

**“Buying In or Selling Out?
Women in Leadership Positions” □**

**Dean Joan Konner
Columbia Graduate School of Journalism
October 20, 1994**

**Maurine and Robert Rothschild Lecture □
The Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the
History of Women in America □**

Radcliffe College, Cambridge, MA □

When I see a long black limousine, I don't know whether I want to ride in it or throw a bomb at it. The stretchier it is, the greater the conflict. I want what the limousine symbolizes—luxury, comfort, command. I hate it because, professionally, luxury, comfort, and command have always tried to exclude me.

Such is my experience as a woman in management. I have both ridden in the limousine and been excluded from it. I've observed it as an outsider, and experienced it as an insider, a peculiar two-way mirror that provides many reflections.

That is a quote from the beginning of an unpublished column I wrote about ten years ago at the end of my first year as an officer in television management. The column was unpublished because I never submitted it for publication. I thought, wisely for once, to keep my mouth shut because it was not in my self-interest to express openly either my observations or my inner conflicts.

That closet column was the silent seed of tonight's theme: Buying in or selling out? Women in leadership positions.

Before diving in, thank you very much to the Schlesinger Library for this invitation, and to Maurine and Robert Rothschild for this opportunity. To be listed in the distinguished ranks of previous Rothschild lecturers and surrounded by the works on these shelves is a kind of arrival—almost equivalent to attending this venerable institution. I would plant my family flag on this peak, if there were one. It's a privilege, and I deeply appreciate being here.

Buying in or Selling out? I speak of this paradox from a very personal perspective. From the moment I entered the management game, I wondered if I'd lost the integrity game.

Is there a difference? Yes. First and foremost, integrity isn't a game.

But there are also other differences: one is a role, the other reality. One is pragmatic, the other authentic. Management speaks in the language of Power, capital P— formal, hierarchical, competitive. Integrity speaks the language of Value, capital V— personal, subjective, connective. Integrity means being true to oneself.

The contrast between a Power structure and a Values structure is the organizing theme of tonight's talk. Power and Values are contrasting models, different conceptual frameworks for the content of our lives, different ways of seeing and being in the world. In each, the same actions and even the same words take on different meanings.

In the external power construct of this culture, success means title, money, power, indicating position in the hierarchy. In a values construct, success means something other: affirmation instead of rejection; expression instead of inhibition; access instead of exclusion; growth instead of limitation.

In the power construct, power means power over others. In the values construct, power can mean control over our own lives. In the power construct, money is the equivalent of power and a way of keeping score. The old joke goes: Whoever has the most money when he dies wins. In the values construct, money means choice. Or, you might go further to say money is the equivalent of freedom.

Although the power construct defines our culture, the values construct, I believe, has more in common with women's lives.

Tonight I want to push beyond the women's movement, beyond women in the power struggle, which has defined women of this generation. I want to explore the values struggle in this society today as a possible path to what comes next. Given the state of the nation, if we don't start this journey soon, we may never make it.

First, let's proclaim the women's movement a success, in society's power terms, because that's what the battle was about, a battle for empowerment. Let's declare victory, even though that battle continues for many women.

Today, at least for many of us, there are opportunities.

In the academy, more of us have tenure. And more women are department chairmen and high-level administrators. Women lead universities, like Duke and Pennsylvania. Women now lead what I consider two of the most important institutions in the free world: the Justice Department in Washington and the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism.

There are more women in politics, more in government, and more in decision-making positions in business and the media—managers and directors, if not yet presidents. We're judges and doctors. We lead major foundations. Some are multi-millionaires of their own making. More of us are earning a decent living, although we're still aspiring to the indecent living of some of our male corporate peers.

For women today, there is awareness and support that didn't exist twenty-five years ago. Women's issues are on the agenda, not just equal pay, but sexual harassment, physical and sexual abuse; women's health; children's issues; the right to choose abortion, embattled but holding on.

And the question that occurs is: Now that we're there, helping to lead the institutions of power that define our society and our lives, where exactly are we?

Here's a computer portrait of the society we're now working so hard to support: More fragmentation of the races, the sexes, religious and sometimes ethnic groups; more polarization between the rich and the poor; more crime and corruption and the continuing plague of drugs; the deterioration of the environment, of cities, of the educational system, of the infrastructure; the inequities of health care; the family and social crisis for so many

American children. It's a familiar litany of signs of the times, and, as we all know, there are more.

In fact, it can be argued, that this country is no longer one culture with a commitment to a common core of values. There is no e pluribus unum. Instead of we, the people, we are a nation of I's and Me's, no longer We's.

There are no leaders. No one individual or group is able to help steer a more collaborative course. Not in Washington, state capitals, or city halls. Not in churches or schools. Not even in the majority of families. Certainly not in business—and not in the media, which grows more contrarian, mean-spirited, and commercial every day. The American dream has all but disappeared, and a new collective vision has not yet replaced it. From the perspective of earlier times, the future looks dimmer.

The question I pose to you, here in this library, an institution dedicated to the contributions of women, is this: Are women in leadership positions helping, as promised, to address the larger problems of society? Are we contributing new ideas to the dialogue? Or are we continuing to only look through the lens of feminism, driving only the feminist agenda, which at this moment in history may be fragmenting society even further? Are we really leaders? Or are we, as some have charged, simply men in skirts?

Here's a story that goes back to the late '60s: I was watching a morning program called For Women Only on NBC, where I worked at the time as a documentary producer. Barbara Walters was host, and her guest on the program that day was Clare Boothe Luce, former Congresswoman. In the interview she predicted that women would never become a strong force in Congress.

“Why?” Barbara Walters asked.

And Mrs. Luce replied, “Because women do not have the instinct for the jugular, and men do.”

To which Barbara Walters responded: “We’ll learn.”

I remember thinking then that that was the wrong reaction. Women weren’t supposed to be trying to mimic the basest, most primitive, killer side of men. We were supposed to be trying to get into decision-making roles to try to change the way business is done, for the better of everyone. Aren’t those competitive, killer values the fundamental problem with the system?

Well, Barbara learned, and so have many women.

This library hosted a talk last spring by Dawn-Marie Driscoll and Carol Goldberg, who wrote *Members of the Club*, a book that describes what it takes for women to achieve in the system. I read the book, and there it was, clearly spelled out, how to buy into the power structure. Never once did it question what of ourselves we might be selling out.

Women know what it is we’re against. We’re against discrimination against women. But what are we for? That old perennial question: What do women want? Not in the context of fairy godmothers with wings, or men on white horses in the wings, ready to grant our wishes. What do women want in today’s changed world, with our own independent voices and having won the right to be heard?

Carol Gilligan, one of your Harvard colleagues, is producing some very insightful work concerning the social development of teenage girls. One of Carol Gilligan’s important findings is that opinions are socialized out of women in adolescence. As a result, young girls tend to become tentative in their opinions. Growing up in the hostile environment of a male-dominated culture, young girls face a choice between being liked and having integrity.

I’d like to suggest a parallel between those adolescent girls and many women in leadership positions. We face many moments of choice between being ourselves or being liked and being “one of the boys”—a choice between having integrity and making others

uncomfortable. And I wonder if women achievers are allowing their independent ideas and differences to be socialized, and compromised, out of the conversation?

Men and women function differently, like computers of a different make—let's say, an IBM and a Mac. We may have the same fundamental potential, but our means and our programs are often not compatible. As I say to my husband to get beyond an impasse, "I guess we just have conceptual differences."

At the very least, men and women inhabit different cultures. From the collective intelligence on the subject in general—and keep in mind that nothing in general is true: Men tend to be warlike, competitive, aggressive, with a worldview that is external, exclusive, power driven. Women, on the other hand, tend to be collaborative, caring, nurturing, with a worldview that is internal, subjective, values driven.

Men are single-minded. Women are complex. Women's lives are composite, like the eye of a fly. That's one reason why women have so much inner conflict and why choice is so essential to our struggle.

Men are ambitious, decisive, self-assured, structured. Women are subjective, cautious, empathetic, informal.

Men are short term. Women are longer term. Women are more concerned about outcomes and the future, a condition that may arise from caring for children, including dealing with the diapers. I'm convinced that if women had been captains of industry from the start, society wouldn't be having the same back-end environmental problems.

We live in a male-conceived culture, and our social structures institutionalize a perpetual state of war with violence and conflict inherent in the system. Everything is either/or. In civilized cultures, like this one, the competitive instinct has been tamed and caged into amoral equivalents of war—in business, politics, even education. Sports is used as

a deceptively benevolent metaphor, and life is lived as a game. Hardball. Home run. Out of bounds.

The vocabulary of sports has infiltrated our language. Successful women now boast of being “players” in a game that is played to win. Survival of the fittest. Protect your turf. Winning is everything. Being Number 1. Keeping score: one up; one down.

One recent example in the news: out of the brutal and bloody events of Haiti and Iraq last week, the New York Daily News published this headline—Clinton 2; Bullies 0. Finally, Clinton scored in the power game. That’s the culture we live in.

Capitalism is war carried out in economic terms. I look at that as good news, proof there can be progress. Killing someone economically is a significant improvement over killing someone physically, although poverty and denial of a place in the social order can produce a different kind of death, a death of spirit, at least in a power construct.

In a values construct, poverty and denial are sometimes the source of strength. That’s why progress so often arises out of pain. In fact, the principal agents of social change are often the outsiders to power: Gandhi; Martin Luther King, Jr.; Nelson Mandela; Betty Friedan—individuals with ideals and vision. Social leaders empower people. The politician follows. Politicians are there to ratify.

In the power construct, there is little impulse to improve without a crisis to create a zone of discomfort, like the threat of war or economic depression. In contrast, in a values construct, the suffering of others in our society—the homeless, the ill without health care, the abused—are sufficient catalysts for action.

In the power model of culture, politics is also war. And using the metaphor of sports, politics today produces some of the best tournaments on television. Everyday we see on the news sound bites from the political power game, like this interview with Senator Dole this summer.

Dole says: “If President Clinton doesn’t compromise on health care, we’ll get him on GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade].”

“But don’t you support GATT?” the reporter asked.

And Senator Dole replied, “The President can’t play hardball on one issue, and not on all the others.”

First, note the sports metaphor: hardball. It’s always there.

Second, consider the fate of the issue: if health care goes up, GATT goes down. One up, one down. Never mind policy. Or integrity. Forget the substance of the issue. All that matters is beating the opposition. Winning is everything. As Clare Boothe Luce pointed out: going for the jugular.

Our politicians just don’t get it. They don’t make the connection. When you kill a part of your own society, you kill a part of yourself.

Lest I paint a distorted picture of our times, as research, I invited some friends and colleagues to talk with me on these issues. Being a TV type, I taped them at my home this summer, and I’m sharing this platform with them tonight:

Betty Friedan, author of the seminal women’s movement book, *The Feminine Mystique*; Marcia Brandwynne, a news and entertainment television producer; Joan Hamburg, a New York radio talk show host and author; Dr. Ethel Person, psychoanalyst and author; Betty Sue Flowers, professor of English at the University of Texas, author, poet, and editor on *Joseph Campbell and the Power of Myth* with Bill Moyers; and I invited a token male: Norman Lear, television producer, known best for his ground-breaking television sitcom: *All in the Family*.

We talked about the system:



[Click to play above clip](#)

LEAR: You can use television as a great measure for what has transpired over the last forty or fifty or more years in terms of the escalating need to satisfy a bottom line...because these guys are all captive to Wall Street and with Wall Street, we are talking about the movement of billions of dollars in minutes around the world, and that is what holds them captive. It is.

HAMBURG: It is our business, too: completely advertising commercially dreadful. I am the very mass market because that's what I do. And when you talk about issues like the environment, I can tell you the shades come over their eyes. It is of no interest. You know what's of interest, if you tell them their well is going to make them have cancer, it becomes a very personal interest. Everything that we all do, it's a way of taking things that matter in people's lives—their jobs, their health, their children, and themselves—which is why everyone is looking for answers. Who are we? Where are we going? And giving them the message in a way that is acceptable.

BRANDWYNNE: Do you want to know what I actually think now about mass media? I think that the people have had so many messages they don't want to hear it anymore. You tell them about shrinking penises and sperm counts that are down by 50 percent. You tell them the most horrific stories. We don't want to hear anymore. Everything has been trivialized; nothing has more importance than the next thing. And, as far as I'm concerned, that is what television has done to us. Mass media.

LEAR: I would just reword that to say business generally. Television is, after all, just another big American business, a set of businesses. They all function the same way. This one, unfortunately, is in your home twenty-four hours a day and in more than one room.

FLOWERS: And raise the children.

LEAR: And raise the children.

But it is the business. It is the corporate ethic. When people criticize television and talk about the content of television, but the content of television basically is "the good guys win." The message that I think reaches America with far more certainty is in a half hour there may be in fifteen second spots, as many as eighteen to twenty fifteen-second spots, and they all carry the same message: you are what you consume. You are healthy, you are loved, you will be loved, you will be successful, if you are what you consume. That is the dangerous message and that is the American business ethic. You know, winning at any cost, and winning has nothing to do with succeeding at the level of doing your best.

FRIEDAN: We are not going to get rid of capitalism. Communism in its autocratic form was a failure. So this is the system we have got and democracy is not that bad, to tell you the truth. The question is: Are you going to put some values in, giving priority to some values of life and a meaning, and of community, in our democratic capitalist system? As opposed to the sheer, narrow definition of the dollar bottom line that has dominated us.

END TAPE

That's the tension in our system today: Power as the only value versus Values as a power.

Television, Capitalism, Politics, and the News came together this summer in the Congressional hearings on Whitewater. It had all the elements: politics and money; conflict of interest; special interest; and the confrontation and drama of outright war, including casualties—some intended and others, as in war, accidental.

We saw American symbols and respected ideals, like the presidency and integrity, wounded, some mortally, all of it by friendly fire. After all, this is supposed to be one country. But it seemed there was no such thing as America, a nation of shared values, simple virtues, common ideals.

I don't care what party you support—Republican, Democrat, or Independent—it was a brutal battle of power for power's sake. The Whitewater hearing—in fact, so many recent Congressional hearings and debates: The Hill-Thomas hearing, for example; or the health-care debate; or gun control. They aren't inquiries, they're inquisitions. They're not debates, they're displays of hypocrisy and obstruction. They aren't deliberation, they're destruction. War, without the killing, but sometimes even that. Remember Vincent Foster's tragic suicide note?

"I was not meant for the spotlight of public life in Washington," he wrote. "Here ruining people is considered sport."

And the news media are part of it. Like politics, mainstream journalism views life through the lens of power: political power; economic power; cultural power; social power. We portray a world in conflict, of clashing ideologies and beliefs, a constant tug-of-war between purposes and opinions, a mean-spirited competitive world of winners and losers. If you're winning, you're hard news. If you're losing, you're soft news or a feature. If you're powerless—like the poor or children, who don't vote and don't pay taxes—you are a statistic or no news at all. News is a business, a part of the system.

When Hillary Clinton appeared in Austin, Texas, the day before her father died, she spoke spontaneously from somewhere deep inside herself about the “politics of meaning,” a politics of caring and community rather than of power. Everyone in the audience was deeply moved. But a cynical press criticized, trivialized, and psychoanalyzed her. “Saint Hillary” the New York Times Magazine labeled her in her search for some higher purpose, some meaning.

The newsroom is a war room, and the Other, the enemy, is the competition. And so, sometimes, is the subject matter.

There are many journalists who practice in journalism’s best historical traditions, pursuing the truth in the public interest. That’s the journalism we teach in our school. But this is a free press society. Anybody can practice journalism, and anybody does, under highly competitive economic conditions. And, in general, the power and money game prevails, producing the negative, mean-spirited, sensational press that the public no longer trusts.

The competitive mentality of the newsroom was amusingly summed up in a song Diane Sawyer sang to Barbara Walters at a dinner in Barbara’s honor. Diane put new lyrics to the tune of “You Made Me Love You.” Forgive me: even if I knew the tune well, my singing voice couldn’t carry it. It went like this:

“You made me ruthless

I didn’t want to do it

Ambition drove me to it.

You made me greedy

I couldn’t bear that you net

three million more than I get.

Your tiny skirts with those

legs on display
started me thinking
Lorena Bobbitt's way.
Desperate to beat you,
I thought I'd do what you do.
I slept with Roone [their boss]...
and Hugh too [Barbara's co-anchor].
Scheming for interviews
where you schmooze
and end in boohoos.

Give me, give me more airtime. It's the air I breathe.

I need to tell my story.

You know, All About Eve.

I even married a Jew,

hoping to be more like you."

Yes, it's funny. Why not? Mike Nichols, Diane's (Jewish) husband, helped her write it.

But nothing is funny without it being at least partly true. What the ditty deftly demonstrates are the rules of the game. Two very accomplished women who have bought in. You decide whether they have sold out.

Gridlock is a mild word for what is happening in society today. The power structure is paralyzed. Power is becoming powerless to deal with society's problems. "Winning is everything" may be fine for a game, but as a social and economic system, it is drowning out rational dialogue, savaging principles and ideals, destroying democracy and maybe with it, the higher potential of humanity.

Is this what women want?

Is this even what men want?

Let's take another look at what women bring to the table. Women, we've read and said, are empathetic, caring, collaborative. Women are inclusive, showing concern for the whole, the larger community. There are signs everywhere today that indicate that what we call the feminine sensibility is growing in our culture—in literature, in art, in history, in the marketplace of ideas. It coincides with concerns about the environment, and an increasing awareness of Mother Earth as our life support system. There is a growing commitment to nature based on the awareness of the interconnectedness of life. Some see it as a more spiritual vision. Spiritual leaders down through the ages have told us: the world is one. One human community. And, if we can't grasp this message as an abstraction, modern technology is manifesting it on computer screens and on television.

Human intelligence creates systems to protect human life. Today, those very systems are threatening it—industrial development that poisons the environment and ever more powerful weapons that threaten life itself. There is growing concern that the competitive, primitive culture that developed according to the Darwinian principle of survival of the fittest may have been a life-support pattern for one period of human evolution, but it may no longer be a life-supporting pattern for today. In such a world, those with a more inclusive perspective, those with concern for others, may turn out to be the fittest.

We are coming around a bend. More of us realize that need for other values, values of collaboration, community, and care. It seems that many women and men alike have had enough of the instinct for the jugular.

Indeed, we found this a point of consensus in our taped conversation—call it community, spirituality, or connection:



[Click to play above clip](#)

LEAR: It is that we have lost contact with the best part of ourselves. With what, from the beginning, makes us unique among the species, that capacity for awe and wonder and mystery and love and higher meaning and God. We have all got the capacity for that search, which this culture makes very difficult, if not impossible, to discuss openly...What women have much more than men is the deeply embedded spirit. Women who are now coming into positions that you mention and ask, what can they bring to it? They can bring this great source in them that is far deeper, far more realized, I think, than it is in men...And that is what you are talking about when you talk about women in these work situations that are bringing love to it.

FRIEDAN: I find it difficult to use the word “spiritual.” But there is, it seems to me, people who are thinking more about meaning in their lives and about the meaning of the work they do. And, that it isn’t just the greed, greed, greed, greed.

KONNER: That word “spiritual” bothers this society. What does spiritual mean?

PERSON: I’ll tell you what it means to me. I divide it differently. I divide it between the poles of autonomy and the poles of community. For me, spiritual is some feeling for community, for an Other as equal to the self. Whereas autonomy is how successful you are and what you can do in terms of me. And I think there is a balance, or should be a balance, between me and the sense of what I would call community and you would call spiritual. Spiritual as a word doesn’t bother me because it means that kind of shared interest in being a member of the human race. I do not believe, strongly do not believe, that women should take on what is a cultural crisis, which is the question of community. To do that is to say that women are fundamentally different, which I do not believe.

FRIEDAN: I don’t think you have to say that women have this special responsibility. I think that it is in, at this point, the larger interest of women, as in men, that we are in a paradigm shift in our society, that we are on a cusp, that we are at a point where there have to be some new priorities of value. You don’t have to use words like spiritual, but value and of community. And they have to be at least, you know, they have to take precedence over the previous narrow bottom line definitions of success for women and men.

FLOWERS: If you think of that old picture of the figure and vase, and if you look at the background, the two faces come out and the vase is the

background. And then, if you look at it a different way, the vase comes up and the faces are just the background to the vase. You know that picture.

I think of spirituality as the matrix which holds everything together, which has always been there and is there and which we could tap into. It is what helps create community. It is already implicitly there as the background to the vase. And in this culture we have concentrated so much on the material, on the vase, that we don't see that other matrix, which is the two faces looking at each other, as if in conversation. And so rather than thinking of spirituality as something we need to import into the culture, or get women to hold up the flag for, that it is a matter of looking at the matrix that exists now, that holds us together, and giving it much more honor and credence. And I think one reason women have been associated with it is that we used to hold things together in community. And it is breaking down because the brightest women are no longer the educators, the teachers, and so education is breaking down. We no longer do all the community work that held it together, and people have not come back together to hold the matrix out of which these various games—capitalism being one of them, the way we set up our society— operate.

You can think of matrix, and it is interesting, it has the same root as mother. You can think of the matrix as environmental. You can think of it as spiritual. I think all these things are true. You can think of it as community. But what's important about the matrix and finding the language to articulate its presence so that we can see it is that in the matrix, the game can be defined with different rules. The matrix holds the power to redefine, to shift the game.

KONNER: How? Give an example.

FLOWERS: Well, in a country like Sweden where the matrix involves judging a society by how it takes care of its least able citizens, you would not have people on the street without health care and homeless in quite the way that we do. Which isn't to say it is a perfect society. I am just saying their matrix has defined the rules of the game—the capitalist game because they are a capitalist society—has defined it differently. But what we can do is understand that we can define the rules differently, that capitalism is not like Moses and the Ten Commandments. It didn't come down in this form and that is how it has to be.

FRIEDAN: There has to be a sense that you want those that you elect, or that you want those that are going to run the company, that there is some way that you begin to insist on these values. I think that the larger community values, there has got to be a movement in this direction.

KONNER: Can you put a name to those values? Put a name to them.

FRIEDAN: Well, I mean some very elementary things that are in the constitution, you know, that are in our ethos of the Common Good for God's sake. The Common Good. You can not make it, you know, the "for profit" will be this much better, but by doing this you are going to pollute the whole water system of the town, or whatever; that the common good becomes something that is actually considered. That has to be a value of capitalism and of a democratic capitalist.

LEAR: And it can't be done, I feel, without this connection, for lack of a better way to put it.

END TAPE

*

Community; spirituality; connection—a new and different matrix.

We're all in search of a new and more accurate vocabulary—different words to change perspective, to tell a different story, to shift the emphasis from power as the only value to values as a power. An evolution, not a revolution.

Let's return now from the dream, a vision of a more humane future, and deal with some of the realities of today. To be true to the complexity of experience, I have to qualify, maybe even contradict, in part, some of what I said. Lectures are not supposed to do that, but life does. Life isn't either/or.

For most women, the power struggle for equality is far from over. We have seen the statistics. Women hold only 3 percent of top management jobs. 80 percent of working women earn less than \$20,000. In a recent survey, 74 percent of women not only didn't get close to, but never heard of, a glass ceiling.

Women still earn less in every field of endeavor. Most corporate structures do not accommodate women with children. Two-thirds of the women under forty who have reached the upper echelons are childless. Most hiring and firing is still done by men, and advancements are doled out by men. Money, status, and power are controlled by men. Women have many more time pressures, conflicting responsibilities, and more stress. Women have learned the hard way that having it all is exhausting.

I also know that although women in decision-making positions haven't changed the paradigm of operation, at least not yet, they have made a significant difference. For example, in journalism: With more women in the newsroom, news now covers a much wider agenda. Women's issues, like rape, domestic violence, child abuse, day care, family leave, are taken seriously. And values and quality-of-life stories—about children, education, the environment, and at long last, women's health— appear not only on the front page but on every page, and on television as well. Some believe that it was the women in the newsroom who made “character” an issue in public life by refusing to accept self-censorship of hypocritical patterns of male behavior in public leadership positions, like drunkenness and marital infidelity. Not everyone believes that particular change has been all for the good.

In all fields and professions, women in the workplace are establishing a different set of values, seeking a better balance between social values and economic ones, between work and domestic life. Women are helping to humanize and civilize the workplace. Gradually, we are moving toward a values-driven culture. Maybe someday we'll see people in the workplace progressing by means of the politics of accomplishment instead of the politics of power. And maybe someday there will even be a Department of Children.

It's bound to be a very long-term operation, but it's a mission worth fighting for, even at the risk of failing. Remember, we, the people, don't have to be reelected.

Will this society continue to make course corrections? Here's what our friends had to say about that.



[Click to play above clip](#)

FRIEDAN: I did have a concrete experience of the last thirty years of how much women have been able to change their lives. And women have changed their lives for the better in terms of more timing, more control, and being a part of a larger society. And that basically has been good for women, and it has been good for families, despite hype to the contrary. And it certainly has been good for the society. It seems to me there will be new leaders that will arise, and they won't be leaders of just polarized movements, but new leaders, hopefully young or old, who will say, "we must put values ahead of just that immediate problem." We can't continue the pollution anymore, and we can't continue some of these practices that are destroying our society. And there have to be discussions like this, whether you call them spiritual, or meaning, or politics of meaning, or whatever you call them.

HAMBURG: There has to be a way that people like us, who have been lucky enough to have certain powers and positions in the community, have to

understand that we have to give back. And by giving back, it is not a matter of just lecturing to people. We have to empower a population.

FRIEDAN: The next step...that ability to empower ourselves must be somehow now embraced by women and men in a different way. Not just against each other.

FRIEDAN: In a way that takes on some of these larger needs for change.

LEAR: The power of people to believe, that is the first part...to believe that they belong in this conversation. Everybody belongs in this conversation. They need to feel empowered to do so because they have too many years of feeling it belongs to others. Everyone, not just women, belongs in this conversation.

END TAPE

*

Not for women only. Everyone belongs in this conversation.

I said at the opening that I come to this subject from a very personal perspective. I scold the system and berate myself for not yet having fixed journalism. It's hard enough to pay faculty salaries. Ah! There's the rub and the reality. Deans, like university presidents, use most of their time and energy fundraising, the hell's gate of higher education; in fact, of every nonprofit enterprise, itself an indictment of our power-driven system and how it orders our priorities.

A final point to underscore: even if we were to achieve a values structure as we approach the millennium, it doesn't mean the end of conflict and struggle. Secular values

versus religious values; democratic values versus corporate values; family values versus workplace values; academic values; journalistic values; human values.

Today's values conflicts aren't simple, like good against evil. Often we're faced with good versus good: free enterprise and individualism versus the common good. The abortion issue. Or the lesser of two evils: Ollie North versus Chuck Robb.

Whose values will prevail?

The question itself uses the language of power. Either/or. Maybe it's time to reword the question. The values question is: How can we seek and achieve a better balance between opposing forces?

Winston Churchill once observed: "Democracy is the worst form of government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

I buy, and buy into that. I am still in awe of that moment of coincidence—of character, intelligence, and collaboration—that created this nation, a burst of brilliance and idealism almost impossible to imagine.

We all, men and women, are the beneficiaries of those revolutionary times. The simple fact that we meet here tonight in the Schlesinger Library to discuss these issues—frankly, openly, and without fear—is demonstration to me that the system is still working. That itself is worth fighting for.

Thank you.