's a cultural thing…I just don't know.

AR – What do you think feminist psychology can…what advice would you give feminists who are in psychology, young feminists entering psychology? What advice would you give them for the future?

JW – About what?

AR – About how they can be feminist psychologists.

JW – My favorite words are 'follow your passion.' What makes work…there's a very famous article I used from many, many years ago called 'How to turn work into play', how to make people enjoy the work that they're doing. And I love my work, I love it. I love psychology, it feeds me And I think that's the way that you do it, you turn your work into play by following your passion. And that has to do with where you want to live in the country, and that wasn't important to me, or I'd be by the ocean right now. Or if it's being in a big university, small university, whatever it is, but whatever makes you passionate, and in academia it has to do with the topics you're researching—you're passionate about history, I'm not a historian at all but I can understand that. That's what keeps you going, and that's what makes it fun, makes you want to get up in the morning. You have to have a job that makes you want to get up in the morning. Maybe not right away but eventually, and you want to go to work and most of what you're is fun and you

{7:24}

enjoy it. I couldn't believe when I first got a regular professor job, that someone was paying me to sit and read a journal. I couldn't believe it. Cause I used to sit at home and nobody paid me when I read the journal. But just to be paid to be knowledgeable, that was my fun and I loved it and I loved the research I was doing. So that's the advice I'd give them. And if following your passion means a lot of punishment from wherever, from spouse, from university, from your faculty, maybe you ought to think about moving to another place. What happens is, it still happens to friends of mine and women like me, they have a spouse who is located and they have to make an accommodation because they are there. Some men are willing to pick up and leave and go other places and some men aren't.

AR – Let me ask Tera if you have any questions that have come up as we've gone along.

[break in tape, presumably Judy is answering a question of Tera's]

JW – You don't have to use the word feminist to do feminist things. I did feminist things all over Lexington, Kentucky and I never used the word. I know some groups it puts off and then they don't listen. So the name of the game, besides following your passion is to get your message through. You don't get your message through if people turn their ears off the minute you say feminist. And unless you're with a group of feminists, it's not a very effective word, so why use it if you don't think it's going to work for you? So besides following your passion, is to do what works for you and still gets the message out. You can do lots of good feminist work, without ever using the word. Now Pam Raymond wouldn't agree with me, and I'm sure a lot of other people wouldn't. And that's okay, I just think each person needs to develop whatever works for them, and still be true to yourself, if that makes sense.

TB – I have one question for you, you've talked about the feminist movement, about how when we got the vote, then we thought we had everything, then there was a bit of a lull, and then all of a sudden Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan come up. So I'm just wondering what you think of the feminist movement today as social and political movement, like you've just said about using the word feminism if women are uncomfortable and stop using that word does the feminist movement cease to exist and how does it continue?

JW – I think it continues by using the word women. Women's health, women in the workplace, women in the workplace. So you don't have to use the word feminism any more and I don't know if there's a feminist movement anymore, I don't feel it very well any more. But of course, living in the middle of Kentucky… But there are women's commissions now, all of a sudden now we have an institute for research on women at the University of Kentucky, which we tried to set up over and over and we couldn't do it. So I think we worked for 30 years to get a commission on women there, which we finally

{11:03}

got in the last five years—after I retired—we got an institute for research on women, and low and behold they are doing feminist things. We have a women's studies, it's not feminist studies, they are doing feminist things over there.

AR – What do you think is the relevance of the word feminism? Why is in fact feminism not so great a word for many women?

JW – I don't know. That's my honest answer

AR – I mean obviously it isn't, a lot of people don't want to use the word and it creates resistance. So the question is: why?

JW – I have students who don't want to use it. I put out a scale that people still used called 'Therapy with Women Scale.' I wanted to call it the 'Feminist-Therapy Scale' and she said, Diane Robinson, one of my favorite students, says "No, Judy, we can't do that because when I get a job I don't want the word feminist attached to me." So employment fears and they may be legitimate fears. I didn't get a job as a feminist. I didn't even get a job as a woman. I got a job as a psychologist, I *thought*. I believed.

I really can't answer that. I know that women are afraid of it. Some of the early feminists in trying to react against what they perceived as the male requirements for the way they should look, decided we won't shave our legs, we won't wear makeup, it doesn't matter how we dress, and that kind of thing. And that put women off a lot. You know some of the early research showing a stereotypically attractive woman and a stereotypically unattractive woman, and asking "Who's the feminist?" And you know the answer to that. I think that scared women off. Women still have the need to look culturally attractive. And I say culturally, I went to Africa and saw women with things on their neck this high and they thought they were beautiful. When I used to teach a class on gender, I used to point out, you see me, I used to teach in a skirt, and I never wore pants I said because in my college we had a dean where all women couldn't wear pants, when I first took that job. And it stuck in mind that I should look professional, and to me, in those days, looking professional meant wearing a skirt. So I think women are afraid of what the backlash will be and that people won't listen to them. So again, when you want to get the message through, you do what's necessary to get the message through, if the compromise isn't a serious one, and you judge how much compromise you make. To me, combing my hair and putting my lipstick on isn't much of a compromise.

AR – Well, Judy, is there anything that we haven't asked about, that you think would be important to add to this tape? We haven't touched on your life or career, or feminist psychology in general…

JW – Feminist psychology in general, I just want to say I think it will go on forever because there are things in every culture that will never stop. I think power will always come to the top like—I hate to say like cream, because to me cream is negative, causes fat, you know— but it will come to the top. And unless there are people who are going to

{14:57}

fight that and present another humanitarian view, then you are never going to have equality between women and men, and you're not going to have social justice. And the fight for social justice has to go on and I think it has to be with women at the forefront. And women at the forefront to me means feminism, if they are going to fight for social justice. Now if they are just going to say I need better salary for me, that's a different story, that's not feminism. That's me-ism, in a sense. And we have a lot of that. I'm afraid that many young women, that's what they want. But that's a culture, too, I think it's in the American culture, a lot of me-ism. So a collaborative culture, theoretically speaking some, like Japanese, have more of a collaborative culture. American culture is

not collaborative, so independence and me-ism is going to come to the forefront unless feminist women insist on pushing for social justice. And it should go on and on, forever.

How's that?

AR – Maybe that's a good place to stop.