Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Celia Kitzinger and Sue Wilkinson

Interviewed by Jacy Young
York, England
May 26, 2015

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Kitzinger, C. & Wilkinson, S. (2015, May 26). Interview by J. Young [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. York, EN.

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 Celia Kitzinger and Sue Wilkinson
Interviewed by Jacy Young
York, England
May 26, 2015

CK: Celia Kitzinger, Interview participant
SW: Sue Wilkinson, Interview participant
JY: Jacy Young, Interviewer

JY: Welcome back, why don't we talk a bit about *Heterosexuality*?

CK: *Heterosexuality* was the first book that we did together and it's a collection of short pieces about heterosexuality. We did it because there had been a great many short pieces and special issues and single chapters (token chapters as I refer to them) on lesbians in this sort of sea of heterosexuality that was unexamined, unexplored, taken for granted. Lesbianism was always a thing that was the special thing: the special chapter, the special feature, the special issue. We just thought "Let's reverse that, let's take the thing that's being taken for granted and make that the object of inquiry" - in a similar sort of way to the way in which some black theorists have done about whiteness, for example.

SW: And we should also say that the personal is political. That it was very shortly after I had come out as a lesbian in mid-life, having spent my first 36 years as a happy heterosexual. So I was thinking, and together we were thinking about, what's the difference? And how could it happen? That was kind of an undercurrent too.

CK: So it was a very productive collaboration, in the sense that we did come at heterosexuality from very different perspectives - me never having been one.

SW: And me having recently relinquished it.

CK: And becoming very aware of what you'd relinquished in terms of power and privilege and the expectations that the world had.

SW: And how utterly different it was to identify as lesbian, and how instantly that locked you into a set of oppressions that were very distinctive.

CK: And that you hadn't known about before. [2:16]

SW: Yeah, I remember you talking to me some years earlier at a conference and you said to me "You can't know what it is that you don't know about lesbianism" and I said, "Why not? I want to! Tell me!" You said, "You can't know," and it wasn't until I came out as lesbian that I did come to know.

CK: One of the things we did in preparing the [*Feminism &* Psychology] Special Issue and the book on *Heterosexuality* was that we wrote letters to people that we then knew or presumed to be heterosexual working in psychology, in feminist psychology. We asked them to address questions about heterosexuality like, "Why is it so common? When did you first realize you were heterosexual? What does it mean to be heterosexual? How does being heterosexual inflect, if at all, the rest of your life? What does it mean for your feminist politics that you're heterosexual? Could you imagine not being heterosexual? Why is it so difficult for many people to change?" We got some very interesting responses, ranging from people who felt extremely insulted at the fact that we even raised those questions, through to people who said they'd have to lie down with an ice pack on their head for a year to come up with the answers, through to the brave people who actually had a go at answering the questions, however adequately or inadequately.

SW: There were a surprising number of them and quite a few of them were surprisingly eminent feminist psychologists.

CK: Yes.

SW: I think I didn't quite realize at the time how much of a threatening exercise it was experienced as being. I'm feeling more admiration for them doing it, in hindsight, than I necessarily did at the time.

CK: And they did question their heterosexuality and they did address in fact quite legitimately why we addressed them as heterosexuals. There are pieces in here by Sandra Bem, Mary Crawford, Halla Beloff, some others, Carol Jacklin. My mother wrote a piece, she's not a psychologist, but it was too good an opportunity to miss. Mary Gergen, Janet Sayers. Lots of great feminist psychologists wrote here about the requirement that we had put upon them to [5:03] address heterosexuality upfront as opposed to maybe as a background, taken for granted contingency, and I think that was a positive move.

SW: I also think it sparked off a broader debate about sexual identities and what constitutes a sexual identity and multiple sexual identities.

CK: And about the role of the identities that we have as psychologists when we do our research. That led to the second book in that series that we did, which was on *Representing the Other*. So as a heterosexual how do you write about, engage with, lesbians? As a lesbian how do you write about, engage with, heterosexuals? And across other intersections of race and disability and class.

SW: And looking at shifting identities across time and across contexts and how do you decide what your identity is if you have multiple ones? Which one becomes salient and when? Those sorts of issues, too.

JY: Let me ask the sort of obvious question then about your experiences with discrimination in your lives, particularly about marriage.

CK: Well I came out as a lesbian at 16, so my experience of discrimination began from then and included mental hospitals and attempts to cure me and exclusions and the usual. I mean it was a very ordinary sort of experience. I think it came as a particular shock to me as a white middle class woman to have that kind of discrimination against me in that way because I had had considerable privilege in my life until then and it was a bit of a shock and not something I felt ready for, prepared for. I had support from my family and that was good.

JY: Absolutely.

CK: But from 16 years of age onwards, I expected it. I did not expect ever to be in a position to be able to marry a person I loved. Or actually even to want to, given the kind of politics I had in the 1970s.

SW: Yeah, I mean as a heterosexual I didn't have experiences of those kinds of discrimination or oppression, it was simply recognizing that my gender was significant when I started to experience discrimination in the workplace and my professional life. So I didn't have any inkling [9:45] until I came out as a lesbian at the age of 36 what additional kinds of oppression I would face. And it was pretty stark. I'm trying to think of what year that was, it doesn't really matter. But people's attitude towards me changed instantly. I could see the flinch and the wariness around me, being very careful about what they said. Then I guess there are the issues that you probably talked about earlier, around trying to set up a Lesbian and Gay Psychology Section within the British Psychological Society, which we were both involved in. We received hate mail from other members of the Society, and a selection of letters was published in *The Psychologist* under the heading "*Are you Normal?*" This is the 1990s were talking about now.

JY: Were those very targeted and personal or more abstract in terms of lesbians in general?

SW: I think they were very personal, because they were targeted at us as proposers of this new Section within the Society and by extension, as representatives of a particular group, but definitely a pathologized group.

CK: I was shocked that psychologists were less able than other people that I knew in the world at the time to accept and lesbian and gay issues. I had expected more of my discipline.

So the major event that we wanted to talk about in terms of discrimination was the marriage stuff because politically, it was very interesting. I never expected to get married and I never expected to want to. As a feminist I have an analysis of marriage as a hetero-patriarchal institution, that is instrumental in the oppression of women, and tied up with religious values and beliefs that I don't share - like taking part in a sort of Princess Di fantasy. Marriage is not something I expected to find myself ever wanting or in favour of. And of all the discriminations and oppressions that I could have described to you that were inflicted upon me as a lesbian, I don't think it would have occurred to me to mention "And I'm not allowed to get married!" as one of the forms of oppression I was facing. That really wasn't on my agenda. And then....

SW: But then, we found ourselves embroiled in a major legal battle to get our marriage recognized. So, I need to backtrack a bit - so how come we came to be married anyway? All of these were actually a series of completely chance events.

CK: You can't get married by chance!

SW: We did, we did.

CK: We got together in 1990, now fast forward over the happy non-married relationship until...

SW: Until I went to Canada for two years from 2002 to 2004 and that just happened to be the period in which marriage equality came to Canada, province by province, and I was in British [13:21] Columbia, which was the second province to open up marriage to same sex couples. And Canada was the first place in the world to open up marriage to same sex couples who were not Canadian citizens or domiciled in Canada. So any same sex couple could marry there, and because it was there, we did.

CK: Well, it was a bit more complicated than that.

SW: It was a solution to a range of practical problems - most particularly, the fact that because of not having any kind of legal recognition of our relationship, if anything had happened to me while I was working overseas there was no guarantee that Celia would have been able to access my flat, my car, or some of our joint possessions that were in Canada. Or visit me in the hospital or have any rights to my body if I died.

CK: Plus, I was getting a lot of questions every time I went through immigration.

SW: You were in Canada rather a lot of times...

CK: Well every vacation period. Sue was working at Simon Fraser University and I was working here at York and commuting vacation times because Canada's a great place to be and Vancouver is amazing and [at immigration] it was like “What are you doing here again?”. It was a mix of a practical solution to some practical difficulties that were confronting us as a couple living in two different counties, and a sort of caught up in the excitement of "Wow, there's a country in the world we can get married, shall we?"

SW: And it was very exciting in Vancouver at that time. You know there were rainbow flags everywhere and street parties and just a general kind of euphoria.

CK: Department stores with wedding lists for gay couples and heavy marketing for cruises up to Alaska because suddenly the gay pound [gay purchasing power] could come to Vancouver. So you had a critique of it at the same time as you got caught up in it. Also the other really interesting thing for me as I was coming backwards and forwards between two countries is that at the same time the campaign for same sex marriage was going on in Canada and as part of that campaign, civil partnerships or civil unions-

SW: They were registered domestic partnerships.

CK: Whatever they were called in Canada, they were being represented as the middle of the bus, that sort of analogy. As not equal, a segregated, "separate is not equal," system for gay people.

SW: Well, the grassroots lesbian and gay movement in Canada would have seen anything less [15:55] than marriage as a failure of its campaign. It was marriage or nothing. Registered domestic partnerships were not acceptable.

CK: Well you had friends in Canada who were also campaigning *against* marriage.

SW: Yes.

CL: There was a lesbian and gay critique of marriage as well. That seemed a minority voice in Canada. The majority voice was certainly amongst the lesbians and gays that we knew in Vancouver, who were campaigning for marriage and against civil partnerships or civil unions or whatever the word is.

SW: Registered domestic partnerships.

CK: What was ironic about that was I would go [to Canada] and hear about how registered domestic partnerships were second best, inferior, inadequate, and it would be a failure to have them in Canada. And come back [to England] and Stonewall, the English campaigning organization, was saying "Give us civil partnerships now, we promise we don't want marriage! Oh no, we don't want marriage. Marriage is for heterosexuals. Marriage is nasty, heterosexual, oppressive."

SW: "We want our own special distinctive institution."

CK: "Our own special thing - civil partnerships." So there were these two different discourses going on in the two different countries at the same time. That was fascinating, it was so interesting. And I could see the arguments from both sides, but as it turned out marriage came to Canada, registered domestic partnerships did not. If we wanted legal recognition of us as a couple we had to get married. That was the way you had to do it in Canada, so that's what we did. So we got married a few weeks after it was first legally possible to do so. So quite quickly. It was a very small ceremony. Who did we get to do it?

SW: We had the Marriage Commissioner and she provided two witnesses who were friends of hers.

CK: And it was in her conservatory and we had a nice meal and went to the beach afterwards. We didn't want the wedding event and we didn't have family out there and it was deliberately small, low key. We'll just do it.

SW: Because we had a few feminist reservations, yes. [17:54]

CK: Yes, but it was lovely actually and it did feel different afterwards and I know a lot of people who say that, but it was amazing.

SW: It surprised us. You wouldn't think, we'd been a couple for what was it about 13 or 16 years by then, you would think it wouldn't really make any difference, but somehow it did. It conferred some special status on the relationship that's still indefinable in a way.

CK: Part of what made it feel special was coming back to England and being denied it - and then you feel something's been taken away and then you realize you had something that you no longer have. So when Sue moved back to this country there weren't even civil partnerships at that point and we were legal strangers, and this just seemed outrageous and intolerable.

SW: Any British heterosexual couple who had gone to Canada and got married would have come back as a married couple, no question. And here we were and we were being told "You're unrelated", when we came back. And then within a few months the government brought in the Civil Partnership Act for same sex couples and it looked as if…

CK: It was a Bill.

SW: All right, it was a Bill. It was discussed in Parliament and it became an Act and it came into force in December 2005. And we were told "Right, your marriage will be deemed a civil partnership in England and Wales."

CK: So we contacted Liberty (which is the civil liberties organization, human rights organization) and as many gay organizations as we could to see if they'd support us. Liberty did, Peter Tatchell's organization, which was then called OutRage, did. Stonewall did not. As usual the sort of people I expected to support me did not. So the argument was, "What was wrong with civil partnerships? You're putting down people in civil partnerships, you're acting like you're better than them because you've got a marriage." No, I don't think so. Stonewall did not campaign for same sex marriage until the very final end of the campaign.

SW: That took another campaign to get them on board, but that's another story.

CK: So we did get some help. Liberty paid for the lawyers and the barristers and the legal fees. And Peter Tatchell did a lot of publicity.

SW: And advised us on how to work with the media, which is not something we had much experience of.

CK: And sort of ethical support for it. You know, that situation where you're thinking "Do I really care about marriage? No, but I care about equality." And we'd been deprived of equality - that [20:38] hurts. So we brought the case. It was heard before the High Court. They brought in the most senior judge, the President of the High Court [Family Division], Sir Mark Potter. The government intervened, it didn't have to, but it chose to intervene to oppose recognition of our marriage. And the judgment came from Sir Mark Potter, after a three day hearing, that we were indeed discriminated against compared to heterosexual couples - but that discrimination was

justified, in his view, under human rights legislation, in order to protect the heterosexual unit of the family. So we lost.

JY: How was that moment?

SW: Well, we knew that our chances of winning were extremely slim, so it wasn't a surprise.

CK: But we did hope that we might have got a Declaration of Incompatibility, which would have been a sort of a medium ground the judge could have taken. That's, I think, what the barrister was hoping for.

SW: So what we did basically was orchestrate the media stuff around losing the case to try and highlight the injustice. I mean the judge said some things that pretty clearly were going to incense the lesbian and gay community. He said we can't have our Article 8 (the right to respect for private and family life) breached - because we were not "family". So we wrote a statement for the press, saying "Guess what? You know lesbian couples, gay couples, are not families."

CK: Unless they have children, they might. He didn't rule out the possibility that we might have kids.

SW: He said we were not a family so we couldn't have our rights breached.

CK: And that thing about protecting the unit of the family. He also said something about "Children do best if they're brought up by a man and a woman in a traditional unit of family." So he basically said a lot of things that whatever your view on marriage was you were not going to warm to Sir Mark Potter if you were lesbian or gay.

SW: I think people who didn't support our case particularly were astounded by the tenor of the judgment - that it was so conservative. I mean we're talking 2006.

CK: Yes, it's not a lifetime ago. So there was a lot of publicity when we launched the case and then when we lost the case, and we analyzed it. We analyzed our conversations with people, we did discourse analysis to look at the ways in which our case, and cases generally, were being presented in the media and public discourse. And we were particularly interested in looking at why civil partnership was presented as enough in some countries and completely unacceptable in others. And we had a very unique perspective on that I think, and it was very hard to convince the English lesbian and gay movement that they had anything less than hit the [23:49] jackpot with civil partnerships. I can count on the fingers of one hand the number of our friends, even, who agreed with us. I mean lots of our friends go way back, they're radical lesbian separatists, feminists. They didn't want marriage. They thought we were bizarre for: (A) to have done it and (B) to have fought for it and put ourselves on the line in this way.

SW: Your mother thought we were mad, as a feminist.

CK: My mother was also particularly worried about the rings, wasn't she?

SW: She doesn't wear a ring. It's a symbol of bondage, shackles, ownership, like handcuffs.

CK: Well for a heterosexual woman of her era, maybe. For a lesbian woman who wants to assert a relationship with her same sex partner, maybe not. We do play with the rings.

SW: They are a piece of symbolism that's quite useful for us.

CK: The rings come off when we go to countries that don't accept our marriage. So we put the rings on again when our marriage was accepted as a marriage in this country, and we did that very publicly and showed the media. When we're on trains that cross into different countries they come off on board. It's astounding to entire train compartments. And then they go on again. We've had a whole train compartment cheer us as we entered Belgium? Luxembourg? Somewhere where "Ooh, we can put our rings on." We've played with words like "wife" and "Mrs." quite deliberately. They are words that for many feminists, for many lesbians, seem at best ironic, but often something dangerous and to be rejected. To explore using those and to use them upfront is...

SW: I was also able to play with the contrast between my first marriage to a man and my second marriage to a woman, and how those have been treated so differently by the societal context in which I was located at the time.

CK: One of the things we wanted to get across in the context of England was that civil partnerships were very close legally to a marriage, in the first place. Any objections you had about property, or tax, ownership, arrangements with children, almost anything, applied pretty much wholesale to civil partnerships as they did to marriage. If you were concerned about why two people in the sexual relationship should get tax breaks, well they got it in a civil partnership as much as in a marriage. If you were concerned about prioritizing romantic and sexual love over friendships and other kinds of connections between communities and people, well civil partnerships do that as much as marriage. Over [26:32] time all the minor remaining legal differences between civil partnerships and marriage were eroded, because lesbians and gays protested against them. By the time marriage finally was accepted in this country for same sex couples we had two virtually identical institutions that served no function except segregation and symbolic inequality.

SW: So we repeatedly said 'Separate is not equal, this is simply segregating."

CK: But that argument works very powerfully in Canada and America, but it's not the language of the political protest of the civil rights movement in this country. We didn't find that it translated very well. All those wonderful images you had in Canada with things like two water fountains with one labeled gay and one labeled straight: "If this isn't right for white and black people, why is it right for lesbian or gay and straight people?" It was a cultural difference, it doesn't transport, because we don't have that language of segregation.

SW: Except that too has changed because I have noticed for the campaign for marriage equality in Scotland, which was slightly behind England and Wales, and then for the referendum in Ireland, which has just passed, they were picking up that terminology now. They're using

"separate is not equal." It's something that kind of entered the public consciousness very late and it wasn't there when we were doing our marriage activism.

CK: No, it certainly wasn't there. And when we were writing and thinking and arguing about marriage, it always ended up within a discussion about *marriage*, not a discussion about *equality*. And yet this is a country in which the lesbian and gay movement fought for the right for lesbians and gay people to join the army so they could go out and kill other people. Yeah, I'm a pacifist. I support the right of lesbians and gay men to join the army. But somehow that argument was not understood either.

At one level it was an experience of discrimination, and it's ended and that's great. At another level it was a learning experience about the intersection of the personal and the political, cultural differences, and how you negotiate your way between those. And again, yet again for me, what do you do when the movements you turn to for support, the feminist movement, the lesbian and gay movement, don't support you, and then come to it much later? And so it both drew on earlier experiences, but it also leaves me with a sense of disappointment I think in liberation movements, and a sense of disappointment in myself that I wasn't able to communicate adequately the political imperative that's driving me.

SW: But you're underplaying the institutional forces arrayed against you, the government and its rhetoric about heterosexual nuclear families.

CK: I'm thinking of Stonewall, not the government.

SW: And Stonewall, the leading lesbian and gay campaigning organization, massively well resourced, massively influential, in bed with all sorts of politicians. If they had been on our [30:01] side the outcome [of our High Court case] could well have been different. We were the little guys, with Liberty and OutRage, both kind of tiny organizations, supporting us.

CK: I guess I'm still interested in exploring the politics of social change and how you do that across those institutional challenges, and particularly when the people you turn to for support don't support you. I think it's some sort of chagrin that they do come to think that equal marriage is an essential, political thing.

SW: We were just ahead of our time.

CK: Yes, but only by a few years, this was 2006.

SW: That was what I was going to say, if you're talking about the politics of social change, what we have no explanation for is then how rapid the change was. In 2006 Sir Mark Potter could say no.

CK: And the lesbian and gay movement could say no.

SW: Yeah, and in 2013 the government could start debating the Bill.

CK: The same government.

SW: Yeah. To bring in same sex marriage.

JY: What do you attribute that rapid change to?

SW: We really don't know, I mean there are little things you can point to, like each of the individual political parties getting behind it was obviously a massive thing. There was a gradual public acceptance and change in attitudes.

CK: Partly because of civil partnerships. Which was one of the arguments against our case. You know, "Go softly, softly." You do civil partnerships and that's the wedge in the door, the slippery slope, which will lead to gay marriage.

SW: Those individual factors, individually and even collectively, don't seem like enough of an explanation for how in just 5 or 6 years it could completely change. Or why Ireland, as a Catholic country, could have a referendum in which 62% supported marriage equality.

CK: One of the things I'm interested in pursuing in the future is how social change works. I seem to have lived through, in my lifetime, an enormous social change. From you know, homosexuality being considered as sick, evil, being treated to get rid of it, to a world [32:34] in which I'm now allowed to get married. And it's taken for granted. My own students are vaguely bored by the idea that there's anything interesting about being lesbian or gay.

JY: It's been two years since marriage.

SW: Some people seem to have forgotten that we ever couldn't get married.

CK: So the social change is massive and it would be nice to have a clearer understanding of how that's come about and what role we have or haven't played in either advancing or impeding it, because arguments have been made on both sides. As social psychologists, that's the sort of thing social psychologists look at. There is some work on it, but I am left slightly baffled.

SW: Yes, me too.

JY: It's interesting to think too how much of this is local change versus global change in terms of attitudes.

SW: If you look at the backlash against lesbian and gay people in Africa and a lot of the Middle East, Far East, it looks a lot less significant than we see it from within the West.

CK: But again that's a social change issue. There are two arguments that I don't know how to assess: one is by modeling equality in the countries that have same sex marriage we are showing a flag of equality and liberty to other countries who then are supposed to feel, "Oh goodness we have to be like them." The other line is that this is then a terrible threat and they retrench to traditional values precisely because we've gone and done this. Again, there's something in the

end about you have to do what's right and that's what underpinned the same sex marriage work we did. We did what we believed to be right, and we didn't know what the consequences would be. It was simply morally, in my view, it was ethically unacceptable not to recognize our marriage. Whatever you thought of our marriage, it was a legal marriage in Canada and a heterosexual couple would have had that marriage accepted.

SW: Then it was an ethical responsibility for us to challenge that injustice. We could do it, so we did do it.

CK: And we didn't have an option not to do it, in a sense. It was very hard work, it took up a lot of time and required skills we didn't have at the time. It was an awful lot of media work. It was quite stressful. I'd never been in a courtroom before, I'd never engaged with the law before.

SW: You'd never had a journalist knocking on your front door when you're in your pajamas on a Sunday morning. [35:08]

CK: With a camera.

SW: With a camera when you opened the door.

CK: Going "Why are you bringing …". It was stressful, and there were times when I wished we weren't doing it, but at no time did I think we had any option but to do it. Because it was the right thing to do.

SW: In retrospect it feels even more so that it was the right thing to do. I don't regret any aspect of it. Even though we lost our life savings through it, even though it took several years of our lives. It was the right thing to do and we learned a huge amount and we learned what we don't know.

JY: So that moment in 2014 where your marriage became recognized in the UK [actually only England and Wales], was that momentous for you in particular?

CK: It was a bit of an anti-climax in a way.

SW: Yes, I was going to say "Yes and no", and probably "no" wins out. Celia said in one of the media interviews, it was like being turned into a pumpkin on the stroke of midnight. I mean we didn't have to *do* anything. It just happened. It was weird.

CK: It felt like the culmination of something that was a long time coming, but we could see that we were going to get there and it was the final "Yes - about time too."

JY: And at that point you'd been married for a decade, right?

SW: Eleven years, yeah.

CK: In a way to re-celebrate it as if for the first time would have been to take away from eleven years of marriage, so we didn't want it to be a huge thing. Though we did have - because when we got married in Canada it was without family - we had a celebration to which our parents came and our families.

SW: It was a renewal of vows, it wasn't a sort of doing marriage all over again.

CK: But we read out our original vows again.

SW: Which we'd written ourselves. They were slightly unconventional.

CK: We had the celebrant read the history of lesbian and gay oppression across the world, and the history of marriage in Canada and the UK, and what Sir Mark Potter said in Court. Our parents, your parents particularly, were slightly baffled. It was an unconventional renewal of [37:24] vows and we had a celebration at the end. It was in a house with a pond in the garden and we got our nieces and nephews, we got everybody, to get a rose petal and put them in a bowl - to express hope that the future generation will fight against oppression elsewhere in the world, against lesbians and gay men. And there was a ceremony bit at the end where they threw the rose petals onto the pond as a way of pledging to fight oppression wherever it happens, so that was nice.

SW: That was nice.

JY: Sounds like a nice end to that period of struggle.

SW: It felt as though a chapter in our lives was over really with that, which I guess it was…

CK: That'll do.

JY: So is there anything else that I have not asked about that you'd like to discuss?

CK: I wanted to say how important I think this project is, because one of the problems for the liberation struggles is losing our history. Without history and without mistakes that your forebears make and learning from them, you reinvent wheels and you lose battles that could have otherwise been won. So I'm really pleased that this exists. I know that when I first started working on feminist psychology and in lesbian and gay psychology, I went looking for who'd been there before me, and it was really hard to find, partly because we didn't have the Internet then. But it was enormously exciting to me to find out about first wave feminism and to find out about the early lesbian and gay activists at the turn of the last century. Discovering that way back then there had been a debate between people who thought that gay people were special and different and unique versus people who thought that gay people were just like everyone else, it was just like colour blindness, a small variation. And those two gay and lesbian groups had been at loggerheads and to see the same sort of debates coming up again, it was like "OK, so these are discourses that get recycled. What can we say about them? What can we do about them? How can we theorize these?"

One of the earliest things I read that really excited me about feminist psychology was Naomi Weisstein's *Psychology Constructs the Female*, and I loved that for her irreverence, for her humour, for the way in which she doesn't pull her punches, and hits straight home. The way in which she attacks psychology on its own terms for not being sufficiently scientific, not being sufficiently objective, and that part of not being sufficiently objective and scientific and positivist and rigorous is not taking into account the social context. And I thought that was brilliant. And she partly inspired my refusal to dismiss positivism, ever, and she partly inspired my interest in discourses that we use in struggle, and what constitutes a good strategy, what makes a good tactic when you want to get your own way, and that [41:08] informed my sense. And she made it possible in a sense to imagine myself in psychology. I really had no sense that I had a future in it. The fact that she was, and had, made it seem possible that I might too. And I hope that the variety and the range of different people that represent a whole range of different kind of feminisms and different kinds of psychologies that are captured in *Feminist Voices* will mean that lots of feminists in the future will find someone amongst that variety that they could see, that they could think, "That could be me. I could have a place in this."

JY: Thank you.

END TIME: 42:06