

UC Berkeley

The 150 Women Project - Holding Series

Title

"Fed Up": A Clerical Workers' Manifesto Sparks a Comparable-Worth Campaign at the University of California at Berkeley, 1970-1974

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/05j8641j>

Journal

Journal of Women's History, 36(3)

Author

Pierce, Jennifer

Publication Date

2024

Peer reviewed

“Fed Up”:

A Clerical Workers’ Manifesto Sparks a Comparable-Worth Campaign at the University of California at Berkeley, 1970–1974

Jennifer L. Pierce

Abstract: In a union campaign that began in 1970 and ended in 1974, the University of California at Berkeley’s American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 1695’s secretaries published a clerical workers’ manifesto, participated in writing a formal affirmative action report with the librarian’s union, and filed a mass grievance against sex discrimination signed by three hundred clerical workers. Significantly, they rallied against sex discrimination with the slogan “equal pay for equivalent work.” Their campaign not only preceded the first comparable-worth campaign in 1978 in San Jose, California, but was linked directly to it through Local 1695 activists and their activism. This article complicates the origin story for the late-twentieth-century comparable-worth movement and highlights Local 1695’s partnership with librarians in crafting what historian Katherine Turk has called an “expanded interpretation of sex equality law.”

On February 17, 1971, a full two-page spread titled “Fed Up: Secretaries in Academia” appeared in the University of California at Berkeley’s student newspaper, the *Daily Californian*.¹ On the bottom half of the first page, a line drawing of a white woman with long hair peered out between two typewriter keys grasping them as if they were prison bars. The authors’ names, Minna Twiefel and Ellen Birdseye, were pseudonyms for American Federation of State County Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 1695 members Margaret Henderson and Carol Hatch, respectively, clerical workers in the sociology department. As Henderson explained in her 2012 oral history, that their frustrations as staff partly inspired the piece, their growing feminist awareness, and the findings on sex discrimination from the 1970 UC Berkeley Academic Senate Report from the Committee on the Status of Academic Women (CSAW Report). “You could say it was our own report on the status of clerical women and a kind of call to action to secretaries, but it was also a wake-up call to the liberal faculty who didn’t recognize the contradictions between their Left politics and their expectation that we wait on them.”²

“Fed Up” provided an important feminist analysis of clerical work that was disseminated around campus and across the country serving as a focal point for women’s discussions about the demeaning nature of their work. As a clerical workers’ manifesto of sorts, it highlighted the ways that their “pink collar” jobs differed from those of academic women, particularly with respect to its feminized status as a “women’s occupation,” demanded respect for their work that kept university departments running, and called for secretaries to come together collectively to foment change—all before clerical organizations like Boston 9to5 were established.³ At the same time, “Fed Up” helped ignite AFSCME Local 1695’s early 1970s campaign for “equal pay for equivalent work” that resulted in a mass sex discrimination grievance filed against UC Berkeley.

AFSCME Local 1695’s campaign was grounded in what historians Dorothy Sue Cobble and Lane Windham have established was an intensive era of organizing when unions attracted more young people, women, and African Americans.⁴ Local 1695’s efforts were also rooted in a revitalized labor movement in the public sector led by national unions such as AFSCME.⁵ In addition, the union’s campaign was part of what Katherine Turk, Nancy MacLean, and others have shown was an effort by women workers to reformulate their grievances with the “new” language of sex discrimination.⁶ Title VII, the antidiscrimination provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, prohibited sex-based discrimination in the pay, hiring, and promotional practices in the private sector. While this gave women legal leverage in private sector industries, it specifically excluded employees of educational institutions.⁷ However, when President Lyndon B. Johnson amended his earlier Executive Order 11246 on affirmative action to include women in 1967, employers like UC Berkeley with federal contracts of more than \$50,000 and fifty or more employees were expected to take affirmative action to remedy past and current inequities. As historian Allison Elias argues, “throughout the 1970s” the meaning of affirmative action for remedying sex inequality was “in flux.”⁸ This indeterminacy gave Local 1695 an opportunity to interpret sex discrimination in varied ways.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s women faculty identified sex discrimination as an obstacle to positions in higher education and sought to integrate the predominantly male professoriate, (Nationally, 24 percent of faculty were women in 1970). Inspired by organizations such as the National Organization for Women (NOW) and the Women’s Equity Action League (WEAL), professional caucuses for women faculty around the country exploded; subsequent studies documenting the extent of sex discrimination in various academic fields multiplied; and hundreds of complaints were filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) by 1970.⁹

By contrast, secretaries (97 percent of whom were women), disgruntled with their second-class status and low pay at large universities across the United States, began organizing unions. Although they encountered fierce resistance from their employers along the way, by the 1980s many had established unions, and clerical divisions had become part of national unions such as AFSCME, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), and the United Auto Workers (UAW).¹⁰

Unlike these university secretaries, AFSCME Local 1695 had chartered their own union in 1967. Veterans of New Left social movements, they saw themselves as activists who embraced radical democracy, alliances within and beyond the university, tactics from social movements, and far-reaching goals such as social justice.¹¹ Further, despite their public sector status, which restricted collective bargaining, Local 1695 had already organized a series of actions and campaigns zeroing in on the sexism and racism that affected Black women as dormitory workers on campus who were making far less money than their male counterparts on the main campus in the late 1960s.¹² In the “maids campaign,” the union challenged and successfully upended the racist and sexist pay structure of dormitory workers through demonstrations, arguments for “equal pay for equal work,” pickets, strategic alliances, and the threat of a strike.

As this article will show, when the UC Berkeley's administration failed to include secretaries in their investigation of sex discrimination on campus—the CSAW Report only included faculty and graduate students—Local 1695 clericals conceived, wrote, and circulated “Fed Up.” Buoyed by the success of “the maids” campaign and the popularity of “Fed Up,” Local 1695 went on to organize its own campaign against sex discrimination. In this campaign, which began in 1970 and ended in 1974, union members published their clerical workers’ manifesto; participated in writing a formal affirmative action report with the librarian’s union, American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Local 1795; and filed a mass grievance signed by three hundred clerical workers. They argued against sex discrimination by deploying the slogan “equal pay for equivalent work.” As I argue, this campaign not only preceded the comparable-worth campaign in San Jose, California, in 1978 but was linked directly to it through Local 1695 activists and their activism.¹³ In addition to complicating the origin story for the late-twentieth-century comparable-worth movement, this article highlights the union’s partnership with women librarians in crafting what Turk has called an “expanded interpretation of sex equality law.”¹⁴

Along with union newsletters, organizing materials, newspapers, and university reports, oral histories conducted with twenty-eight central activists uncovered the stories surrounding this campaign. Following oral historian Alessandro Portelli, I recognize that subjectivity is what makes oral history sources distinctive as evidence.¹⁵ Their value lies in what they reveal about how narrators make meaning out of their lives and inform our understanding of collective recollections of events in the past. Local 1695 activists help us understand how and why “Fed Up” came to be written, its meaning and significance to the clerical women who read it, and the union’s subsequent use of it as an organizing tool in their mass grievance against sex discrimination.

The Dissemination of “Fed Up: Secretaries in Academia”

On January 30, 1970, a women’s liberation conference titled “Women Breaking the Shackles” was held on the University of California at Berkeley campus. Sponsored by the AFSCME Local 1695, the Women’s Faculty Group, and the Graduate Women’s

Caucus in Sociology, the conference included presentations such as “The Struggle of Women for Liberation in the United States and in Vietnam,” “The Socialization of Women,” and “Women as Workers and Organizers.”¹⁶ In her 2012 oral history, Judy Shattuck, a Local 1695 clerical worker and former union president, recalled the excitement of organizing and attending the conference. She saw it as an opportunity to recruit new union members and develop political allies with other groups on campus, but she was especially eager to share her union’s newsletter, which had just published its first article about sex discrimination on campus.¹⁷ Titled “Ladies in Lab Coats,” it compared the experiences of clerical workers and lab technicians in chemistry, arguing that a link between negative stereotypes associated with “women’s work” and their low pay and status contributed to their experiences with sex discrimination.¹⁸

At the time, sex discrimination was being investigated on campus by Elizabeth Scott, a statistics professor, along with several other professors, in a study on the status of academic women. In May 1969 the Faculty Senate asked them to produce a report on the topic.¹⁹ Scott sent out open-ended questionnaires to every female graduate student on campus and began compiling their results. As Margaret Henderson, a Local 1695 clerical worker, said, “Grad students all over campus were talking about what might end up in the report. . . . Of course, what we wondered was whether there would be anything in the report about clerical workers. What about *our status* as women in academia?”²⁰

Professor Scott completed the *Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley Campus* (CSAW Report) and presented it to the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate on May 19, 1970. The seventy-eight-page report concluded that the university was—intentionally or not—“practicing discrimination against women as evidenced by the scarcity of women holding appointments in ladder steps.” Of the 1,245 faculty in tenure-track positions across campus, only 45 were women. Moreover, the numbers of women had worsened over time. Their percentages at all ranks (i.e., assistant, associate, and full) were smaller than they had been in the 1930s and the 1950s. In addition, women graduate students were actively discouraged in their PhD programs, faced with assumptions that scholarship was “unfeminine” or that “women aren’t capable of mental work on the same par as men.” Others faced denial when requesting maternity leave from their graduate programs.²¹

As the findings about the status of academic women circulated around the Berkeley campus and other UC campuses, secretaries in AFSCME Local 1695 wondered, as Henderson did, whether the university planned to do anything about *their* status as women.²² In this context, and a year before “Fed Up” was published, Carol Hatch, another AFSCME 1695 clerical worker, began discussing her idea for an essay she wanted to write in a feminist writing group that included sociology women graduate students.²³ She was interested in making a sociological argument about secretaries as workers. As the conversations continued, her friend Margaret Henderson, who wrote for Local 1695’s newsletter, became involved, and they ended up writing the piece together. It appeared in a biweekly supplement to the *Daily Californian* called the *Every Other Weekly*, which featured poems, artwork, and political essays.

"Fed Up's" main argument was that faculty and administrators expected secretaries to be their personal servants. In the authors' argument, this work fell into two categories: "tasks that save time for the master and tasks that bolster the prestige of the master and maintain status boundaries between master and servant."²⁴ What made clerical work humiliating were the daily "boundary maintenance rituals" that operated to elevate the status of male faculty members and demean female clericals. For example, a secretary pushes buttons on a Xerox machine while a professor stands idly by watching and waiting to have the copy personally handed to him.²⁵ The article also detailed the ways bosses chastised their secretaries. For example, when a clerical worker found herself mentally composing a letter without first putting her fingers firmly on the typewriter keys and adopting "an expression of intense readiness to type," she discovered she was "being watched disapprovingly by some faculty member who has been observing his servant-children for signs of idleness."²⁶ In another, secretaries who turned off fluorescent lighting in an office where sunlight streamed through the windows were yelled at by a department chair for creating an unprofessional workplace. Afterward, the chair retired to his own private office which "he kept pleasantly lit by sunlight most of the time."²⁷

At the same time, "Fed Up" also emphasized the crucial work secretaries did to keep the office running smoothly: writing memos, answering phones, composing informational handouts, creating filing systems, and operating as the department's institutional memory for best practices and policies. Significantly, Henderson and Hatch recognized that secretaries did important work; their critique was not of the job but of the sexist, informal requirements attached to it.²⁸ Problems for clerical workers began when they allowed themselves to notice the constant barrage of insults that "boundary maintenance rituals" entailed—being treated as if one were a "non-thinking being," being yelled at for a minor mistake, or being expected to care for a distraught male professor's feelings. (Like most departments in this era, all the faculty were men.) "Raised consciousness" created a greater sensitivity to these slights, and as secretaries allowed themselves to "notice and react to more incidents," they found themselves in "an almost constant state of rage." Of course, if they wanted to keep their jobs, that rage was "impossible to act out." Their jobs called for looking "respectful," pleasantly "bland," and "moderately busy at all times" but also refraining from criticizing their bosses' bad behavior.²⁹

"Fed Up" maintained that secretaries had been "conned" as workers by the "pretense" that they were *not* servants by being labeled "white collar workers" and by identifying themselves primarily by some other role such as "wife, pre-wife, student or student-wife." Put another way, Henderson and Hatch understood that their work had been proletarianized as a working-class women's job.³⁰ They were not middle-class professionals. In addition, women, as most incumbents in secretarial jobs were, had been socialized to put men's needs and agendas ahead of their own. The absence of class consciousness and feminist consciousness, along with "the illusory sense of privilege vis-à-vis other workers," had contributed to clerical workers' lack of unionization in

the past. But for “fed up” clerical workers, Henderson and Hatch thought it was time for change: “When rising women’s consciousness and rising workers’ consciousness cause this internalized line of control to break down, when the master’s orders are no longer automatically accepted as rational and reasonable requests, and when the masters perceive that they are not admired and loved as they previously believed, all hell breaks loose.”³¹

By publishing their analysis of secretarial work in the pages of the daily campus student newspaper in 1971, which was read widely at the time, “Fed Up” served to educate faculty, administrators, and students about the treatment of women in this job in a highly visible and creative way. Indeed, one could argue its publication held male faculty members accountable for their sexist behavior. As it turned out, “Fed Up” also greatly impacted the women who read it and, to a lesser extent, the faculty for whom they worked. As Local 1695 member and clerical worker Maggie Cunningham said in her oral history, “We loved the piece Margaret and Carol wrote—everyone talked about it!” Shattuck recalled, “It really struck a nerve—this is how we get treated! We have to do something about it! If people hadn’t read it, they wanted to read it because everyone else was reading it.” Margy Wilkinson, another Local 1695 member, said, “Some of us worked with faculty who considered themselves to be liberal. This article really called them out. You think you are this cool, liberal guy, but you treat the women you work with like servants? Ha! My boss was sure I had written it!” In fact, as Henderson was to learn in conversations with Local 1695 members, faculty in departments across the campus were convinced that “their secretary had written it.” Meanwhile, back in the sociology department, even though Henderson and Hatch had purposefully adopted pseudonyms for the piece, fan mail began arriving in their department mailboxes.³²

Part of what may have made this article so popular among secretaries across campus was its focus on and critique of mundane, everyday activities such as dialing the phone for a professor standing nearby or making copies on the photocopier for the department chair who could not do it himself. In putting together these ethnographic details piece by piece, Henderson and Hatch built a sociological analysis that did not describe one specific work relationship, or even one department, but systematic practices that took place in academic units across the university—practices that operated to prop up men’s status and belittle women. In doing so, their essay appeared to build upon the work of Erving Goffman, who argued in his 1967 book, *Interaction Ritual*, that patterned and repeated face-to-face behavior builds social structure.³³ Goffman was a well-known sociologist who had worked in their department. Unlike Goffman’s book, however, Henderson and Hatch’s piece zeroed in on the reproduction of gender inequality. In short, they wrote and published a feminist sociology of work while working in the sociology department as secretaries.

The article’s attention to “emotional labor”—that is, managing the feelings of others as well as their own on the job—also resonated with many of the women unionists. It “struck a nerve,” as Shattuck put it, by capturing the frustration, the humiliation, and the anger of being treated daily by one’s boss as if one were a personal servant, a

child, or a non-thinking being. "Everyone hated being treated that way," Wilkinson said. In turn, the article also gestured toward the caretaking dimension of secretarial work, specifically that women were expected to sympathize with the pressures their male bosses faced and to alleviate their concerns. As Cunningham explained, "There was always this built-in assumption that you would listen to their problems, soothe their bruised egos." As Henderson said, "What drove me crazy about the job was the constant expectation to be concerned and polite, when all I wanted to do was scream—'You are acting like a petulant child!'"³⁴

In addition to revealing the emotional dimension of their labor, another appeal of the article was its humor. It detailed the deplorable ways bosses treated their secretaries and, at the same time, mocked their foibles. Many unionists recalled laughing out loud the first time they read it. "I will never forget the story about some professor going ballistic because a secretary turned out the lights—during the daytime in a sunny office!" Cunningham recalled. At the same time, the article used archaic language to accentuate the absurdity of some job requirements: "the *compleat* secretary is expected to hand him the receiver after dialing the number" (emphasis added). For Wilkinson, it was a one-liner that she remembered best, "Secretaries were supposed to adopt this look of 'intense readiness to type' at all times. . . . 'Intense readiness to type.' That just made me laugh and laugh." In addition, there was a clever jab at the academic profession, specifically the idea that academics bear the scholarly mantle of objectivity. Henderson and Hatch called this out as a bias that implicitly sees the world as men do. In liberating themselves from that bias, they too became biased—but this time on behalf of women clericals. Finally, there is meta-humor about the article itself. As it made fun of the overly demanding boss, its very existence as a polished, analytical critique also operates to parody the parody. As Shattuck explained, "It's like a joke on the faculty. So, you thought secretaries were non-thinking beings? Then how come we were able to write this?!"³⁵

In addition to its appeal to women clericals on campus, "Fed Up" was important for other reasons. While the CSAW Report put a spotlight on the plight of professional academic women, the *Daily Californian* article highlighted those working in feminized jobs. In 1970 at UC Berkeley, 98 percent of clerical workers were women.³⁶ In addition, the essay underscored the daily indignities women faced in this kind of work, specifically the assumption that women clericals were there to serve men. While the feminist critique of women as servants to men was certainly not new, the publication of this kind of careful ethnographic detail and analysis about how it played out in clerical work as a "boundary maintenance ritual" was innovative. Mary Kathleen Benét's book *The Secretarial Ghetto* took up similar themes, but her book remained unpublished in the United States until 1973, and Jean Tepperman's book *Not Servants, Not Machines: Office Workers Speak Out!* came out in 1976.³⁷ Indeed, the phrases in Tepperman's title—not servants, not machines—appeared to borrow directly from "Fed Up." Finally, the focus on clerical work highlighted a class dimension absent in the liberal, middle-class feminist focus of the CSAW Report. Women in working-class

jobs not only faced different problems than women in predominantly male professions, but they received far less pay than their middle-class counterparts. Henderson and Hatch's article put a socialist-feminist lens on sex discrimination against women in pink collar jobs.

The influence of "Fed Up" reverberated far beyond the university. It was reprinted widely in journals and newsletters for the women's liberation movement across the country. Its first reprint came in the winter 1971 issue of *Women: A Journal of Liberation* in Baltimore, Maryland. Then it was reprinted in March in *Everywoman* in Venice Beach, California. Another republication followed in April in *Off Our Backs* in Washington, DC, and, finally, another in May 1971 in the *Women's Page* in San Francisco. The line drawing of a woman trapped behind typewriter keys also appeared in 1973 in the first issue of *9to5 News* in Boston. According to historian Rosalyn Baxandall, this practice of using a piece from one feminist publication in another was a common process for many feminist periodicals in the 1970s. Movement publications highlighted women's issues for discussion and circulation among other women. As one newsletter added in a postscript to the essay: "If you have, or would like to write about your situation, if you are interested in getting together with other women to talk about the problems we all face, if you would like more copies of this leaflet or other literatures, write to *The Women's Page*." The fact that "Fed Up" was reprinted so many times in many different publications suggests its broad consumption and appeal to young women across the country—many of whom worked as secretaries.

Equal Pay for Equivalent Work and the Mass Grievance

As "Fed Up" circulated around the country, women's workplace issues continued to bubble up on the Berkeley campus. On International Women's Day, March 8, 1971, NOW sponsored an educational conference on the Berkeley campus that many women from AFSCME Local 1695 attended.³⁸ Unionists complained initially because there was nothing on the program addressing working-class women, so a workshop titled "Extending Protective Legislation to All Workers" was created in response.³⁹ At the time, many labor unions opposed the Equal Rights Amendment (which NOW endorsed) because its passage would eliminate protective legislation such as breaks and "hours limitations" for women. The panel aimed to introduce a "Labor ERA," one supporting the ERA, but *only if* it extended protective legislation to all workers, including men.⁴⁰

The workshop became the impetus for a group of women including Maxine Wolpinsky Jenkins from Local 1695 to establish a new socialist-feminist group called Union W.A.G.E. (Women's Alliance to Gain Equality). Union W.A.G.E. aimed to achieve "equal rights, equal pay, and equal opportunity" for *all* women. It also sought to help women learn how to navigate the terrain of male-dominated unions and to organize nonunion women.⁴¹ As Joyce Maupin, one of its founders and a shop steward for the Office of Professional Employees International, observed: "Women were very underrepresented in unions. . . . [So we] tried to nudge the union movement into

taking action on women's issues and protective laws, and on organizing."⁴² Although NOW had overlooked these issues, Local 1695 and other labor activists prevailed in bringing their concerns to the table.

By mid-April, almost one year after Professor Scott had first presented the CSAW Report to the academic senate, the report and the budget committee's recommendations were finally on the senate's agenda. The senate passed three recommended resolutions, including modifying the nepotism rule, "gender-neutral" hiring and promotion, and establishing a senate standing committee on the status of women.⁴³ The Berkeley administration, however, decided to wait to address the CSAW Report issues.⁴⁴

This decision did not sit well with women faculty, who thought the university was moving far too slowly on CSAW's recommendations. Organized under the umbrella of the League for Academic Women (LAW), the activist group decided to exert political pressure by asking that HEW investigate UC Berkeley for sex discrimination. On April 29, LAW and NOW jointly filed a formal class-action complaint against UC Berkeley and the UC system administration. Submitted to the HEW's Office of Contract Compliance regional office in San Francisco, it covered all areas of the university and charged the university with sex discrimination in the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of both academic and nonacademic women as well as discrimination against women students in admission and fellowships.⁴⁵

Nationally, the activism of Bernice R. Sanders of WEAL, who understood the potential application of Executive Order 13375 (which prohibited sex discrimination by federal contractors) to universities, instigated complaints like this one. Sanders filed the first charges of sex discrimination in the academy in January 1970, encouraged women faculty across the country to do the same, and initiated WEAL's campaign to spur the federal government to enforce the executive order against colleges and universities. By the time LAW filed its complaint for Berkeley, it joined hundreds of others filed against institutions of higher education across the United States.⁴⁶

HEW planned to come to UC Berkeley in the summer of 1971 to begin its investigation. Despite including nonacademic women in the complaint, HEW focused its review on faculty and graduate students.⁴⁷ It took over three and a half years for HEW to complete its investigation of academic women and come to an agreement with the university. In response to these investigations, the university administration established an affirmative action coordinators committee with representatives from each campus unit.⁴⁸

In June, the university librarian appointed a man as the library's representative to the affirmative action coordinators committee. Not surprisingly, the appointment of a white man to this post raised the ire of library staff. Many librarian assistants were Local 1695 members. But, according to the CSWEL Report, "it was not until six weeks later, when employee groups insisted that they, too, should be involved, that the Library Administration recognized the urgency of the problem."⁴⁹ Only *after* the American Federation for Teachers (AFT) 1795 (representing librarians) and AFSCME Local 1695 (representing library assistants) announced their intention to join NOW

and LAW in the complaint to HEW on behalf of women library staff did the library administration finally call for a meeting of its employees.

In August, after this meeting with librarians and librarian assistants, a group of women formed the Library Affirmative Action Program for Women Committee. They prepared a report on the status of women in UC Berkeley's libraries that drew upon statistical data and testimony from staff members. As the authors of the final document noted, "the concern for the status of women in the Library . . . was a direct result of the growing awareness of women across the country of their inferior job status" as well as several "crucial events" in the university community. These included AFSCME 1695's "intervention on this campus on behalf of women dormitory workers, who were demanding 'equal pay for equal work'"; the 1970 CSAW Report prepared by Berkeley's Academic Senate; and the class-action lawsuit filed by LAW and NOW.⁵⁰

In December 1971, the librarians and clericals completed the *Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library at UC Berkeley with Recommendations for Affirmative Action* (CSWEL Report). *Employee News* reported its findings the following month describing "gross sex discrimination" against women employed as librarians and librarian assistants in hiring, placement, promotion, and pay on the UC Berkeley campus.⁵¹ The report showed, for example, that while 64 percent of the librarians were women, only 16 percent held positions in the highest job classifications compared to men, 48 percent of whom held such positions. In addition, "women's salaries start[ed] lower and then very rapidly level[ed] off in contrast to a steep and steady climb of male librarians' salaries over the course of their employment." Women librarians with twenty years of experience made the same salary (\$11,952) as men with only eight years of experience. Among library assistants, the few men in these positions also advanced to higher levels more rapidly, thereby garnering higher salaries.⁵²

In addition to laying out a statistical portrait of sex discrimination in the campus libraries, the CSWEL Report was important in two other respects. First, it underscored the fact that library professional, technical, and clerical personnel—including women and men—worked in so-called women's occupations and consequently were underpaid compared to those employed in "men's occupations" with the same level of education and experience. For example, in comparing a female Library Assistant Level III who worked for ten years with a male Library Van Driver who held his position for just one year, the woman and man received the same salary (\$7,593). This meant it took ten years for a woman working as a library assistant to catch up financially with a brand-new van driver. Second, the report provided concrete recommendations to the university, including an immediate salary increase for all women and men employed in the library to create parity with salaries of *comparable* male-typed occupations; corrective reclassification for women whose advancement stalled because they were women; provision of childcare facilities; and implementation of an affirmative action program.⁵³

In the 1970s, librarians across the country began creating task forces on the status of women in their professional associations, devoting special issues in professional journals to the topic, and calling for equal pay for librarians. Like women faculty, those

who worked in public universities anticipated that affirmative action could remedy their low pay.⁵⁴ Although librarians were aware that the feminization of the occupation led to depressed wages, according to retired UC librarian William Whitson, the CSWEL Report was the first of its kind to make a comparable-worth argument.⁵⁵

The work surrounding the CSWEL Report and its findings informed the union's next campaign for librarian assistants and other clericals across the university. In March 1972, Local 1695 formed a "women's caucus" and began gathering statistics on women's jobs across the university to supplement the report.⁵⁶ Like Henderson and Hatch's article "Fed Up," the women's caucus focused on clerical work and other positions where women predominated. The union's study highlighted the low pay and low status accorded to such positions. In their argument, UC Berkeley paid workers in these jobs less because they were in "women's occupations." Local 1695 tied women's low pay in clerical work to sex discrimination.

As AFSCME's work continued, the national economic recession hammered the UC system. When Ronald Reagan started his second term as governor in 1971, the California budget was in dire straits, and the governor unveiled an austerity budget. Among other cuts, his budget for UC included no increases (even though the institution expected enrollment to grow), no funds for capital outlay, and no salary increases. In response, UC President Charles Hitch instituted a hiring freeze and proposed layoffs. This in turn provoked protests from the unions on campus, and Reagan, who had vowed when elected in 1966 to "clean up the mess at Berkeley," continued to put financial pressure on the UC system. In October 1971, he threatened to cease prevailing wage agreements with one thousand union workers in the building and trades and those represented by other unions (e.g., cooks, teamsters, printing trades) who worked for UC. Over the next several months tensions escalated as the push for prevailing wages continued and the unions from the building trades ultimately called for a strike.⁵⁷

By April 17, 1972, the building trades strike began, and AFSCME Local 1695 and AFT 1795 members joined the picket lines against the university until June 29, when the parties reached a settlement.⁵⁸ At its peak, the strike idled 1,800 workers across the Berkeley campus and at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. As part of the agreement, UC recognized the existence of librarian pay inequity in the CSWEL Report and agreed to negotiate with them for a pay adjustment.⁵⁹ Further, the campus locals (both AFSCME 1695 and AFT 1795) won use of outside arbiters for their grievance procedures, which until that time had used UC professors as hearing officers.⁶⁰

By the fall the union began to circulate flyers with statistics about the status of "women's occupations" at the university and published them in the October 1972 issue of *Employee News*. Among the findings, women were overwhelmingly concentrated in jobs with lower salaries compared to men in nonacademic positions. For example, although women comprised 56 percent of the nonacademic workforce, only 23 percent held positions paying \$800 or more monthly. In addition, women who entered UC's management program were paid "an average yearly salary \$5,000 lower than the

average man in the same position.” Along with the article analyzing sex discrimination at UC Berkeley, *Employee News* reprinted Henderson and Hatch’s *Daily Californian* piece about clerical work, retitling it “Stoking Coal for Old No. 1.” “Old No. 1” was a reference to the national ranking of the sociology department. As Shattuck said, “We thought it would help raise awareness about the issue for those who hadn’t read it before, and for those who had, it seemed an important reminder. It turned out to be the perfect organizing tool for starting conversations about the mass grievance!”⁶¹

While Local 1695 highlighted wage differentials between women’s and men’s jobs, their ultimate focus in the campaign became gender inequity in annual pay raises. In the 1970s, staff pay raises took the form of one set percentage for all nonacademic jobs—typically between 5 and 10 percent, with special additional raises for select job titles. Those who received special raises were often in supervisor jobs or in the technical and professional jobs; positions held primarily by nonacademic men. As Shattuck explained, “Ironically, the University called these special raises ‘inequity adjustments.’ The ‘inequity’ was between these men’s salaries at UC and at outside employers. Our sense, of course, was that the immediate inequity lay elsewhere.”⁶² In 1972, “inequity adjustments” of 8.5 percent, 11 percent, and 13.5 percent went to various employees, again mostly men. Clerical workers received only 6 percent. The effect of these raises was to widen, not reduce, the gap between men’s and women’s wages. As Leslye Russell, a spokesperson for the union at the time, told the *Daily Californian*, the inequity adjustment was doubly unfair because “it is based on a system where men earn \$200 to \$250 more per month than females with equivalent education and experience.”⁶³

In the library campaign, “Equal pay for equivalent work” became the union’s rallying cry.⁶⁴ As Henderson recalled: “In the maids’ campaign, women in the dormitories and male janitors were doing essentially the same job. But, for library assistants and other clericals, it was different. Men were in other kinds of jobs doing work of comparable skill to ours, but our salaries were lower simply because we were doing a job that had more women in it. And, with the ‘inequity adjustments,’ even our raises were downgraded because of the jobs we were in. So, we argued that our jobs were equivalent to theirs and that our raises should be too.”⁶⁵

With this argument and the evidence gathered by the union and in the CSWEL Report, Shattuck said that the Local had “no trouble finding individual clerical workers eager to grieve the situation.”⁶⁶ As Lawson recalled, “I don’t remember how many women we actually talked to about filing a grievance, but our final results were huge.”⁶⁷ Cunningham had a similar recollection. “The article that Margaret and Carol wrote appealed to a lot of women and brought them into the campaign. Plus, the [LAW and NOW] class-action complaint opened the door for us to talk about how *we* were affected by sex discrimination. Not everyone who worked on campus was a professor, right? And, then you know we had a reputation from the maids’ campaign. We fought for women and we had won. The library campaign just made sense to a lot of women and we had earned credibility from our earlier work.”⁶⁸ Wilkerson also thought the union had done a “terrific job” persuading secretaries to file grievances. She attributed

their success to the alliances they had created with different groups including women faculty (LAW), librarians (Local AFT 1795), and the graduate students (Local AFT 1570) who supported them and helped them get the word out. She also recalled how the piece "Margaret and Carol wrote worked its magic." "When I mentioned the article, women would inevitably say, 'Someone in the union wrote that? Everyone in my office loves that piece! So, how is it connected to the grievance?' And then, I'd just take it from there. It ended up being the perfect introduction to our campaign."⁶⁹

It would appear that the union's organizing efforts and the article had done their "magic" because by November 1972, 300 female clerical workers at UC Berkeley, including 240 library employees, filed a mass grievance against the university regarding sex discrimination in pay raises.⁷⁰ The librarians' campaign followed a different trajectory because the university had agreed to negotiate with them about their pay inequity complaint following the building trades strike.⁷¹ Specifically, the union asked for a 5 percent raise on top of the 1972 6 percent increase and flat dollar amount increases in future pay raises to end the widening gap between men's and women's pay. Local 1695 tied the mass grievance to the larger issue of sex discrimination at UC and, as the union's spokeswoman maintained, "if satisfaction is not achieved through the University's grievance process, the union will take it to the courts."⁷²

What is striking about the Local's "equal pay for equivalent work" campaign was its radical challenge to the unequal gendered structure of the workplace. Unionists were calling out the devaluation of clerical work as women's work and the wages and pay increases that resulted from that undervaluation. In doing so, as Henderson and Shattuck acknowledged in their oral histories, the union was making a "comparable-worth argument" before the 1980s comparable-worth movement began. According to sociologist Joan Acker, "comparable worth argues for raising wages in sex-segregated, female dominated jobs on the grounds that this work has been historically undervalued."⁷³ For advocates, that undervaluation is a form of sex discrimination remedied by raising women's salary level to that of men's in jobs with comparable levels of skill and experience. As Turk has argued, this interpretation of sex discrimination relies upon a definition of sex equality that is far "more expansive" than merely calls for "equal pay for equal work."⁷⁴ In short, the Local was not asking that men and women be paid the same in the same job; they demanded the transformation of the historical and unequal valuation of the gendered division of labor.

The campaign continued for many months with numerous press conferences; ultimately, the Local took the university to court. The university's initial reaction to the grievance was to ignore it.⁷⁵ Then, in January 1973, the university rejected the grievance because it did not deal with applying of university policies to individuals. Cunningham, the union president at the time, told the *Daily Californian* that the university had a "narrow determination of what can be grieved. Sex discrimination is grievable."⁷⁶ The Local then took their case to the Alameda County Superior Court, asking the court to require that UC Berkeley honor the submitted grievances.⁷⁷ In its settlement with the court on the twenty-third, university officials agreed to submit the union's claim

of sex discrimination in pay adjustments to arbitration.⁷⁸ The union then had the option to take the case through the UC grievance procedure or select an outside arbiter.⁷⁹ Cunningham said the Local had little faith in the university giving them a fair hearing, so they opted for outside arbitration.⁸⁰ In March, on the anniversary of International Women's Day, the *Daily Californian* lauded AFSCME and LAW's fights against sexism in university employment as examples of "the rising political activism of women throughout the U.S."⁸¹

The date for AFSCME 1695's arbitration was set for March 1, 1974, and Arthur Jacobs, the arbiter, ruled many months later in the university's favor.⁸² He ruled that the pattern of discrimination was not "intentional" because UC was "merely following the wage standards of society."⁸³ As Shattuck recalled: "In fall 1974, he [Jacobs] ruled against us, essentially upholding both UC's arguments. He ruled it unlikely that UC had purposefully wanted to pay women less than men, and that with the wage differences, UC was mirroring society at large and therefore was not guilty. We would have been more depressed than we were by his ruling except that months before it, we had already won in real world terms. With the 1973 wages, the year after our 300 grievances were filed, UC reversed its usual pay pattern and awarded higher increases to clericals than to the male-typed jobs. Among the factors cited by UC to explain this was 'employee discontent.'"⁸⁴

For AFSCME 1695 union members, the result of the "equal pay for equivalent work campaign" was discouraging but also complicated. They were not successful in persuading the arbiter to accept their argument about the historical devaluation of clerical work as a female-typed job. There would be no change in how future "pay inequity raises" operated because the university simply adhered to existing wage patterns in the labor market. At the same time, before the grievance's settlement, the university had given *slightly* higher pay increases to female clericals than to incumbents in male-typed jobs—although not enough to reverse the salary differentials between women and men—and attributed their decision to "employee discontent." To some, like Shattuck, this suggested that the union had won in "real world terms."

Other unionists were critical about how the university used the term *employee discontent*. For example, Henderson thought that by calling their complaint about sex discrimination "employee discontent," the university "erased the structural dimensions of the problem. It suggested that it was a problem with the employee, not the workplace."⁸⁵ Indeed, neither the arbiter nor the university recognized a problem with the gendered and unequal division of labor on campus or in broader labor market. In their view, the "invisible hand" of the labor market was gender neutral, and its seemingly unequal outcomes resulted from individual choices.

Conclusion

Although Local 1695 did not win its mass grievance on sex discrimination, its campaign remains an important addition to women's labor history. The article "Fed Up"

provided a feminist analysis of clerical work that resonated deeply with the experiences of secretaries across the Berkeley campus, reckoned with their rage and frustration with their bosses, and called upon secretaries to come together and take action against their employer. Further, the article's dissemination across the nation in feminist periodicals not only speaks to its broader reception in the women's liberation movement but also marks UC Berkeley as one of the epicenters of clerical workers' activism on the West Coast. Just as "Fed Up" reverberated from one feminist periodical to another across the country, Local 1695 members' activism echoed around the San Francisco Bay Area. Maxine Jenkins, for example, who joined Union W.A.G.E. on the Berkeley campus, also went on to give a speech in 1973 titled "Organizing the Unorganized" at the California State Federation of Labor Women's Conference that spoke back to sexist and racist labor leaders who maintained that white women and people of color were unorganizable. In addition, AFSCME Local 1695's successful unionizing efforts led to the development of other clerical, technical, and professional unions in the UC system. UC Davis, UC San Francisco, and UCLA were quick to follow in their footsteps. By 1973, seven UC campuses had AFSCME locals; and by 1983, over 30,000 UC employees had become AFSCME members. As the third-largest employer in the state of California, a state whose economy is often likened to that of a small country, this was an enormous accomplishment.⁸⁶

"Fed Up" also led to a "new" rallying cry against sex discrimination—"equal pay for equivalent work." Unionists understood this slogan as a radical challenge to the unequal gendered division of labor. They denounced the historical and sexist devaluation of clerical work as women's work and the wages and pay increases that resulted from that undervaluation. Not only were they making a "comparable-worth argument" before the late 1970s and early 1980s, when the comparable-worth movement had taken off across the United States, but their campaign provided lessons to guide other unions in California on the same issue. Jenkins went on to work as an organizer for SEIU Local 101 in the mid-1970s to defeat Board of Supervisors member Dianne Feinstein's first package of legislation outlawing collective bargaining for city workers, which Jenkins defined as an attack on working women because it would obstruct comparable-worth reforms. Then, in 1977 Jenkins went on to organize for AFSCME Local 101 in San Jose where the nation's first successful comparable-worth campaign was waged in 1978.⁸⁷

Finally, historicizing Local 1695's comparable-worth campaign has implications for transnational women's labor activism in the late twentieth century. In England, women demanded equal pay, better job opportunities, and childcare at the first Women's Liberation Conference in 1970. In Australia in 1972, a report written by a sociologist on the status of librarians "blew apart the discriminatory practices by men in decision-making positions in public libraries."⁸⁸ The report, in turn, led to changing laws and feminist activism challenging sex discrimination in the profession. As these historical accounts and "Fed Up" suggest, more transnational stories exist to be told about labor activism among librarians and clerical workers in the late twentieth century.

Notes

Thanks to Jennifer Davis and the anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

¹Minna Twiefel and Ellen Birdseye, "Fed Up: Secretaries in Academia," *Daily Californian*, February 17, 1971, <https://digicoll.lib.berkeley.edu/record/53005/#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=12&r=0&x=ywh=-1147%2C-442%2C13384%2C8133>.

²Margaret Henderson, oral history conducted by Jennifer L. Pierce, Berkeley California, October 25 and 26, 2012; see also Anne Leffler, sociologist and former UC Berkeley graduate student, personal communication, October 30, 2020. I conducted twenty-eight oral histories with women who participated in AFSCME Local 1695 between 1966 and 1983. Most had been lead activists who had maintained close ties to the labor movement over the years rather than those who had only been involved for a few months or a year. They were conducted between 2012 and 2014 when activists were in their sixties and seventies. Sadly, Carol Hatch died in 1989, so she is not among the interviewees. All oral histories are in my files. Unless otherwise specified in an endnote, narrators agreed to use their actual names.

³Lane Windham, *Knocking on Labor's Door: Union Organizing in the 1970s and the Roots of a New Economic Divide* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

⁴Dorothy Sue Cobble, "'A Spontaneous Loss of Enthusiasm': Workplace Feminism and the Transformation of Women's Service Jobs in the 1970s," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 56, no. 3 (Fall 1999): 23–44; Dorothy Sue Cobble, "A 'Tiger by the Toenail': The 1970s Origins of the New Working-Class Majority," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 2, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 103–114; and Windham, *Knocking on Labor's Door*.

⁵On the growth of public sector unions, see Joseph Hower, "Public Sector Unionism," *Oxford Encyclopedia of American History* (March 2017), accessed on December 2, 2020, <https://oxfordre.com/americanhistory/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.001.0001/acrefore-9780199329175-e-395>. On public sector unions in the 1960s and 1970s, see Joseph McCartin, "Bringing the States' Workers In: Time to Rectify an Imbalance in U.S. Labor Historiography," *Labor History* 47, no. 1 (2006) 73–94; Michael K. Honey, *Going Down Jericho Road: The Memphis Strike, Martin Luther King's Last Campaign* (New York: Norton, 2007); and Paul Johnston, *Success While Others Fail: Social Movement Unionism and the Public Workplace* (Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 1994).

⁶Nancy MacLean, *Freedom Is Not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); Carrie Baker, *The Women's Movement against Sexual Harassment* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Premilla Nadasen, *Household Workers Unite: The Untold Story of African American Women Who Built a Movement* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2015); Katherine Turk, *Equality on Trial: Gender and Rights at the Modern American Workplace* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015); and Ryan Patrick Murphy, *Deregulating Desire: Flight Attendant Activism, Family Politics, and Workplace Justice* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2016).

⁷Turk, *Equality on Trial*; and Alice Kessler-Harris, *In Pursuit of Equity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁸Executive Order 11375 added "sex" to the list of protected classes outlined in 11246, and women became a category of workers covered by affirmative action guidelines. See Allison Elias, "'Outside the Pyramid': Clerical Work, Corporate Affirmative Action, and Working Women's Barriers to Upward Mobility," *Journal of Policy History* 30, no. 2 (2018): 301–333, 303.

⁹Sara Evans, *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America at Century's End* (New York: Free Press, 2003), 83; Robert Bazell, "Sex Discrimination: Campuses Face Contract Loss over HEW Demands," *Science*, November 20, 1970, 834–835; Kay Klotzenberger, "Political Action by Academic Women," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Alice Rossi and Ann Calderwood (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973), 359–391; Mariam Chamberlain, *Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1986), 275–298; Amanda Golbeck, *Equivalence: Elizabeth L. Scott at Berkely* (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2017); and Teresita L. Chan Kopka and Roslyn A. Korb, *Women, Education and Outcomes* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1996).

¹⁰On statistics, see Valerie Oppenheimer, *The Female Labor Force in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 63. On unionizing university clericals, see Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 222; Richard Hurd and Gregory Woodhead, "The Unionization of Clerical Workers at Large U.S. Universities and Colleges," *Newsletter: Center for Collective Bargaining in Higher Education* 5, no. 3 (July/August 1987): 1–10; and Jonathan Hoerr, *We Can't Eat Prestige: The Women Who Organized Harvard* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997).

¹¹I argue elsewhere that Local 1695 embraced what sociologist Vanessa Tait calls "social justice unionism." Vanessa Tait, *Poor Workers' Unions: Rebuilding Labor from Below* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005), 9; and Jennifer L. Pierce, "'We Were Democracy Mad': Clerical Workers' Unionism, Anti-Racism, Feminism at the University of California, Berkeley, 1966–1972," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 102 (Fall 2022): 181–199.

¹²Pierce, "'We Were Democracy Mad.'"

¹³While the term *comparable worth* was used by "labor feminists" in the 1940s and 1950s, it was not taken up again by contemporary feminists until the late 1970s. On "labor feminists," see Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement*, 98–99 and 163–167. For scholarship on the comparable worth movement, see Turk, *Equality on Trial*; and Joseph Hower, "You've Come a Long Way—Maybe: Working Women, Comparable Worth, and the Transformation of the American Labor Movement," *Journal of American History* 107, no. 3 (December 2020): 658–684. For details of the San Jose campaign, see Johnston, *Success While Others Fail*.

¹⁴Turk, *Equality on Trial*, 103.

¹⁵Alesandro Portelli, "What Makes Oral History Different," in *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Essays: Form and Meaning in Oral History* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

¹⁶"Women Break the Shackles at Boalt Hall," *Daily Californian*, January 30, 1970.

¹⁷Judy Shattuck, oral history conducted by Jennifer L. Pierce, Berkeley, California, October 18, 2012.

¹⁸"Ladies in Lab Coats," *Employee Newsletter*, January 1970.

¹⁹Golbeck, *Equivalence*, 212–213.

²⁰Henderson oral history.

²¹Herbert Blumer, Elizabeth Colson (co-chair), Susan Ervin-Trip, Frank Newman, and Elizabeth Scott (co-chair), *Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley Campus*, May 19, 1970, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED042413.pdf>.

²²Shattuck oral history; Anne Lawson [pseud.], oral history conducted by Jennifer L. Pierce, Oakland, California, October 23, 2012; and Margy Wilkinson, oral history conducted by Jennifer L. Pierce, Berkeley, California, October 15, 2012.

²³Leffler, personal communication.

²⁴Twiefel and Birdseye, “Fed Up.”

²⁵Twiefel and Birdseye, “Fed Up.”

²⁶Twiefel and Birdseye, “Fed Up.”

²⁷Twiefel and Birdseye, “Fed Up.”

²⁸In 1970, Judith Ann published an essay about the proletarianization of dead-end secretarial positions in private corporations. Although she emphasizes clericals’ alienation and lack of power, as Henderson and Hatch do in “Fed Up,” she does not recognize secretarial work as making a valuable contribution to a workplace. Judith Ann, “The Secretarial Proletariat,” in *Sisterhood Is Powerful*, ed. Robin Morgan (New York: Vintage, 1970), 95–110. Allison Elias argues that in critiquing secretarial work, feminists sometimes neglected to highlight the valuable work clericals did, thereby collapsing their critique of the sexist aspects of the job with the job itself. Allison Elias, *The Rise of Corporate Feminism: Women in the American Office, 1960–1990* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2022).

²⁹Twiefel and Birdseye, “Fed Up.”

³⁰On the proletarianization of clerical work, see Harry Braverman, *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the 20th Century* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974); Ann, “The Secretarial Proletariat”; and Louise Kapp Howe, *Pink Collar Workers: Inside the World of Women’s Work* (New York: Putnam, 1977).

³¹Twiefel and Birdseye, “Fed Up.”

³²Maggie Cunningham, oral history conducted by Jennifer L. Pierce, Berkeley, California, October 12, 2012; Shattuck oral history; Wilkerson oral history; and Henderson oral history.

³³Erving Goffman, *Interaction Rituals: Essays in Face-to-Face Behavior* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

³⁴For quotes, see Shattuck oral history; Wilkinson oral history; Cunningham oral history; and Henderson oral history. On the concept of emotional labor, see Arlie Hochschild, *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Feeling* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

³⁵Cunningham oral history; Wilkinson oral history; and Shattuck oral history.

³⁶Anne Lipow et al., *A Report on the Status of Women Employed in the Library at UC Berkeley with Recommendations for Affirmative Action* (hereafter, CSWEL Report), December 1971, https://archive.org/details/ERIC_ED066163/page/n11/mode/2up?q=A+Report+on+the+Status+of+Women+Employed+in+the+Library+at+UC+Berkeley.

³⁷Mary Kathleen Benét, *The Secretarial Ghetto* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973); and Jean Tepperman, *Not Servants, Not Machines: Office Workers Speak Out!* (Boston: Beacon, 1976).

³⁸Henderson oral history; Cunningham oral history; and Wilkinson oral history.

³⁹Interview with Joyce Maupin in Tepperman, *Not Servants, Not Machines*, 128.

⁴⁰Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement*, 193.

⁴¹Diane Balser, *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Feminism and Labor in Modern Times* (Boston: South End Press, 1987), 61.

⁴²Maupin in Tepperman's *Not Servants, Not Machines*, 128–129.

⁴³"Faculty Acts on Women's Status," *Daily Californian*, April 15, 1971.

⁴⁴Golbeck, *Equivalence*, 314.

⁴⁵Susan Ervin-Tripp, "A Life of Research in Psycholinguistics and Work for the Equity of Women," an oral history conducted by Shanna Farrell in 2016, Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2017; "Complaint Filed against UC," *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 30, 1971; and Joyce Wolfe, "Complaint Filed against Campus; HEW, Women, and Berkeley Officials Tangle in an Investigation of Sex Bias," *Journal of Educational Change*, University of California at Berkeley 3, no. 6 (1972): 21–35.

⁴⁶Bernice Sandler, "A Little Help from Our Government: WEAL and Contract Compliance," in *Academic Women on the Move*, ed. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973), 437–452, 440–441; and Sherry Boschert, *37 Words: Title IX and Fifty Years of Fighting Sex Discrimination* (New York: New Press, 2022), 1–10.

⁴⁷Letter from UC Berkeley Chancellor Albert Bowker to Floyd Pierce, Director SF Regional HEW Office, August 16, 1971, Box 99, Folder 3 1971 (August–October), CU-149, University Archives, Bancroft Library, Records of the Office of the Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley.

⁴⁸"HEW Accepts University's Hiring Plan," *Daily Californian*, February 19, 1975; Memo from the UC Berkeley Office of the Chancellor to Deans, Vice Chancellors re: establishing formal affirmative action plans dated June 15, 1971, Records of the Office of the Chancellor.

⁴⁹CSWEL Report.

⁵⁰CSWEL Report.

⁵¹"Gross Sex Discrimination in Libraries," *Employee News*, January 1972.

⁵²CSWEL Report.

⁵³CSWEL Report.

⁵⁴James Mildren, "Women, Public Libraries, and Unions: The Formative Years," *Journal of Library History* 12, no. 2 (Spring 1977): 150–158; and Suzanne Hildenbrand, "Library Feminism and Library Women's History: Activism and Scholarship, Equity and Culture," *Libraries and Culture* 35, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 51–65.

⁵⁵William L. Whitson, "Librarians, LAUC Berkeley and the AFT: The Struggle for Academic Status at the University of California, Berkeley, 1963–1991," accessed October 20, 2020,

<https://www.lib.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/staff/laucbhistory.pdf>. The CSWEL Report is also discussed in Sue Galloway and Alyce Archuletta, "Sex and Salary: Equal Pay for Comparable Worth," *America Library* 9, no. 5 (May 1978): 281–285.

⁵⁶"Gross Sex Discrimination in Library"; and "Women's Action Caucus Formed," *Employee News*, March 1972, author's file.

⁵⁷"Analyst's Report," *California Journal*, February 1971, 35; "Reagan Proposes No Raises for Next Fiscal Year" and "Organizing against Budget Cuts," June 1971, *Employee Press*, Box 59, Folder 29, AFSCME Publications, Walter P. Reuther Library, Detroit, Michigan; "Reagan's 1971–1972 Budget Draws Heavy Attack," *California Journal*, February 1971, 32; Peter Schrag, *Paradise Lost: California's Experience, America's Failure* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 48; and "Governor Threatens to End Prevailing Wage Agreements," *Employee Press*, October 1971.

⁵⁸"Union University Talks Continue," *Daily Californian*, June 22, 1972; and "UC Labor Strike Ends: Unions Satisfied by Results," *Daily Californian*, June 29, 1972.

⁵⁹Whitson, "Librarians, LAUC Berkeley and the AFT."

⁶⁰"News: Berkeley Strike Scoreboard: Salaries Climb Ten Percent," *Library Journal* 97: 3532 (November 1, 1972); and "News: Berkeley Librarians Win Substantial Benefits," *Library Journal* 97: 2797 (September 15, 1972).

⁶¹"Women's Pay and Sex Discrimination at UC," *Employee News*, October 1972; Judy Shattuck, "Creating a Unionized Staff," Panel on Affirmative Action, The History of Women at Cal: The First 125 Years [Conference], Berkeley, California, April 29, 1995, author's file; "Stoking Coal for Old No. 1," *Employee News*, October 1972; Henderson oral history; and Shattuck oral history.

⁶²Shattuck, "Creating a Unionized Staff."

⁶³"AFSCME 1695 Union Protests 'Low Pay' for Women," *Daily Californian*, October 4, 1972. See also "Women's Pay and Sex Discrimination at UC."

⁶⁴Judy Shattuck, Untitled conference presentation, April 13, 1993, author's file.

⁶⁵Henderson oral history.

⁶⁶Shattuck, "Creating a Unionized Staff."

⁶⁷Lawson (pseudonym) oral history.

⁶⁸Cunningham oral history.

⁶⁹Wilkerson oral history.

⁷⁰"300 Clericals File Mass Grievance against UC," *Employee News*, November 1972.

⁷¹Despite their agreement to negotiate with librarians, UC ultimately refused to give them the percentage increase that would correct the gender inequity in their salaries. See Whitson, "Librarians, LAUC Berkeley, and the AFT"; and Galloway and Archuletta, "Sex and Salary."

⁷²"Arbitration of UC Union Set," *Daily Californian*, February 27, 1974; and "Mass Grievance Filed at UC Berkeley," *Spokeswoman* 3, no. 6 (December 1, 1972), https://archive.org/details/sim_spokeswoman_1972-12-01_3_6?q=AFSCME+1695.

⁷³Joan Acker, *Doing Comparable Worth: Gender, Class, and Pay Equity* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 3.

⁷⁴Turk, *Equality on Trial*; see also Hower, "You've Come a Long Way—Maybe."

⁷⁵"Chancellor Bowker Is Late in Responding to Mass Grievance on Sex Discrimination," *Employee News*, December 1972.

⁷⁶"Union Charges Sex Bias in UC Salaries," *Daily Californian*, January 10, 1973.

⁷⁷"University of California: Women and Minorities Fight for Equal Pay," *Black Panther*, December 22, 1973, https://archive.org/details/sim_black-panther_1973-12-22_10_32/page/8/mode/2up.

⁷⁸"Discrimination Case Goes to Arbitration," *Daily Californian*, February 23, 1973. At the time California law allowed the formation of unions in the public sector but precluded "collective bargaining." In this case, arbitration, where an arbiter hears the evidence and makes a finding, was the alternative. See Pierce, "'We Were Democracy Mad,'" 183.

⁷⁹"UC Agrees to Accept Mass Grievance," *Employee News*, April 1973.

⁸⁰Cunningham oral history.

⁸¹"International Woman's Day," *Daily Californian*, March 8, 1973.

⁸²"Arbitration of UC Union Set," *Daily Californian*, February 27, 1974.

⁸³*Employee News*, September 1974.

⁸⁴Shattuck, "Creating a Unionized Staff."

⁸⁵Henderson oral history.

⁸⁶Balser, *Sisterhood and Solidarity*; Maxine Wolpinsky Jenkins, "Organizing the Unorganized," in *Women in the Labor Movement, Speeches from the California State Federation of Labor Women's Conferences* (Berkeley, 1974); "We Won!" *Union News*, July 1983, author's file; and Hannah Appel, "Tenant, Debtor, Worker, Student," *New York Review of Books*, February 8, 2023.

⁸⁷Johnston, *Success While Others Fail*, 55–57.

⁸⁸Sheila Rowbotham, *Daring to Hope: My Life in the 1970s* (London: Verso, 2021); and Diane Kirkby and Caroline Jordan, "'These Labourers in the Field of Public Work': Librarians, Discrimination, and the Meaning of Equal Pay," *Labour History*, November 2019, 103.