History of Psychology
2011, Vol. 14, No. 3, 287–310

1093-4510/11/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/a0024799

"WOMEN'S STUDIES IS IN A LOT OF WAYS—CONSCIOUSNESS RAISING": The Educational Origins of Identity Politics

Christopher P. Loss
Vanderbilt University

The second-wave feminist movement crystallized a new politics of personal identity that was fueled by and became inextricably linked to the modern university. On and off campus women organized into groups to press for political and educational rights. Along the way, women discovered that politics and education were both personal and that the achievement of "identity" offered the most direct path to true selfhood and liberation. This conclusion helped forge an enduring bond between higher education and identity group politics that continues to shape American higher education and politics to this day.

Keywords: consciousness raising, higher education, identity, second-wave feminism, women's studies

In the spring semester of 1970, Cornell University rolled out a general survey course titled the Evolution of Female Personality. The class was among the first wave of women's studies courses to suffuse the undergraduate curriculum in response to the swelling tide of the campus wing of the nascent second-wave feminist movement. In the next several years, hundreds more women's studies classes and programs—including Cornell's, which opened in 1972—would flood college campuses. The Evolution of Female Personality, like many of the courses that followed in its wake, sought to uncover the distant psychological, social, and political causes of women's subjugation as well as the prospects for improvement in the present day. Nineteen different professors and guest scholars from across the disciplines contributed to the course, which attracted a stunning two hundred pupils despite not being advertised in the official course catalogue. To accommodate the frenzy of interest, students rotated in and out of large "lectures" and "small discussion groups" that, according to one observer, "sometimes functioned as consciousness-raising (CR) sessions."[1]

As this example well illustrates, the second-wave feminist movement ushered in a new politics of knowledge that was deeply wedded to a new

Christopher P. Loss is an assistant professor of higher education and policy studies in the Department of Leadership, Policy and Organizations at Vanderbilt University.

This research was supported in part by a Small Research Grant from the Peabody College of Education and Human Development at Vanderbilt University. A version of this article was first presented in May 2009 at The Therapeutic Origins of Politics, Public Policy, and Citizenship in the Post-1945 United States Conference at the University of Oregon. Thanks to the *Journal's* two anonymous readers for their intellectually generous reports, to Wade Pickren, and to the following individuals for their comments on earlier drafts of this essay: Brian Balogh, Ellen Herman, Sarah Igo, and Catherine Gavin Loss.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christopher P. Loss. E-mail: c.loss@vanderbilt.edu

historicized conception of female identity. In CR groups and in women's studies classes, women discovered that politics and education were both personal and that the emotional and intellectual excavation of one's "identity" offered the surest path to liberation. The goal of this essay is to explain how the group mobilizing tactics of the second-wave feminist movement, in interest groups off campus and in consciousness raising groups on it, shaped the institutionalization of women's studies, transforming the modern university into a key broker of identity politics.

What is identity, and how did it achieve such a strong purchase on education and politics in the 1960s? Answers to these questions will vary widely depending on when and where you look.[2] In the post-1945 United States, the origin of identity politics is traceable to three primary sources. The first source was the spread of a therapeutic worldview in which average Americans and policymakers mined their emotions for answers to their most pressing personal and social problems. Some scholars who have studied this widening jurisdiction of psychological knowledge refer to it as the "therapeutic ethos" and have located its epicenter in the rise of consumer capitalism during the decades around the turn of the 20th century. The broad consensus among these scholars is that a therapeutic mode of self-understanding—denoted by a belief in dynamic personhood and a penchant for conspicuous self-referencing—offered individuals a way to cope with the psychic challenges of modern American life. The standard story carries a powerful critique of the vanishing public sphere as it was eclipsed by self-absorbed efforts to adapt to a heartless world.[3] What this scholarship has until quite recently failed to show is how individuals and groups also deployed therapeutic techniques and practices to jump start political action.[4] As we shall see, during the 1960s and 1970s second-wave feminists searched their inner lives and discovered that their personal and group histories could serve as a powerful wellspring for political mobilization.[5]

The second source, and well documented, was the civil rights movement. It thrust African American and white college students, along with millions of "local people," into the thick of national politics for the first time.[6] Organizations like the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality closed the gap between the self and society and infused political action with deeply felt personal and moral significance. It was a heady mixture. Graduates of "The Movement" never forgot what they had done. In a typical refrain, one northern white college student recalled, "The Negro struggle was, more than any other, *the* event of my life."[7] The experience of joining hands with African Americans set off a flurry of student political activity at predominantly white college campuses elsewhere. Calling itself the new left, founding members claimed the civil rights movement as its guiding light. "This was how [Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)] was born as well . . . ," recalled University of Michigan graduate student Tom Hayden, who helped found SDS. "I started in the South, not in Ann Arbor; I spent two years in the South."[8] Awed by the courage and conviction of African Americans, the new left, with SDS at its core, sought to emulate the nonviolent direct action of the early civil rights movement; and, for a time, they did.

This brings me to the final—institutional—source of identity politics: the modern university.[9] It was where students met and interacted and the psycholog-

ical and the political melded into one another for the first time. The rise of SDS bears this point out well. Inspired by the experience of penetrating and then toppling Jim Crow—even when done vicariously—college students returned to their home campuses convinced that, like African Americans, they too were oppressed. Although the campus scene of the twilight cold war years was hardly oppressive by Jim Crow standards, students' complaints about the alienation of college life were not unwarranted. Lingering McCarthy-era bans on political activity, combined with the engrained habits and customs of the in loco parentis legal regime created a stifling social and intellectual climate at most campuses. The regime defined students as "children" and granted professors and administrators far-reaching parental powers, especially over their female charges, who were subjected to strict codes of conduct that governed their comings-and-goings, bedtimes, dress, and dating rituals. Aggrieved students at schools such as the University of California, Berkeley and the University of Michigan, and other "multiversities" like them, followed the lead of the civil rights movement, forming nonviolent direct action campaigns in the hopes of undoing the knot of campus alienation.[10]

But reforming higher education, to say nothing of American society, took much longer than SDS ever imagined. Frustrated by their lack of progress, members gave up trying to "name that system . . . and change it," as SDS president Paul Potter put it, in 1965, to destroying the system entirely. And when that happened, all hope for "One Big Movement"—interracial, cross-class, and coeducational—was destroyed with it.[11] The "turn to violence and mindless disruption" in the late 1960s, SDS veteran Todd Gitlin later explained, ruined the new left and dispersed its members among a multitude of small groups, each with its own narrow agenda.[12] With African American students already long gone in search of black power, men went one way on campus, women another. The early hope and promise of a unified student movement that crossed racial and gender lines proved impossible to sustain. The weight of opposing political and intellectual agendas "fractured" the seemingly sturdy student movement of the early 1960s into a radically plural assortment of student identity groups.[13]

This was bitterly ironic. For despite all their differences, the men and women who founded the coeducational new left decried interest group politics as secret politics, as antidemocratic politics—as a "politics without publics."[14] Yet women—like men—ended up becoming part of a politics they said they hated when they divided among themselves into identity groups in the late 1960.[15] Drawn together by their quest for individual and group understanding, women's groups mined their personal history in search of the causes of their present oppression. They engaged in a deliberate practice of sharing and learning—of consciousness raising—that helped to steer American politics into "previously nonpolitical terrains: sexuality, interpersonal relations, lifestyle, and culture."[16] The numbers of claims lodged by women's groups—and by all manner of previously marginalized segments of society, from Blacks and the aged to the disabled and gay—exploded in the early 1970s when the public's faith in party politics and in government fell to rock-bottom depths.[17] Identity politics, what are sometimes referred to as personal politics, was the public's response to the "crisis of competence" in American political life after the traumatic 1960s.[18] The second-wave feminist movement led the way.

Yet women's and other groups' turn to identity politics was not alone a consequence of diminished trust in government, profound as that distrust was and continues to be.[19] Overlooked, in the rush to embrace this new skepticism was a more enduring basis for this revolution: women's increased trust in themselves. Higher education's widening hold over the public sphere after World War II powered this revolution in identity politics. The college campus became the destination of choice for millions and millions of young people in the postwar period: between 1940 and 1970 enrollments grew more than fivefold, climbing from 1.5 to 8 million with women's share of the total eclipsing 40% by 1970.[20] And it was on college campuses where the personal and the political intersected and identity was created, nourished, and grown. It was a fecund environment—particularly for women. Hundreds of thousands of women discovered their identities in CR groups and in women's studies classes at colleges and universities in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There they learned that both politics and education were personal and that finding one's true identity was the surest path to liberation. Organizing and learning from one another in tightly knit groups, it turned out, was the most effective way of protecting both identity and its liberating potential on and off campus.[21]

Group Mobilizing and the Second Wave

The second-wave feminist movement did not start on college campuses. Though that is the space where many of its most dramatic events were played out and enduring accomplishments were achieved. Two loosely federated strands of the women's movement, both of which deployed group mobilizing to achieve their goals, crisscrossed and strengthened one another in the 1960s, eventually circling back to the university by decade's end. The first strand of the second wave included vested interest groups committed to the achievement of equal rights for women. A mix of professional women's organizations and political lobbies—from the League of Women Voters and the Young Women's Christian Association to the League of American Working Women and the Women's Bureau—patrolled Washington, DC, to alert male politicians' to the host of long-neglected women's issues they cared about and wanted to change: employment and salary equity, birth control and abortion rights, and education and childcare. This coalition stressed the equality—or "sameness"—between the sexes and gained significant momentum after President Kennedy created the Commission on the Status of Women (1961–1963). The real hub of the second-wave's equal rights coalition, however, formed three years later when the National Organization of Women (NOW) mobilized to ensure the enforcement of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act banning sex discrimination in employment. The act's failure to extend antidiscrimination protection to women in higher education spawned the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), an offshoot of NOW, founded in 1968 by female academics, many of whom had ties to the American Association of University Women (AAUW), since the 19th century female academics' major professional body and lobby group.[22] WEAL's major goal was to close the loophole in the Civil Rights Act by ending sex discrimination against female faculty and administrators, students and staff.[23]

Another more radical strand of the second wave emanated from the male-dominated mass student movements of the mid-1960s, was closely linked to college campuses, and sought liberation, not just equality. For the tens of thousands of female liberationists who joined this fight, their goal was to identify and dismantle the male supremacist power structure that permeated American society and institutions, including higher education.[24] And like their counterparts in the equal rights' wing of the second wave, the liberationists turned to group mobilizing in order to advance their agenda.[25] But unlike the hierarchically organized interest-group model pursued by WEAL and NOW, the liberationists relied on a scatter plot of "leaderless, structureless" small groups, known as CR groups, where members discussed and analyzed their secret experiences in preparation for political action.[26] CR groups, sometimes called "rap groups," quickly spread after 1968 thanks to the growing network of liberationist organizations and to the media's mounting interest in the second wave. The poet-activist Robin Morgan described women's liberation occurring whenever "three or four friends or neighbors decide to meet regularly over coffee and talk about their personal lives . . . in the cells of women's jails, on the welfare lines, in the supermarket, the factory, the convent, the farm, the maternity ward, the street corner, the old ladies' home, the kitchen, the steno pool, the bed."[27]

CR was more organized than this, if only slightly. As historian Anne Enke's brilliant study of the diffusion of the second-wave movement across the major urban centers of the Upper Midwest revealed, CR was always context specific—a moving target that took on different meanings, in different locales, among different groups of women.[28] The most commonly cited CR guidelines were sketched out by Kathie Sarachild—a new left veteran and a founding member of the New York Radical Women—circulated at women's liberation meetings in New York and Chicago, spreading from there to other urban centers and to college towns.[29] The goal of CR was to help women understand that their personal problems were not individual problems amenable to private solutions, but social problems experienced by all women that demanded political action. During CR sessions women spoke freely on a host of personal, previously secret topics—"husbands, lovers, privacy, sex, loneliness, role-playing in the home, our children, our parents, our daily routines," a participant observed. By discussing their common experiences of oppression in small, female-only groups, participants gained insight into patriarchy's power over their personal and political lives. "It was like opening up a whole new world," recalled Sarachild. "I was talking with other women and learning things I had never known before."[30]

CR's utility stemmed from its easy transportability and because it infused politics with educational insight and therapeutic possibility. Among the country's small coterie of radical liberationists—whether they viewed female oppression as an outgrowth of material or sexual relations—CR was a political mobilizing technique, nothing more. They traced CR's origins to the Chinese Communist Revolution, when Mao's army permitted "liberated" peasants to "speak bitterness" about the wrongs that had been perpetrated against them.[31] While technically true, most rank-and-file liberationists' understanding of the CR process was shaped by more familiar political motifs.[32] None was more important than "participatory democracy," reintroduced to a new generation of Americans by SDS in their signature 1962 political treatise, the *Port Huron Statement.* Partic-

ipatory democracy, SDS believed, would reinvigorate a polity severely dispirited by secretive interest group politics and elite decision making. Ironically, though SDS bemoaned group politics, it nevertheless remained beholden to groups—what it called communities—united not by race, class, region, or pecuniary self-interest but shared experience. It was in experiential communities where "private problems" were recast as political issues and resolved through participatory democracy.[33]

The implicit gesture toward "personal politics" in the *Port Huron Statement* literally migrated to the women's movement, flourishing there in more radical fashion than it ever had in SDS. As activist-turned-historian Sara Evans documented, it was in SDS and SNCC where budding feminists first experienced the crippling effects of male oppression.[34] The male leaders of both organizations shunted women into demeaning administrative roles and publically degraded them. Fed up, bands of sisters, like Casey Hayden, Mary King, Jo Freeman, and Shulamith Firestone, broke for good with the male left but held tight to participatory democracy, which they recast as consciousness raising. From means to ends, CR groups' component parts—sharing, analyzing, and abstracting private experiences to mobilize for political action—meshed with participatory democracy's goal to personalize American politics.[35]

The CR process was also educational. By sharing individual experiences, participants used it to uncover their personal histories and true identity. This view was articulated most forcefully by Florence Howe, a CUNY Graduate School professor and early women's studies innovator, whose remarkable scholarly and organization-building work on behalf of women's studies later propelled her to the presidency of the Modern Language Association, in 1973. She first came to CR during her stint as a SNCC Freedom School teacher-volunteer in 1964. Howe joined hundreds of northern white volunteers in Mississippi to teach Blacks about their rights as citizens. They used unconventional practices intended to enhance democracy. Students and teachers sat together in circles, on the floor, rather than at rigidly organized desks typical of a traditional school. The curriculum emphasized black history and culture, drawing on students' everyday experiences living in the shadow of Jim Crow. Students were encouraged to divulge stories of their individual experiences of oppression in order to jump-start class discussion. The goal was to help the students realize, in Howe's words, "that they [had] knowledge of value to themselves and others."[36] This highly personalized approach to learning left a lasting impression on Howe and other teachers like her. As Howe recalled, female volunteers like herself departed Mississippi with new CR-inspired teaching methods later used to "[turn] the women's movement into a teaching movement."[37]

Finally, and ironically, the CR process was therapeutic. This was most controversial, and many radical women's groups dismissed that accusation. Radical women's groups, like the New York Redstockings, flatly rejected the claim that CR was just another name for therapy, declaring in their widely circulated 1969 Manifesto: "CR is not therapy." The authority of therapeutic interventions, they contended, rested on the faulty assumption that male-female relationships were "purely personal."[38] "I am greatly offended that I or any other woman is thought to need therapy in the first place," wrote Redstocking Carol Hanisch, in her signature polemic, "The Personal is Political," published underground shortly

after the Manifesto. "Women are messed over, not messed up! We need to change the objective conditions, not adjust to them." In Hanisch's opinion there was no such thing as a truly personal problem—every problem had a material basis and was about power, plain and simple.[39]

Hanisch's hostility toward therapy, which was shared by women associated with both the second wave's equal rights' and liberationist blocs, stemmed from received understandings about therapeutic interventions and the kinds of people who needed them. Here the person and ideas of Sigmund Freud loomed large. Freud's psychoanalytic theory exemplified how bourgeois, patriarchal knowledge systems contributed to female oppression. Freud's ideas, albeit diluted for a mass American audience, had lent the guise of scientific certainty to longstanding assumptions about women's innate inferiority that exhausted the first-wave women's movement in the 1920s. This point was broadcast to a wide audience by the unofficial leader of the women's equality movement, Betty Friedan, in her groundbreaking, best-selling feminist tome, *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). A psychology major at Smith College who later studied briefly under Erik Erikson, Friedan spelled out the ways in which "the problem with no name" was energized by "Freudian thought." In her opinion, Freud's premise that anatomy was destiny—that women's psychosexual development was skewed as a result of "penis envy" and the "feminine Oedipal attitude" (named the "Electra Complex" by Carl Jung)—was flawed. Female inferiority was not predestined but socially constructed by patriarchal ideologies and institutions.[40] "[T]he core of the problem for women today is not sexual," wrote Friedan, Freud clearly in her sights, "but a problem of identity—a stunting or evasion of growth that is perpetuated by the feminine mystique."[41]

Later, liberationist thinkers targeted the adjustment regime to pinpoint Freudianism's role in derailing women's quest for liberation since the 1920s. Shulamith Firestone's Marxist-inspired tract, *The Dialectic of Sex* (1970), was the most intellectually adventuresome and important work to do so. In her analysis, as Freudianism suffused clinical therapy and the social sciences during the interwar period, it became increasingly mechanistic in the hands of crudely trained American practitioners who turned it into yet another "applied" field. It was in this context that Freudianism was "regroomed for its new function of 'social adjustment,' " explained Firestone, "to wipe up the feminist revolt." Transmitted via print matter, therapists, and the patriarchal social science disciplines, Freudianism became the ideological foundation of an "artificial sex role system" in which "adjustment" meant accepting "the reality in which one finds oneself" regardless of how misogynistic that reality might actually be.[42] "The revolt of the underclass (women) and the . . . restoration to women of ownership of their own bodies," Firestone concluded, applying the capitalist fetish with property to the body proper, was the only way to destroy the patriarchal regime that controlled the most intimate dimensions of women's lives.[43] Women needed secure reproductive rights and new reproductive options in order to break the shackles of male oppression. According to Friedan and Firestone, Freudianism had hijacked the first-wave women's movement and it was thus critical to prevent the same thing from happening again.

Yet the second wave never really succeeded in escaping its therapeutic imprimatur. One reason was prosaic. CR's small-group format, as historian Ellen

Herman observed, often resembled a group therapy session.[44] The other, more complicated, reason was linked to the changing definition of identity itself in the postwar period. At the forefront of this reinterpretation was the German émigré psychoanalyst Erik Erikson, in whose hands identity became firmly psychologized and historicized. A 1933 graduate of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute, Erikson's study of identity served as the singular research focus of his long career as a therapist, teacher, and public intellectual.[45] In the United States, Erikson honed his craft at leading university hospitals before settling at Harvard University, in 1960. But it was during his time at the University of California, Berkeley, while working with soldiers at San Francisco's Mt. Zion Veterans' Rehabilitation Clinic during World War II that he coined the term with which he would forever be linked: "identity crisis." He postulated that most bouts of maladjustment were caused by the "lost sense of personal sameness and historical continuity" wrought by wartime service. Transported to distant lands and then thrust into combat, Erikson contended that even seemingly well adjusted soldiers felt "their lives no longer hung together—and never would again." Erikson would shortly conclude that "identity crises" were not only situational but also developmental, and they were especially common—maybe inevitable—in young adults. Aware of their past but unsure of their future, the youthful ego, Erikson claimed, easily overloaded and lost the capacity to integrate and synthesize the self's place in a changing world.[46] His formulation of identity as dynamic and historical—as the sum total of one's past experience—transformed the ways in which selfhood was understood in the post-World War II period. Identity's tantalizing promise of individual and group liberation is what made the concept so attractive to so many Americans, especially to Blacks and women. Identity gave all those who chose to use it a personalized template for self-liberation. Indeed, it was the key to opening the door to political acceptance, economic independence, and social respect.[47]

At the same time, the institutional decentralization, professional expansion, and intellectual fragmentation of the therapeutic professions also played an important part in the popularization of identity in the 1960s. The passage of the 1963 Community Mental Health Act, an extension and refinement of the federal government's role as emotional caretaker of the nation originally outlined in the 1946 National Mental Health Act, was most important. It decentralized psychological care, previously dominated by state-run asylum facilities, transferring it to new, locally run community outpatient facilities and treatment centers.[48] The act's definition of community care was ambiguously defined and changed constantly over the next several decades. At the time, however, the explicit nod toward "community" appealed especially to young, newly trained practitioners who were inspired by the activist spirit of the era but skeptical of their ability to use their training to heal psychic pain and dislocation. A tide of antiprofessional critiques—led by French philosopher Michel Foucault and Hungarian-born psychiatrist Thomas Szasz, both of whom indicted psychological knowledge as a tool of social control—made increasing numbers of psychologists, especially women, wonder whether their professional training cured human suffering or caused it.[49]

Some female psychologists acted on their concerns. At the 1969 meeting of the American Psychological Association (APA), a contingent of feminist psychologists formed the Association for Women in Psychology (AWP). Following in the tracks of the Association of Black Psychologists, formed the year before,

the AWP and its 35 (female and male) founding members aimed to make known women's second-class treatment within psychology. The association focused on expunging the commonplace sexism of the male-dominated profession and on stopping the proliferation of sexist psychological knowledge that enabled sexist behavior to occur in the first place. Starting in 1972 the association promoted "feminist therapy"—therapeutic techniques developed by and for women—to counteract patriarchy's hegemony over psychological knowledge and institutions.[50] The following year, an AWP-inspired task force report to the APA leadership resulted in the creation of the APA's Division of the Psychology of Women (Division 35). The division—which because of its official ties to the APA irked some members of the more loosely organized AWP, despite both groups' overlapping mission and membership—became the center for research on feminist psychology and therapy, and home to *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, the field's leading journal, first published in 1976.[51]

Beyond the APA's ambit, in San Francisco, Chicago, New York, and Boston, self-identified radical therapists organized "therapy collectives" to remake psychological knowledge from the bottom-up. Professionally, they sought alternative certifications and increased autonomy from the medical school-university system that monopolized the training and placement of psychologists; practically, they sought to change how patients accessed and understood the therapy they received. To achieve both objectives radical therapists reformulated the therapeutic encounter as a social rather than individual process in which society itself was the problem, and liberation from the white, middle-class adjustment regime the cure.[52] An article in *The Radical Therapist*—the movement's principal mouthpiece—expounded on this point: "Therapy is change, not adjustment. This means change—social, personal, and political. When people are fucked over, people should help them fight it, and then deal with their feelings. A 'struggle for mental health' is bullshit unless it involves changing this society which turns us into machines, alienates us from one another and our work, and binds us into racist, sexist, and imperialist practices."[53] By rejecting adjustment and accepting liberation, radical therapists helped to translate psychological knowledge into political terms that challenged rather than accommodated the white, middle-class status quo.

In time, these alternatives to patriarchal psychological knowledge freed feminists to reconcile CR's therapeutic means and political ends. Doing so was not necessarily easy. The belief that therapy led to narcissistic self-annihilation, not political action, was difficult to overcome. Marilyn Zweig, an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Florida and member of the Gainesville Women's Liberation Group, offered this contorted explanation: "Although we are not a therapy group and do not try to resolve personal problems of individual women, we want to study ways to make the conditions of all women better so that individual women should have fewer problems. In the long run, then, each of us can hope that the group will help to make a better life for her personally."[54] Pamela Allen, a CR proselytizer from San Francisco, struck something of a middle ground in her popular book *Free Space*, describing CR as a political act that coincidentally felt good. "The total group process is not therapy because we try to find the social causes for our experiences. But the therapeutic experience of momentarily relieving the individual of all responsibility for her

situation does occur and is necessary if women are to be free to act."[55] In the end, feminists across a wide political spectrum decided that CR could be political *and* therapeutic.

Institutionalizing Women's Studies in the Modern University

The agendas of the second wave's equal rights' and liberationist coalitions finally intersected on college campuses in the several years that bracketed 1970. The campus-based second wave worked from the top-down and the bottom-up, eventually meeting in the women's studies classroom. First, women's rights' advocates set their sights on ending discriminatory hiring and admissions practices that they claimed had eroded women's role in higher education since the 1920s. This goal was pursued by the WEAL, whose legal team gathered copious data that revealed an "industry-wide pattern" of sex discrimination in higher education. The league eventually filed suit under Executive Order 11375, signed in 1967, which banned sex discrimination in federal employment and by federal contractors and subcontractors, including higher education.[56] Many of the nation's top colleges and universities were implicated: Harvard, Wisconsin, Michigan, Columbia, Minnesota, and Chicago, and the entire state college systems in California, Florida, and New Jersey. "Women have taken the first long step on the hard and rocky road of equal opportunity," said Bernice Sandler, chairperson of WEAL's Federal Contract Compliance Committee and the mastermind of the organization's legal strategy, "The American campuses will never be the same."[57]

This was an understatement. While NOW's push for an Equal Rights Amendment stalled out in state ratification assemblies, a victim of antifeminist Phyllis Schlafly's well orchestrated conservative countermobilization, the drive to end sex discrimination in academia continued apace. WEAL, with the support of other vested women's political interests, lobbied Congress's growing group of female lawmakers, and their male colleagues sympathetic to women's issues, to craft legislation banning sex discrimination in higher education. In 1972, WEAL's legal strategy finally paid off: Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments irrevocably altered the gender politics of American higher education.[58] Title IX was primarily intended to remedy inequities in female professors' compensation and in student admissions. As implemented, however, it had far-reaching implications for all aspects of university life—from the professoriate and student services to athletics—covering as it did "any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."[59]

Before the enactment of this groundbreaking legislation, groups of female students and faculty mobilized at the grass roots to expose the blatant sexism that ordered women's experiences inside and outside the college classroom. The doctrine of in loco parentis exacted an especially heavy toll on women, whose social and academic conduct was closely scrutinized by male peers, faculties, and administrators. Their academic options were often limited to so-called feminine fields of study, like education, social work, home economics, and nursing. Furthermore across the masculine, Eurocentric curriculum, faculty relied on patriarchal knowledge and authoritarian pedagogical techniques that signaled female students' second-class status.[60] "The traditional curriculum," wrote historian Barbara Sicherman, "while assumed to be blind to sex, only confirmed the

woman student's conscious or unconscious conviction that women were inferior to men, that their achievements were virtually nonexistent, or, if noted at all, distinctly second rate. It told her in addition that only as a wife and mother could she be completely fulfilled."[61] That was why Betty Friedan wanted to enact "a national educational program, similar to the G.I. Bill" to release the "untapped reserves of women's intelligence in all the professions." Her generation had "wasted" their college years pursuing "M-R-S Degrees," or so the joke went, preparing for a "career" of marriage and motherhood. Friedan was not laughing. "The only point in educating women," wrote Friedan in the closing chapter of *The Feminine Mystique*, "is to educate them to the limit of their ability."[62]

Women's feelings of alienation ran deep everywhere—at coeducational universities but also at coordinate colleges and at single-sex institutions, where the spatial separation of the sexes, even when chosen voluntarily, seemed to contribute to women's intellectual and emotional estrangement. "I fight to be recognized in class," said a female student at Douglass College of Rutgers University, "and if I'm a success, the teacher thinks I must be an exception to the female race."[63] A student at Sarah Lawrence College admitted her past education had not given her "any sense of heritage or anyone to identify with, with the exception of Betsy Ross." Her outlook improved after she enrolled in a women's history course and "found [herself] . . . within a historical perspective."[64] At the University of Wisconsin, coeducational since the 19th century, a student shared her frustrations in detail: "In classes, I experienced myself as a person to be taken lightly. In one seminar I was never allowed to finish a sentence; there seemed to be a tacit understanding that I never had anything significant to say. Invariably, I was called by my first name while everyone else was called Mr. All in all, I was scared, depressed."[65]

Women's documented misery was not typically due to a lack of numbers. At many institutions, female students nearly equaled, and sometimes outnumbered, males. Rather, women's sense of alienation was caused by the utter lack of respect and recognition they suffered in and outside the classroom. This was the conclusion of a study sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation, which blamed institutionalized patriarchy as the root of women's problems: "At both the undergraduate and graduate level women students are often subjected to a concentrated dosage of materials formulated by and filtered through an exclusively male perspective."[66] Writer and activist Adrienne Rich went a step further when she denounced the "man-centered university" as "an insidiously exploitive environment for women."[67]

Feminists looked to women's studies to loosen patriarchy's iron grip on higher education. Some liberationists, like Rich, who came out as a lesbian in 1976, urged the creation of wholly autonomous women's studies programs and classes.[68] Rich's sense that the nascent women's studies movement was really a reflection of the white, middle-class, heterosexual norms of its founding mothers would, in time, prove true. In less than a decade, new feminist voices from across the racial and gender spectrum would turn inside-out all the foundational assumptions of the early women's studies field, exposing what Chicano studies professor Chela Sandoval later characterized as the second wave's misbegotten effort to create a "false unity of women."[69] By the mid-1980s, disunity reigned as women's studies was sliced and diced into an increasingly diverse array of particularistic

racial, class, ethnic, and gender configurations—into ever finer-grained understandings of identity and its related scholarly expressions.

In the early 1970s, however, white, middle-class female academics really did dominate the women's studies movement. For these women, many of whom were members of the AAUW and subscribed to that organization's equal rights platform, their experiences working in the modern university and observing its reluctance to radical organizational alterations convinced them to err on the side of incremental, rather than revolutionary, change. In particular, the "hard lessons" of black studies offered these mavericks a cautionary example.[70] Instead of expending valuable capital on complete organizational and intellectual autonomy, as had black studies' innovators, women's studies supporters gravitated toward interdisciplinary programs and classes to occupy the space between the rigid, patriarchal borders of the male-dominated disciplines.[71]

Two additional factors favored this bureaucratic approach. The first was women's relative strength in faculty and student numbers, an advantage neither than nor later shared by Blacks; the second was women academics' deep understanding of disciplinary politics and power. The AAUW's willingness to work within the established male-dominated academic professions, as historian Susan Levine documented in her history of the association, might have landed the AAUW in the thick of the second wave's "moderate mainstream," but it also delivered tangible results.[72] The AAUW's institution-building strategy helped female academics across the disciplines forge standing caucuses in virtually all of the professional disciplinary associations—the APA, as already discussed, as well as the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the American Historical Association.[73] Not only did this approach ensure its female members access to real professional power in the long run, at the time it also allowed them to form ad hoc national bodies to help guide the nascent women's studies movement into being. The MLA's Commission on the Status of Women, established in 1969, was among the most influential of these groups. The commission coordinated the collection and distribution of women's studies syllabi, reflections, and testimonials from across the disciplines. These materials capture in stunning detail the influence of CR on the organization of early women's studies courses and programs.[74]

One of the contributors was women's history pioneer Gerda Lerner of the University of Wisconsin. Whether founding one of the first programs in women's history at Sarah Lawrence College, or serving as president of the Organization of American Historians, Lerner spent her professional career working to further women's place in the American history profession.[75] A close examination of Lerner's life and path-breaking scholarship reveals the ways in which early women's studies innovators put the therapeutic and political dimensions of consciousness raising to work in their classes. Born in 1920 and raised in an upper-middle class Jewish family in Vienna, Lerner was an academically and politically precocious youth. She was a top student at her Gymnasium and attracted, at a young age, to antifascist politics. After being jailed by the Gestapo, in 1938, she immigrated to the United States in 1939 with the help of her then-boyfriend's relatives. Together they settled in New York, married, but quickly divorced. Six weeks after ending that relationship, Lerner met and eventually married the theater writer and director Carl Lerner. She followed him to Hollywood. There she filled her time as a new mother, a part-time writer, and

as an active member of Los Angeles's Communist underground. She became a Party member in 1946 and two years later helped to organize the Los Angeles chapter of the Congress of American Women, a Popular Front feminist organization. In 1949, the Lerners moved back to New York City, at which point she decided to pursue her long-postponed college education. After collecting a bachelor's at the New School, she enrolled in the history graduate program at Columbia University in 1963.[76] Her dissertation-turned-book, *The Grimke Sisters of South Carolina: Rebels against Slavery* (1967), was declared an instant classic, establishing her as a powerful voice in the male-dominated American history profession.[77]

In graduate school, Lerner discovered that it was impossible to separate her personal life and political beliefs from her intellectual pursuits. Her personal experience, perhaps as much or more than her professors or peers, shaped how she studied the past and the meanings she derived from it. She recalled "testing what I was learning against what I already knew from living." Mining the past in search of women's history, Lerner realized that her personal life—as a Jewish immigrant, political activist, historian, and woman—was the decisive factor in how she approached her work. "I never accepted the need for separation of theory and practice," she recalled, in 2005. "My passionate commitment to Women's History was grounded in my life."[78]

This discovery convinced her that history and identity were intimately connected. Indeed, by studying history, Lerner changed her identity, eventually breaking from her Marxist past, in the mid-1980s, after several decades of private struggle.[79] The pain of this decision and of her lifetime of "various transformations" was chronicled in her 2002 autobiography, *Fireweed*.[80] In the work's opening line, Lerner described the "breaks, the fissures" of her life: "I've had too many—destruction, loss, then new beginnings." Yet her story ended on a hopeful note, revealing the liberating power of her own history and perhaps all history. After a lifetime of contemplating the history of women, Lerner concluded by applying that history to her own life, "The fact is that I combine all these elements of my life, and I think I have finally found the wholeness that embraces contradictions, the holistic view of life that accepts multiplicity and diversity, a view that no long demands a rigid framework of certainties."[81]

Well before her public confessions, however, Lerner was excitedly probing the possibilities of history's role in women's liberation. In her contribution to *Female Studies*, in 1972, Lerner reflected at length on the therapeutic power of women's history in women's lives:

> Most girls, by the time they reach college, have been accustomed to "failure," to subordinating their curiosity, initiative and particularly their own female reactions and feminine insights, to the standards imposed by the dominant culture. They actually "turn off" the essential parts of their personality and force upon themselves a separation of feelings and thoughts, of intellectual performance and being. This alienation is true to some extent for all people in our culture, but it is particularly true for girls and young women. Feminist Studies must attack this division of self at its roots. This is simply a fancy way of saying that CR is an integral part of teaching Feminist Studies. Before women can study Feminist Studies with any effectiveness, they must come to grips with their own deep-seated anxieties, tensions and uncertainties in regard to their femininity. They can do this

> only by learning that what they have considered to be personal agony and traumas are really societally conditioned problems.[82]

Based on her life experiences, Lerner thought the study of history could help women discover their true identity—one free from imposed, patriarchal definitions. After all, if femininity—what in a few years would be known simply as gender—really was historically constructed and conditioned, as Lerner and others claimed, then why not use history to construct it anew?[83]

By all indications, first generation women's studies instructors considered the historical excavation and reconstruction of female identity an important academic *and* therapeutic endeavor. Given Lerner's description of the therapeutic effects of women's history, we may carefully question the accuracy of other founding mothers' strenuous assertions later on that early women's studies classes were relentlessly, indeed exclusively, "serious" academic experiences devoid of therapeutic undercurrents. There was not a more serious scholar, nor committed women's studies supporter, than Gerda Lerner. Yet, embedded within her lengthy description of the goal of women's studies lurked an unmistakably powerful defense of its therapeutic benefits.[84] This is not to suggest that first-generation women's studies courses weren't the rigorous intellectual encounters their instructors were trained to deliver and, later, claimed them to be.[85] Rather, it is to say that those same courses also delivered real therapeutic effects to students and instructors. Just as CR, as dissected above, was more than a mere political act, early women's studies courses often provided participants with more than academic training. Organized around the growing corpus of knowledge and scholarship by and about women, women's studies courses, like any stimulating college course, sometimes led students to unforeseen intellectual and emotional destinations, to new points of embarkation. To think otherwise marks a profound failure to grasp the utter spontaneity of the pedagogical experience. A truly "transgressive" college classroom, as bell hooks reminds us, is an "exciting place" precisely because playfulness, empathy, and serious intellectual engagement go hand-in-hand.[86]

To believe students' and instructors' own accounts, women's studies offered just such an experience, mixing heavy intellectual lifting and fun with deep scholarly engagement and therapeutic reinvention. Of course, the therapeutic dimensions of women's studies classes expressed themselves differently from one course and institution to another. In time, however, a number of therapeutic pedagogical practices, bearing more than a family resemblance to CR, became indelibly linked to the field. One was the transformation of the teacher into a "clarifier, a translator, a resource" instead of an authority figure; another was the use of small-group discussion and democratic deliberation; and still another was the reliance on journal writing, where students divulged the secrets of their private lives.[87] As an individual form of CR, journal writing was believed to be an effective way of continuing the process of self-discovery outside the classroom, of melding theory and practice. "I consider the journal as potent a political tool as the activist group project," said Florence Howe, "for it fosters confidence in a necessary skill, as well as the significant growth of consciousness about one's own and others' lives."[88] Many students agreed. Amanda Kissin, a freshman at Barnard College, said that Sexuality in Literature affected her "personally" and drew her

closer to the larger women's struggle: "The course gives me a nice sense of being part of it. I know that it's not just my own neurotic perception." Beryl Kaplan, a classmate enrolled in Determinants of Sex, was more specific. "Education is a basic foundation for any kind of movement," she explained. "Women's studies," she concluded, "is in a lot of ways—consciousness raising."[89]

Female students learned about women's contribution to American literature and history in these classes. Many students also found their new women's studies courses ripe with possibilities for intellectual and personal emancipation. "I've never been as interested in academics," explained Ella Kusnetz, a student at Cornell University. "Female studies is a new reference, I have some identity now as a woman."[90]A student at San Diego State College (now University), birthplace to one of the first women's studies programs, described her experiences in women's studies as nothing short of revolutionary. "Ultimately [women's studies] is an organizing tool, getting a woman to realize her own oppression so she can deal with it."[91] English professor Elaine Showalter of Douglass College at Rutgers University reported that her courses had actually emboldened some students to divorce their husbands. "Although their husbands threaten me, I can't feel it was my fault," she explained. The readings and discussion helped them make this decision on their own, "sensitizing women to the political and cultural aspects of their lives."[92]

Some male faculty and students predictably cried foul at the institutionalization of women's studies. They ran with anecdotal accounts of gender bias and outright discrimination in women's studies classrooms to advance their case. They derided it as a "fad course." And they claimed it fragmented and politicized a college curriculum already in a state of disarray.[93] "Black studies is divisive enough," protested a humanities professor. "Female studies would inevitably be aimed toward political goals, which I am far from sharing."[94]

Complaints such as these persisted but went largely unheeded. After decades of intellectual and emotional neglect, women, like Blacks, were finally given their due. In 1976, the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs counted 270 programs and 15,000 courses being offered by 1,500 different higher education institutions.[95] One year later, female faculty from 500 different institutions gathered together in San Francisco to found the National Women's Studies Association, to this day the field's main professional body.[96]

After black and women's studies suffused the modern university, waves of identity groups hungry to assert their particular consciousness—their difference—mobilized to do the same.[97] Following the lead of Blacks and women, Asians and Latinos, in particular, but also Native Americans and, increasingly, gays and lesbians, began demanding a right to an education of their own, too.[98] Group mobilization off campus fueled group activity on it, as demands for rights by one group led to similar demands from others. So did the massive influx of immigrant flows from Asia and Latin America following the enactment of the 1965 Immigration Act, and the growing demand among the children of these immigrant populations to access higher education.[99] In the last quarter of the 20th century, minority enrollment climbed from 15 to nearly 30% of the national total, setting the stage for the formation of yet more campus identity groups and the production of allied scholarship.[100] And while minority students were unevenly spread across the higher education sector, disproportionately concentrated in 2-year and in

less-prestigious 4-year institutions, the diversification that occurred was still profound, particularly compared to the pre-1965 period.[101]

White men did not passively sit back and watch from the sidelines. So-called "unmeltable ethnics" also got in on the action. President Richard M. Nixon's courtship of white working-class ethnics in his 1972 re-election campaign certainly energized these efforts. Nixon's quest to forge a "New Majority" of southern Whites and northern blue-collar workers to topple the Democratic Party encouraged his support for the 1972 National Ethnic Heritage Studies Act, which provided $2.5 million in federal aid for the development of ethnic studies programs and courses.[102] Courses in white ethnic studies (also called Euro American or immigrant studies) were offered at 135 schools, according to a study by the Federal Office of Education. Italian, Irish, Greek, Polish, and German studies—complete with rallying cries of "Italian Power" and "Polish is Beautiful"—found especially supportive environments at urban institutions in New York, Buffalo, Detroit, and Chicago.[103] The growing focus on "difference" lay at the core of the identity debates of the early 1970s, even for white ethnic students, who let it be known that not all White male students were the same.[104] Ethnic identity, like racial or gender identity, was worth discovering and preserving, they claimed, "no longer . . . considered something to get rid of as quickly as possible."[105] "I guess Blacks legitimated cultural diversity," concluded sociologist Father Andrew Greeley, the director of the Center for the Study of American Pluralism at the University of Chicago, in 1973. "Once that was considered all right, they legitimated it for everybody."[106]

In what became a predictable pattern, identity groups decried their exclusion from the curriculum and administrators granted reparations by making room for them in it. Professor Isao Fujimoto captured the essence of this essential political dynamic when he described the birth of Asian American studies at the University of California, Davis: "Students from all over are interested in getting classes started. Whenever there are concentrations of Asians, there are attempts to push for Asian American studies classes." Fujimoto's colleague, George Kagiwada, thought that improved relations between students and administrators marked a profound shift in how each regarded the other: "The climate is quite different . . . You don't have this line of open challenge to the system as such. Rather, [students] have developed a kind of acceptance of the system."[107] An acceptance of the system, Kagiwada might have added, predicated on the very same small-group political and therapeutic mobilizing tactics originally mastered by the second wave's campus contingent.

Ultimately, the search for a usable past and a new identity originally taken up by the second wave's liberationist wing, once set free in the college classroom, proved impossible to contain. This therapeutic approach to curricular maintenance resembled democracy in action, satisfying the deeply felt needs of students as well as the bureaucratic needs of administrators. According to education researcher Arthur Levine's exhaustive longitudinal study of student life, savvy administrators learned that granting identity groups a piece of the curriculum and an organizational base from which to operate (commonly overseen by an assistant dean, faculty adviser, or both) was worth the effort.[108] To wit, the numbers of campus-based Native American and Latino groups doubled during this time while the number of gay and lesbian groups tripled, while at many institutions diversity went from a voluntary extracurricular option to an involuntary curricular requirement.[109] Furthermore, by the early 1990s, nearly half of all four-year colleges and

universities required students to take a multicultural general education course in order to graduate.[110] To be sure, identity politics had found fertile ground in higher education, where the study of one's own, or someone else's, identity had literally become an expected "learning outcome" of a college education.[111]

Conclusion

The second-wave feminist movement radically reconfigured American higher education and politics. The second-wave's vested interest groups in Washington, DC, with the critical assistance of key congressional allies, won statutory equality for women in higher education. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 assured women equal treatment and opportunities in the classroom and on the playing field. This promise of equality was further strengthened by the institutionalization of women's studies inside the academic core. Women's studies offered students a space to engage in rigorous intellectual study and therapeutic individual and group reflection. Like the CR groups that fueled the second-wave's liberationist bloc, women's studies classes also served as a multifaceted site for political action, therapeutic engagement, and academic rumination. Together, the second wave's use of well-organized, hierarchically arranged interest groups on the one hand, and small CR groups on the other, provided a blueprint for intellectual *and* political action—a blueprint that future identity groups would roll out with increasing frequency. The second wave's fight to harness the most precious resource available at the university—education—unlocked identity's liberating political, therapeutic, and intellectual potential in ways that transformed faculty and students as well as higher education and the society it served.

Endnotes

1. For the best overview of the class and its creation, see Sheila Tobias, "Beginnings in the 1960s," in *Testimony from Thirty Founding Mothers: The Women's Studies History Series*, ed. Florence Howe (New York, 2000), 29–38. Quote in Florence Howe and Carol Ahlum, "Women's Studies and Social Change," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood (New York, 1973), 405–6.

2. "Identity" has often been used interchangeably with the concept of citizenship and Americanization. Scholars from a number of different subfields have deployed it promiscuously in the last two decades. The foundational literature has focused on the formation of a dominant white, Anglo-Saxon conception of "American identity," tracking the interplay between and among immigration, racial politics, and public policy, with a particular emphasis on the 1920s. See, for example, John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of* American Nativism, 1860–1925 (1955; New Brunswick, NJ, 2002); Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, 2002); John Bodnar, ed., *Bonds of Affection: Americans Define Their Patriotism* (Princeton, 1996); Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven, 1997); Desmond King, *Making Americans: Immigration, Race, and the Origins of the Diverse Democracy* (Cambridge, MA, 2000); Mae M. Nai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, 2004); and Carl Bon Tempo, *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War* (Princeton, 2008). Another strand of the literature has privileged the concept of "Whiteness," offering a more cultural interpretation of identity. See, for example, Grace Elizabeth Hale, *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the* South, 1890–1940; and David R. Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became*

White (New York, 2005). Still, a third strand has looked at identity from the standpoint of eugenics and the rise of racial science. See, for example, Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (New York, 1985); and Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the turn of the century to the Baby Boom* (Berkeley, 2001).

3. On the emergence of a therapeutic ethos or culture, and its connection to false consciousness and the spread of market capitalism, see Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York, 1977); Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York, 1978); Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture*, 1880–1920 (Chicago, 1981); Jackson Lears, "From Salvation to Self-Realization: Advertising and the Therapeutic Roots of the Consumer Culture, 1880–1930," in *The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History*, 1880–1980, ed., Jackson Lears and Richard Wightman Fox (New York, 1983), 1–38. Recently, Lears has reopened his exploration of these ideas in Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America*, 1877–1920 (New York, 2009).

4. On the relationship between the therapeutic ethos and political action, see Ellen Herman, *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts* (Berkeley, 1995); Doug Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (New York, 1998); Eva S. Moskowitz, *In Therapy We Trust: America's Obsession with Self-Fulfillment* (Baltimore, 2001); Brian Balogh, "Making Pluralism 'Great': Beyond a Recycled History of the Great Society," in *The Great Society and the High Tide of Liberalism*, ed. Sidney M. Milkis and Jerome M. Mileur (Amherst, 2005), 142–82; and Christopher P. Loss, *Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, forthcoming 2012).

5. In this essay, I focus on the psychohistorical origins of identity—defined as the sum total of an individual's life experiences—stressing the connections between identity and higher education in the post1960s United States. The concept of identity is attributable to the psychoanalyst Erik Erikson. His foundational explications are in *Childhood and Society* (1950; New York, 1985); and *Identity, Youth, and Crisis* (New York, 1968).

6. John Dittmer, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (Champaign, IL, 1994).

7. Charles E. Fager, *White Reflections on Black Power* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1967), 8, emphasis in original.

8. Cheryl Lynn Greenberg, *A Circle of Trust: Remembering SNCC* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1998), 33.

9. Loss, *Between Citizens and the State.*

10. On the multiversity, see Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (1963; Cambridge, MA, 2001).

11. Paul Potter, "Name the System" (17 April 1965) in *Debating the 1960s: Liberal, Conservative, and Radical Perspectives*, ed. Michael W. Flamm and David Steigerwald (New York, 2007), 95; Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York, 1987), 417.

12. Gitlin, *Sixties*, 417.

13. Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (Cambridge, MA, 2011), 180–221.

14. "Port Huron Statement," in James Miller, *Democracy is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York, 1987), 333–35.

15. On the paradox of identity group mobilizing in the post1960s, see Hugh Heclo, "The Sixties' False Dawn: Awakenings, Movements, and Postmodern Policy-making," in *Integrating the Sixties: The Origins, Structures, and Legitimacy of Public Policy in a Turbulent Decade*, ed. Brian Balogh (University Park, PA, 1996), 34–63.

16. L.A. Kauffman, "The Anti-Politics of Identity," *Socialist Review* 20 (Jan–Mar, 1990): 67.

17. Jack L. Walker, *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements* (1994; Ann Arbor, 1991), 35. Walker's work is based on sophisticated quantitative analyses of group growth across the 20th century. On the explosion of group mobilizing in the postwar period, see Brian Balogh, *Chain Reaction: Expert Debate and Public Participation in American Commercial Nuclear Power* (New York, 1991).

18. Edward Berkowitz, *Something Happened: A Political and Cultural Overview of the Seventies* (New York, 2006), 6. See also Bruce Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (New York, 2001).

19. The public's growing distrust of government has been well chronicled. For a survey of its lasting effects since the 1960s, see, for example, E.J. Dionne, *Why Americans Hate Politics* (New York, 1992).

20. Thomas D. Snyder, ed., *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait* (Washington, DC, 1993), 76–77.

21. The literature on identity politics is contentious. For the case against identity politics, see, for example, Kauffman, "Anti-Politics of Identity"; Todd Gitlin, *Twilight of Our Common Dreams: Why American is Wracked by Culture Wars* (New York, 1995); Michael Tomasky, *Left for Dead: The Life, Death, and Possible Resurrection of Progressive Politics in America* (New York, 1996); David Hollinger, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York, 1995); Nelson Lichtenstein, *State of the Union: A Century of American Labor* (Princeton, 2002); Arthur Schlesinger Jr., *Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York, 1991); Shelby Steele, "The New Sovereignty: Grievance groups have become nations unto themselves," *Harper's* (July 1992), 47–54; Richard Rorty, *Achieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth Century America* (Cambridge, MA, 1997); and Walter Benn Michaels, *The Trouble with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality* (New York, 2006). For the most balanced appraisal of identity politics, see Amy Gutmann, *Identity in Democracy* (Princeton, 2003). On the role of universities in the creation of identity politics, see Gitlin, *Twilight of Our Common Dreams.*

22. Susan Levine, *Degrees of Equality: The American Association of University Women and the Challenge of Twentieth-Century Feminism* (Philadelphia, 1995), 154–57. For NOW's transformation into a powerful interest group, see Katherine Turk, "Out of the Revolution, into the Mainstream: Employment Activism in the NOW Sears Campaign and the Growing Pains of Liberal Feminism," *Journal of American History* 97.2 (Sept. 2010): 399–423.

23. For the best political history of women's quest for equal rights in the 1960s, see Hugh Davis Graham, *Civil Rights and the Presidency: Race and Gender in American Politics*, 1960–1972 (New York, 1992). On the history of the quest to end sex discrimination in higher education, see Andrew Fishel and Janice Pottker's classic study, *National Politics and Sex Discrimination in Education* (Lexington, MA, 1977).

24. Florence Howe, "Women and the Power to Change," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Florence Howe (New York, 1975), 136–38; Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York, 2000), 70–81. On the radical women's movement, and its differences with the liberal women's movement, see Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in* America, 1967–1975 (Minneapolis, 1989).

25. On the role and importance of group politics in the second-wave feminist movement, see William H. Chafe, *Women and Equality: Changing Patterns in American Culture* (New York, 1977).

26. Jo Freeman, "The Tyranny of Structurelessness," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 17 (1972–73): 151.

27. Robin Morgan, ed., *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement* (New York, 1970).

28. Anne Enke, *Finding the Movement: Sexuality, Contested Space, and Feminist Activism* (Durham, 2007). As Enke writes, the second-wave feminist movement was "nearly infinite in its origins as well as its continued and changing expressions" (2).

29. Claudia Dreyfuss, *Woman's Fate: Raps from a Feminist Consciousness Raising Group* (New York, 1973), 10–11.

30. Florence Howe and Carol Ahlum, "Women's Studies and Social Change," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Rossi and Calderwood, 393–424; Rosen, *World Split Open*, 196–201; Herman, *Romance of American Psychology*, 297–300.

31. Jack Belden, *China Shakes the World* (New York, 1970), 166.

32. James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States*, 1945–1974 (New York, 1996), 646.

33. Miller, *Democracy is in the Streets*, 333.

34. Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights and New Left* (New York, 1979).

35. For the two most widely cited CR guidelines, see Kathie Sarachild, "Feminist Consciousness Raising and Organizing," in *Voices from Women's Liberation*, ed. Leslie B. Tanner (New York, 1970), 154–57; and *Ms.*, "A Guide to Consciousness-Raising," (July 1972), 18, 22–23.

36. Howe, "Women and the Power to Change," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Howe, 148–49; Florence Howe, *Myths of Coeducation: Selected Essays*, 1964–1983 (Bloomington, 1984), 1–17. See also Jo Freeman, *Women: A Feminist Perspective* (Palo Alto, 1975), 451.

37. Howe, "Women and the Power to Change," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Howe, 137.

38. "Redstockings Manifesto," in *Voices from Women's Liberation*, ed. Leslie B. Tanner (New York, 1970), 109–11.

39. Carol Hanisch, "The Personal is Political," 1969, available at *http://scholar.alexanderstreet.com/pages/viewpage.action?pageId = 2259* (accessed April 3, 2011). On women's contested historical relationship with psychoanalysis, see, for example, Jean Baker Miller, ed., *Psychoanalysis and Women: Contributions to New Theory and Therapy* (New York, 1973); Barbara Ehrenreich, *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women* (New York, 1978); Elizabeth Lunbeck, *The Psychiatric Persuasion: Knowledge, Gender, and Power in Modern America* (Princeton, 1994); and Mari Jo Buhle, *Feminism and Its Discontents: A Century of Struggle with Psychoanalysis* (Cambridge, MA, 1998).

40. Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (1963; New York, 1983), 103–25. On Betty Friedan and the writing of *the Feminine Mystique*, see Daniel Horowitz, *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminist Mystique* (Amherst, 1998). Horowitz argued that Friedan sought to dismantle orthodox Freudianism while still "underscoring the benefits of therapy and self-discovery that she herself had experienced beginning in her Berkeley [college] years" (219). Her book thus condemned and embraced therapy as a technique for the discovery of identity.

41. Friedan, *Feminine Mystique*, 77.

42. Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (New York, 1970), chap. 3, "Freudianism: The Misguided Feminism," 46–80, quotes on 72, 78–79.

43. Ibid., 11.

44. For common steps, see *Ms.*, "A Guide to Consciousness-Raising," 18, 22–23. On the relationship between CR and therapy, see Ellen Herman, *Romance of American Psychology*.

45. On Erikson's life and ideas, see Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik Erikson* (New York, 1999). For a stimulating recent account of the origins of identity, which discusses the importance of psychological selfhood in its formation, but does not discuss Erikson, see Linda Nicholson, *Identity Before Identity Politics* (New York, 2008).

46. Quotes in Friedman, *Identity's Architect*, 160–62. For Erikson's primary work on identity, see *Childhood and Society* (1950; New York, 1985); and *Identity: Youth and Crisis* (New York, 1968). In *Childhood and Society*, Erickson wrote: "I think that the psychoanalytic method is essentially a historical method. Even where it focuses on medical data, it interprets them as a function of past experience" (17). He elaborated on the importance of history in *Identity:* "One methodological precondition, then, for grasping identity would be a psychoanalysis sophisticated enough to include the environment; the other would be a social psychology which is psychoanalytically sophisticated; together they would obviously institute a new field which would have to create its own historical sophistication" (24). For a helpful distillation of Erikson's ideas, see Gitlin, *Twilight of Common Dreams*, 127.

47. By the late 1960s the term identity was everywhere, as Erikson was well aware. He mused in the prologue to *Identity:* "'Identity' and "identity crisis" have in popular scientific usage become terms which alternately circumscribe something so large and so seemingly self-evident that to demand a definition would almost seem petty, while at other times they designate something made so narrow for purposes of measurement that the overall meaning is lost, and it could just as well be called something else" (15).

48. Gerald N. Grob, *From Asylum to Community: Mental Health Policy in Modern America* (Princeton, 1991), 239–72; James W. Stockdill, "National Mental Health Policy and the Community Mental Health Centers, 1963–1981," in *Psychology and the National Institute of Mental Health*, ed. Wade E. Pickren and Stanley F. Schneider (Washington, DC, 2005), 261–94.

49. Grob, *Asylum to Community*, 279–92. Michel Foucault's *History of Madness* appeared in translated form in the mid1960s. Szasz's *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of a Theory of Personal Conduct* (New York, 1961), was reprinted five times over the course of the 1960s.

50. Leonore Tiefer, "A Brief History of the Association for Women in Psychology: 1969–1991," *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 15 (1991): 635–49.

51. Martha T. Mednick and Laura L. Urbanski, "The Origins and Activities of APA's Division of the Psychology of Women," Ibid., 651–63.

52. Jerome Agel, ed., *The Radical Therapist: Therapy Means Change Not Adjustment* (New York, 1971). Grob describes the same phenomenon as a psychiatric counterculture; see Grob, *Asylum to Community*, 273–301.

53. Agel, "Introduction," in *Radical Therapist*, ed. Agel, xi.

54. Marilyn Zweig, "Is Women's Liberation a Therapy Group?" in *Radical Therapist*, ed. Agel, 164.

55. Pamela Allen, "Free Space," in *Radical Feminism*, ed. Anne Koedt (New York, 1973), 278.

56. John D. Skrentny, *The Minority Rights Revolution* (Cambridge, MA, 2002), 130–41.

57. Bernice Sandler, "A Little Help from Our Government: WEAL and Contract Compliance," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Rossi and Calderwood, 451. On Sandler, see Betsy Wade, "Women on the Campus Find a Weapon," *New York Times*, 10 Jan. 1972, E22.

58. Fishel and Pottker, *National Politics and Sex Discrimination in Education*, 67–136.

59. On the shift of Title IX from sex equity to athletics, see Amanda Ross Edwards,

"Why Sport? The Development of Sport as a Policy Issue in Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972," *Journal of Policy History* 22, no. 3 (2010): 300–36.

60. Pepper Schwartz and Janet Lever, "Women in the Male World of Higher Education," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Rossi and Calderwood, 57–77.

61. Barbara Sicherman, "The Invisible Woman," in *Women in Higher Education*, ed. W. Todd Furniss and Patricia Albjerb Graham (Washington, DC, 1974), 161.

62. Friedan, *Feminine Mystique*, 368, 370.

63. "New College Trend," *New York Times*, 7 Jan. 1971, 37.

64. Linda Greenhouse, "A Graduate Program Sets Out to Find History's Women," *New York Times*, 20 March 1973, 34.

65. Joan I. Roberts, "Women's Right to Choose, or Men's Right to Dominate," in *Women in Higher Education*, ed. Furniss and Graham, 53.

66. Roby, "Institutional Barriers to Women Students in Higher Education," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Rossi and Calderwood, 53–54.

67. Adrienne Rich, "Toward a Woman-Centered University," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Howe, 17, 20.

68. Rich's key tract in this regard was *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (New York, 1976).

69. Chela Sandoval, *Methodology of the Oppressed* (Minneapolis, 2000), xi.

70. Howe and Ahlum, "Women's Studies and Social Change," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Rossi and Calderwood, 415.

71. Rich, "Toward a Woman-Centered University," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Howe, 31–33. On the grave difficulties of black studies' pursuit of autonomy, see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (1988; New York, 1989), 469–521.

72. Levine, *Degrees of Equality*, 151.

73. Ibid., 137–57.

74. The volumes were published by Know, Inc., in Pittsburgh, PA. Sheila Tobias, cofounder of the women's studies program at Cornell, organized and edited the first issue.

75. Lerner's graduate program in women's history started at Sarah Lawrence College in 1972. She served as President of the OAH in 1981–82—the second woman to be so honored and the first in 50 years.

76. On Lerner, see Gerda Lerner, *Fireweed: A Political Autobiography* (Philadelphia, 2002); Lerner, *A Death of One's Own* (Madison, 1985); Lerner, "A Life of Learning," ACLS Occasional Paper Series 60 (2005): 1–21; and Daniel Horowitz, "Feminism, Women's History, and American Social Thought," in *American Capitalism: Social Thought and Political Economy in the American Twentieth Century*, ed. Nelson Lichtenstein (Philadelphia, 2006), 191–209.

77. Gerda Lerner, *The Grimke Sisters of South Carolina: Rebels Against Slavery* (Boston, 1967). Lerner's exploration of the relationship between slavery and women's oppression in *Grimke Sisters* continued in her later work. See, for example, her two-volume magnum opus, *The Creation of Patriarchy*, 2 vols. (New York, 1986), I; and *The Creation of Feminist Consciousness*, 2 vols. (New York, 1993), II. On Lerner's contributions to the field of women's history, see Daniel Horowitz, "Feminism, Women's History, and American Social Thought," in *American Capitalism*, ed. Lichtenstein, 205–9.

78. Lerner, "A Life of Learning," 10–11.

79. She worried about the "straightjacket" of Marxist thought during her graduate school years but did not formally renounce it until several decades later, following the writing and publication of *The Creation of Patriarchy*, which Lerner claimed "shattered the last remnants of my adherence to Marxist thought" (Lerner, "A Life of Learning," 19).

80. Lerner, "A Life of Learning," 1.

81. Lerner, *Fireweed*, 7, 368.

82. Gerda Lerner, "On the Teaching and Organization of Feminist Studies," in *Female Studies*, ed. Rae Lee Siporin, 10 vols. (Pittsburgh, 1972), V, 35–36.

83. In *Creation of Feminist Consciousness*, Lerner wrote: "In the course of the establishment of patriarchy and constantly reinforced as the result of it, the major idea systems which explain and order Western civilian incorporated a set of unstated assumptions about gender, which powerfully affected the development of history and of human thought" (3). Lerner regarded education and history as the source of and solution to women's oppression: see chap. 2, "The Educational Disadvantaging of Women," and chap. 11, "The Search for Women's History," in *Consciousness.* For the definitive early statement on gender as a historical construct, see Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91 (Dec. 1986): 1053–75; and Joan W. Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1999). For her part, Scott grew weary of gender as a category of analysis, openly worrying about its widespread use by historians from across the subfields. By the late 1990s, according to Joanne Meyerowitz, Scott "turned more concertedly to psychoanalysis, to the fantasies, that enable identities, including the 'phantasmatic projections that mobilize individual desires into collective identifications" (1352) in Joanne Meyerowitz, "A History of "Gender"", *American Historical Review* 113 (Dec. 2008): 1346–56.

84. On the therapeutic power of education, see Christopher P. Loss, "'The Most Wonderful Thing Has Happened to Me in the Army': Psychology, Citizenship, and American Higher Education in World War II," *Journal of American History* 92 (Dec. 2005): 864–91.

85. For an encapsulation of these assertions, see Howe, ed., *Politics of Women's Studies*.

86. bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York, 1994), 7. Recent qualitative studies of effective pedagogy have reached the very same conclusions. See Ken Bain, *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Cambridge, MA, 2004), esp. 22–47.

87. Marcia Landy, "Women, Education, and Social Power," in *Female Studies*, ed. Siporin, V, 53–63, quote on 62.

88. Howe, "Women and the Power to Change," in *Women and the Power to Change*, ed. Howe, 157.

89. "Pressure and Popularity Spur Variety in College Women's Studies Courses," *New York Times*, 7 May, 1975, 39.

90. "New College Trend," *New York Times*, 7 Jan. 1971, 37, 70.

91. Barbara Isenberg, "Boosting "Liberation": Women's Studies Rise in College Popularity," *Wall Street Journal*, 9 June 1971, 1.

92. Ibid.

93. Jane Sims, "Colleges Expanding Women's Studies," *Washington Post*, 26 July 1971, A3.

94. "New College Trend," *New York Times*, 7 Jan. 1971, 37, 70.

95. Mari Jo Buhle, "Introduction," in *Politics of Women's Studies*, ed. Howe, xv-xxvi.

96. Gene I. Maeroff, "The Growing Women's Studies Movement Gets Organized," *New York Times*, 18 Jan. 1977, 41.

97. By 1992, 43% of all colleges and universities offered courses in black studies, and 40% courses in women's studies. See Arthur Levine and Jeanette Cureton, "The Quiet Revolution: Eleven Facts About Multiculturalism and the Curriculum," *Change* (Jan/Feb., 1992), 25–29.

98. Arthur Levine and Jeanette S. Cureton, *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student* (San Francisco, 1998), 58–63.

99. James T. Patterson, *Restless Giant: The United States From Watergate to Bush v. Gore* (New York, 2005), 293–95.

100. National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics: 2007*, available at *http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/ch_3.asphttp://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/ch_3.asp* (accessed April 30, 2009).

101. Michael Kurlaender and Stella M. Flores, "The Racial Transformation of Higher Education," in *Higher Education and the Color Line*, ed. Gary Orfield (Cambridge, MA, 2005), 11–32.

102. The legislation included money for black studies, too. On ethnic consciousness, see Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* (New York, 1972). On the spread of ethnic studies in general, and the National Ethnic Heritage Studies Act in particular, see Skrentny, *Minority Rights Revolution*, 277, 322, 324; and Nathan Glazer, *Ethnic Dilemmas, 1964–1982* (Cambridge, MA, 1983), 135–36.

103. Gene I. Maeroff, "White Ethnic Groups in Nation are Encouraging Heritage Programs in a Trend Toward Self-Awareness," *New York Times*, 28 Jan. 1974, 11.

104. Novak, *Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics.*

105. Ibid.

106. Cheryl M. Fields, "White Ethnic Studies are Spreading: They Focus on European Groups' Experiences in America," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 16 April 1973, 1.

107. Frank Ching, "Expansion of Asian American Studies on U.S. Campuses Reflects Growth of Ethnic Consciousness," *New York Times*, 16 July 1973, 18.

108. Arthur Levine, *When Dreams and Heroes Died: A Portrait of Today's College Student* (San Francisco, 1980).

109. Arthur Levine and Jeanette Cureton, *When Hope and Fear Collide*: *A Portrait of Today's College Student* (San Francisco, 1998), 58–63.

110. David Yamane, *Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line in Higher Education* (Baltimore, 2001), 7.

111. Lest there be any doubt, consider the litany of best-selling books published to protest the rise of identity politics in higher education. See, for example, Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Minds of Today's Students* (New York, 1987); Dinesh D'Souza, *Illiberal Education: Race and Sex on Campus* (New York, 1991); Roger Kimball, *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Higher Education* (New York, 1990); and Gitlin, *Twilight of Our Common Dreams.*

Received September 24, 2010
Revision received June 1, 2011
Accepted June 2, 2011 ■