

Maureen and Mike

# Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

## **Archives and Special Collections**

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: [library.archives@umontana.edu](mailto:library.archives@umontana.edu)

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

**Oral History Number: 378-003**

**Interviewee: Judy Smith**

**Interviewers: Erin Cunniff and G.G. Weix**

**Date of Interview: March 7, 2002**

**Project: Montana Feminist History Oral History Collection**

Erin Cunniff: This is Erin Cunniff interviewing Judy Smith on March 7, 2002, for the Montana Feminist History Project in the Women's Studies Department of the University of Montana. Okay, so could you tell me about how you initially got involved with feminism, feminist activism in general?

Judy Smith: One interesting thing is when I first got involved, we didn't call it feminism. That came later. We called it women's liberation, because I was part of the social liberation movements of the '60s, and the word feminism wasn't something that was part of our vocabulary. Later on, we realized we were the multiple wave of all of these things that women had been doing, but at that time, it didn't seem to us to flow that way. So, we talked about it as what was going on with women, within the context of like, the anti-war movement and the student movement in Austin, Texas, where I was in graduate school.

So, in the '60s, when we were organizing for a lot of change for lots of other folks, including the civil rights movement...This is the classic story. A lot of us were doing that work and going, "Well, we're talking about freedom and rights and treating people like full human beings and equality, and yet women are treated the same old way." So there was a rather thorough discussion in Austin, because Austin was one of the major places for the student movement. There was a rather thorough discussion there of what was going on in that movement, and a group of women basically saying, "Well, we're not interested in being part of this anymore." So we broke off, and started our own movement, and that happened all around the country. One of the more interesting things I think about the women's liberation movement at that time is that it was parallel evolution. The same thing was going on in lots of, you know, kind of hot spots around the country, so in...You'd find out in Madison, you'd find out in Berkeley, you'd find out in Harvard, you'd find out in wherever it is that...where there were quite a few campuses where there was a large student movement going on, this same phenomenon occurred, which is the women that were involved in those political change conversations just said, "Whoops, no. Not doing this anymore." It caused a fair amount of...Well, it still does. I think it would be always interesting to ask some of the men from that period how they feel about it even today. I occasionally run into a few of them and they still have quite a bit of a feeling about what that did.

So, for a group us, we decided we would spend a fair number of hours with each other talking over the whole concept of what it meant to be a woman, and how'd you grow up being a woman, and what did you feel about it, and that was called the consciousness-raising groups. And again, it was a kind of a spontaneous evolution. No one told us how to do that. It was just, okay, let's all get in someone's backyard and talk over sexism, and socialization and the

meaning of the things that we've been taught and how...what we want to do about it. So, that was one thread that was really important for me.

A second thread is that I'm trained in a particular field, and that's sort of played directly into the whole birth control and abortion movement, because I had some training in that area. I was in graduate school in Biology, and at that time, basically it was hard to get birth control pills, and it was very hard to get an illegal abortion, because basically in Texas it was illegal. There were very few places it was legal. So, a group of us decided we'd start making birth control and abortion available. And we didn't provide the actual abortion, but we did take women places that they could get abortions. And my colleagues and I in the graduate program at the Biology department went down and investigated the clinics and made sure that they were safe, and made sure that they used sterile technique, and all those kinds of things. We took on a certain responsibility around birth control and abortion at that time.

Again, I think when you have your own experience of something being illegal that you think you absolutely have a right to, that's a radicalizing experience. And you can go in various directions with it, but at that time, at least in the late '60, most of us went in the direction of saying, "I have a right to that. I'll have it." So we worked at different levels. We did some legal challenges. We did, as I say, direct access kinds of things. We did quite a bit of education. And it just worked out that I was part of the group that brought a court case that ended up being the *Roe v. Wade* case and so we went to the Supreme Court and won that particular case. But, I think more importantly than that was just the sense of it that we were very, you know, entitled.

I think that's something that's always interesting to ask who gets involved in what part of the women's movement, when? So, it was a lot of women with quite a bit of education, quite a bit of a sense of themselves that they should have what they want. So the issues that came from that are issues that are pretty predictable. You know, women wanted sexual freedom. Okay. Women wanted equal rights to jobs that pay money. Okay, you know, those kinds of things. So, those were the first issues that kind of rolled out of that part of the women's movement, and it's because it was a student-based movement, those were the kinds of conversations a lot of us had.

But also, interestingly, because of other political philosophy that I had, I spent a lot of time over in the minority side of town, which is where a lot of the Hispanic and African-American folks lived, so I got very involved in poverty issues as well. But I can't say that the Austin women's movement did. That just happened to be an interest of mine.

After all that kind of happened, and I finished up my degree, and I wanted to move somewhere, and at that time, I was pretty alienated from Austin because it was growing quickly, and I didn't want to live in a city. And I'd come backpacking up here. And there was sort of an ethic at that time of going back to the land. A lot of folks that I've met who have come to Montana when I did in the '70s moved to Montana because they wanted to be here closer to the clean air, water, the mountains, create their own community. Live as a part of, you know, a better

environmental relationship. So a lot of folks moved here. I was one of them. Moved to Missoula, and I was interested in the fact that there was a university here, because I figured that's how I could make a living, would be to figure out how to do some teaching at the university. And I had done some teaching at the university where I had just gotten my degree. So, I thought maybe I could come up and propose teaching some of the classes and some of the things I did there. Also, they had an underground newspaper here, and I had worked for my years as a graduate student at the underground newspaper called *The Rag*, which was the local sort of subversive newspaper of the time. *The Independent* now has nothing really...It's very different than what we did with the underground press, because the underground press considered itself accountable to the movement. *The Independent* and these papers right now—there's no movement to be accountable to, but at that time it was a very different relationship. So, I worked on that. And there was one there called *The Borrowed Times*, so I had heard about Missoula. So, there were just some things in Missoula that made me think, "Well, that might be a place I could go live, and do some of the things I want to do. And it's not a city. And it's close to the mountains."

So, I moved here in '73, and spent about three months in the library, trying to see if there was anything about women in the library here. There was very little. I just sort of poked around, just to see what was going on here, and talked to some people. And this is sort of a funny part. So, you know, I asked about who'd been doing what on campus, and I'd heard, "Well, there were a couple of people who'd been doing some things on campus." Carolyn Wheeler's name came up, who had been in the English department, and had done some courses, and had worked in the Women's Center. Diane's name came up, but what was so funny about Diane's name is that, people said I should probably talk to her and meet her, but when I did, she was totally negative to me. She said, "Nothing can happen here. We've done whatever there is to be done in Missoula. Don't even bother."

I was like, "That's interesting." So, she wasn't a part of my life very much early on, because what I brought was a focus also on the whole birth control and abortion thing, and so, when I came in, I tried to find the women who were working around those issues and said, "I want to start a clinic. So, I want to talk to you about starting a women's clinic here." Then I also said to the women on campus, "Look, I want to teach Women's Studies. So, I want to do that here, so how do we do those things?" There wasn't a Women's Center, so I said, "Well, let's just start a Women's Center."

Again, there's a certain pattern to all of this, because, like I say, I think many of us who got involved in this wave of the, you know, women's movement, were very entitled women. Like, we just said, "You know, there should be this." So we walked over to the UC, and there was an empty space, and it was an old café. We just said to Ray Chapman, who happened to be the head of the UC at that time, "We'll take that, and we'll make it into a Women's Center." He just looked at us. We said, "You know, and then if...something has to change later, that's fine." But we had some petitions. We had students and faculty and people who wanted us to be able to do that. He had no idea what it was. We just said, "We'll do it."

We got that set up, and then we said, “We also want to teach a Women’s Studies class.” So we proposed to teach an interdisciplinary Women’s Studies class, and Mary Birch was one of the first allies we had, who retired from the Social Work department not long ago. She sort of said, “Well, okay. I’ll help that.” So she and me went to the Social Work department and said, “Sponsor this class, and we’ll do it. And it’ll be an interdisciplinary class, and we’ll, you know, get a lot of people involved with us, and we’ll advertise it.” We had lots of students who wanted to take it and we offered it. Then we went to the Faculty Senate and said, “Look, we have a successful class. Put this in the catalog and let’s do it.” Well, it didn’t happen. But it’s that kind of sense of things that in some cases you can make certain things happen, and in other cases you can’t. You run into certain kinds of institutions, you know, that you could have great change at certain times, and not much change at all at other times.

Basically what happened for me when I came here is there were some resources here, there was some flexibility here, but there was no way to make it inside the institution here. And I’m not a very institutional person, so I did a lot of things that were pretty much extra-institution. I think that was what was so disconcerting for the institution, because they didn’t know what to do about that. I mean, they couldn’t get rid of us, because they weren’t...you know, they weren’t paying us. So, we did a lot of classes. We put on a lot of conferences. We just, you know, we had a lot of things happening and a lot of students were involved in our projects and different faculty folks joined us and whatever. But, in some ways the university had no real hold over us. We can talk in more detail about some of this, but it was...it was a very interesting experience for me, because it was an experience of saying...Well, there’s an anarchist theory—I don’t know, again, if you’ve studied political theory, but—that you make the new society in the, you know, the alley or the parking lot of the old society. Well, that’s kind of what we did. You know, we sort of came in here and said, “There’s a vacant hole over here. Let’s just build this thing, and show what it can be, and start teaching these classes. And sort of just do this stuff.”

Diane then joined in on that after a while, because she was another one who was willing to sort of, just kind of come in and do this stuff. So, we created something here for...Well it was probably from ’74 to ’85—about ten plus years. A significant number of students went through our classes. I actually sat on some graduate committees, which I always thought was kind of funny. You know, so by being present, and being willing to just say, “We have something to offer, and we’ll offer it here.” We were able to do a certain amount of something. The difficulty comes when you have to maintain that, because you don’t institutionalize. It’s not become part of a system, and then after awhile, people get too old to want to keep working for free, or need health insurance, or life’s change, or you know, those kinds of things. So, but that’s my general sense of what we were doing here on campus at that time period is we had some very creative, skilled people who were willing to work together. And as long as we didn’t have to ask the university for their approval, as long as we just kind of move along and show the things that we were doing, and that they were very supported by the students and by some faculty, you know, there wasn’t much the university was going to do about it.

We got several CETA jobs, so we employed people over at the resource center. We got a lot of work-study jobs. We set up intern programs. Some departments were much more open to working with us than others. And there wasn't any Women's Studies program. Social Work was one of the better ones. Interestingly, this was the one I was always fascinated with—we had Home Economics, because some of the women in Home Economics were very aware of all of the things that we were talking about. They had opened up to some of the Psychology people, and then Education. So, the classic female areas were the ones that were the most interested, and the least threatened, you know, because they didn't claim great academic ability. When we started hitting up against the guys and their great academic fiefdoms, that was the part that was much harder to do. Sociology was helpful because of a couple people.

EC: Who were they?

JS: Paul Miller, Dick Vandiver. Both of them were very helpful and very interested. And they would actually create classes and do independent study. And they got a lot of grief for it. Their department really gave them a very hard time for supporting us. Well, I should probably say this part. Toward the end, the school decided they did want to get rid of us, and so they investigated us. They did a whole academic—I don't know what you call this—but anyway, they wanted to investigate us to say that we were giving credit and we shouldn't have been able to. It was very much a witch hunt. And that language is something that some people use. And so, basically this guy, Rick Broom(?), in Sociology, did this little study to document that we were somehow not doing what we said we were doing, or were illegitimate, or somehow we're exploiting students, and all of this. Unfortunately there was another person involved too, who...I'm sad to say it was Maureen Curnow, who was never very helpful. But anyway, all that happened, and so, you know, it was like, "Well, okay. Let's see what they can document." I mean, I have no idea. But, so then I went to this sort of thing when they gave their big report, and they were just totally puzzled. They were like, "Well, it looks like they offered these classes. And several hundred students took them, and they actually read books, and wrote papers, and had a big impact on them, and they did it for free." So, it was like it was that whole thing about, "Oh my gosh! It must be a plot! It must be something, you know, subversive."

We said, "Well, this is what we do." But by that time, for me personally, I had just kind of had it with the university. It was sort of like, "Eh, I don't need this." So, went off and did some other things.

I do think one of the most important things about the [Women's] Resource Center—and I'm really glad it's still there—but I do think one of the most important things that happened there is that there was a conscious attack on it by the institution to say there are people here that are...What's the right word? They're taking it out of just what it could be as a student thing. They're making it this larger thing. They're professional, and they're, you know, bringing in resources that students wouldn't be able to bring in. So, if we got them out of there, and it was just a student thing, then it would be much more controllable. And that's true. And that happened. And they tried to move the...out of the UC. And they moved it out of the space.

Then, when it came back, it was tucked away in a little corner. There's just been numbers of, sort of waves of experience around that. But basically then in '85, after it got really clear that there was this pressure to really close down opportunity instead of allow the opportunity to sort of continue on, a number of us just said, "Well, let's leave this. It can be students. There's a value to it. There is going to...maybe going to be a Women's Studies Program sometime. Let it be. Let it happen, and we'll go off and do other things that we want to do." So, for me there's kind of a discrete time period there, as I say, that we made a major effort to build something, and then realized that the...you know, the institution itself just didn't want to swallow us anymore. It wanted to spit us out.

EC: What about Jim Flightner's part?

JS: One of my favorite things about coming over here, one time G.G. was...came to a reception, and Jim Flightner was there. Were you there at that one? And poor man. You know, he obviously was very, you know, humiliated almost, and he apologized, which I appreciate. I think he had finally realized that that had been such a mistake on their part, and that we had done some pretty amazing things and...and contributed a great deal. And that they had reacted inappropriately. So, I think that was his official apology, which I appreciated. I thanked him, you know. At least he acknowledged it.

EC: Could you explain that? What he—

JS: He was the Dean of the school and was involved on that whole investigation of us, and sort of drumming us out of the academic hall, or whatever. He realized that that was, as I say, inappropriate. Plus, there had been...I don't know if this was exactly the same time, but there had...One other time, kind of like that, that was very funny, is we had a conference here that talked about lesbianism and at that time, there was some people in the community that got very upset about it. There was all this conversation around how we were all witches. I mean, all that stuff that seems amusing, but when it is something that someone is saying about you in a community, and then the administration took it seriously. So, you know, when your institution is susceptible to that kind of thing, that's the danger. So, I got called in to another Dean's office to say, "Well, we've had a complaint about you. And I just wanted to talk to you about it."

I was like, "Okay. What's the complaint?"

"Well, this person says you're a witch, and that you said...talked about it on the radio."

I said, "Well, I do talk on the radio. I actually understand witchcraft as an experience in women's lives and there's a history around it, but I do not consider myself a witch. I do not practice anything along that line. There's nothing like that that we do in the Resource Center. There may be people like that in Missoula, but not me."

Then he apologized and said, “Oh, I know. But I had to ask you that.” So, you know, it’s just one of those, sort of, sillinesses. But it got to be very clear to me, and this is something that we were talking earlier.

The campus became something different. When I was on campus in the ‘60s, the campus was where all political activity happened. When I came here, that was my assumption still, and as the ‘70s went into the ‘80s, I think that really changed. So, I don’t think campuses are where the action is anymore—for better or worse. I mean, I’m not saying that’s bad, I’m just saying that there was a shifting of that. And so, as that shift happened, again, various things could happen and there were various resources available in different ways. One of the reasons that the university did get annoyed with us is we started getting some significant grant money, because we did a lot of policy work to get money for Carl Perkins, to get some gender equity money, some things that we knew about, and wrote grants, and started doing it. And the university almost said, “Well, why aren’t we getting that money? Why are you getting that money?”

It was like, “Well because we know about it.” So, there were just a number of issues that were sitting in there. So in some ways the parting of the waves was more to say “Okay. Well, we can create something else somewhere else that’s going to be easier and have more resources for us, and then leave the university over here to do what it’s going to do.” Then other people came...I don’t know exactly when you came G.G., but...okay.

G.G. Weix: Nineteen. Julia Watson came in ‘88.

JS: Julia Watson, right, right.

GGW: So the lost years are ‘86 to ‘90.

JS: Okay. So, some other people came and started to have a conversation again, and wanted to do some women’s projects. Again, it wasn’t lost totally, it was just that there was a hiatus, and then some other folks came with a different kind of energy. Also Women’s Studies became different. You know, when I started—I mean it’s funny, but—when I did Women’s Studies, no one had been trained in Women’s Studies. I mean, what was that? So, all of us had all these different kinds of degrees, and, you know, had huge arguments, and they were kind of fun. We had actually one of the regional Women’s Studies meetings here, and we, we consciously set up interdisciplinary venues, because I...my training’s in Science. So, you know, I had one with the Philosophy person. We were just trying to show how you’d look at the same question, but with your different perspective. We used to have a lot of fun with it. Well, there was no Women’s Studies establishment, you know, or a degree system or anything. That’s another thing that’s changed.

In the feminist movement, and I use that word now, because I’m much more thoughtful about it, there’s a whole conversation around the institutionalization of feminism, and what happens, whether it’s in a university, whether it’s in a domestic violence shelter program. It’s when



something starts out as a political movement, it develops something...Well then how does it move forward? Does it get institutionalized? There's certain positives to that, because there's budgets and staff, and all of that. But there's also a downside to that, which is all of a sudden you have to fit someone else's credentials and structure, and conversation about how you should be. Depending on who you talk to in the feminist movement, there's either a great sense of loss around that, or there are people like me who say, "Well, then you go on and do something else." I mean, that's fine. It got going and then you do something else. It depends on where you find yourself at any one time. That's kind of the experience that I had.

The great time in the '70s, in my experience here was that we did find resources, like Margaret Kingsland was over at the Humanities Committee. I want to make sure and mention these people because I think they're very key. She's one of these inside the system people who really wants to help those of us that are trying to push the system. That's one of my philosophies that I still hold to, which is you've got to have an analysis of inside and outside the system, and how you work that together, if you really want change. Well, Margaret sat, sort of holding the purse strings of the Montana Humanities Committee, and she was a feminist, and she was very interested in helping. So every year for about—I don't know how many years—we would have a conference, she would help us with all kinds of projects. She was just very encouraging, and then she would also hammer on the other people that brought in their projects, and say, "Well, where's the women's view here? What's the—" Because, you know, she had us there as a constituency too, so she could do more because we were there, and we could do more because she was there. That worked really well. At the state level there was a Women's Bureau for a while, and a woman named Sue Bartlett that was head of that Women's Bureau. There were some folks that, when the Carl Perkins program started, they immediately came over and came to the Resource Center and said, "We want you to apply for these grants because we know you'll be the people who know how to do this stuff." So there was building that kind of network all around the state of that connection of how women knew to work with each other. I think that was the great value of what we did.

One of my favorite things now...this is a little bit related to one of these questions about the good news. One of my favorite things now is I do...I travel around and I go to a little town and someone comes up to me and says, "Oh, I took your Women's Studies class in 1979, and it's changed my life and—" and that's great. Because that's exactly what everybody hoped would happen. I mean, if you believe in social change at all, you'd have to believe that a larger and larger set of folks get something different in their life, and it just pools up, pools out until all of a sudden something else can happen.

I don't know if this is totally true, because we haven't verified it, but I'd like to say that some of the things that we're able to do now, like at the state level with some of the policy work I do, is very much a result of this early work. Because a lot of women are around that...We knew each other twenty years ago, and yet now they're the legislators and they're the people in the government and some of us are still here running the non-profit entities and whatever else, and so there's a pretty interesting set of folks in the state now. It's not necessarily so visible. That's

one of the things about the women's movement that they always say, "Well, where's the women's movement?" If you know where to look, there's a lot going on.

GGW: Who are some of those individuals who are legislators, for example?

JS: Well, when I said that, I was thinking very specifically of a couple people just because they're who I worked with recently. I'm working on a welfare thing right now, and so Chris Kaufman is one. But Chris came over from the Resource Center with us to WORD, and then went on to meet Helen and is now a legislator over there. And then Rosie Buzzis, who's here in town, represents the university, and she was on the school board for a while, and she works in Flagship? Yes, I think Flagship, an educator, those kinds of things. Let's see, who else do I want to mention? There's a couple of Native American women that we worked with that I still see, but they weren't in the legislature this time. I'm trying to think who else would be...

GGW: How many women were in the legislature?

JS: This is going to be bad. See, I'm not going to remember all these names.

GGW: I was just wondering.

JS: The woman who is from Crow, and I'm not going to remember her name...There were a couple of women over from that sort of Crow Agency area that were in the legislature. I'm not remembering them—their names. Then there's a woman named Karen Fenton that we used to work with pretty closely who's now I think, still back up on the Salish Kootenai reservation. Jeanne Eater (?) was someone who we used to work with over on more of basically on some history and other things, not so much the legislature. I'm not going to remember the legislators' names.

GGW: These are some of the women we're interviewing.

JS: Yes. Then, the very good thing about that, and maybe Diane talked to you, is that when we did do the regional Women's Studies meetings here, one of the big things we brought to that is our insistence that Native American women would not only be included, but that we would pay someone to actually bring them here, and pay them to be here. Because in the region there'd been all this conversation around, "Well, we want to include. We want to include. We want to include." But it never really happened. So we all got together and said, "Well, the way it happens is you show that you value it enough to pay people." So, that was kind of a breakthrough, and that's how we connected up really well with some of those women. They came and were participants and did different workshops, and we also did an art show and very specifically recruited Native American women's art. We said, "That's not craft, that's art." That's a distinction of the time. That may have changed now, but at a certain time, craft was not considered as valuable as art. Some of that has shifted now I think. We got to know some of those folks. That created some good bonds.

I think personally, that's what the university should be about. I mean, talk about using resources. I mean, that's what you use the resources that are in a place like this to do, is to reach out and create things that can't happen. Bring in different, you know, different sets of people and different experiences and put something that weaves together. You can't do that as easily other places. University is I think really uniquely valuable for that. So we were able to do that for a couple of years. You may all still be doing it. I don't mean to say it's not now, but just that at that time. That's kind of what we did. There were core people, again some faculty people who worked on that, certainly a number of graduate students that have gone on and done other things, worked on that. Then as I mentioned earlier to you, Erin, the other programs that we had started in the community, like Blue Mountain Clinic and Women's Place, those really fed in and out of the Resource Center, because we would recruit there for students who would want to work in the different organizations. We'd do educational on...There was a lot of flow through because there was a core of women that would be involved in several of those. Since my particular interest was in that, I was involved in all of them. But some of the people would be involved in one or two or three of them. Again, there was that flowing around of, of people that were interested.

We always had something new. A new Brown Bag topic at the Resource Center with...you know...One time it would be history, and the next time it would be reproductive, because we'd want to do that. Then we might want to do health, and we might want to do...oh well, whatever it was, you know, we just would be constantly flowing in those other issues. We did assertiveness. These are the little things. Like I can remember, too, we were the first people to do assertiveness training, we did it of course from a feminist perspective, and then other people picked up assertiveness, and it became sort of a standard conversation, but, you know, that was a feminist tool quite early on. We did the first divorce survival workshops, and we did a divorce survival handbook.

I don't know if Diane told...talked to you much about this, but...because of my sister Lin [Linda Smith], who was a printer, we got into self-publishing a lot. Because we worked on *The Rag*, we really believed you have to get information out to people. At some level, by the way, I think we were very naïve. But, that's another issue. We thought, if you just got people the right information in their hands, then they would, you know, do something. So we did a lot of printing. We did the birth control handbooks, we did the divorce handbooks, we did a career change handbook, we did—

EC: They wrapped up the birth control handbooks, didn't they?

JS: Well, there were a lot of things that happened with that. Yes. Diane has that story about that one. That's the McGill handbook from Texas days. We used that same one...That's one of the things Diane and I have laughed about. Because we, in Texas, were having our same stuff, using that same handbook that the school down there hated us using, and she was up here with

the schools hating her using it here. That's the kind of synchronicity I mean about what was going on at the time. There was just so much going on, you know, so it's been fun to kind of check into that and see. Anyway, we just published a lot of things. That newsletter that G.G. brought in, that we were really committed to having that. You can see the range of topics, and a lot of the things we were up to were in that. It was very wide-ranging, and as a result of that, we had a lot of different kinds of women involved with us. Like, we had the first woman who was a forester, who went through the Forestry school. I mean, just a lot of them just came in and said, "Well, what do you do?"

We said, "Well, here's what we do, and wouldn't you like to come?" We had something to offer a wide range of women. It was not at all that sort of...you know, feminist are all, you know, weird and look like this stuff at that time. That was as I say, an interesting experience. It was something that I think both...I'll speak for myself and then Diane has probably said too. It was really doing Women's Studies in a way that probably we couldn't have done better. The trick of it is you can't maintain it, you can't sustain it. There's the high and the low of it.

EC: And laying that foundation for the future program to build upon. What was it like starting things like the Blue Mountain Clinic at that time? Or clinics for women—

JS: Here's another one of my theories. If you're going to be different, you have to be really good. Because people have to overlook all the weirdness about you and kind of say, "Okay. You know what you're talking about." That's one of the things that I think has helped us out here is that a subset of us who kind of worked like at the clinic...You know, we could....We knew what we were talking about. We were really pretty good. Barbara Burke is one of the people I met when I first moved here, and she's one of the ones I'm thinking of now. She started running Planned Parenthood. She went off to the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, got her Public Health degree and came back and started running Planned Parenthood. We were friends. I went and worked with her for a while when she would need that. When we started Blue Mountain, we brought half of the Planned Parenthood staff into Blue Mountain. We had a number of conversations with the Health Department people. Because they were the more progressive edge. When we were doing Women's Place around abortion, they knew we were doing abortion referral. They knew we had that interest. We went around and talked to a lot of them. So, again, we had a certain credibility from our background. I'm not a big advocate necessarily of having Ph.D. degrees, but it does help you when you're going to do this kind of stuff. Again, this is my argument—if you're going to be different, it's very helpful to have a credential, it's very helpful to act like you know what you're talking about and to have people be able to go there with you.

So what we did is we just shopped having a clinic. We just believe it was the right thing to do. We just went to all these medical doctors, sat down in their offices, and said, "We want to do this clinic. Do you want to do it?" I went and talked to a lot of different medical people and they were all sort of embarrassed to say no, because they realized they should do it. That's the other

thing. When you're around these people, you know, that are working with their own professional guild and whatever, that's, you know—

[End of Tape 1, Side A]

[Tape 1, Side B]

JS: —we could go talk to and, and all of sudden then we were saying to them, “Come over here and work in this clinic,” and, you know, just didn’t find any but takers.

The other idea that I had was “Well, if we need money, what we want to do is we’ll, we’ll setup notes and we’ll self-finance the clinic. I’d been always into that kind of stuff, which is how do you figure out how you put resources together, and...entrepreneurship and things like that? I went to ten people and said, “Give us 2,000 dollars, and then we’ll write a note and we’ll pay you back by a certain time.” That’s how we started Blue Mountain Clinic, with that money from those people. We went and finally we said to this doctor...This is the other very interesting that you learn, is that, when you’re out on the edge, there’s a lot of people out there with you, and some of them are out there for reasons like you are, and some of them are out there for other reasons, and you’ve got to sort of figure out where you can work with them and where you can’t. Well, there was this doctor that was kind of out there on the edge, and he was being denied hospital privileges at one place, but we went and talked to him, and we watched him, and we thought he really knew what he was doing. So, we took a doctor to open up that probably, everything else being, I wouldn’t have wanted to do. But, that was the only way we got started. His name was Lewis and he had, as I said, lost his privileges from one place. But it was over one of these personality things, not over his ability.

We took an old room in a dental building. We made all the furniture. We cleaned it up. We went to Seattle and learned all the procedures. I wrote the standing orders for the nurses. I mean, we all just said, “We’re doing it.” It was in the women’s health movement model, which is you know, everybody can learn how to do these things. You just figure them out, and then if you need to have, you know, professionals, you get them where you need them, but they don’t have more say than anyone else does. It was an interesting experience, I think for everybody, especially for the doctors. We just did it, opened up, and started, you know, having twenty women every weekend that came in and got procedures. I remember the very first time we did it. I mean, we just were all like, “Okay, here we go. Open the door. First one comes in. Sign the chart. You do this. I do this.” So it worked. We paid off the notes. You know, Blue Mountain has gone on to be what it is.

The core of women who started that, most of them didn’t stay a whole long time. There was stresses and strains onside the organization for sure. Some of us stayed for awhile and then left. Other people stayed a little longer and then left. It’s become more medicalized. But again, it’s one of those things—it’s an institution now, so what do you do? But it got started, and...One of the things also that you really learn, or at least for me, I think is real important to pay attention to is that, like the women who come in and that you, you’ve done this for them, you can’t really expect them to understand exactly what it is that you’ve done for them, and that you shouldn’t have that expectation of them, Otherwise you’re going to be bummed out, and they’re not going to really understand why you’re bummed out. Because, for them, it’s just like, “I need an abortion. You’re a place that provides abortion.”

I want to stand there and say, “Do you realize what we had to go through to provide this abortion for you? I mean, you know, what I’m saying?”

It’s really important I think historically to watch out for that. As feminist, I think we have to be very thoughtful. Just for like, the two of you, I can’t expect you to totally understand what, you know, I did, and therefore go, “Oh. You did that, and I don’t have to worry about it anymore, and—” No. I mean, that’s not how it’s going to work. One of the things that interests me a lot is some of this intergenerational stuff right now. There were no feminists for me to pay attention to when I was growing up, but now there are plenty of them around for other people to pay attention to, so what do you do with that? That’s one of the things. One of my answers about Blue Mountain Clinic is “Hey! There was no one there to even ask how to do it.” You just said, “This is how we’ll do it.” That’s the model I think we used over and over again.

GGW: What would you say were influences on the models that you used?

JS: You know, there were significant influences probably, really early on. Both my mother and father are interesting people. They grew up in fairly conservative small towns in Oklahoma and Missouri, but they...both went to school in New York City. They were both exposed to a lot of different ways of looking at things, and so we were raised in a household where people respected other people even if they were different. My father got several awards for...in some ways, it seems not a lot now, but at that time it was...national something for Christians and Jews, and NAACP, you know, all those kinds of things. That was just part of our life, and also the idea that differently-abled people are integrated. My father was very big on kids that aren’t able to do mainstream work not put in the corner, but brought...so we were around all of that a lot. I got pretty early on that message that people aren’t different. People should be able to have opportunity. It’s very important.

My father is...when I think back on him I always think I’m amused by him, because he was really into the power of positive thinking. We got that hammered on all the time. We ate dinner together every night, and, you know, we reported on what we did in school. It was like, “Well, you just get out there. If you just do this—” He was this guy with three daughters, right? So, it was like, “Zwoop! No gender issue here,” because it was thus what he had. He was raised on a farm, and just went out and did everything. So, we did everything. There was a lot of that in my immediate family, and as I grew up, it was just kind of like, “Oh, okay. That’s what you do.” It’s just totally supported. I never had any thought that that wouldn’t be the way you’d do it. I was always surprised when someone thought maybe it wasn’t the way you did it.

The other thing—and I think this is not totally good, but, I mean, it’s—you’re lucky if you do well in school. If you do well in school, people really leave you alone. So you can be as odd as you want. But, you know, if you’re doing really well in school, they can’t do a lot to you. Well, that was my experience, especially in Texas. I moved to Texas later on, and I was very different

than a lot of the folks there. That could have been harder than it was. But it wasn't, because I pretty much had support of my own family, and I did well in school.

One of the hardest things though, as a result of that, is to get over the myth of, of meritocracy. Like, for the longest time I kept going, "God, I'm smart, and I do things well. I should get rewarded." Well, no. That's not true. We don't live in a society like that. But, it's hard to break that. But, I think if you have the right kind of childhood, where, you know, it's positive and people do reward you, you do think you can do anything. I mean, that's the bizarre part of this entitled experience, I think. That's why it was hard in some ways to connect up with women for awhile for me, because so few women that I ever met had this exact kind of experience, so when we'd do consciousness-raising, my experience wasn't one that a lot of other women kind of resonated with. Plus, I'm six feet tall, and I'd been very athletic, and I'm very verbal. Just all those things that, you know, are different. So that was, that was part of it, part of the influence.

My mom loved Eleanor Roosevelt, so I always keep her in my mind as someone who's probably influential. And Albert Schweitzer. My mom went to school with Albert Schweitzer's daughter, so I always heard about him. I was very impressed by him, that he was an organist and then became a doctor, or the other way around. Maybe I can't remember which it was at first. He had this entire thing about respect for life, that as much as you can, you would never kill anything. So I grew up with that. You know, it's just...those are threads that come together for me.

Then when the '60s happened it was like, "Whoa, whoa! Look at that!" There was a lot to do. So that's, to me, kind of the Resource Center. We could talk more about specifics if you have something in your mind that you'd like to understand more about that part of my experience here. I do think...My analysis is that, is that there were a lot of potential allies and kind of a space waiting for that to happen. I don't believe in, like a person like me takes credit for this. It's sort of like, I had an expectation. I came in. There was all this there that it could come. You know, but sometimes that outside person with the expectation almost has to come in and stir it up a little bit, and then the thing happens.

GGW: What was a typical day like, in terms of the seven a.m. to five p.m. routine?

JS: In the Resource Center days? Well, here's one thing that I also really believe. Even though you're not getting paid, I believe you have a schedule, and you show up, and you do work. You work by example, like if lots of stuff has to get done, just because you happen to be a person that has, you know, more at school, or a different credential, doesn't mean you don't do it all. At the Resource Center we did it all. When there was a mailing, everybody did the mailing. Or if you had to clean the floor, every body cleaned the floor, or whatever. We did that.

Usually, a couple of us would get there pretty early. We'd get a lot of phone calls, so answering the phone and fending off just...inquiries and whatever. We'd usually have a meeting of some kind. But it was a collective, so we, you know...meetings were long. You'd try to decide, you



know, what your program would be or who was going to be doing what. Often enough there'd be some excitement around...some activity or something that would go on. Around lunchtime or something people would come in. My real memory of it is that there'd be quiet time, but then often enough there'd be...Like between classes, or at certain times, a lot of people would just come in. You'd just tell stories, and all this stuff would happen, and blah, blah, blah, blah. Then it would quiet down again for awhile.

But, a lot, as I say, phone calls, people dropping by, it was kind of a clearinghouse, happening place, in the, in the best days. I mean, there were some times when it wasn't like that. Plus, we finally developed a really good library, and it was one of the only places you could find all the things that we had. We had people in looking for books, and checking things out, and asking us questions pretty often too. Usually it was pretty full with, you know, just that exchange of information and things with folks in my experience.

EC: When was it open?

JS: It was for classes. We would sometimes teach our Women's Studies classes there and our assertiveness classes, workshops, and things like that. Then, certainly when we did our conferences, it was our, you know, sort of base to work out of and there would be a lot of things going on in there, connected with it.

GGW: Did you travel from the Resource Center to conferences?

JS: Yes.

GGW: Which would be the most memorable?

JS: Yes. Well, one of things that is really enjoyable, and I hope you all have had a chance to do it, is to, you know, gather up a whole bunch of you and drive off somewhere to some women's conference, because you get to spend quality time with each other that you don't otherwise. The very first time we went to the founding conference for the National Women's Studies Association in San Francisco, we went, and we got a university van, and we drove it. It was snowing, so you could not see anything, because it was in January, and so we went over the pass, Lookout Pass into Idaho, and I'm driving this and it was like, "Oh, no!" Anyway, we, we'd do this, and when we arrived in San Francisco everybody's like, "Who are you?" This carload of women from Montana get out and it's like, "Montana's here!" Because it was such a, you know, again...Again, it may not be your experience. My experience is people think most of the people in Montana are trees with no brains. So, the fact that you are..."I'm Montana." We got out. We're, you know, doing whatever we're doing. Drove back, the very same kind of weather. Got as far as Alberton, and all the semis were off the road. All of them were off the road. I'm driving along going, "There's a message in this, Judy. Why don't you think about this?"

I said, "I think I'm going to get off the road." I just angle over like this, and the car goes 360 all the way around, and we're all like, "Aaah." We stayed in a motel in Alberton on the way back. But the greatest thing, to me, is that all...There were like, I don't know, eight of us maybe just going to those conferences and realizing, "Oh my gosh! There are all these women, all over the country. They're doing all these things. They may not even be interesting, but they're doing them." You know, enjoy that, and listen to it, and each time you'd go you'd have a new thing and come back and say, "Oh, you know what I heard? I heard these people are organizing because fat is a feminist issue."

You go, "Fat is a feminist issue? What is that?"

Then after awhile, another year, you'd be saying, "Oh, there's this body workshop that everybody's doing around fat, blah, blah." So you know, you just listen to it. All of a sudden it would become this whole analysis and something that would, you know, be worked on. It made up for living in Montana to some degree. Because, you know, Montana's totally out of it. It was kind of like, okay, if you go to these places you could actually get content and then you can come back and...The great thing about Montana is that you can then do something with the content, because you know, there's some flexibility here. You're not locked into certain rigidities, because no one owns the territory yet here, so you can say, "Okay. Let's do that here." That was very good. We did travel every year for awhile. We'd try to go to those National Women's Studies meetings. Depending on who you talk to, they'll tell you those are memorable in some way or another.

GGW: And you hosted some regional ones in '79.

JS: Yes. Yes. We hosted, right. We hosted the regional one, and then we certainly had a range of other kinds of conferences that were statewide conferences as well.

EC: Did you get any resistance to the conferences that you hosted or the topics that you were dealing with in consciousness-raising?

JS: Well, like I mentioned, the university got unhappy with us when the community heard we were talking about lesbians. That was like...a problem. The university, in my opinion, was totally inappropriate because they kind of apologized for that to the community, which I think is...you should never be doing. Other than that, no, not really.

EC: But the women and technology, or bodies?

JS: No, no. You know, because to some degree...again, we weren't asking to be accepted in the middle. We were acknowledging that we were a pretty unique track. We had things that were important to raise, and we were in conversation, but we didn't ask to be...you know, yes this is the middle road. We didn't look for that. We were willing to be on the edge. If you're on the edge, get your own money, bring up your own things, people aren't too unhappy with you. And

also, you know, again, like...let's take the technology. There were a lot of people around the country that were talking about the things we were talking about. It isn't as though it was just this little group of women in Montana. It's just that no one else in Montana necessarily was talking about that. So, you know, people heard about it other places.

EC: So, I wanted to ask you about your involvement in of getting women involved in different studies, for example the hard sciences?

JS: So again, in the early conversations in Women's Studies, some of the academic areas that came up very early were like the...oh, English, and Social Work, and History. You know, women started saying, "Okay. Let's study women and let's understand women."

Then the areas that for a while there was almost no activity would be the more traditional science and technology areas, and everybody would say, "Well, what's there to do in here?" It's science, so women would do it the same way men would do it, or there'd be the same answer to the equation, or whatever. So a number of us—and this is, was a nationwide conversation—said, "Well, maybe not. Maybe this actually would be done differently if women did it. Maybe they'd ask different questions. Maybe they'd approach it with a different perspective. Maybe they're not even interested in some of the things that are valued now because it's a male, whole male, whole male approach to things. Let's ask questions about that."

There were a number of women—most of them again in science departments that began to deconstruct some of this—also began to say, "What is the role of women in science? Like, she...there's a lot of women and then they drop out at certain key times. Why do they drop out there? What's going on in science that makes them drop out?"

There was a conversation around computers. This has changed a little bit, I think, but I had a very good friend who ended up...now she teaches women and technology in Canada, because Canada actually has a very interesting support for that kind of study on the whole question about women and technology. Her theory was is that young women weren't becoming engaged with computers because of the way computers were taught. The games that had so much violence, and the imagery that was used with computers—it just was alienating to little girls. Plus they wouldn't fight to get on it. So, if you only had one or two computers in a room, little boys would get them, and little girls would not. Well, now some of that's changed. There's a computer for everyone. There's not that same gender activity. Plus, some of the learning techniques have changed. It will be interesting to see if women do engage computers, but for a while they weren't as much.

There's been a lot of conversation around that, which is like, I could tease you and say, "Why didn't you know how to work that particular piece of machinery, you know? Like, a guy would know that." Well, there's a certain choice that women make too not to engage in machinery. What's that about? I used to always use this example about kitchens, which is...You know, there's incredible technology in kitchens, and women all engage that technology. They get in

there, and they do all the stuff with the technology, but that's okay, right? Because that's in the kitchen. But if you took them out and put them in somewhere else, they would not engage at all, the same way. There's that whole issue of perception and desire and all that that you have to begin to think about and talk about too. It's an interesting area. I always say, you know, if you had many lives, I would have, I would have had one in that whole area. I have a Ph.D. in science. I would have, you know, gone along the line. I would have probably done more research. I would ask more of those questions and probably be doing something along there. But I didn't pick that path. But there's some certainly interesting things in there. There are people doing it. Like, I understand there's a woman here on this campus now in physics who wants to write a WETA grant. Do you know about this? Has she approached you?

GGW: (inaudible)

JS: Yes. So she wants to do this. She thinks one of the problems for young women is the fourth or fifth grade teachers, right? So, she wants to engage them in how to do inquiry-based learning. So, you know, that continues on as part of the whole—

GGW: (inaudible)

JS: Right. Right. Yes, that's true. That's true. While we're on the Women's Studies thing...I do think one of the key things that's been of interest to me about Women's Studies is the one we just talked about, which is, is Women's Studies just about finding out what women do and just adding them into this sort of established way of looking at things, or is it actually saying, "No, let's look at things completely differently." That's been a struggle, like, Gilligan's work...Are you familiar with her? Although I don't totally like her work, there's something in her work that I really appreciate which is that women really have different values and they have different ways of approaching things, and if you change your frame and look at it that way, would reality really be different? I mean, those are just engaging questions, and it's that's what the university is for in my opinion. You know, when I'm at WORD, and I'm sitting there trying to figure out what to do about welfare, I don't get to sit very long, and say, "Well, let's see. Do you women really think about it differently?" I mean...That's not on my plate. So it's great to have places that...where it is on your plate, and try to say, "Okay. What do we know about that, and how do we then learn what we do? It's not enough just to know. What would we *do* about that?"

If women have a different value system, how do we get that value system in place, so people like me that are doing welfare reform say, "Look. The value system is that which would actually then work better for me under welfare reform in my opinion." So, you know, it's that linkage of, of academic understanding and work with the actual political, practical work that Women's Studies originally started out being about. I don't know if it's stayed there. That's a question that a lot of people ask.

GGW: Are there any other fields that you can think of that did that?

JS: Well, didn't Sociology, to some degree, do that? And I bet Anthropology might want to argue it does that. But Sociology, at least certain Sociology people, would say that they started asking questions around social problems because they wanted to understand them, and then help provide solutions for people in the field with them. Of course Social Work would want to argue that at least part of what they do is ask questions to get information that, you know, allow you to set up programs that, that address things in society.

GGW: What about the sciences?

JS: Well, I'm cynical about that. See, I think to some degree the way you're trained when you're in an academic science program is not to be of use. I think it's to ask intellectually rigorous questions that engage you and your colleagues, and if it happens to be of use, because...good, because then you can get some money for it. It may have changed now. You know, again, I was in school awhile ago, and it may be that because of funding, you know, business interest is there, and you better show business interest what it is that you have that's of use to them, so maybe that's happened. But in general, no, I don't think so. You can think of examples where that's not true. Like, you know, Louis Pasteur looking at his little mold to see if it was going to cure something.

GGW: Well, we're still wondering what would bring Women's Studies here, under ten years, into dialogue with the sciences?

JS: Hmm. Well you know... There's two things I really notice that have happened. One thing that's happened is if you get enough students in there that are women...like, that's happened in Sociology and some of these other programs, where almost the whole student body became women, and all the faculty are men. And then you try to point that out to them, and you help them say, "Okay, maybe something has to happen in this exchange differently." So, I don't know if that's happened very much yet, in the sciences here. But, in some places, there's a significant number of women that are...especially biological, ecological, natural history-based science, I bet there's quite a few women. That would be one thing. It's just that it would be volume of women in the classroom that would be a basis for something. Then, of course, there's these key women that take faculty positions, and begin to have some influence at that level, and say...the trick is they have to be willing to say it though. See, if they won't acknowledge that they think Women's Studies, or feminism, or whatever is important, then they're almost like a hindrance to you, because it's kind of like, "Woo-hoo, I made it, and you can too!" I don't know, again, who's in the departments here. I do know that for awhile there were a couple of...even some of the men, in the biological sciences, that were very interested in...you know, if...if we had had a way of paying our way, some of us who had this training could have probably gone in and made more change there. But you know, we would have had to do it for free, and that didn't engage me. I do think that's still there. I do think that some of the men themselves have some interest in this. It's just than how you get inside that conversation.

GGW: Is there a parallel in some of the programs that WORD has initiated in male-dominated realms like home-building, and finance / loans, and—

JS: Oh yes. Oh yes. One of the parallels that's very clear is that what we've done out in the community, just like what we did here, is we said, okay. We know how to do something. We'll set it up. We'll show you it works. Then, we want you to do it too. That's the creating a model and based on your own principles, so when we started the whole microloan business analysis, we said, "You know, women often can't get credit. They often don't start businesses because they don't have access to resources, and they want to start small. And banks don't want to loan to them, and they're overlooked, and—" There's a whole arena for how someone could employ themselves in a small microbusiness, and they could get resources, and maybe eventually employ one or two others, but never create a big business. That's something that's of value, so let's create a program that promotes that. And we did. And we got money to do that. And we targeted women and low-income people. Again, it's one of those ones where we showed how it worked, and now someone else does it because it does work. So, it's the same model to a large degree of being able to demonstrate something, prove it up. You know, kind of say, "Okay. Why don't you try it?"

Now with housing, we're also doing something similar, although we haven't quite yet hit a point where we have women who will overwhelmingly say they'd like to do our projects. The contractors like to do our projects. They consider us innovative, and that's positive to them, and they want to work with us. One of the first things we did do is if you get a contract with us to build a house, you have to employ a certain number of women in your crew. It's right there in the language. That was the first time that was done, that we know of, in Montana anyway. And that's okay. You know, they were willing to do that. You know, it's just a little chipping away a little bit at some of that. So, but see, that's that parallel where you have the cards. See, here on this campus, you guys don't have very many cards still. But, we do. We have the money to build a house. They better listen to us. That's one of the difficulties I would say probably over here is...some Women's Studies programs have gotten the president or the, you know, administration people to cut in, say, "You're going to do it." I don't now if that's happened here or not. I just don't know about it.

GGW: I think it's an interesting analysis about resources and models, and on the model front, I think that is what works. You show a successful model to anyone, and you happen to be the Women's Studies program and people have a positive experience, it doesn't matter what department they're from. But you have to show them a successful model. And the second way to go is to have the resources to call the shots.

JS: Yes, yes. Right. We, in most cases, were the model, a few cases were the resources. That's another thing I always say and, right...At WORD right now, we're doing this thing of, "Well, okay. What'll we do? There's shifts in, in funding, and shifts politically in..."

I'm always saying, "Okay, where's a place we can model something? Where's an openness for us, because you know, you don't want to go head to head against established things because, again, if you're different, it's very hard to go head to head. You go into an area that's open, where you can try out something new, and then demonstrate it back." That's what we do with the family resource centers. There were no family resource centers here. So, you know, if you look over and over again, that's the same model that we're using. It's like, "Okay. Here's something we can show you needs to happen. We can even, you know, bring it to you, and negotiate with you." Schools haven't really picked it up. Barb's going to try to get them...In a couple weeks there's going to be a meeting to see if they'll all at least pay 2,000 dollars for each one to have a family advocate in the resource centers.

GGW: Transition over to that?

JS: Yes, yes. So, that's still in process. I'm going to need to go in just a few minutes because I have something at seven downtown I've got to walk over to, but your last thing that comes to your mind for this part?

EC: Just, sort of closing up, you know, what do you...Is there anything that you wish you did differently, or what do you think was the most important thing that you've left in your trail, for women like myself?

JS: You know, I don't really have anything I would have done differently, which is fortunate. One of the skills I think I have is starting things and then leaving them, and not feeling like I have to own them, but letting them evolve and feel good and encourage, and I think that's what I would say I have done, is that there's many institutions that are based around a feminist analysis that I've helped start and can let go and say, "Okay, fly off here." See what it's going to be, and what you're going to do. So, I like that role. The hardest part about that role is getting older. This is something that we chat about, which is, you know, when you're in your 50s, it's a little different than when you're in your 20s and 30s, so then, you can't just keep starting and flying off here. You got to figure out some other thing that's going to happen.

One of the things I've done in the last couple of years, at WORD even, is to try to really draw back, and say, "Look. I'm only going to do certain things now. I'm going to be gone here. Other people have got to figure this out. Other people have got to move this organization where it's going to go. I mean, I'll be here. I'm a resource person. I'll help you out, but I'm not the engine anymore. Someone else is going to be the engine, or a group of you are going to be the engine. Because I'm going to go over here and do policy" It's been a little bit tiring. I don't mean it that way, but it's just like, I don't want to be in there in the same way that I have been. I want to be over here. That's a struggle, just to try to get that to work. But, that needs to happen. Like I said with the generation thing, WORD consciously employs 20-somethings, 30-somethings, 40-somethings and 40-somethings. That's a goal of ours. Because that conversation has to go on in a constructive way, and we actually do that purposefully with each other. Like, we have little sessions where we say, "Okay, what do the 20-somethings want to say to the 50-somethings?"

and duh, duh, duh. Those are fun, because you know, they're beginning to understand differently about things that way. I think that's the only way a movement stays alive. You just need to have that flow of communication back and forth, so we work on that at WORD and I'm... I think that's another thing I'm really glad of.

GGW: Does WORD have "Take your daughter to work day?"

JS: For about three or four times, and then, for whatever reason, the mothers decided they didn't want to continue doing that. We definitely did do it for awhile. We have a lot of kids that...It's interesting. A lot of people's, you know, children come to work, on some fairly regular basis. And that's another thing. Sometime if we want to talk about WORD in one of these interviews, we definitely try to think very clearly about what's our family-friendly policy? Because that's one of the things that we think makes us a feminist work environment. You know, we talk about how do you be a feminist work environment? Well, most women are going to have kids of some sort at certain times, and how do you make that work for them and for the work environment. I think there was a certain naiveté at the beginning. Like, "Whoa, you can bring your kid anytime! Oh, it's always—" Well, and then it was like "Aaaagh! No, you can't bring your kid!" How do you negotiate all that, and you know, have it be a positive experience for everybody, and whatever. So we evolved.

I should say that too. I think Janet Finn is really taken by this. I'll just say it again. You know, probably because I am a biologist, to me, watching the work that we've done in Missoula evolve, you know, the feminist, you know, institutional model has evolved here. And our work just moves that way. And, you know, to me that's a perfect model to think about things. Because evolution is not about magic. It's about, you know, a response to environment, and a, you know, a movement from one, again, resource pool and possibility to another. And things just move and evolve, and...But you're alive. As soon as you know, you can't, you know, move it and evolve, you're not alive anymore. That's the trick, I think, about a lot of these things is to keep them there.

EC: Can I ask you one more thing? Can you just briefly, if possible, list the organizations and things that you helped to start in Missoula that you can remember?

JS: Well, I'll give you the official ones that are like institutions and there have been lots...because the other way I like to work is I like to put together groupings. So, like there was the Resource Center and there was Women's Place, and there was Blue Mountain, and there was WORD. But then, there's some groupings too. Like, we did the women and technology for a while. We did the incest prevention coalition for a while. We did the welfare reform coalition for a while. I'm in MISC right now, which is the Montana Income Support Collaboration. We did ARHC, At Risk Housing Collaboration. So, to me, that's the model I work in, is to bring together people and sort of see what can happen out of that? Again the institutions that have really stayed around...the Resource Center is still here, which I am glad. Women's Place, unfortunately, isn't still here. But there's a whole history as to why that's true, and various



things happened there. Blue Mountain's still here. Certainly WORD is still here. You know, those are the ones that I mainly think of as the institutions.

EC: Okay. Well, thank you very much. I really enjoyed this.

JS: Yes. Sure. And like I say, if you want to ask me again for something else we can—

[End of Interview]