

## **Cynthia Enloe - "From #MeToo to Nationalism to Voting Doing Gender Analysis can Make Us All Smarter"**

**Cynthia Enloe:** Hi everybody, this is a real honor and a treat to be here at TED University. My first time at TED and my second, maybe my third time in Ankara. Do we think it is my third? Yes. See, I have people monitoring me. So, you know you can't get away with much. You know, so it's my third time in Ankara and my first time in TED and I'm just delighted to be here with all of you. When Zuhail and I were talking on e-mail about what might be an interesting title topic range of discussion. I thought that maybe talking about the what is now called the #MeToo Movement might be interesting, particularly because that means "I'm greedy" you should know, so it means that in the discussion time maybe we can talk a little bit about whether sexual harassment in the workplace has had any effects here in Turkey as a movement to resist it, but also to connect it to all the politics and nationalism, which I know all of you here in Turkey think about a lot and have thought about it for a long time and it is always gendered. And then perhaps not as often linked to sexual harassment and other forms of violence against women, nationalism and nationalist movements and what they think about masculinities is and what they think about femininities and but oftentimes not connected to voting. And I think one of the reasons that I've been thinking a lot, as a gender curious person, about voting is because in the United States there is a lot of discussion about how do women vote? How do men vote? Which women vote this way? Which women vote that way? How do men vote? Which man vote which way? Which has to do with race and class as also a religious affiliation in the US? But oftentimes voting is not really talked about as seriously as, *(Is that so running? Oh good! It'd be awful to stand here and think that one's picture is kinda flashing up on the stage)* ... But oftentimes voting is assumed to be not as jazzy a topic, not as urgent, not as exciting. But, in fact, of course, it is. And I think one of the reasons I think a lot about the relationship of sexual harassment to nationalism, the voting is because I was never taught in school, I don't know whether any of you might think in school I mean in elementary school and in high school, hopefully in university you talk more about how women in every country with some male allies in every country, how they won the right to vote. So, I was never taught about that. I don't think I ever heard in English. The term "suffrage" or people who supported women's rights to vote, "suffragist." I don't think. So, is that term used here in English suffrage and suffragists? Okay, right. I was never, I don't think I even heard the words in grammar school, elementary school or high school and to tell you the truth when I went to a very good university which at the time wasn't in the United States was all women's university. I had both men and women as professors.

They never talked to me about how women won right to vote, in any country, including not in the United States. And you know when you learn something late and you begin to wonder why nobody ever talked to you about it. You become kind of evangelical, you become kind of a missionary. If you never knew about it, now you want everybody to know about it. Right? But I try to remember why none of my women professors. When I think about their age and their generation, I think they had to fight all kinds of sexism to get PhD's and their topics. So that they could be my professor at my all-women's university. All of them.

Remember when women didn't have the right to vote or when they were early women voters and they never taught it. And I wonder about that. I wonder about silencing of one's own struggles and why would that have happened. So, that's why I want to link sexual harassment with nationalism with women's right to vote and why put them altogether. So, let me start at the back end because I think one of the things that putting all those three things together and you know what this is like. If you put and you know that #MeToo and nationalism and voting. And it should be a really powerful word. It's usually used as a blend word. It's usually used as a word to escape any kind of analytical argument is just and and and... But if you put them together in an interesting way, in fact, it forces you to ask questions you haven't asked. So, one of the things that strikes me about thinking about voting and the gendering and the gender politics of voting, nationalism and nationalists and the gender presumptions under the notion of the nation and #MeToo which is the presumption that women are fair game in the paid workforce. One of the things that strikes me about that is that so many of the ideas and practices that had to be challenged by the early suffragists in Turkey or in Brazil or in the United States, those presumptions are still pretty much alive and well, they're more likely to be challenged now. Thanks all of you are teaching gender in international relations, gender in politics and women's history. They are being likely more challenged now, but some of those ideas run right through the opposition to women's suffrage. The presumption that the nation is made up of patriarchal families and the idea that women in the workplace are fair game to any abusive male behavior. Amongst those ideas are -and this is what women has had suffered had to fight, so I'm very interested in anti-suffrage movements in every country. So, this would mean not only the 1920's in Turkey, but this would be the 1890's into the 1920's in Turkey, and I know very little about the anti-suffrage movement here. The little bit I know, I don't I definitely don't know enough, so, anyone want to send me anything about Turkish suffragists, send. What I do know is that it wasn't given to women. It really in Turkish or in English or in any other language you have to really make sure you clean up your languages and that by that I don't mean grammar, I

mean how you say things. So, in a lot of countries it is still said that women were given the vote in x date. Right? No, no. Because if you think that women were given the vote by, whoever you're thinking of in your head, you're presuming that there was no movement. You're presuming that there was no pressure. You're presuming that there was no theoretical thinking that was put out there by women.

So, for instance in Egypt, the women's suffrage movement began really in the 1910's and really became very forceful in Egypt in the 1920's. Why? Because this is about the link with nation and voting. Women were crucial... (Some of you study the history of women in Egypt and Egyptian feminism and Egyptian feminism. Kinda sorta?) Yeah, there a lot of Egyptian feminists who are now writing in English about it. There's also an American historian of Egyptian feminism by the name of Margot Badran and as well as others. And one of things that really set off the Egyptian feminist movement was the denial of the vote after they had been so prominent in the nationalist movement. Sequence matters, right? Sequence doesn't explain everything. But, in less this way, when I'm reincarnated, I'm going to come back as I keep thinking of this, but it gets more complicated. So, if I believed in reincarnation and then I... the question is you never come back as what you wish for. You come back as an ant or something. Right if I'm lucky I'll come back as a worker ant, but you know you never know. But I would come back as a historically minded feminist anthropologist. I'm not any of those, right? So, this is a big long wish list, but sequence matters. What had happened in Egypt is that Egyptian feminists had started magazines, they had started reading groups and they had started schools, they had started movements in the 1890's. By the 1900's, they were working with their male colleagues. Sometimes brother, sometimes husband, sometimes just ideological soulmates in opposition to a British imperialism, British colonialism in Egypt and the crucial moment came in their wonderful photographs of this. Therefore, the crucial moment came in 1919 in Cairo when there was a mass public demonstration against British colonial rule. And their photographs, by 1919 of those demonstrations, what you see? You see, women, both covered and uncovered, women from the countryside, women from the city joining with men, also in range of class and region, coming together to in this protest against British colonialism. The movement worked. It wasn't just one demonstration. The movement worked and the British begrudgingly gave up at least most of their domestic control of the Egyptian affairs. What wouldn't they give up? The Suez Canal. Right? They wouldn't give up foreign policy and control of the Suez Canal. But for the British colonial rule, it was a big concession. It's 1919. Think of sequence, think of you are a woman who was in that demonstration or you were not able to be there but you were energized

by it, you thought you were in a protest of your allies, you thought you were in the protest, this is about how expectations rise. You thought you were in a demonstration about shared values and you thought you were in a community, a wider anti-colonial community of like-minded people who had the same idea of what the Egyptian nation would be. That's what you thought. And then the first legislature met, made up of the nationalists. Because now the British are running local affairs. And all male legislatures passed a constitution that was written for and all male, only male electorate. And what happens when you have expectations that are dashed. You don't agonize, you organize. Right? And in fact there were women's groups, women's magazines, women's activism before that, but that started what became known as the EFU (The Egyptian Feminist Union) and it was a suffrage organization.

So, every country, the relationship between nationalism and feminism, that is two sets of ideas and goals, between nationalism and feminism and women's right to vote is a bit different. So, for instance, as we have to be locally curious as well as internationally minded. Do you feminists, you have to stay awake a lot? You know, a lot of caffeine helps. Because you got to be so curious, yes you watch international trends, but you never, ever, ever imagine that one place is just like another. Ever. It doesn't mean you won't find common trends. But you never presume Brazil will be just like Egypt or Egypt will be just like Mexico. So, in Mexico there was the rise of a nationalist movement, not against so much a foreign colonial power at this point because this is now 1910 is a very long bloody revolution in Mexico, 1910-1917, but it was against a dictatorship that was presumed not to really care mainly or prioritize the well-being of all Mexicans. And a lot of women we now know, thanks to feminist historians, we now know that women who were presumed to be just at home minding the kids, in fact, joined some of the armed groups but also supported the nationalist movement against the authoritarian regime, that was ruling Mexico in 1910. The male-led nationalist Mexican movement rewrote the constitution by 1917, rewrote the constitution and they also wrote a nationalist revolutionary movement, but it turns not to be so revolutionary after all; and to have a very shrunken notion of the nation as proved by what they did the voting rights. The male revolutionary nationalists of Mexico in 1917, wrote a constitution that had a male-only suffrage. Why? It is rather different than Egypt. Because they presumed that women were all under the thumb of their local priests and because their notion of the Mexican nation, the new revolutionary Mexican nation was to be a secular nation and because they thought that male priests had so much power over women, especially not men, they wrote a constitution that they thought would preserve the revolution by not allowing women to vote. Got it? This is the same reasoning behind the French

revolutionary nationalist reveal a constitution. When did women win? This is now a question time. Just to make a wild guess. Or maybe you know. When did women win the right to vote in Revolutionary France? When did women win the right to vote in national elections in Revolutionary France? Just think about France as a model.

**Audience:** 1930?

**Cynthia Enloe:** You're on the right road.

**Audience:** 1944?

**Audience:** 1945? Ah, Good!

**Cynthia Enloe:** 1945 is Italy, 1944 is France. But it's World War II and it's because of women's role in the resistance that no longer could be denied. So, militarism and women's campaigning for suffrage can get pretty muddy. Right? If, in fact, women, and this is true in Kuwait, in fact women who are campaigning for the right to vote think that they will have to prove to men that they are valuable for fighting a war. If you begin to think that the only way, this is just you as a woman suffragist, you have to do playacting in your head to really think historically. If you as a woman suffragist whether today you are a man or a woman or non-binary, if you're a woman suffrage activist, you yourself may not be militarist but you, you are Kuwaiti, but you may think that the men in power who can write or rewrite the constitution that they are so militarist, that they will only be persuaded that you are worthy of being thought of as a first-class citizen. If you, as women prove that you're valuable in the waging of the men's war. It's very easy to complicit, right? And you think you're becoming complicit for the sake of strategic wisdom.

The reason I am starting with suffrage is because so many of the presumptions about who women are or who they should be or who girls are or who they should be that were so much a part of the resistance to women winning the right to vote in lots of different countries, definitely including the United States. Were ideas that still fuel the rampant sexual harassment of women in the workplace. Four generations later. It doesn't mean that none of those ideas have been challenged, but it means that they are very sustainable.

And so, now it is very nice to mention this newer book. And one of the reasons I started thinking about it was because I realized that most of my colleagues and my students and my friends, we're using "sustainable" as if it's always good. We want a sustainable development, we want a sustainable economy. We certainly want a sustainable environment. But you know what? The only things that are positive when they're sustained are things that are positive. You can sustain

militarism by sustaining the idea of the enemy. You can sustain patriarchy by sustaining the idea that women are useful but they're always inferior. Patriarchy is not one idea. Patriarchy is a set of ideas and that set of ideas is really hard to not only challenge the first time in 1890's, or in the 1760's, depends on how deep are you going the feminist thought history, but they keep coming back. Certainly, I thought, this is embarrassing to tell you, but I follow certain weapon systems and you think they been defeated in this national legislature and then they come up again. And then because you stop watching that particular very deadly weapon system, you think it's not going to come up again, it's been defeated, it's funding has been taken away and by God, here it comes again. So, I think that ideas that undergird patriarchal ways of living our lives aren't defeated just once in the suffrage movement around the world. They first have to be scrutinized. They have to be made public. They have to be scrutinized and challenged constantly which means that a movement is never done. Thinking is never done. Gender and politics and women's history can't ever stop being talked. And amongst those ideas that fuel the rampant sexual harassment of women in the workplaces is our patriarchal idea. So, let me say what I mean by patriarchy. This is the only way to find it and obviously you will explore it more deeply. But just we're on the same wavelength here as far as how I have come to think about what patriarchy is. Patriarchy first of all assumes kind of three pillars, I think. The first is mainly about ideas. Oftentimes unexamined ideas. The first set of ideas is that there's people, there are humans called women and there are humans called men. You could always tell them apart and they're always separate. That's just the way the world is. The second set of ideas that holds up patriarchal sports teams, patriarchal legislatures, patriarchal media companies, patriarchal political parties and patriarchal families and ourselves. We become patriarchal without thinking about it.

The second pillar is, the presumption is that whatever is masculine and the patriarch gets defined whether some men aren't quite as masculine as they should be, which is why homophobia is so crucial in patriarchy sustainability. And the second is that whatever is masculine, kind of work, a kind of skill, a kind of way of expressing yourself, a kind of curiosity, whatever is masculine is superior to whatever is feminine. You'll notice that patriarchs and almost every culture on the world, the patriarchs don't presume that what is feminine is unnecessary. In fact, it's patriarchs who put motherhood on a pedestal. It's patriarchs who say that you need a certain kind of feminized emotional quality to a society. And most nationalist don't think that women are unnecessary. If they think, even if they think the nationalist movement strategizers, agenda

setters and ultimately constitution writers should be masculine. They think that women are crucial.

You know, one of the first times that Mao Tse-tung in China ever really thought about women was when he was a librarian. Are there any librarians in the room? Well, I am a big fan of librarians, especially feminist librarians. Because feminist librarians think you should collect different things than non-feminist librarians do. All those feminist newsletters of the last two months, they think, "Oh, definitely, they should be in the library." I was at a conference once with feminist librarians and I thought, "Oh my god, I don't even know what feminist librarian is." I mean, what makes you a feminist librarian, they said, "You collect ephemera, you collect things that most librarians say, a too short-lived and don't deserve to be in the library. And feminist librarian says, "But that's everything feminist that have ever been written." And, you know, they last two weeks, three months, right? And so, they collect things differently. It's really interesting.

And so, the idea is, the second pillar is the patriarchy is quite attached to, invested in is that you do need women and Mao Tse-tung wrote his first ever published article on the oppression of mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law. It was his first study of power and equality, but he has thought it was some kind of women oppressing other kind of women. This was when we was a young librarian, and I think he would've been in Shanghai at the time. So it is about the valuing; and so part of that is what in any society or what at any time (societies are not static) what at any time in any society are thought to be quintessentially masculine. And one of the (kind of) themes that keeps running through patriarchal history is that rationality is masculinized; and emotion is feminized. So, you as a patriarchal nationalist you can think, "Oh, yes, yes, our society for it's well-being, our nation, for its wellbeing needs women's emotional values and emotional expressions. We need those. But it's men's rationality that really should guide the nation. So, the feminization of emotion and the masculinization of rationality are really crucial and you can watch it in the weapons industry by the way, and look one of those famous people in my little trade, to write about this ethnographically from observing it, not just sitting down and thinking, you know, actually seeing it at work is a wonderful feminist international relations scholar who I know you know, named Carol Cohn was asked to, was invited as a young scholar at the time to take part in, I think a two-week long roving seminar, on and by nuclear war and nuclear weapons strategist. And she didn't go in thinking this but by the end of it she was just struck by the kind of male masculinized, because it is not just about men, it never is, it's about certain kind of masculinity when it's rationalized as worthy of nuclear strategizing authority;

and what she noticed was how much the men in her group (there were very few women) but the men in her group really competed with each other to show no emotion about a weapon of human devastation. How they spent two weeks together? Really trying to prove to other men, their masculine credentials by doing what they thought you had to do to persuade other man, which is to show that they had no emotional reaction at all to devastation.

One of the people who has, one the man who has written about this and about the long-term cost of this to himself and to others, his name, Daniel Ellsberg. Daniel Ellsberg is most famous in American politics. Because he is the one who, as young staff man in the Pentagon, took what was the Pentagon's secret internal study of the disaster that was the American intervention in Vietnam in the 1970's. Daniel Ellsberg, "young Dan." He took it and he xeroxed it with a couple of friends. Night after, night after, night, took pages of Xerox, and then gave it to The New York Times, the Washington Post called it "Pentagon Papers." And they are, The Pentagon, doing in the internal reflective study of itself and coming up with the findings that the US lead war in Vietnam in the 1960's and 1970's was a disaster. That's Daniel Ellsberg. But Daniel Ellsberg has written a new book called, I believe it's got "doomsday" in it, so it may be Doomsday Book which is very famous medieval piece of literature. I think it's the Doomsday Book that's by Daniel Ellsberg and what he does is for the first time for himself, he comes out and says when I was a young nuclear strategist working in California for one of the big nuclear strategic think-tanks that was hired by the the US government to outline the use of nuclear weapons as an instrument of national security. When I was there, I, for the first time ever came, was face-to-face with the mathematical calculations as to how many people (didn't talk about the environment) would be killed by different forms of nuclear weapons, the nuclear atom bomb, the nuclear hydrogen bomb and he saw the figures and then what he writes about in Doomsday Book is about how none of his male colleagues would even talk about this at meetings. They wouldn't do it. They would not talk about destruction. They would not let themselves do anything more than stay at the abstract level of strategic use. This is about maintaining your credential as masculine, always in the eyes of somebody else. It is like beauty you know. Beauty is they say in the eye of the beholder meaning you don't get to say "I'm beautiful." You can try. But it's somebody else gets to define you. So, that's also true of masculinized rationality. Other people get. So, you're constantly trying to persuade your policer of are you masculine enough by proving that you're not emotional when you're in a meeting that's deciding whether nuclear weapons should be deployed or not.



On the third pillar, I think, of patriarchy. So, the first is the notion of there are men and there are women and they are separate. There's no blurring. Don't talk about gender. That's too scary. Keep man and keep women separate. That's the way the world is and if the world isn't that way, it should be that way. That's where you go from belief to ideology. The second is that whatever is masculine is superior to whatever is feminine. It doesn't mean you don't need emotional people to sustain your society, but should never let them make the decisions. It doesn't mean that all men are rational, but that some men will judge whether other men are rational enough to be able to take part in masculine behavior such as making decisions.

The third is that whatever is masculine should control whatever is feminine. And that involves obviously power and politics and constant exertion. I think this is one of the things that really was so startling to me when I belatedly, I was a little late to the game here. A lot of you are way ahead of where I was. I have been studying politics for 20 years at least. I have been studying the Vietnam War. I have been studying politics for quite a long time. And then my students, thankfully, my students at my small university began to ask didn't I know anything about women. This is embarrassing, right? At this point, there was no such thing as women's studies or gender studies, but these students have begun to hear about it because they had heard that there are courses offered like this in women's studies, which sounded absolutely bizarre at University of Massachusetts, Amherst. And they said, "Well, can't we have some of those courses." But I don't have any idea what those are. I've gone to the University of California at Berkeley, when Berkeley was quite radical university, but not radical enough to offer a course on women in politics, not that radical. Anyway, so I began to be embarrassed. That's always a good start and I began to study the thing that I actually at that point knew the most about, not enough but enough almost and that was state militaries. I was studying state militaries and insurgent militaries all over the world I was studying what was in Soviet military, Philippines military, Brazilian military, the Kenyan military, and that was the thing I, kind of knew most about, but I was really watching race and ethnicity in militaries, and I still am. And they said, "Well, if that's what you choose to do the most research on, couldn't you find out where women were in militaries." I only have the teeny tiny little clue as to when the dominant race or ethnic men started bringing women into their militaries because they're running out of the men they trusted and that was always racial. So, race and gender, you always have to think about them. If you think that racism and sexism, you always have to think about them together and watch the history of both and watch how they affect each other particularly how it leads, always thinking about both together.

So, I thought okay, well, I'll take this thing that I supposedly know something about and I'll really stride studying it, asking my own question which was for me a very new question, which is "where are the women." Where are the women in the Kenyan military? When? Where? Which women? Kikuyu women or Luo women; Who? I began asking where are women in the British military, which women, when, why, for how long? Always ask. Any group that's marginalized either racially or in terms of gender, any group that's marginalized be sure not only to ask when does the designers of the state's military start using them asked when they stop using them. When they no longer think they're necessary. So, I began asking that question. You know when you ask new questions? It's very exciting. It's very exciting to ask new questions. Don't ever be defensive and think, oh, I don't know, be defensive, be, say "I don't know." And then think: "Oh, I'd better find out." You know, that's interesting.

And when I did, here is what I found. This came as a real surprise to me as a Berkeley trained, University of California, Berkeley, during the height of the Berkeley political activism trained political scientist, is that men who run, and they were virtually all men, men who run their country's militaries and most of them are civilian, occasionally they are generals but most of them are civilian. They think about women all the time. All the time. I don't mean that they're just sitting there in offices reading porn magazines. I mean, they are so nervous about women and that was a revelation to me. Because these men who were defense ministers or were senior strategists or were war waging media advocates, they thought about women because they didn't think they can control them. They worried that women particularly as mothers wouldn't encourage their sons to join the military. That's a big worry. And if you look at the Pentagon's website, US Defense Department's website, recruitment website today, just look at all the attention to mothers. And the more attention you see the more nervous you know they are. And they don't spend anywhere near as much attention to fathers. They are really concerned that women who are the mothers of teenage boys will discourage their teenage sons from enlisting in the US military and this is true both for their website for Spanish-speaking parents of potential soldiers as well as English-speaking. The Latina, Hispanic, Spanish-speaking site also is very heavily oriented to Latino mothers. So, the first thing I learned is they thought about women a lot because they didn't think they had control over them.

They also thought about women a lot I learned because and they acted this out, they were very worried about women in prostitution. They wanted male soldiers to have access to women in prostitution, but they didn't think they can fully control the women in prostitution. They were having sexual relationships with their male soldiers. So, the amount of energy that goes into

any military's attempt to control the sexuality of their mainly male troops and out of that their attempt to control women in prostitution was something I never even thought about. Now, when I think of any war, when I think of any military in politics, I always ask; where are the prostitutes, where the women in prostitution. Who are they? How much are they affected the best booklets ever, so don't have enough about this by the way, enough studies. You have to do research, just kind a make it up, and the best and most complete study we have in, this is, again, I'm afraid by an American because the American military is so important. So, it's studied a lot. And this is by Asian-American political scientist, a friend of mine, named Katherine Moon. She is a Korean-American political scientist, and she wrote a book which if you have any chance to read it, go online and see if you can get it. It's called "Sex Among Allies" and it is a great study of the US military's attempt to control Korean women in prostitution around US bases in South Korea and she's got every memo. For those of you who are teaching and taking gender and international relations. And you wonder how all these books get written and why more books aren't written. Kathy tells the story of being a PhD student at Princeton. One of the elite US so called elite US universities and she proposed this topic. She wasn't sure what she can find. She said, "I wanna look at women in prostitution around US military bases in South Korea. I'm not sure what I'm gonna find, but I've heard a lot from my extended family about so many Korean women going into prostitution usually because they're poor. Going into prostitution around US military bases and I don't know what their lives are like. I don't know if there are politics about them, but I wonder about the politics of those women." And her supervisor said two things to her: "I'm sorry Kathy that's not politics." Secondly, "Even if it were, you'll never find anything on it." And she did. She found every memo. But she also showed that the whole Korean-US Cold War alliance, military alliance, which was a linchpinned in the Cold War that alliance in South Korea and highly militarized government and the US government that Cold War alliance absolutely depended on their attempts to control Korean women in prostitution because so many fights broke out around who gets what prostitute.

So control I began to learn was much more on the minds. What I also learned was that because that would be so embarrassing to admit that as a high level military strategist as a policymaker for international security that you actually were concerned about women and you worried about women and you tried to control them and you didn't always control them, in fact they never speak about it. So that what I learned with this very early wakeup call study I did, I mean, it was a wakeup call to me, was that there's a lot of anxiety. There's a lot of patriarchal assumptions. There are a lot of attempts at control. There's a lot of resistance to those attempts

and it's almost never ever talked about publicly. So, when you look at the ideas in the suppression of women's voting, which still goes on, even if they have the right to vote in the constitution and then you look at nationalism and presumptions about what is the nation. What should the nation look like and you look at what leads to the justification of sexual harassment by men in the workplace or schools or militaries, which is a workplace amongst those militaries by male perpetrators. In fact, you got this undergirding I think of these three very diffuse are not easy to always see patriarchal ideas. The ideas that women should be someplace not others? Why it's very hard for women to become the first woman firefighter in her local city? She shouldn't be there, but she also shouldn't be in some of the high-tech companies.

There's a book by Asian-American high-tech investor, the name of the book is "Offset," which is a tacky term, *Offset*, and she charts on the workings of sexual harassment in the big Silicon Valley companies. But you can also do your own study. Watch when Facebook and Google first ever introduced any women onto their Board of Trustees. And it is recent. It is recent because a local newspaper, to follow the tech industry in the United States, you have to oftentimes follow the local newspaper and this is the San Jose paper, I think the San Jose Mercury, which most of us don't read but they cover the tech industry, they cover both ways and sex and every one of the big tech companies and when they blew the whistle, that's when Facebook got not much a teeny bit embarrassed and Google got not much but it teeny bit embarrassed and began to stop having all-male Board of Trustees. So, women being where they're not supposed to be that violates all three pillars of patriarchy. And it is one of the things that allows a lot of men to imagine that sexual harassment of those women colleagues in fact is justifiable.

The other thing about sexual harassment and this is really quite the #MeToo movement which didn't introduce sexual harassment. The first time, sexual harassment was ever used as a concept was 1979. It's new. It's a new idea and it was developed the concept was developed by feminists working with women in factories who were trying to support women in factories who we would now call sexually harassed. But then they was just being made uncomfortable, abused, insulted on assembly lines by male foremen walking up behind them on the assembly line. And those women labour activists and feminist lawyers began to think, "So, what's going on here?" "What's going on here in so many different kinds of workplaces?" Because until you have a concept, you're likely just think it's just a bunch of jerks. Now "jerk" kind of is a concept, but if you stay at that level of analysis. This is why concepts matter, if they're useful. Every concept should be tested. Don't take any concept and not tested before you decide you're going

to use it. Concepts are not infallible. They could be really wrong. But the feminist concept of “sexual harassment” did the following: It shone a light on what clearly was a pattern of sexism and a particular kind of sexism in the workplace. It meant you're not just talking about jerks, not just talking about the guy you won't get in the elevator with, you are not just talking about the guy in your workplace who you won't stay after hours the long day of work, because that guy stays after work too. If you are left at that then you never change anything more than, maybe transferring him or this is what most likely happens, before you have a concept and before you have a law that backs up the concept and before you have a movement that enforces the law, you need all three, is that you the woman, who is harassed, quit. And so the anti-sexual harassment movement only began in 1979 and it's become, it's had various iterations. It's different in every country, but it is always challenging these basic three pillars of idea and practice both that sustain patriarchy and again isn't just in the old fashion companies. It's not just in the all-male old fashion worksites. It is in high-tech companies, it is in hedge funds. It is in the star, always in quotes, architecture firms, and it is not just a Hollywood thing that if you really read some of the case studies and film industry, one of things you will notice is that the sexual harassment goes on mainly, not just amongst the well-known actresses and not only by well-known actors. It goes on by people who have working production relationships. In that way, Hollywood is a workplace that has a lot of low-pay jobs. But that has those patriarchal presumptions. The “joke” in English, not really a joke, the term in English that's been used for generations is the “casting couch.” Did you hear that term? And that presumes that any woman who wants to get ahead in the film industry, particularly she wants an acting job, has to be first laid out. And so far as people have assumed a lot of women have presumed it. The first thing a woman who presumes that is that “Oh, she is just trying to sleep her way to the top.” All in quotes, probably all one word. And that's how women become patriarchal. They just think “Well then, that's the way it is here in the film industry” in Bollywood, in Mumbai or in Hollywood, in California, or any other film industry in any other country is the casting couch is part of the normal furniture. The sexist furniture. The patriarchal way of doing things. What the #MeToo movement that really got off the ground the hashtag part, became a social media movement. The #MeToo movement was actually started by Tarana Burke, an African-American woman working in Alabama with the African-American teenage girls and she tried to get those teenage girls to not think themselves ashamed. But as abused. That's really different. And so, she made the term, the slogan for her local Alabama teenage African-American girls group: Me Too. And the t-shirts made. Because the t-shirts said, “You're not alone.” If you aren't alone, it's a pattern. If it's a pattern, we can all resist it. So just #MeToo on

a t-shirt, one teenage girl to another teenage girl said, "You're not alone." You are not the one who is shameful. Is this a pattern of abuse, and together, we will resist it. The #MeToo which came out of Hollywood in October 2017, with the outing of Harvey Weinstein, the producer, might be not a big star, but he is just very powerful. The reason Harvey Weinstein could get away with years, years of known, not only harassment but sexual assault, years, was because he had so much money in the game. Not just that he had money, he had money in the production of films other people want to make. If you wanted to make a film, you're a director, you're a scriptwriter, you're a producer. Particularly those three groups: You're a scriptwriter, you're a producer or are you a director, then you certainly are not going to talk about Harvey Weinstein because maybe you can persuade him to produce your next film.

Harvey Weinstein is the equivalent of a hedge fund manager in that sense. He is not a celebrity, mainly. He used his celebrity status. But he is mainly a funder of things other people want to make. So, here's the last point and then we should open for discussion although I have been talking too much, and that is that "sexual harassment" as a concept has done something that really is so radically removed from "He's just a leech, stay away from him," which is the pre-sexual harassment way of understanding of workplace power dynamics, "Oh, he is just a leech, stay away from him." #MeToo and "sexual harassment" as a concept from 1979 on, said "Sexual harassment is not only perpetrated, it's enabled." Let me do that again. Cause I know for a lot of you you're working in second and third languages. I'm so embarrassed to be so mono mono lingual here.

"Sexual harassment" as a concept because it's a political concept that allows us to see more realistically the power dynamics that are gendered in a workplace. And what it did as a concept is it made us curious about, if necessary, resistance to not only the perpetrators, but everyone in that workplace, man or woman, who enabled him.

And enablers are, you have to tell me what Turkish law looks like, but in American law, this has all to do with the movement helping to get legislators just to be realistic. So, they wrote a realistic labor rights law. It is usually movements that make legislators more realistic about "here's how power works." If you're going to try and address it in the law you better know how it works. And what the enabler idea did in the #MeToo movement especially but even before that, it's said anybody in a workplace, particularly in the role of a supervisor, may not be the boss, may not be the owner, be the supervisor in that department for instance, who, him or herself, has not been the perpetrator, but has known of abuse going on and is turned away from not recognizing it because of that "Abusers are too important." "He's too crucial to our bottom

line.” I hate this term, “he is,” I hate this term, “the star in our department and our architecture firm, in our brain studies department, University Rochester...” “He brings in the grants.” In a lot of academic departments the star is the grant gatherer. “He is too important to us.” And so I am not gonna, you know, “She should move,” “She should get another job,” She should live with it.” And when that person who is being abused comes to the manager and says so-and-so, professor so-and-so, director so-and-so, supervisor so-and-so has been gropingly, on the job, or at the bar, after the job, but it is crucial that you go to because of wanting to get promotion better than hangout after the job. Your workplace can last a long time. It's not only when you check-in at your office and a manager, or supervisor, or director, or professor, or dean, or Hollywood producer says, “You know, guys will just be guys.” That's as patriarchal as you can get, right? “Boys will be boys.” I don't know what it would be in Turkish, is equivalent of saying that's “Just how guys deal with it.” Is it equivalent in Turkish, maybe with different words, may not be those words, but that sentiment, “That’s just guys are deal with it,” “Boys will be boys.” Is it equivalent in Turkish or something like that?

**Audience:** “Erkektir yapar.”

**Audience:** “Erkek milleti.” “The nation of guys.”

**Cynthia Enloe:** Is that nation, my God, you guys are a gift here. But the fact is so many of you have heard that term. Then, when it said it's almost said altogether as it is one word. That is what patriarchal sustainability looks like. “That's just normal,” “That's just natural,” “Get over it,” “Deal with it,” “That's the way the world is.” And if there's anything that makes a person who is just becoming a feminist, man or woman, sit up and maybe stand up, it’s when somebody says something is “natural,” because natural is such a powerful camouflage. Because if something is natural, it means you can't investigate it and it means it has no history. It's always been that way and it means you can't challenge it or it's foolish to challenge it. “Oh, that's just natural.” So natural, for anyone who's got any kind of feminist curiosity, makes you stand right up and say, “Wow, what do you mean by that?” “Do you mean it has always been that way?” “It's always that way everywhere?” “It's ever been resisted?” “What happens when it has been resisted?” and “boys will be boys” or “a nation of guys” that is enabling. And that is what sexual harassment as a set of laws has done in many countries. It is said that people who are enablers and there are usually people in positions of authority higher than either the perpetrator or the victim. When those people ignore it, or turn away from it, or justify it, or tell the person not to charge or file any charges. They are subject under the sexual harassment law and they will be

fined. So, a lot of the biggest sexual harassment cases have gone to court. They've actually found guilty the enablers, not just the perpetrators.

So, voting, the making of ideas of nations, the building of nationalist movements, the building of anti-sexual harassment concepts and movements, they're not all the same and they're definitely not all the same in every country or even every region. They all have to be investigated. But always watch for these three pillars of patriarchal ideas. Even though they may take rather shifting, updated, modernized forms. Thanks.

**Audience:** There are questions we can take....

**Cynthia Enloe:** ... Or stories. We'd love stories. Yes, hi, hi, hi!

**Audience:** Hi, thank you for coming here today. I know the answer was inherent in your speech but are we able to ask a question which is very important to me personally?

**Cynthia Enloe:** Sure.

**Audience:** But I have to read it...

**Cynthia Enloe:** Sure. Read it. No, no, no, this is good. No, no, you say exactly what you mean...

**Audience:** Do you have any suggestions to young female academics that face their abusers or sexual harassers every day in academic workplaces or circles? Even in feminist one... I mean, how can we keep on fighting? Because exposure can be also harmful to women as well.

**Cynthia Enloe:** It's dangerous. It feels dangerous. Yeah, I don't have... Tell me your name.

**Audience:** Tuğçe.

**Cynthia Enloe:** Tuğçe, I don't have the magic answer (I mean none of us do) but here's what I've learned from other people. I have a colleague who's just gone through this; just gone through this. And that is, don't ever be alone. Don't ever be so ashamed you don't tell anyone. You do all this already I'm sure, anybody you know does; take notes even if they're just for yourself. Describe and tell this to any colleague or friend of yours who is going through this. Take notes, describe when and where and how that harassment has happened or keeps happening. Notes, details, specificity. Specificity earns credibility in the eyes of your future hearers. So, take notes. It is painful to take notes because it's so embarrassing. That is the point of the harasser. The harasser wants you to internalize your shame. So, you won't tell anybody or you won't even write your own notes. Secondly, as quickly as possible and every time it happens, if it's a repeat, tell at least one other person, as soon as you can and that other person



does not need to be in your workplace, is that's all the better, but sometimes there's not enough trust in the workplace, but tell somebody. And then if you can together decide who is the third person you can tell. Sometimes you have to have your conversation with your best buddy. So you together can figure out. So, who else should you tell until now. Because in every sexual harassment case, this doesn't totally answer obviously the whole problem, but in every sexual harassment case (that is to become a case, that's the first thing), that is somebody has charged a workmate with this kind of abusive behavior. Having somebody else that you told early meaning you didn't make it up just when, this is the camouflage now, you didn't just make it up when you didn't get the promotion you wanted. Right? That's kind of "Oh, that's the only reason she's telling that story now." And if you're taking notes at the time, date them, and you've told somebody and hopefully to other people. What it does, it says even to those enablers who would like you to go away, would like you just to internalize your own shame, you have evidence that at the time this happened. The third thing is, and this is about sanity, right? Have solidarity with some other people. Because one of the reasons that sexual harassment is so prevalent in the silencing of it. That's why the #MeToo movements are coming as like a shockwave. It's becoming as a shockwave because people are speaking out about harassment for decades. Why now? Because people haven't spoken about it. And so, the third thing about solidarity is it keeps you sane. Alright? Because the way to build silence, if you're a patriarchal builder, the way to sustain patriarchy is to make each person, usually a woman, but not always a woman, feel as if they are alone. Feeling you are alone is God's gift to patriarchy. "Oh, it's only me," "Oh, I should've known better," "Oh, I shouldn't have been doing so much xeroxing when there wasn't anybody else in the office," or whatever. "I should've known that even though the whole department is going out for coffee after the meeting I should've known that in that space he'd act that way." "I should've known." And "I should've known" says, "I must be the cause." So, solidarity is somebody saying "no, no, absolutely not! You don't stop rape at night by all women being curfewed", right? ...which actually, somebody did suggest once! "If women don't want to be the objects of sexual harassment, of sexual assault, that this isn't just sexual, assault that she stays home." Oh, please! "They shouldn't take the bus." "They shouldn't take the crowded subway car." "They should stay home." "So, the way to end sexual abuse is to curfew women." But that kind of blaming oneself is so crucial to the perpetuation of sexual harassment. The other thing is, this is much harder. And do it together and be sure you know who you are. I'm really saying this because a colleague of mine has just gone through this. She did not, did not, did not want to file a charge for a couple of reasons. This is true for all of you in universities as well. All the other kinds of workplaces. Make sure, I don't know what it's called in Turkish

organizations, do you usually call them human resources department or HR departments... Is that quite common? That's almost always where sexual harassment charges are supposed to be filed. Almost no presidents of any organization come out of the HR departments. Why? Because HR departments are not supposed to be strong departments. They come out of the finance departments, right? So, people in HR who may be very well trained, they've gone to management schools, they are very committed to fairness in the workplace, that's why they become HR specialists, but they know they're weak in the whole organization. They are not the powerhouses, but they have to be made the powerhouses. One of the things we're learning, I just talked to a whole group of management people, critical management people, that was really interesting, um, professionals... And they said the HR departments are weak because the leadership of organizations want them weak which means the HR departments don't know what to do with these charges and they oftentimes also tried to discourage a person from even filing because they say it'll go nowhere; or the company or office or university rules are such that it's done by mediation. Watch, watch, watch, watch, watch out for compulsory mediation! If you work for any organization, read the fine print. Does that organization, that's true if you're now in university you are gonna go out and get jobs, well, you have jobs, if you're gonna go out and get better-paying jobs, a little better paying jobs, kinda better-paying jobs... Do yourself a favor and look in the fine print of your organization's employee rules. Because amongst the things are getting globalized, our lawyers strategizing for employers to protect themselves. Because I gave this example just out of my own American understanding.

In Australia, two summers ago, and I said this may be just very American, this kind of compulsory arbitration. And way in the back, up in the balcony and Australian said "No, no, no, we are working in a humanitarian aid, big aid organization for Australia. It's right in our contract." That is you file a charge. You're not allowed to really take it forward as a charge. You are required by your boss, by the employer to subject yourself to compulsory mediation. And mediation is not the same as bringing a charge. Mediation is something that you sort it out without any trouble, which is what employers want. But here's the thing, you know this because you say power: Who hires the mediators? Not the abused person. Mediators are usually contract workers employed by employers. And of course, they want the next contract, don't they? The second thing to watch for, this again is not a great comfort here. The second thing but it's really important because if you see it band together and get it out of your contract that is out of everyone's contract. The second requirement has been globalized, again as the Australians said, "Oh, no, no, our lawyers now advise our employers the same thing." The second thing is called

the non-disclosure agreement. Non-disclosure meaning “make public”. The on-disclosure agreement. That’s been globalized referred to by English-speaking globalizing lawyers who advise employers that is writing into contracts that whatever result of anybody's charge is, it will be agreed on with and, you bring in the charge, signing a non-disclosure agreement which will say the following. They’re really devastating.

And again, it's a number of the Hollywood actresses that have broken the silence about this, they have enough celebrity to break the silence and say, “I am breaking my non-disclosure agreement.” You can be taken to law and sued for everything you have. That's a legal document: the non-disclosure agreement. And they decide to take the risks. They said this is just an overall silence agreement. The non-disclosure agreement says, “I will never talk about the charges I brought.” “I will never talk about the resolution of the charges.” “I will never name the institution as the institution where I had to bring charges.” That is in a contract and it's now been so globalized. My guess is half of the companies in Turkey have non-disclosure agreements and compulsory arbitration requirements right there in the small print of your contracts.

So, solidarity, keeping notes, trying to find some way to bring a charge. And my colleague finally got up to courage and she is a tenure track and that's important. It's even harder if you're not tenure track. A tenure track, highly professional, early stage, social scientist. And she said, “The first person I talked to in my department was another woman of color who she had known very well. Oh, she is also a woman of color. I talked to another woman of color, in my department who’s more senior. And I talked to her because I thought she has more security and she also knows this department better, you know every department is kind of quirky. You know, she knows this department better, she’ll have a sense who this guy is, has he been doing it forever? Yes, the answer was yes. And no other department chair had ever charged him. And but what happened was: Is that when she had the courage to talk to a person more senior than her in the department who she trusted, she really talked to her mainly to have kind of a collegial workplace friend. That woman said, “He has done this to me for years.” And then she said, “But if you believe in charges, I will too.” You know, one and one don't equal two; one and one can equal “a movement!” Right? Not always but and so this more senior, more secure person joined her in the charge. And that made it really impossible for the department chair to ignore. Absolutely important because now it’s two people saying that same behavior by that same faculty member has been going on and the department says, “Oh, that's the way he is, you know.” It's not easy. But you are being quiet, so don't be quiet. Ok? Really. Yes, Hi!

**Audience:** Hi! Thank you very much for such a great presentation. Actually I want to talk about every point you've raised now. But I don't think I can make it right now. I just want to ask one question, ask for your advice. You keep encouraging us to be aware of trivial, be aware of normal and ask the woman question. So, I am in the stage that being aware is not enough anymore. So, when you're working in an institution that is very gendered or militarized, you are just aware of this stuff but you can't do anything to change it. I mean, I am in the stage that I feel kind of powerless. And I can only be angry about it, but I can't do anything else about it. I applied to your "feminist curiosity" in my PhD, like when I was doing PhD it was a bit more easy for me to.... But right now I feel like, no, I don't know I'm powerless. I don't want to use this power in my daily life anyway. But I can only be angry but I don't know what else I can do.

**Cynthia Enloe:** Anger is good, you know. Because you don't usually just get angry if you think something is normal, right? So, being angry is the first step to say, because angry, not always, we sometimes get angry at the wrong things, you know. But angry says is on the first step to thinking, "Why do I think this is so unfair?" and it's really important as much as... I mean you think this already. To try and think "What's so unfair about this?" "What is so destructive about militarism for instance?" "What is both unfair and destructive about an organization becoming so militarized?" "What is it?" And then, as much as you can, again, talk to other people about it.

**Audience:** What if you don't have any other people to talk about it?

**Cynthia Enloe:** Ah, but that's really interesting. No, no, so, the other thing to do is branch out from the organization. Again, I'm making it sounds nothing is easy. If things were easy, we would have an equitable world, right? And equal is different than equitable in English. Equal means getting the same pay. That's good. Getting the same chance of training, that's good. Being heard equally. Equitable is equal with justice. Equitable is really hard because you have to think about justice, right? Not just about collecting the data to show equality. But coming back to your point: If there are other people even in, you have to define it broadly, your field, try and get a conversation going about the fields, so this woman who wrote, I am trying to think about her last name, who wrote, *Offset*, this book about gender inequity and sexism in the high-tech industry in Silicon Valley. And yeah it's very very interesting. And it took her a long time to kinda piece together it wasn't just her. Wasn't just, that's enough, racism, what was she encountering here. And she began to write letters to the newspaper because if it's about an industry or whole sector of public life or economic life, letters to the newspaper are really

influential. It's amazing because other people say, "Oh my God, that's the way it is in my company, too. Or my agency, or my NGO, or my university, too. So, sometimes it's trying to build some kind of informal, to start with, community around acknowledging, defining, shining a light on what you're seeing in your own organization. So that other people who are in other organizations who also may be feeling alone can say, "Oh yeah, but you know that's the road down which organizations are going." "I'm really worried." "It didn't use to be like that. But now it's... And you try and... And when you feel alone wherever you are in acknowledging whatever patriarchal or sexist or racist or militarized inequities are being embraced by your organization. Try to think broadly about whose field is this. Sometimes it's a profession. Sometimes it's an industry, right? Sometimes it's a whole civic action network of NGO's. And try to get everybody who is alone in their own place to feel as they're part of the community. When this is what happened, this really woke me up this summer. I was asked to do a talk at a convention. I'm not kidding. A convention of people, meaning what's funny about it, is that they asked me. They asked me to give a talk to a management academic, who teach management studies. I said, "Are you sure? It's not my field, I don't really know much about that." They said, "No, no that's why we're asking you." And they had created a community of critical... Do you all have management programs in your universities, business management, MBA, kind of credentialing? These are usually one part of departments if you're lucky. People who are doing what they now call "critical management studies" and the amazing thing is they've created a community within this, not so welcoming management studies, organization. And there are enough of them now that they actually have those meetings. And out of their own meetings, they begin to think, "Oh, I'm not the only crazy one who wants to do a whole course on Boeing." Ask your management studies, friends, who were teaching management studies in the universities at METU or TED, in Ankara, or wherever. Ask them if they have a course on Boeing, the big airplane manufacturer. Turkish Airlines bought a lot of MAX 8's. They are all grounded. So, who's offering courses to management students on Boeing, on their cover-up, on their attempts to compete with Airbus and therefore cut corners on safety engineering? That's what's coming out. And these were the people doing but what struck me about that is that they created a community out of lonely people. That is they were the critical person in every one of their management, academic programs, and by coming together they had comradeship, they had solidarity and they gave each other a sense that they could do something. So, I'd say definitely start kind of building some kind of very informal, get together for coffee, kind of network. And then decide out of that are other people seeing what you're seeing going on in their organizations? Should we find ways to blow whistles? Is there something we should do? It's

not a magic answer and it takes patience, right? But again, what any kind of injustice, normalization does, try to do to us, is make you feel you're the only one. That's a secret to their sustainability, make you feel as though you're the only one. All you can do is gnash your teeth and then finally quit. "Oh, thank God, she has gone." But when you create communities, it can really be six people having tea together and say, "Oh my God, that's what's going in your organization. They're excepting certain military contracts in your organization. Your HR department is as weak as ours and ours is the weakest in the world. Yeah, Hi, yeah?"

**Audience:** First of all I would like to thank you for coming here, taking your time and making this presentation possible. I was wondering about the suffrage of the United States actually. I am more interested in the history. How did the ratification, the agreement of the 19th Amendment proceed? How did it affect the goals of the women's movement?

**Cynthia Enloe:** Well it's very... Tell me your name?

**Audience:** Alihan.

**Cynthia Enloe:** Alihan, It's very good that you asked this question. A couple of things happened. The first thing that almost happened was the demobilization of the movement. This is a movement in the United States that the fight for women's suffrage, the movement for women's suffrage, which was not always unified. I mean, they debated each other about racism especially. Inside the movement and, outside have been going on between 1848 and 1920. That means a lot of the people who started the movement died before they saw the "Amendment" passed. If you're a social change person, aspirant, you got to have the long view. Everything won't be accomplished in your own lifetime. But that movement, because it won the 19th Amendment, of course, a lot of people have put their lives on hold. You know, they left their households. They jeopardized if they had a paid job. They jeopardized their reputation by being a social activist and they said, "That's enough. I've done this for the last 20 years, I've to get back to some other kind of life." And that's called the demobilization of the movement. But a lot didn't. Now this is very interesting. The first thing that happened is that was Alice Paul, sometimes it's real individual people, Alice Paul was one of those radicals of the American suffragists. She said, "Okay, we've won the vote, now we should start a political party." And she started the women's party and a lot of people thought she's crazy. How can we have a women's party? But, in fact, what it did is a couple of things; it made clear to everybody winning the vote was in itself the goal. It was the goals that women with the vote would actually change public policy and so she said, "Okay, so maybe the women's party won't be able to win

enough seats in Congress to have an effect.” But saying we’re a party, since we have an agenda, a manifesto, and we will try to influence campaigns of other people.

The other thing that came out of it was an organization that still exists called the *League of Women Voters* and right from the start they wouldn't side with any party in the US (that means Republicans or Democrats) but they would work for fair elections. And the *League of Women Voters* for a long time was thought to be kind of a white middle class, too respectable, too safe, too easy. But in fact this happens with a lot of organizations that last a long time. It now is the anti-voter suppression organization that is it the League of Women Voters is putting a lot of effort into exposing unfair voter suppression efforts in states like Ohio, Virginia, Florida. And so, the League of Women Voters has now kind of re-found its mission, which takes attentiveness to ensure fair elections and having activists who study what makes elections unfair and what you have to do to make elections fair, that's an ongoing commitment. The other thing, the third thing is that I've just learned this from a graduate student of mine, who did a dissertation on women in the League of Nations, not the UN, before the UN, in the 1920's and 1930's and 1940's, The League of Women Nations. And a lot of suffragists decided that peace was the reason that they fought for the vote and they started working with the League of Nations. That was a total surprise to me. I had no idea that a lot of suffragists in the US, Germany, it'd be interesting to know if any Turkish suffragists... Yes, her name is Soon. She's a Korean American, Soon Jang, J, A, N, G. And you can get it from the Women's Studies Department, at Clark University, if you just send me an email, I'm just cenloe@clarku.edu, um, I can then tell you how to get it, but yes. So all three of those lines...

But some people did relax. Some people went back to [quote] being housewives [/quote]. But that always happens with the movements, right? If people in the peace movement or a nationalist movement or a suffrage movement, if you put your life on hold, you know, you can't do that for... Well, some people can. But most of us can't. We have elder parents to take care of, right? We have a job to earn some money we have to get back to. We go to university, we put off going to because we are involved in the movement. So that moment when the goal, this alleged goal has been one... that 10 years after that is really a dangerous moment. Some people

have to stay alert and organized. Or the goal will be shrunk by those who never want to give it, into almost nothing. I've learned this from a lot of other movements. The patriarchal people of all sorts, they resist and resist and resist; then you keep up your momentum and your pressure long enough, you get them to concede a little bit. And after they resist all that time to figure out how to make their little compromise work for them. That's what Syrian women learned in Geneva. "Okay, no women at the table, UN negotiators, US and Russian negotiators, British negotiators... No women at the table, we don't need any women at the Syrian peace table." This is now Geneva. Who needs them? What guns do they control? That's the militarization of peace negotiation. You don't get in the room unless you show your gun at the door, right? "You don't control any guns, why do we need you, the Syrian feminists? We only need people at the peace negotiation that control violence. If you don't control violence, then why do we need you at the peace negotiation table." So, they push and they push and they push and they have a lot of international allies, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, MADRE and other really good transnational feminist groups. They finally get the UN embarrassed enough, so that the UN negotiator says, "Okay, okay, okay, okay, we'll insist that both sides, the Assad side and the insurgent side on the Syrian table at least had to have a couple. And so who are the couple? The couple are the women that each side chooses they know won't make any trouble.

So, you can find resistance, resistance, resistance. Then you find some compromise. Then you find a patriarchal strategy for turning the compromise into something that works for them. And this is the competition now for women's votes in 2020 in the US. There is a lot of attention to the women's (well there isn't a block) votes in the US and all of us who are very engaged in this are really trying to take seriously, so which women in the US, because the people who are courting women's votes for the more conservative side of things, are precisely those who were most patriarchal, but they're courting women's votes. So, which women find the Republican ticket most appealing. You can't just say all they're stupid, or all they're racists, or all they're whatever your dismissive, contemptuous, misogynist term is. You got to actually be curious. Well there are very particular women in the US who have found the Republican ticket appealing to them and it tends to be white women, not all white women but tends to be white women, not African-American women, not Latino women, not native American women, not Asian-American women. Some, but not mostly, mostly women were identified as white. Secondly, amongst white women particularly, since not all white women vote for Republican at all, this is really interesting to me, particularly women who identified as belonging to Christian Evangelical Churches, not just any Christian, not just any church, but those churches that have



been most politically active against women's abortion rights. So, for a lot of white women who identify with what it called Evangelical Christian Churches, their top priority is denying abortion rights. For their own deep feeling and they see the Republican Party as the party who will guarantee that. That doesn't mean they like everything about Trump, doesn't mean they like everything about the militarizing foreign policy, the form of the Republicans, no, no, but it means they prioritize one issue and on that one issue, they think that's the party who will deliver it, i.e. The Supreme Court nominations, public policy, state legislature by the state legislature. The third group, and this is particularly interesting to me, the third group of women who in 2016 voted disproportionately for Donald Trump for president are, I watch, why women who live in American suburbs, not rural and not city districts, but suburbs. And all of us have to really think about what's this thing about that because they are not evangelicals, they tend to be more rural. They aren't necessarily women who have strong feelings about the Republican Party, but it turns out that living in the suburbs in the US, in 2016, two things about your life in the suburbs and I don't have any idea what this is true in the outer ring of communities around the Ankara of the outer ring of communities around Istanbul. It's probably not the same but in American suburbs there are two things that are characterized. One, you really think about property a lot. You think about who will protect your property values. Whereas people who are renters in the city, I mean, they are trying to pay their mortgage or pay their rent and they certainly think about it. But they're not as property focused when they think about candidates, but because the Republican Party is an anti-tax party. (Except for everything but the military.) That sometimes persuades people, men and women living in the suburbs, that it's the party that's protecting their interests. And the second thing about living in American suburbs again is the suburbs compared now especially to city neighborhoods in the US. But you can ask this about Colombo, South of Sri Lanka. Take any city. If you live in suburbs around the US, outside of main cities, you are likely to live a more mono-ethnic life. The public state schools you go to probably you don't have students who are ethnic diverse. You are much less likely to have people who look different than you, whatever that means, as your neighbors. You just don't live as ethnically or racially diverse in everyday life, which means that it's much easier to make you fearful... about immigration, for instance. And if that ties with your property values, gotcha! Well, here's what is changing. I'm not sanguine, I'm not predicting, I'm just saying that there's evidence now, you have to watch things over time, here's what just happened in Virginia. Virginia, which usually is a Republican state. First of all, the suburbs in Virginia are becoming astoundingly ethnically diverse. There are some suburbs that are half white, half Korean. Other suburbs that are Korean, Somali, Vietnamese, and white. Other suburbs that are African-

American, white, and Syrian. In that suburb, that is, suburban people, even white people, are less likely to live mono-ethnic, mono-racial lives than they were and that means that they're less able to be appealed to by simply racist fear mongering, which means they can be detached from a party that makes that their claim. The other thing about suburbs, this is why gender always matters, is that evidently the votes that switched from Republican in 2016 to a Democratic candidate for Congress in 2018. Just last year. We're not anybody living in the suburbs. Because men and women tend to be property oriented and tend to live mono-ethnic lives if they live in the suburbs. But women began in the suburbs to switch from Republican to Democrat now. Since suburban white women were crucial to the Republican victory in 2016, there's nothing automatic, but it means that suburbs change, ethnic distribution changes, women's concerns about credibility, about violence, about legitimacy change. So, keep your eye on suburban white women, not because they're the most important they are, but they seem to be the group that is moving, on the move. Because they are changing their ideas about what they fear and they are changing their ideas about what matters, they are changing their ideas about how to value a candidate. So, I'm not, as you all have been telling me about your own elections, I'm not sanguine, I don't automatically think, "Oh well. now we've got momentum in one direction. I don't have to worry anymore." No, no. But it just means that the voting and gender is going to be more crucial than ever. In the Democratic primaries and on this, so see how micro you can get? It's so interesting, right? Interesting to me, well anyway. And that is, watch African-American women voters in the primaries. This is where the Democrats are trying to choose their nominee. African-American women vote... When you watch voting in Turkey or in the US or any place else, watch at least three things. First of all, watch turnout. Do women and men actually go to the polls and turnout on voting day to vote in the same percentages as men in the United States now amongst African-Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, native Americans, and white voters... In every one of those communities, women are more likely to vote than their male community members. Everyone is different as they are. So, watch turnout. Because in the past, women have been discouraged to go out and vote. "Just let me vote, I'll vote for the household."

The second thing to watch is this depends on exit polling, so you got to have really reliable, scientific, trustworthy exit polling; that is when people come out of polling, they can be asked if they will answer honestly. They'd be asked, "How did you vote?" And that you don't give a name. But race, ethnicity, education and gender are always asked and you can really find out what.

But the third thing and we're just talking about this earlier is even if you don't have that kind of data on turnout and on preference... about who is taking part in campaigning. I don't know why it is, but I go on a Sunday afternoon to write postcards, I mean, this is mild activism folks, but anyway, you know, you do what you can, my handwriting's terrible, I tried to make my handwriting kind of legible cause I'm writing for whatever candidate I'm supporting, Sunday afternoons I go and write postcards to people in other States saying turn out to vote, "your vote matters," that kind of thing... And I look around the room. This is Sunday afternoon, I don't know how gendered it is in terms of working, you know paid work, but every Sunday afternoon I've gone, this is in Boston where I live, I'd say two thirds of all the volunteers just sitting there and doing this kind of humble, you know, postcard activism, some people are making phone, but two thirds of women, I don't know why, I don't know, I have no idea why, is that kind of volunteerism? Just not thought exciting enough? I don't know. But in your own situation, try to collect data, try to find any kind of data, interview with your own families, try to get some handle on the gendering of voting. Because I think we really should not denigrate it and imagine it's not as exciting as revolutionary movements or civil wars or social movements. Voting is really, really interesting and it's highly gendered and it's gendered over time. Thanks everybody!