

My name is Berit As, I was a Social psychologist from Oslo, but I have been teaching in different universities almost in every continent. In addition to be an academian, I am a politician, a feminist activist and a peace activist.

### 1. FEMALE CULTURE. (9'54'')

I was asked when I first became aware of the female culture, and of course, it didn't happen like this; it happened through a series of experiences. I think, I shall mention a few: first of all, I grew up in a street where there were only boys, and when I came into my teen age period they told that I was emotional, I was subjective, I was irrational, I couldn't think logically, I was too much in the spirit of the moment, I had to be more kind of reflective, and all these things. And then, I got so surprised, because when I behaved, for instance, a little aggressive... then, I was hysterical! But when the boys were a little aggressive exactly when the same kind of body movements and so on, they were very masculine and they were almost heroes. So, same kind of behaviour had different adjectives depending if I was doing it, or some of my girl friends were doing it, or if boys were doing it. And this continued when I came into the university; I started to discuss with economists and philosophers and so on, when we were in restaurants, and then the girls were very quiet, very silent, and I wondered about that. And, when I had with the others a very strong argument, what the male students said?: *"Dear Berit, you felt 20% on the marriage market !"* Because I discussed with them. I saw the other day just a new research which said: *"Men are listened to, but women are interrupted"*.

So, this was the kind of out world which told me that it was a different kind of opinion or perception of an act according to if it was a man or a woman who performed it. So, I started to read on *sex differences*, and there is specially one woman, I am only mentioning one research-project by a woman called Eleanor Maccoby. [1] She was a very known researcher in *sex differences*, and she had one special kind of results that made me wonder... She had a big group of students, boys and girls over 100 IQ, and then, she asked them to guess what kind of grade they will have in the next kind of exercise, and the boys guessed right. And, it was a qualification of 63%, you know

that it is a high qualification between what they really guessed and what they got. For the girls was absolutely different, it was a negative thing; they guessed wrong about half of the time. So, I wonder: How can? And then, I just started to think: it might be that if you are evaluated by the *Master Culture* to be subjective, irrational, and so on, but when you talk with your women friends, you are perfectly understood. Might it be that we are talking from two different kinds of perspectives? And, the perspectives from which women talk it is a kind of another world where things means different things? And, if it is so, perhaps this other world, it is something that you can discover if you do research? And perhaps, the perspective from which men are talking, it is their world, and that stands from their experiences, from what they are told that they must represent: courage, competition, power, being the one, the one who wins, use of power might be brutality, you can really fight for it, for your little boy... Then, the girls are told: be patient, be clever, be silent, listen, do what your Mother and Father say. And, if that it is installed very early in the personalities, I think that, it will influence their understanding of how world really is and what the expectations are.

So, I started to think, if there is another world, it is invisible; it is the boys world that is visible. So, for Heaven's sake: How can we find this other world? Is it possible that it is another culture? And, that made me going into Anthropology, and I thought that Social psychology was the same as Anthropology because I read some marvellous anthropologists: Margaret Mead, [2] Ruth Benedict, [3] a man called Malinowski; they were very famous. And, the thing was that I thought that this was my thing when I became a psychologist, but that was not the case. So, I had to really decide that my Psychology should turn towards bigger groups and societies, and not necessarily psychoanalysis. And then, I wondered: How do I search? How do I find this culture? And, I made my mind that I had to work with anthropologists, and I went to another office, it was allowed to sit there because I got a stipend, and when I was sitting there, I was just trying to find out what it is culture. And, that was a very different job because different people has about 160 different definitions of what a culture was. But there was something that almost everybody included in their definition, and that was that if two groups speaks different languages, or dialects, or their understanding of language is different, or they have different symbols and signals, then, they might have a different culture. The second dimension was that if two groups are organizing their activities in different ways, and have different kind of leadership, and different kind of resources, and different goals, then you might have two cultures. And the third one was perhaps the most important be-

cause they said: if two groups have a different relationship to tools and resources, then you might be absolutely sure that you have to do with two groups. And there were two others areas also, and the one was time. If the people are using the time of their lives in two different ways, doing different things, and being in some way committed to do those things, and being controlled by others, then you have two different groups.

## 2. FEMALE CULTURE. (6' 7')

And this was in the beginning of the 70's, it was really before the *Women Studies* started out, and when it started out, you had a lot of material about how women and men talk differently, and talk about different things, and interpretate signals in different ways. And, I went into male organisations and female organisations as a student, and I saw how different leadership was performed; I saw the recruitment, that was so different; and the goals for women were often: health, peace, child education, food; while the men was concerned about: engineering, about mechanics, about power, about competition, about... So, just listening to the kind of goals that men and women organisations had, I said, oh God, this is certainly different ways. And then, I started looking at the time schedules, and this was at the time when they had introduced this daily time books, and you read them, and then you saw how different women and men were behaving during the days. And, at least women had all the responsibility for children at home, very much for making the food, taking care of the clothes, doing the health care, washing and taking care of the equipments, and so on. Men were going out to earn money, so much money that they could pay, this is a marxist kind of thing, they really could pay for the reproduction which the women were doing at home. But you know, this was old fashioned because that was in the time when you had the Industrial Revolution and men were the industrial workers, but from the 1.960 the majority of industrial workers in the world were women. So, suddenly, we were thinking theoretically from a time that was an old time, and the new research on women showed also that women didn't have any money. In Mexico City, the first UN Conference: What did we find out? We found out that women owned only 1% of all the property and all the capital in the world; they couldn't speculate. We found out that when it came to the division of money from work, women received about 10% of the total volume; and, what else did we find out...? And that was done by researchers, I think, they were 55 women who were invited to a pre-conference in Mexico City, where they had gathered, about women's and men's kind of lifes around the world, and from this kind of research that

was the result. In the developing countries women were doing 75% of the life supporting work; in the industrial countries women were doing 65%. And that was adding together what they got for paid and what they had to do for unpaid. So, suddenly, it appeared that those two worlds were a little bit different. And from that point of view, I thought: Why is this *Women's culture* kept so invisible? Why isn't it worth anything? Why isn't that women are not receiving any kind of rewards, and specially money in the money culture, for all the unpaid job and production that they do in the whole world, in the farms, and so on? And suddenly, she was there, the woman, Charlotte Perkins Gilman [4] who wrote a book in 1896 on *Women and Economy*, and the introduction was: if a farmer buys a horse, then the production increases, so the horse is a factor in the production. But if a farmer gets married, the production increases but the woman is not a factor in the production. And she wrote a whole book about that. And, it influenced the whole American population, so they were taught something called *home economics*, and in the rest of the world they thought that was household things, but it was really a kind of keeping the eyes, and the kind of perception on the very, very importance of women in the American Culture. And that might tell us something about why in America women from the time when they came to that country, they had had quiet a high *status*.

### 3. FEMALE CULTURE. (11'18")

I got fascinated by this idea, and I thought, in which way can I show that this is what happens in all societies around the world. And then, I came across Margaret Mead's *Male and Female*, and she was testing this in three primitive kind of tribes in the South Pacific: the Mundugumor, the Arapesh, and so on. And found out that male and female roles were different in all these cultures, it has a little different content. But, specially Ruth Benedict, she was the one who opened my eyes, but I shall come back to that later... Because I wrote an article in 1964 which was called *On Female Culture*, an attempt to make a theory to support women's self-reliance and their activities, really to be conscious about how valuable they were, and in some way every society would stop if women were not acting in the way that they are. But anyhow, it took some time until 1973, I was sent as a delegate from a Norwegian party to the UN, and there's a Norwegian Embassy, and I talked very much about that, and then they said: *Do you want to have a big conference? Or, do you want to talk to lots of people about this?* They said: *We are willing to invite every Embassy which has people as representatives in the UN to a meeting, it would be about 200, but there will*

*be women and there will be ambassadors from the other countries, and you can give a speech, and you can ask: Is there an invisible Female Culture in your country? And, would that also be divided in this kind of jobs that men and women do? How women perceive themselves? How men perceives themselves? How it is possible that men doesn't understand anything of what women talk about because women are talking from another perspective, or from another structure? And, it was about 200 people who came: Gloria Steinem, [5] Betty Friedan, [6] Robin Morgan, [7] all these people who were on the Rights when it came to feminism. And, the most impressive and the most interesting thing was that women came from Sudan, from Guatemala, from The Philippines, from China, and they said: *You are right! We are living into parallel cultures!**

For me this was a tremendous kind of support, fantastic really! So, I wondered: What would this kind of structure be, that really was so different that men didn't understand what we were talking about? While we had had to learn to understand what men were saying to us and between themselves, otherwise we couldn't adjust to their kind of demands and expectations. So, in a way, women had a kind of double view and a double experience. And the interesting was then, that I read Ruth Benedict. And, she has been writing about the structure of culture. And, what does she say? She says that every little culture, small or big, it consists of elements: family habits, religion, production, trade, elements of women and men relations to each other, the marriage form, sometimes they have a totem animal like the bison ox, or like we have an ice bear, some places they have an eagle... But anyhow, all these elements constitutes the culture, but the thing is that there is always one element that it is more important than another. So, that in some culture it is, let me see, the seven Lappish Gods, in another culture is Buddha, in another culture might be market... marketing theory, during the Cold War it was militarism and it was the atomic bomb. So, the thing is that you make a kind of a map between those kind of elements in the structure, and then, you will find out that almost everything is interpreted in that culture according to that superelement, specially that kind of element, which really it might be the marketing, or it might be social democracy, or it might be communism, or it might be Buddhism, or it might be Islam, or whatever it is. So, while the History goes on, big groups in our world are in some way under some understanding that there is a main kind of perspective that you really should adhere to. But in almost all of them, it is the male structure culture which is the dominant and to which women had to adhere, to accept, and to bow. So, this stayed there in America, and also having all these persons kind of

discussions with Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan, and so on. Because Betty Friedan had written the book called *The Question that Nobody Talks About*, and that was the women's question.

So, back again, I am concerned about how is that *women's culture* is so unimportant, so invisible, so demanded to be under without any kind of rewards? And then, I think, it started to grow an understanding of, on the one side, what patriarchy is, and how it is functioning in Islam, in Catholicism, in primitive tribes, etc. Always a very clear-cut for the women, and then I thought a little again about marxism because it says that: *what you do, or what you are threaten to do, will always be the base for your understanding of your life and for the stablishing the values that you are expressing.*

So then, women all over the world we have as central values: to take care of kids, to clarify water, to be concerned about the health; and, if you look at the bigger societies, women gets nurses, they are mothers, in wars they take care of all the soldiers that almost kill each other, a Florence Nightingale... [8] We must not forget that all these activities that women are doing are in some way expression of deep values which they have had to develop to, in some way, defend the way they are living. So, if you have to live in a certain way, you will develop knowns and values about what you really are doing, to in some way, get your identity, and be sure that you are a person that is valuable. So, if you are a certain group, or you are a group that is suppressed, the slaves will, in some way, make a kind of image of themselves and of their value, so it's hard to get out of the slave's role. And, that is also men, they don't care about what women do or slaves do, if they only get the kind of services that they want, and if they don't get the services, they will punish. So, the thing is that the *Master Society* will always define what it is right for themselves, and for the lower classes, or for the subgroups. And, that makes us understand that those values which we develop comes from the structure very often of the patriarchal culture. So, my next question had to be: Why is this kept so invisible?

## 1. MASTER SUPPRESSION TECHNIQUES. (4'44')

So, I have been wondered: How is it possible to keep the *female culture* so invisible and so suppressed? And then, a personal experience started to open my eyes. I became a politician, in my community, I was a member of the branch of the Social Democratic Party, but this happens in all

parties, and I came up in a position together with three men, we were sitting together, and we were leading this party group. And, while we talked with them privately, they agreed with me; but when they came with proposals, we should go into the programme, they behaved as they didn't listen to me. So, I wondered very much: What is it going wrong? And, fortunately, I had a friend, a very smart friend in the union, who said: *Can you use your understanding from your methodology? You have been trained in advanced methodology in USA, you must be able to understand what's going on!* I have always said that if you want to understand a group meeting you must see everybody in the group. But, I had only looked at the members, I had look at those who were sitting beside me. So, suddenly, I withdrew my chair about more than half a meter backwards. And then, I observed what my comrade on my right side was doing while I was speaking. He was gasping, as if he was extremely tired. He did this, when I talked. He looked at me, and then, he did this. He looked at me again... and, made some kind of very funny gestures. And, the he turned towards his friend, and he started whispering. And, at the end, he also took a paper up, and he read the paper, he didn't listen to me, took up his pen, underlying things, and put it back again, and... was so tired, so tired, so tired. And, he did like this on his hip, that was not massage! It was: *Do I have some more coins? Yes, I have. Then, I can go and buy myself some limonade.* And, he went up the stairs and up to the table where the beer and everything was, and he made noise, went down again, stopped and talk to people, and then when I was finishing my proposal, he sat down and smile. And, so, I understood, with the body language of this man, every person was concerned about what he was doing and they were not listening to me anymore. And, then, I started my second observation round about four months. I started to train in front of the mirror, to do the same thing as he did, which I wanted to do to him, with a little more kind of female kind of gestures. You know, smiling like this, laughing at him, doing all those things. At to my surprise, I won; the proposal was mine. The person who really rose up said: *You know, is it not what Berit As said what our Prime Minister said?* So, I won. And, then, I started to understand what is it with body language. Should I develop a theory about how men use the body language to suppress women?

### 3. MASTER SUPPRESSION TECHNIQUES. (6'53')

I never thought that the five *Master Suppression Techniques* should be something that went all over the world. I was translated into 30 different languages. Like the Tibetan, the Bengali, the

Spanish, and the German. All these countries, all these languages. But, it came for a very special kind of experiment, because when I experienced how I was treated, I saw that the women in the Party, all of them were treated that way. So, they became silent, and I asked them: *Why don't you talk? Why don't you propose your smart things?* And, they said: *Oh, no, I must be formulated myself a little only, or perhaps, it wasn't a good proposal, perhaps I am a little dumb* ;;; And, I said: *You are not dumb. Bring with you next time your grade book from the school, I want to see it.* And, so, they came and showed me grades that were absolutely excellent. So, I said: *Do you think your teachers were evaluating you wrongly? You are not dumb. You are smart. You look quite well too. So, why should you keep your mouth shut?* You see, this is something we have learnt, that if we fail we think is something wrong about us; but, if a man fails, and we have a research on that, he always gives the reason to something outside himself. Now, we are starting to do the same thing, we are asking: Who is now making believe that I am dumb? Because I'm not, I'm not ignorant. I'm clever. So, why shouldn't I propose? And, then you have to look for something which you can divide in five: have you been made invisible? Is it so that he pretends he doesn't see you? Is he making a shower to you, is he ridiculing you?, saying: *Oh, you are so nice when you are angry Mrs. As!* Are you sure that you have all the information? Has been information kept away from you? Is it that somebody outside in this kind of auditorium is telling you that you are guilty, or that you are sinning because you ask for money for a nursing school, "*Ah, you are taking it from the old people's home, then!*", to make you feel guilty. Or so, do they give you guilt, or do they give you shame? You know, or, is it so that whatever you do, being nice, being ungrateful... It doesn't matter what you do, it is wrong !!! And that is from that sociologist in America, Merton, [9] who says: *damned if you do-damned if you don't.* It doesn't matter what you do, everything is wrong. And you see, if you see that this happens, you can do like this: he doesn't see me, he makes me invisible. And then, I said to all women, and you keep your eyes open: Is he ridiculing you? Use of the finger language. Are also you girl friends aware of, all the women aware of that you don't have enough information which the men obviously have? Are you feeling guilty or shameful because somebody ask you to do that, or they behave like you should? And, so, in this little chapter, suddenly all the women were doing all this, and they were laughing, and the person who has felt that she was dumb she got support. And, that's all what you need from a language point of view. And, men were asking after a while: *What are you doing? What are they doing, Berit?* And, I said: *They are liberating themselves. Not with bombs, and spears, and dinamite, but only talking to each other in a very simple finger language.*

So, I made these kind of categories: being invisible, being made invisible, you feel very uncomfortable, you are not quoted in the party while the men are doing it, and so on; being ridiculed; being one from whom information is kept away; being the one for which adjectives are used differently when you behave like men are doing; and, then, are they giving you a feeling of being guilty, or should be shameful?. So, that became this *Master Suppression Techniques* which goes all over the world from Japan to Brazil, to Tibet, to Bangladesh these days, to Russia, to Kazakhstan, to Guatemala... and, women feel that these five categories are something they can use, and they can talk about it everywhere; and, they get stronger, and they said: *I'm not crazy! I am not hysterical! I'm not dumb! It is somebody out there who makes me believe that I am inferior!* You see?

## 1. WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY. (4'34')

You see, this house was the *Women's University* for 25 years, and it is written a beautiful kind of story about it. Then, we went broke, and I don't think we were really too popular because we had an special education, and the pedagogy was to take care of all kind of women who just had their grammar school, which meant that we didn't demand that the students should have a college or a high school before they entered. Because we said, all these issues which we are treating, for instance, violence against women, that it is something that might hit women with a Doctor's degree, and it might hit a very young farmer's wife. So, we built a special kind of education, and not only that, but we had some *status*. And the *status* was that we would in some way educate women, so they could develop their self-reliance, their self-respect, to understand that they were carrying an invisible *women's culture*, and to understand the feelings that they had when they felt uncomfortable. That was very much because it was something called the *Master Suppression Techniques* that in some way were almost throwing every women off her feet when she dares to oppose something in the *patriarchal society*. So, we had a series of wonderful *status*. Why take them here? The Minister of Education came up here once, and he said: *Why can't you do that by distant education?* And then, I said to him: *You know, we have two students for each room, at the moment they stay here for three or four days, they go home and they said they are healed. And, why? Because the other women in the room very often tell them: Oh, how marvellous you are! You know, you are taking care of refugees, you have been sick, you have been healing yourself, you have been doing something for the community, you are a member of the Red Cross, and I am so im-*

*pressed with you! Next time they come, this woman will tell her roommate: I have heard about you; have you built this farm all alone? Have you taken this extra education in English? Oh, you know, I am so impressed !!! So, while they are staying here, they are building each other up. And, with the education that we give them in leadership style, in how to take care of their health, how to in some way don't get depressed when they are overlooked, and all these things, because they understand that these are the habits of the male society, and how they possibly could fight for a much more similar salary because there are laws. And, the interesting thing was that the Queen of Norway, she came and visited us, and she took two hours of education. And, she was almost shocked when she heard about how many Human Rights, rules that Norway had misunderstood or misused. And, she also took an hour in High School where you have the feminists who were teaching society from a feminist kind of perspective. So, this house was all these things, and you see now, it is a beautiful place and I need 2 million Euros to buy it back.*

#### 4. WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY. (14'07")

At a certain time in History, I just realized that something was very wrong in the teaching of women. And, I wondered, what should I do? Because when I was sitting in a Committee to evaluate, for instance, women's work, the two men with whom I cooperated never read any of the books that were referred to by the women. On one occasion, it became really completely crazy, because it was a woman who wrote a beautiful thesis about theatre, and how very often were men who were playing the roles of women. And, she went from the theatre in Greece in the Classic times and up to the day today, and what kind of roles women are supposed to play. And, this was a tremendous level written thesis, and then, the only thing was that in her references it was only references to women who had written about History, about social roles, and so on. And then, those two men in the committee said: *We can't accept that! It's only references to women's works!* I said: *What are you doing? We have had lots of lots of theses which have had only references to men's works, and you never really reacted to that!* And then, I also saw something, and that was that women very often they fetch their kind of information, not only from Psychology, but really to explain some of the women's kind of behaviours: they use History, they Sociology, they use Economy, they use a series of others... they use Religion. And then, the men in my committee said: *You know, she doesn't belong really to one discipline! She should be more disciplined! She should write this and only use, for instance, material from Psychology !* And I said: *But we have had men here who have*

*done a little of the same thing, and you call them generalists; and, that was a good thing, but when women do this, you don't use the same word.*

And then, I thought, if it had been a women's university, it would not have been divided up in the disciplines, which I found out that all the Norwegian, and all the Scandinavian universities were. So, I started again to travel, and I travelled to 20 universities in the world, to see in which way they organized their knowledge, and I found from Pyongyang, Mexico City, Kenia, Halifax, Harvard, Upsalla, Conphenhaguen, Cambridge... that they were exactly similarly organized. You had the same corridor in Mexico City, for instance, you had, economists were sitting there; then, the medical people were sitting there; then, the theologian were sitting there; and then, you have the technical people, the engineers were sitting there... and they fought against each other for money and for prestige! And, when I really looked back in their History, it was as if this kind of dividing up the world, and the understanding of the world with different kind of languages and models and so on, it was as if it stands from the Middel Age! So, I started to question: Is it really right that when you are working on an issue that you can only follow it economically from the time in the beginning when it was linked to moral, morality and ethics, up to Chicago, and Friedan, and Chicago Boys? [10] And, you know, they follow this kind of economic movements all the time, and they will see a series of economists... And, in some way, they have it also in medicin, it happens in History... in some way this is wrong. And, I started to think: How is it in these days when new things appears, women are getting into the labor force, and something is called the "*climate crisis*", there is globalization, there is something happening in the languages... And, I started to work in a new knowledge theory which links these things together. And, you see, that means that you can't really approach any kind of question without asking about the ecology today. You can't really do any kind of research saying that despite of the fact that this is a technological kind of fantastic, fantastic thing of weaponry, you can ask how this happens when you develop the uranian bomb and those women who are in the area get these kind of disformed babys. So, these goes together, the technology and how influences over health! And, the same thing it is about Medicine, and so on, it might have some very difficult kind of, dangerous kind of effect because it costs too much, so people can't use it. So, the thing is, you can't really understand the world unless you put it together. And, in some way, you always know that when I do research, the thing is that when I start saying, I want to look into this issue, this issue you have to define it according to a series of other things, you can't take a part of that issue out, and say in which way it is influenced

by economy, because it is not influenced by economy, it's influenced by the pollution in the air, it's influenced by the technicality, or the kind of transport...

So, the thing is that I made a whole theory about a new knowledge base after I have been to 20 universities and looked how they organized their kind of knowledge. So, I said: Where do I teach this? I couldn't teach it at the University of Oslo. And, the two people that really encouraged me, one was a mathematician in Greece, and another was a Jewish Professor at Stanford in America. They said, both men, they said: *This is right for the old times; it can't be these strong kind of borderlines between the Sciences anymore because they are interacting in a new way when you have a new way of financing things, you have a new way of looking at things historically, you have the influence of indigenous people.* And, what do they find when they went to the indigenous people? They had an understanding like that!!! They started by saying: *We are so happy about the Sun over Father and the Moon over Mother.* And, you know, we have to understand exactly in which way the Cosmos is influencing over Earth. And so, we have a new world where we know something about the stars, far, far away; and then, we have clipped up, and we have divided the atom, so we know about the neutrons, what it is made out of; we have a tremendous kind of information, but the thing is: How you put it together? So, in some way, you are only stuck like the scientists in CERN. [11] You know, they think they will find the answer to the secret of life if they are able to shoot at the particle the moment it is in... in the... it's in! Because it goes out and in, and you have to really shoot it at the moment that you can reach it! It's non sense! That is not the way knowledge is built! Knowledge is built because you see the whole thing, and so the first and most important thing of the *Women's University* is a *holistic* kind of approach. And this *holistic* kind of approach has to be structured. And, if it is structured, and if you can't in some way tell people why this is now, in this new world, a necessary way of organizing our knowledge, and to approach every new element of the environment, or the History that we will catch... then, we don't understand this world! So, of course, you get resistance because think about all these people who are leaders of departments of Economy, departments of Medical Schools, departments of Nuclear Sciences, departments... you know, in some way, touch any of them and say, in some way: *I think you should have a wider view!*

I think, for instance, and I have done to the military leadership in Norway: *Why are you doing wars towards embryos in the bodies of women? Why is it so that in Basra in Iraq, those women said to*

the General Secretary of the UN, we don't dare to get children because the children we get don't have eyes, they might have six arms, they are only...? And then, the women in Vietnam, up today, they get this kind of mishaped babies. A little man this size, who has learnt only one word in his whole life, and he is grown up but he is only that size, and the only word he can say is "Mama". And, women are then attacked in their stomachs, and this is where were born babies! And then, what the Pope say? That crazy man said: *Make an action of violence into an action of law. Don't make abortion!*

You know, on the ethical side, on the technical side, on the human side, on the ways really this *technofascism* is entering the global world, the only force that really can fight against it, that it's women, and women's peace organizations, and the women's understanding, and women's willingness to see and to have a perspective that is much wider; and to really start from their their own kind of self-reliance: we are going to fight, we are going to fight, we are going to fight for a new world in which this kind of male technological thinking has to go!

## 5. WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY. (9'47'')

But I live in a little country, Norway; it might be the most patriarchal and the most authoritarian in the Scandinavia. And, perhaps, that is exactly why this kind of *Master Suppression Techniques* were the ones that I saw here. If there would have been a more democratic, a more kind of open society, perhaps they hadn't experienced the kind of behaviour that made me really think about the *Master Suppression Techniques*. I should mention that it now exists as a theory in more than 30 languages. But, that is not my message, my message is: *What did this Women's University idee really contribute to the liberation of women in this local area and in Norway generally?* And I shall mention a few areas. As Social psychologist, I know very, very well, very much of the *organizational theory* and theory about leadership. I have been teaching in America, I have been a visiting Professor in America, and I know that most of the theories stands from industry, and it stands from male professors who are among male leaders; and, most of the theories about leadership and organizational kind of life fits men! It doesn't really give some kind of understanding to women! So, the thing was that when I was searching for that I found a wonderful kind of Social psychologist from Harvard called Rosabeth Moss Kanter, [12] and she wrote a book about men and women in corporations. And, she was so right because she said: *now in these modern times when women*

are entering the boards of organizations, if she enters, men will have the tendency to look at her as a mother figure, or a wife figure, or a social worker; they are used to see women when they appear in this kind of light. And some times, they really start to talk and say: Do you think...? What is really this woman like? They behave towards her as if she was, if for instance, something that had happened if a negro, one negro comes in !!! And then, he is really looked upon... are really thinking: What is he like? And then, Rosabeth Moss Kanter says: Women's interests are not looked upon as a group interest unless you 40% of women on the board. Because then, they start to generalize. But, that doesn't go into the kind of theories that would help women to get leadership. So, we develop a theory, a curriculum here at the *University of Women*, which really told women how they were looked upon by men when they were entering a kind of a board. And, we told them how men were in some way interpreting them when they came to an interview. So, they would have a counteraction and would understand that the men was expecting this, and so on. So, we had 800 women from all over Norway coming here and taking this course, and it was on university level. And within two years, 150 of them had gotten their leadership job that they wanted. So, all these women are very thankful, but that was not, it was one of the goals. We had another goal, and that was to teach all the women who came here, academian or not academian, what kind of women's research had been done all over the world. So, that those groups who needed it in their everyday life would be able to know about the research findings of their group: single mothers, for instance, violated women in the family, women farmers, how they were really discriminated through centuries in this country before we made a law that it was the oldest child in the farm family that should inherit the farm instead only the oldest son. So, one of the main thing was to convey all the researchs of *Women Studies* to those groups who needed it in their own everyday life, so they could put it in a bigger perspective, and understand some of the suppressions of that group which they belong: all the women who didn't get pensions, or women who were mistreated in the families, or women who were left out of the History... So, we were trying to make a curriculum of History here, we were stopped, the thing is today after working from 1.991 to today, we have a book out about *Women in Viking Age*. It has never been written before because they only write about men, and all the conferences on this issue I have visited have had 11 men and 1 woman; so, we made a conference on 11 women and 1 man. And then, this is written up in a beautiful big book from specialists in Ireland, in England, in Sweden, Norway, and in three languages, in the languages in which those scientits really use when they present their material at our congress about *Women in Viking Age*.

These are just examples, you know! Farmers women, what happens? They should be 50% of the farmers in Norway, they are only 25%... Why? Because their parents tell them, it would be such a beautiful act if you, at your younger brother as a kind of confirmation, give him your right to the farm. So, this kind of pressure is still working, and then, those women who are giving away their kind of rights to inherit they have to come here, and we have to talk with them, and we have to say: *Are you encouraged that this doesn't happen again in the next generation?* Issue after issue, after issue! Teaching women Data and some of the Data technology, so they don't feel outside the world when the whole kind of modern institutions says: *You have to go on Internet!* So, we are trying to avoid this class division between those who are able to use the Internet and those who are not able to use it at all! So, you see, we had a very broad kind of curriculum. And then, we understood that women around the coast of Norway they couldn't afford to come here. So, we had to take our teachers to Stavanger, to Mosjoen, to all these kind of places to teach them there. And, in one place, people really come and say: *You know, I could never have written this book about women's History in my town, if I hadn't been taught by the Women's University that the History of women in my district is as important as the History of all the men.*

## 1. WAR & PEACE. (4'05'')

You see, very many men think that they are in a production line. And, let me take an example about, for instance, building up a car. And, then, you know, you first make one part, then another part, then you put it together, and finally, you put all the parts together, and it becomes a car. And then, you do one thing at the time. *"And that's the most effective way of doing this"*, says this man. The thing is, imagine now, that you are a mother, you have a two years old child sitting on a potty in the bathroom, while he is sitting there you are cooking the jam again because it started to be a little bad, and you have a washing going in the washing machine, and in some way also, you hear that it rings on the door and is the postman, he wants to deliver a package, and he wants you to write on a piece of paper that you have received it. And not only that, but then you see, your mother-in-law, she is calling, you should really have to stop the machine at that time, and your child is crying too, and your mother-in-law is calling and she has felt down the stairs, and she thinks she has broken her hip, *"Come immediately! Because, you know, it's quite painful!"*. And then, does this woman put herself on a chair, and thinking: *Which one should I do first to get*

*the profit and to get the most priced? Because men are often thinking: How should I do this thing effectively, the one thing, so I can really be honored? You know, she is not thinking on what do I earn most. She sits there and she thinks: Which catastrophe shall I avoid first? And, that's two absolutely different views of a complicate situation. And, I am afraid, that very many men think that there's a kind of linear intelligence; while women think that there are so many things interacting at the same time, that in some way, I have to have a holistic overview. And then, once the Vicedirector of Volvo Company called me, and he said: I got impressed, I have heard that at Harvard they are now producing artificial intelligence. And, I have understood that they are working on a linear model; while you are reminding me that intelligence is not only linear, the one clean thing following the other clean thing, it might be a series of things that are interacting at the same time, and in some way, you have to understand the total picture. So, he sent me to Harvard, and when I came to Harvard, they had already understood that, so they had stopped the programme. This relates then both to war and peace, and to the technofascism which I think is developing in the world.*

## 2. WAR & PEACE. (9'45'')

This thinking about how men and women were in different ways related to technology made me really remember an anthropologist called Marvin Harris. [13] He said that in every society you have raw material, and that raw material usually have to be handled, so it can be useful either for trade, or eating, or building. And, to do that you need to have tools. And those tools will be designed according to what raw material you have. And, it will also be designed about the end product that you want to make out of this raw material. But he says one thing that it is very clear: *It is only those who has the access to the technology, to the tools; it is those who earns the tools, and can handle it, and can hitch others to handle it... and, since very often raw material is owned by men, in the majority of situations, it is men that develop the technology to really make the tools, to use the tools, and in some way to utilize these kind of experiences that goes further in the world.* They need spears through the History, and that's why I call this analysis a materialistic historical kind of analysis, so they have needed weapons, and the weapons have been made. And not only that, if I walk out on the side of the UN building in New York, I look at the infrastructure, and I think: *How many women have been really building this infrastructure? How many women have been building these skyscrapers? How many women do we have seated in the car factories making the design*

*for the motors and for the outside of the cars? How many women have been planning the light, and the lightening structure of the lamps all over New York? Then, I thought, I went further: How many women have been making the modern weapons? And of course, not only the cannons, and so on, but the atomic bombs, and the drones, and all these kind of things that can be used for mass murdering. And I went into this, and I asked people around: How many women had been taking those jobs in the weapons factories? They said: None! It is the 40% of all ingeneers in the world, who are men, who are working in the weapons factories.*

So, I had to start to read Militar Strategy, and as I did that I came across an strategist called Herman Kahn, [14] and he had written two books, one about thermo-nuclear war, and one about *thinking the unthinkable*, and in those books he said: *We have really to calculate what kind of wars we are going to have with the atomic bomb, and then we can't just count individuals, we have to count millions of people each time we either win or we either loose.* So, he introduces the term *megabody*. [15] And, as I was writing him and some of the old strategists, the one who gave the advice to the Prince (of Norway) and so on; I just felt that the whole language in military strategy had nothing to do with poeple's security. It has to do about how you do really get a victory, how you do get the whole of the territories, how you do treat the people who are the enemy's kind of property. Because the children, the wifes, and the houses is the enemy's terrotiry, and if you have a victory you can take it all. This was very, very foreign to my thinking.

And then, I started to listen to reports from wars, and war songs. And I found that when it was men who reported it they said: how many dead; how many had been taken to hospitals; what kind of weapons the enemy used; do we have more or do we have less soldiers; the generals talked to each other and said: *How many brigades can we spare?* And, that meant, how many brigades can you accept to die in this kind of fight. And, when I thought back about all the women's literature that I had written, it was never mentioned anything like that. Only that, for instance, in the American Civil War, some men came back and they have their broken legs and they have to be taken care of. And, when Alba Muddle, I don't know if you know about her, she was a Swedish kind of delegate to the UN Disarmement Committee, she wrote a book in 1.976. And, on one page there, she writes how many of the veterans from the Vietnam War who took their own lives afterwards, it was 500.000; she wrote about how many of the veterans which didn't get an honorary recognition when they left, it was 110.000, they had used narcotica; she was writing about how

many of the veterans from the Vietnam War who went into divorces, and who made this kind of poor people under the bridges of New York. And then, I thought: *It's certainly isn't only a winning of the battle, because it is only 50.000 names on the big black Memory Wall in Washington! So, they were those who died in battle, the others came back and then they couldn't stand when they met the civil society to remember what they had done.* The thing is that this kind of experiences from big battles and from wars are what men through History have had. And, the interesting thing is that, those whom we read about, are those who won. So, this goes into my theory about war and peace, and how men and women are reacting differently, and have very, very different kind of attitudes towards war and peace.

## 1. WOMEN'S ECONOMICS. (14'17')

I mentioned this necessity to give people Hope. And the interesting thing about Hope is that it makes you more secure, you get some kind of power out of it, so you can show some resistance to the kind of expectations that the patriarchy is throwing at you. This resistance is really a resistance towards the *Zeitgeist*. [16] And, what is it the *Zeitgeist*? The *Zeitgeist* is exactly globalization, globalization of finances, making the majority of women poorer... And, when you start to see that, you get a little... no, not only a little, but you get angry! And, when you get angry, you ask yourself: What can I do? And, if it then has been able to give people self-respect, self-reliance, and they want to do something, then, the leaders appears. And, I wrote about this in the 80s. And, living through the 80s, and 90s, and the beginning of this century, it has appeared the one kind of understanding after each other. But, I really think that both understanding, of the male technology, which has always become a kind of fascist technology, and to understand the kind of economic development in the world... when women understand that, and more and more women do it because they go to universities, they study the kind of economic theories, which never, never really take into account the women's unpaid production! And, you know, this is... you won't believe all those economists who are talking on the metalevel about money, capital, profit... So, they don't understand that if women disappear, they wouldn't have any society anymore. So, then, of course, you would expect that something would happen... and, it did happen with a person I mentioned already, Charlotte Perkinson Gilman, who in some way said: there is something about women and the value of money. And, the thing is that, we have to look into that, we have to make a science out of this, we have to make a science called *feminist economy*. And many, many

women around the world they said: Yes !!! And, one of those who really were able to make a leadership within this area, her name was Marilyn Waring. [17] Marilyn Waring comes from New Zealand, she took education as an economist, she became a conservative parliamentarian. She was courageous!!! And, the reason why I started to be very interested in her was that she changed the politics against atomic weapons in New Zealand. That was the first time!

Because, you know, it is in such a way in parliaments, specially if you have two groups, that that group which doesn't have the majority, they propose all kind of beautiful things they would do, so they would do everything for every group, and they would, in some way, stand for another society. The thing is that they know that they will not win... because they are a minority. So, at one special point in time, it was the conservative who had this kind of power in New Zealand. And, I think the leader of the socialdemocrats said, his name, I think, he was Lander... The question was if boats, that really were led by atomic energy, should come to the harvers from Australia !!! And, then, this labor leader said: *We will never accept that!* And, he knew, of course, that he wouldn't get this through because he was a minority; he lacked one person. So, when it came out in the New Zealand Parliament, everybody was shocked because it was a woman among the conservative who crossed the floor, and gave them, to this socialdemocrats, the majority !!! So, the Australians kept their boats with atomic reactors outside their harvers!

I heard about that, and also heard that she had written a book which was called, *If Women Counted*. And, what did she say there? Three very important things: first of all, she also was seated looking out of her window, and then, she saw all the bushes, the trees, the flowers... And, she said: *Isn't something similar, you know, this kind of landscape is not worth anything until is cut down, and made into woods, and sold? It has no value as it stands there !!!* And, then, she said: *Oh, I have experienced - and that was exactly what I experienced too - if in a family the Mother dies, there's some kind of insurance and social security system that makes that woman so valuable that the husband who is left can get help from a woman who take care of the children, of the house, of themselves... and pay for her with the money that he has gotten because his wife died. So, the thing is, as long as the wife is alive she isn't worth anything, but at the moment she is dead, then she is worth money! And, this man can just buy another kind of help !!!* So, from this on, she said: *Who are really those persons who get the very high salaries in this country? Ah, - she said - that belongs to those two people who are seated beside each other, having guns, and there are two*

*lights on the wall, and the moment the President give them a call to start an atomic war, they had at the same time to push the button! So, the war can start! The thing is that those men, they get crazy after a while, so they have to be exchanged, because it is such a psychological pressure to be seated there and having the kind of responsibility for starting an atomic war. And, they are tremendously and highly honoured, and they have a tremendous salary !!! And, then, she said: Then, I have been in America and I have seen this women in America who really takes care of big groups of children, the catholics women have a lot of children, and to bring them to school, they have to feed them, the husband is almost not there because he has an important job, they drive and everything, they too go to swimming... and, you know, those women, they are not... they don't get a cent for all those kind of works they are doing! So, How can? And, what should I do?*

And then, she started to write. She started to write, and the reason was that she took her point of departure from Norway. Sitting in New Zealand! Looking at Norway! For Heaven's sake! What did she find in Norway? She found that after the Second World War, the leader of the Statistics Bureau in Norway said: *We had no survived if not the women had grown potatoes in the loans, had had rabbits inside, and a little pig which they put in the garage.* In my family, we had a pig. We named them after the Kings of Denmark, so it was called Fritz, Christian, Knut... and so on, and my Father loved him! Then, we had rabbits in an outdoor thing, and my son and I... no, no, my young brother and I, we had to feed them. And then, we had some hens, and we were shocked when my Mother cut their heads because they flew around... And then, we had carrots in the loan... And that was what the women did. And this leader of the Statistics Bureau, he said: *It's only fair that we decide what kind of value this is in money. So, I am calculating, how much really this Norwegian women should have for keeping the Norwegian society alive, with the kind of production, and with beign so... showing the solidarity to the oposition groups, and to those who really fought for England, and so on! So, I am calculating, how much the unpaid production really is worth and put it into the State Budget... no, the GDP.* [18] And, it was a tremendous picture of the worth of women's work. He did that the first year after the war, and the second year after the war. But then, the Swedish, and the Danish, and the Finnish, they came and they said: *This is non sense !!! And the thing, you have to take it away otherwise we can really compare over GDPs in the Scandinavian countries.* So, it was taken out of the Budget, and out of statistical kind of evaluation. And, so, what does Marilyn do? She says: *Let's get some kind of overview; how much time women are using for different kinds of activities in different countries, and let's either give them*

*the lowest female salary which exists in that country, and see how much it amounts to. Or, should be said that those women who leave their jobs, like teachers and hairdressers and so on, they had a salary; should they have exactly that kind of compensation if they leave their jobs and stay at home taking care of it? Or, should we calculate the kind of value in the way that we look at how much they did of cooking, of washing, of doing economic kind of planning, and then, we should take as a point of departure, the salaries of those kind of occupations, and we should put it together in a salary for that woman who had left her kind of paid work.*

So, she came out with this book which was called: *If Women Counted, or, Counting On Women*. And, what really happened? Was that, it went all over the world. And, it started a kind of University work on *Feminist Economics*, and in addition to that, there's an international big association now of women who teach *Feminist Economics*. It hasn't reached Norway, but we are doing that in the Women's University, we are putting up now a kind of a thread, or a kind of protest to the economists, and to the politicians in Norway by really starting teaching this *Women's Economics* in our kind of curricula.

## 1. HOPE, IDENTITY & RESISTANCE. (8'41'')

Perhaps the most important thing to do these days is to give people hope. Specially among women when they had experienced that the situation is really worsening for all the women all over the world. When the economists say: *the poor gets poor everywhere, and the poor countries get poorer, and the richer countries get richer...* And then, the women economists around the world they say: *So, who were the poor in the beginning?* And, that was women! So, it means that when the poor get poorer, and the rich get richer... then, it is the women who get poorer. And, wherever I go, in the Philippines, in Africa, I just find that this is right. The women get poorer and poorer. That happened already in 1960. Ester Boserup [19] who is a Danish economist, she found out that the more money we gave out to developing countries, the poorer women get. Her area, where she did research was the Southern part of the Sahara. But you see, if this happens, and if at the same time, more and more women get education, more and more women speak different languages, more and more women are aware of this... It is a funny kind of relationship between deterioration, and then, bigger understanding !!! And, that is the first kind of element of Hope; if you get a better understanding you can start to work together. And, that's exactly what happened up

through the 60s, 70s, 80s... It was such strong movement among women that in 1967 the UN made the Declaration against all kind of discrimination of women. It is a fabulous kind of document. And, it was accepted almost by all the countries which are members of the UN. So, I said, despite all this kind of deterioration, there's an increase of the understanding; and when this increased, something else happen: it started this kind of globalization. The globalization, or the kind of forces of the *Imperialism*, was made in such a way that it opened all ways for transnational kind of groups to increase their profit, and in some way, to split up the families. So, that happened also, and women became very much single providers, and, despite of the fact that has become a worsen situation, the women started to work together. And, this working together was very, very clearly shown both, in India, in Africa, and also in this Western Societies where those who took on the leadership they did a thing: they put up what you call Refugee Crisis Centers. And, in the Crisis Centers, they started to write books, and they started to support each other. And my kind of working hypothesis is that when women start to work together and they get a greater understanding, and they understand that this is something to do with the *Imperialism* and the globalization of finances, then, it will appear leaders. In such a situation is not really the suppressed people themselves who can take the lead, but there will be some kind of appeal to leaders to really take action. And, that is also what we have seen, we have seen all those wonderful kind of feminist leaders, in all the continents, and not only that, but they started to work together. We had a series of International Conferences, like the one I had here in 2002, where I have gathered the leaders of Liberation Movements around the world; very, very eminent Quakers of France who were taking on these kind of Peace marches... And, in some way, when they came together for three weeks here, you saw that it was a kind of feminist leadership growing on every continent. And, that gave me Hope!

So, the kind of Hope I got, it's the one I am trying then to give to all groups of women who I might visit; beign, for instance, lectured at the University in Manila, which was led by a nun, Sister Mary Mananzan, [20] and where she had a Women's University where I was teaching from grammar school up to university. Then, I found that the women there were very, very interested. They were women who wanted to be journalists, they were women who wanted to be social workers, they were women who wanted to be psychologists. And, they said: *How is divorce law in your country? Can women be divorced?* Because in The Philippines is not allowed to get divorced. And, the they said: *Is it possible that you could have abortion and, you know, contraceptives in*

*your country?* Yes, I told them. And, they wrote they wrote, and they listened. And then, they said: *And, if women love each other, is it possible for women to love each other? Is that allowed in your country?* And, I said: Yes, it is. And, I went to the Director, to this sister Mary Mananzan, and I said: *How can? They are so tremendously interested.* And, really, she said: *You know, most of them are prostitutes.* And, I said: *What are you saying?* And, she said: *Yes, because... since it is not allowed to be divorced in this country, men have a second wife.* In a way, just like in Mexico City, where also have a second wife...

## 2. HOPE, IDENTITY & RESISTANCE. (3'41'')

And, then, she said: *You know, they are prostitutes. Because it is not allowed to have divorces in this country. But the interesting thing is that they are paid by the man they serve to get a higher education. So, we don't call tuition anymore, we call it prosti-tuition !!!* And, that is very important, to get as many women into the academy, and to really give them education, because it is only three ways in which women can get a good life (in The Philippines): they can be nuns, then they are paid, and they can be sent to Europe to get the Doctor's degree, they come back and they are teaching; get a good education, but they are very, very poor in this country, so the smart ones, they often gang up with a married man, and he pays for them. And, the third one is to marriage a very, very rich man; but, you see, there are no so many rich men. So, these are the three ways that women can get some kind of *status*. And, so, when I have been visiting Tanzania, Uganda, where the Norwegians gave them special house for women's research, Kenia, over and over again, Mexico, and a series of other countries in Asia, and so... I have been looking for: Did these women have any chance to get education? Did they get any chance of knowing about women in other countries? Did they have some kind of special ways, methods, to really understand what their way to liberation was? In all places, I found some women who had some ideas and who were courageous. And, that was because they had gotten education, some times they have been able to gather some money, they have been able to travel... So, there is a kind of a group that could be a leadership of the liberation of women everywhere. I met with Angela Davis [21] in Paris, and she was the one who said: *You know, it has never happened that the very, very suppressed, the very, very used people, the poor people, they very seldom can lead their own kind of fight against suppression.* You have to find some women, or some too, who can really take on this kind of leadership job. And, I feel in my own age, I see a series of leadership women, leader position women,

and they can do that! The most important thing is, of course, that they understand to which extent they are economically really suppressed.

### 3. HOPE, IDENTITY & RESISTANCE. (4'01'')

When I was asked to be the first women political leader in Norway in 1973, I told those 54 men that I wouldn't take on the leadership unless I have 40% women on the board, and that, when it came running for the Parliament it would always be as many women on the top in the different counties as it would be men. I also said that you will have to address me as Chairwoman, and not Chairman. And, that was very hard for them to swallow. But, the interesting thing was the Quota. Because I knew from Rosabeth Boskanter that if you didn't have as much as 40% women in the different kind of groups in the party, they wouldn't be looked upon as a group with special interest. So, that was the introduction of the Quota, and within a few years, almost every party had the Quota. The Labor Party didn't have it until the end of the 70s, and the conservative are the only that said: *We don't need it!* But, the thing is that the Quota is so important in the first liberation because you have to have a solid representation of the group that really want to fight for their rights. And, the interesting thing is that I also propose to change the Constitution, so that it would have to be half of the parliamentarian should be women, and half of the parliamentarians should be men. And, that's History by itself !!! How it was counteracted, and how it was met in the Parliament with laughter... And, in some way, I said, some times you will start to be very, very sorry that you didn't accept that, because it might be that we will be more women than men.

But, anyhow, I talked about this necessity of Quotas because I found out all over the world, and I have written a kind of document for the Committee of Foreign Affairs of which I was a member, about how the Quota was done in Cuba, in Russia, different kind of percentages, and in the way they have argued that women should in some way be in these radical countries included. But, when I talked about that in Oslo University, I made a verse, I made a little song, and the song goes about Noah who was just a smart man because he took two of each of all kind of animals, and then, people laughed about him! But, you know, I think I should like to sing this little song for you!

*Old man Noah*

*He took two of*

*Creatures on the earth.*

*Every claw and fracción*

*Got affirmative action.*

*Old man Noah*

*Whom they proof of*

*He was square and good.*

## NOTES

1. Eleanor Emmons Maccoby, (1917) is a psychologist best known for her contributions to developmental psychology and the psychology of sex differences. She has also worked as a professor at Stanford University. She was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1974 and a member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1993.
2. Margaret Mead, (1901-1978) was an American cultural anthropologist who featured frequently as an author and speaker in the mass media during the 1960s and 1970s. She earned her bachelor degree at Barnard College in New York City and her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Columbia University.
3. Ruth Fulton Benedict, (1887-1948) was an American anthropologist and folklorist. She entered graduate studies at Columbia University in 1919, where she received her Ph.D and joined the faculty in 1923. Benedict held the post of President of the American Anthropological Association and was also a prominent member of the American Folklore Society. She studied the relationships between personality, art, language and culture, insisting that no trait existed in isolation or self-sufficiency, a theory which she championed in her 1934 *Patterns of Culture*.
4. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, (1860-1935) was a prominent American feminist, sociologist, novelist, writer and a lecturer for social reform. She was a utopian feminist during a time when her accomplishments were exceptional for women, and she served as a role model for future generations of feminists because of her unorthodox concepts and lifestyle.
5. Gloria Marie Steinem, (1934) is an American feminist, journalist, and social and political activist who became nationally recognized as a leader and spokeswoman for the feminist movement in the late 1960s and early 70s. Steinem currently travels internationally as an organizer and lecturer and is a media spokeswoman on issues of feminism.
6. Betty Friedan, (1921-2006) was an American writer, activist, and feminist. A leading figure in the women's movement in the United States, her 1963 book *The Feminine Mystique* is often credited with sparking the second wave of American feminism in the 20th century. In 1966, Friedan founded and was elected the first president of the National Organization for Women (NOW), which aimed to bring women "into the mainstream of American society now in fully equal partnership with men".
7. Robin Morgan, (1941) is an American poet, author, political theorist and activist, journalist and lecturer. Since the early 1960s she has been a key radical feminist member of the American Women's Movement, and a leader in the international feminist movement. Her 1970 anthology *Sisterhood Is Powerful* has been widely credited with helping to start the second wave feminist movement in the US.
8. Florence Nightingale, (1820-1910). The English nurse founder of modern nursing. She made outstanding contributions to the knowledge and improvement of public health.
9. Robert King Merton, (1910-2003) was an American sociologist and University Professor at Columbia University. In 1994 Merton won the National Medal of Science for his contributions to the field and for having founded the sociology of science. He is considered to be one of the founding fathers of modern-day sociology.
10. The Chicago school of economics is a neoclassical school of economic associated with the work of the faculty at the University of Chicago, some of whom have constructed and popularized its principles. In the context of macroeconomics, its concepts are in contrast to the schools based in coastal universities (notably Harvard, MIT, and Berkeley). Chicago macroeconomic theory rejected Keynesianism in favor of monetarism until the mid-1970s, when it turned to new classical macroeconomics heavily based on the concept of *rational expectations*.

11. CERN, derived from the French name Conseil Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire. It is a European research organization that operates the largest particle physics laboratory in the world. Established during 1954, the organization is based in a northwest suburb of Geneva on the Franco–Swiss border, and has 21 European member states. Israel is the first, and currently only, non-European country granted full membership.
12. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, (1943) is a professor of business at Harvard Business School, where she holds the Ernest L. Arbuckle Professorship. In addition she is director and chair of the Harvard University Advanced Leadership Initiative.
13. Marvin Harris, (1927-2001) was an American anthropologist. He was born in Brooklyn, New York City. A prolific writer, he was highly influential in the development of cultural materialism. In his work he combined Karl Marx's emphasis on the forces of production with Thomas Malthus's insights on the impact of demographic factors on other parts of the sociocultural system.
14. Herman Kahn, (1922-1983) was a founder of the Hudson Institute and one of the preeminent futurists of the latter part of the twentieth century. He originally came to prominence as a military strategist and systems theorist while employed at the RAND Corporation. He became known for analyzing the likely consequences of nuclear war and recommending ways to improve survivability. His theories contributed heavily to the development of the nuclear strategy of the United States.
15. Megabody, megadeath (or megacorpse) is a term for one million deaths by nuclear explosion. The term was used by scientists and thinkers who strategized likely outcomes of all-out nuclear warfare. The term was used to refer to the "megadeath intellectuals", the group of thinkers surrounding RAND Corporation gathered by the strategist Herman Kahn. The concept was notably discussed in Kahn's 1960 book, *On Thermonuclear War*. The term was created in order to discuss the likely consequences of conducting nuclear war, such a large number of deaths, and it could also be associated with other nation-state weapons of mass destruction.
16. Zeitgeist, the spirit of the age or spirit of the time, is the intellectual fashion or dominant school of thought that typifies and influences the culture of a particular period in time. The German word Zeitgeist is often attributed to the philosopher Georg Friedrich Hegel.
17. Marilyn Joy Waring, (1952), is a New Zealand feminist, a politician, an activist for female human rights and environmental issues, a development consultant and United Nations expert, an author and an academic, known as a principal founder of the discipline of feminist economics.
18. GDP or Gross Domestic Product is defined as "an aggregate measure of production equal to the sum of the gross values added of all resident, institutional units engaged in production". GDP estimates are commonly used to measure the economic performance of a whole country or region, but can also measure the relative contribution of an industry sector. The more familiar use of GDP estimates is to calculate the growth of the economy from year to year (and recently from quarter to quarter). The pattern of GDP growth is held to indicate the success or failure of economic policy and to determine whether an economy is 'in recession'.
19. Ester Boserup, (1910-1999), was a Danish economist and a writer. She studied economic and agricultural development, worked at the United Nations as well as other international organizations. Her most notable book is *The Conditions of Agricultural Growth: The Economics of Agrarian Change under Population Pressure*. It was her great belief that humanity would always find a way and was quoted in saying "The power of ingenuity would always outmatch that of demand" in a letter to Northern Irish philosopher T.S. Hueston. She also influenced the debate on the women in workforce and human development, and the possibility of better opportunities of work and education for women.

20. Sister Maria Mananzan, is a catholic nun, feminist activist, and writer. She wrote the book “ *NunSense: The Spiritual Journey of a Feminist Activist Nun.*”, 2012, where on the cover side she refers to Gurumayi: “Life is... dancing with the playful consciousness of God “. A book published by the “Institute of Women’s Studies, St. Scholastica’s College”. ISBN: 978- 971-8605-33-2
21. Angela Yvonne Davis, (1944) is an American political activist, scholar, and author. She emerged as a prominent counterculture activist and radical in the 1960s as a leader of the Communist Party USA. She had close relations with the Black Panther Party through her involvement in the Civil Rights Movement, although she was never a party member. Because of her interests included prisoner rights, she founded Critical Resistance, an organization working to abolish the prison-industrial complex. She is a retired professor with the History of Consciousness Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and a former director of the University's Feminist Studies department.