

## WOMEN WHO LEAD

Ann-Louise S. Silver

This essay addresses ideas regarding women and leadership, highlighting those gendered aspects of leadership that complicate women's efforts at full success. Leadership need not imply pushing forward, advancing frontiers, or conquering an opposing force. Instead, it may connote initiating collaborative efforts that aim at promoting order and thoughtfulness where chaos and confusion had predominated. Inevitably, such leadership produces forward movement, advanced frontiers, and some form of victory. Examples are drawn from the psychoanalytic literature, and from professional and clinical vignettes. Historical trends are noted as illustration. While the reader inevitably will find evidence of ambivalences and contradictions within the material presented, the author maintains the validity of including these inconsistencies, believing they are closer to an emotive truth than would be a more tightly crafted, perhaps therefore more arbitrary discussion. The purpose of this paper is to highlight, yet again, the vitally important topic of women's efforts and frustrations in leadership issues.

The conservatory of the National Botanical Garden in Washington, D.C., located within sight of the Capitol, provides a metaphor for women who lead or wish to lead. Recently the structure underwent repairs. Among its difficulties, some cacti had pushed so forcefully toward the sun that they cracked the glass ceiling. Symbolic of eco-feminism, they allowed fresh air into an Industrial Age structure that defies Nature and her seasons. Cynics might counter that those cacti are the most phallic-shaped in the collection, and they are especially tough, thick-skinned, and spiny. If they symbolize the new woman leader, these cynics counsel keeping one's distance.

Presented at the American Academy of Psychoanalysis Seminar Series: Clinical Advances in Dynamic Psychotherapy, October 30, 1994, New York University Medical Center.

Dr. Silver is the Director of Education at the Chestnut Lodge Hospital in Rockville, MD. She teaches at the Washington Psychoanalytic Institute, Walter Reed Army Hospital, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and the Washington School of Psychiatry. She coordinates a Washington School of Psychiatry study group with Maurine Kelly, Ph.D., and Tybe Diamond, LCSW, "Women's Contributions to Psychoanalysis," where many of the ideas in this paper were discussed.

Address correspondence to Ann-Louise S. Silver, M.D., Chestnut Lodge Hospital, 500 West Montgomery Avenue, Rockville, MD 20850.

However, these cacti could serve as logo for the Glass Ceiling Commission of the U.S. Department of Labor, established in 1988. It studies and documents the pervasive forces blocking women from top-echelon positions in every branch of our economy. The commission investigates the complaints about any organization receiving federal money that may bar women from upper management. The Glass Ceiling Commission can withhold federal funds. Women can be tough-skinned and prickly when the world requires.

In the neighborhood of the Botanical Garden, a growing percentage of senators, representatives, and judges are women. Women constitute a growing proportion in all professions. In neighboring Baltimore, in 1995, Johns Hopkins Medical School graduated more women than men for the first time in its history. People no longer look wide-eyed on hearing that a young woman has chosen a career as a surgeon or architect, a banker, mathematician, or pilot.

While the current literature on women's studies emphasizes the factors in our patriarchal culture that impede women, the accounts of women who have emerged as leaders in every area of endeavor abound. Our first lady has such impressive force, credentials, and leadership skill that she has inspired her enemies to print bumper stickers saying "Impeach Clinton, and Bill, too." Hillary Rodham Clinton symbolizes her generation's conflicts about women in leadership. Present in the shadows of her photos lurks the question, "Is she taking good enough care of Chelsea? Shouldn't she bake more cookies?" Gossip mongers who label Bill a philanderer send a message to ambitious women that their perspectives should narrow to home and hearth, that looking to the health care of a nation is somehow less important than doting on their spouse.

### DEFINING LEADERSHIP

The always-useful *Oxford English Dictionary* guides us through the various definitions of the verb "to lead," demonstrating that authority is not a masculine trait. Reviewing the first three definitions, one finds that the first seems the most universal and the one with the least gender bias: 1. "To conduct. To cause to go along with oneself. To bring or take (a person or an animal) to a place." The second, also, describes a leadership style suggesting parent or teacher of either gender: 2. "To accompany and show the way to. To conduct, guide, especially to direct or guide by going on in advance. To cause to follow in one's path." Only when we reach the third definition do we arrive at a style of leadership suggesting a military officer or a Fortune 500 CEO: 3. "Of a commander: to march at the head of and direct the movement of."

It is in that third category where women have difficulty, seemingly intruding on patriarchally forbidden turf. Shannon Faulkner, in her nearly successful storming of The Citadel, challenges this system. Photographer Timothy Greenfield-Sanders portrayed her well in Catherine S. Manegold's, September 11, 1994, *New York Times Magazine* article, "The Citadel's Lone Wolf, Shannon Faulkner" (p. 57). Faulkner wears a scoop-necked, floral-patterned dress, her jewelry including a gold cross necklace and small spherical earrings. Her hair is shoulder-length and auburn. She stands with hands on hips, solemnly confronting the viewer's gaze with her own. Her feet point straight ahead, not turned to the side, as one would imagine *all* women would do, instinctively, or under the direction of the photographer, to appear as thin as possible. Here is a forceful presence.

When there are demarcated leaders and institutionally defined followers of orders, we confront the glass ceiling, and with it the notion that women leaders are defying nature. Commanders or team captains biologically should be "alpha males" with a superabundance of androgen. Men are meant to lead, just as male gorillas, chimps, wolves, and lions dominate their respective groups. Brute power, muscular strength, and the ability to intimidate all seem necessary requirements.

Language conveys physical realities. We literally "look up to people." Studies show that tall men are far more likely to get hired than short men. Even if the short man has a college transcript with an "A" average, he is far less likely to land the job than will the tall man with Cs. Women are shorter than men. And when it comes to phallic size, they cannot begin to "measure up." "Getting one's point across" and "You've got a good point there" point to the genitals as well as to the topic under discussion. David Roberts's fascinating *Smithsonian* article (1994) documents that when it comes to flying, men have seen the sky as their domain. Anything that defies gravity is a phallic extension.

If we reduce struggles for leadership to a battle of the sexes, however, we forget the crucial beta males, whose competitive strivings bring out the alpha in those who triumph. Alpha males dominate the other males. Men have always struggled with coercion, authority, and hierarchy. Only in recent decades, as we women have gained confidence in our voice and gained a degree of equity with men, have we entered their often brutal and primitive contests for authority. Tina Brown, the new editor of the new *New Yorker*, understands her power and influence. The October 17, 1994, cover, drawn by Mark Ulriksen, gives us a football's view of the team huddled above us. A multiethnic team of women smiles sweetly down on us, wearing the traditional cosmetics both of ladies and of football players, confronting us with the strange extremes of images of gender.

I reviewed these three definitions of *leadership* to stress that we all lead,

and routinely. We persuade, guide, mold; we influence those in our environment. Everyone attending a conference or reading a journal article is actively searching for information and insight to enhance her or his leadership skills in the consulting room, classroom, at home, or elsewhere. Women have always had a domain of leadership in the community. Our transition has been a monetary one. We are less and less willing to give away our services. We form our own packs, our own committees, our own businesses.

And we rule differently. Give a typical woman leadership and she will form a collaborative committee. A committee meeting I chaired last year, of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis Study Group on Psychoanalysis and Women, organized the panels for three subsequent meetings. One of the members, at the close of the meeting, observed, "Look how much we got done, and without any leadership at all." I had been chairing, darn it, keeping the group on task, but without issuing commands. As Gail Hornstein, founder and director of Mount Holyoke's Women's Studies Center, has said, "The first thing a woman does when given authority is to form a committee. She has a group who will advise her and who will share responsibility if things don't work out." Implicit in this approach is the assumed willingness to share the glory for successes.

However, as this vignette illustrates, the committee provides a setting for overt and covert rivalries. Through committees, task forces, reform movements, and advocacy groups, we manifest egosyntonic leadership. We get together to get the work done. I've enjoyed displaying an antique quilt on my office wall. It conveys warmth and tenacity, but more importantly, quilts were worked by *groups* of women, who chatted while they sewed, or listened as one of them read, and then they discussed the reading. They shared leadership, rotating among themselves the designing of the quilts. I recommend Whitney Otto's novel, *How to Make an American Quilt*.

#### DEFINING WOMEN AS FOLLOWERS

As I prepared this paper, I swamped my office with the many recent articles and books delineating these issues and their effects on the moods and activities of women and men, individually, or as couples or in groups. Carol Gilligan (1982), Deborah Tannen (1990), Susan Faludi (1991), Jessica Benjamin (1988), Nancy Chodorow (1978), and Peggy Orenstein (1994) have spoken to the widest audiences. Women exercise authority and initiative relatively easily when working with other women, just as men in groups define their group methodologies. Leadership by women in girls' and women's schools and women's businesses and organizations is not notably problematic. But leadership when men and women work to-

gether remains contested and confusing. Dale Spender (1989) neatly documents that men and women seem to agree that men are entitled to at least 60 percent of the air time. Women faculty members, lunching with a male colleague, are far more likely to facilitate the man's conversations with supportive remarks and questions that encourage amplification, without expecting or receiving reciprocity.

Consideration of leadership thus slides into domination and questing. Our traditional religions and our mythologies support these as gendered. I will give three examples that illustrate the extent and longevity of the patriarchal orientation. Eve Rittenberg and her father Stephen presented a paper to the American Academy of Psychoanalysis in December 1994, highlighting the absence of a literature of women who succeed as leaders and heroes. Our fairy tales and legends abound with males venturing on grand quests, returning home triumphant. But literature's women in power go mad; they kill their children or are burned at the stake. The authors draw examples from literature even into the 20th century; they highlight novels written by women.

My second example is the Orthodox Jewish prayer I discovered when I was considering ordering my life by its directives: In the book of *Daily Prayers*, I read, "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast given to the cock intelligence to distinguish between day and night. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast not made me a heathen, . . . who hast not made me a bondman, . . . who hast not made me a woman. Women say (and the following is printed in much smaller font): Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast made me according to thy will." It was little comfort to find in *A Prayer Book with Explanatory Notes* (De Koven, 1965, p. 37), "The blessing 'who has not made me a woman' does not mean that woman is less important than man. The blessing merely means that men are glad that they have to fulfill all the duties of a man. For in Jewish law a man has many more duties than a woman."

Finally, historian Barbara Harris highlights analogous statements in orthodox Christianity. Women are supposed to walk dutifully behind their men, to feed them and their offspring. She quotes St. Paul: "The head of the woman is the man. . . . For the man is not of the woman: but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman: but the woman for the man." "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak." "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man. . . . For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing" (Harris, 1984, p. 4).

As we know, Freud's writings on masculinity/femininity, activity/passivity, grew from the general culture of his time, a culture that continues to form the bedrock for our development and that of our children (Young-Buehl, 1990). Sander Gilman (1993) documents how the Viennese dominated and scorned the Jews in exactly those terms which Freud then applied in his theories of women. Into the 20th century, women's inferiority had been viewed as fact; women still were barred from higher education during Freud's young adult life. Karen Horney's daughter, psychoanalyst Marianne Horney Eckardt, notes that women were not granted admission to German universities until 1908.

#### VIGNETTES OF TRANSITION

In the United States, we've come such a long way since E. P. Ballintine, a woman psychiatrist on the staff of the Rochester (NY) State Hospital, wrote encouraging other women psychiatrists to become assistant clinicians. In 1908, states were beginning to enact legislation requiring at least one woman physician on the staff of each state hospital. She wrote, "I wish to especially call your attention to the position of clinical assistant. . . . This position is not salaried; the incumbent merely has her maintenance. . . . The clinical assistant and intern obtains a practical training from her large clientele and from her relations with the friends of her patients, and in addition the discipline that comes from working with a large medical staff" (Spurlock, 1986, p. 31). This suggests that not only was the woman psychiatrist not paid, but she was unlikely to socialize with the male physicians. She would content herself visiting with her patients' relatives.

Robyn Muncy's spectacular book, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform: 1890-1935*, should be required reading for every woman employed in a helping profession. It provides necessary historical perspective on our professional empowerment, and the relationship between reform and professionalization. Muncy documents women's entries into professional life at the beginning of this century. They built upon the notion that women are "by nature" altruistic, empathic, generous. Women have come to leadership in championing the causes of beleaguered groups: Jane Addams helping homeless immigrants, Emma Goldman helping disenfranchised factory employees, Alice Hamilton helping industrial workers.

While creating their new professions in the Progressive era, these women discovered that their male counterparts were much more willing to cede professional territory, to acknowledge the female right to expertise in instances where women and children were the only clients. This encouraged creators of new female professions—unconscious of their motive I am sure—to define certain social problems in ways that made women and children central. They needed other

women's dependency on *them*. Mothers empowered female caseworkers, policy-makers, and bureaucrats because if fathers were defined as responsible for the children's problems, then professional women would have had a harder time claiming jurisdiction over the issue. The special tragedy of this was that as female professionals were wrangling desperately for a spot in the professional world, their interest thus encouraged them to blame their nonprofessional sisters for all children's ills; if anything to increase the burden of female responsibility for child care, to shorten the leash that tied most women to home and children. . . . Thus only by rendering somebody else powerless could professionals justify themselves. (p. xv)

Perhaps Frieda Fromm-Reichmann fell victim to this female professional dynamism in her promoting of Sullivan's theories of the schizophrenogenic mother.

Muncy notes how frequently the emerging leaders modeled their behavior on that of their fathers, who very often had careers in public life. Now, we find daughters observing their mothers in positions of leadership, and forming their career agendas based on these observations, as Dorothy Cantor and Toni Bernay have documented in *Women in Power: The Secrets of Leadership*. However, we still generally campaign on a platform of altruism and empathy.

J. C. Smith (1990) states that, "The most widespread pattern of human interaction is the domination of the female by the male" (p. 63). He adds that the most important revolution of our era is that of gender equality. Only by reforming man's domination over women can we revise a pervasive abuse of authority and exchange it for an egalitarian exchange of ideas and information.

Certainly, the women's liberation movement of the 1970s has reaped a continuously rich harvest, facing much resistance. Why is it, then, that women leaders, for example, as represented in *Women in Power*, say they did not overcome huge obstacles nor do they recall instances of male domination. They have worked, gradually arriving in positions of prominence. Very often, they grew up in families where one or both parents worked in politics. They had absorbed the paid parent's style, and were proceeding, having fun in doing what they were doing. They credit their mothers' activities in PTA, etc., as role models.

Did these women somehow miraculously escape these societal forces delineated by Judy Mann in *The Difference: Growing Up Female in America* and by Peggy Orenstein in *Schoolgirls: Young Women, Self-Esteem, and the Confidence Gap*? Do they experience an amnesia to the pain of chronic frustration, analogous to the forgetting of the pain of labor, once the euphoria of delivery supervenes? Does something fundamental happen to us when we have cracked the glass ceiling and have breathed the fresh air of empowerment? Many women, upon losing the burden of envying

those with authority, reorganize their psyches, forgetting pained reactions at the daily insults of going unnoticed, once these insults are replaced by the envious glances of others. Some of us unthinkingly forget our past pains, and too readily deny the existence of continuing disenfranchisement of other women. We become one of "them," the empowered, and we enjoy ourselves.

#### FRIEDA FROMM-REICHMANN

This feature of having confident fun flows through the career of the woman leader whose life and work I am studying, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, whose career formed a heroic quest. She was one of the very first women to receive a university education in Germany. Her mother, along with other women, formed a girls' school to help their daughters prepare for their Abitur. Once graduated, she was among Germany's first women doctors. She was fortunate to have Kurt Goldstein, the founder of holistic medicine, as her medical school dissertation mentor. Then World War I began and she ran the hospital for brain-injured soldiers, which Goldstein titularly headed. Thus she, a major in the Prussian Army, became expert in neurology and in the rehabilitation of massively traumatized men.

She discovered psychiatry, did an internship under Kraepelin, but was appalled by his disregard for the dignity of the patients he publicly interviewed. "This I could do better," Frieda thought. She trained as an analyst, opened her own sanatorium, worked closely with Georg Groddeck, founder of psychosomatics, and then with the outbreak of World War II, she came to the U.S. by way of Palestine. Her former husband, Erich Fromm, helped her find work at Chestnut Lodge, where she defined the specialty of psychoanalytic application to the treatment of schizophrenia and related illnesses. In an interview held a year before her death in 1956, at the age of 67, she had said, "So, if you want to know something for my epitaph, then I think we could say I wasn't lazy and I had lots of fun, but of another type as compared with many other people. It was a special type of fun" (Fromm-Reichmann, 1989, p. 481).

Her first paper to the Washington Psychoanalytic Society, soon after her arrival in the United States, was titled "Female Psychosexuality" (Fromm-Reichmann, 1995). She highlights "girls' pride in their menstruation. . . . Little boys cannot be more proud of the size of their penis and their urine jets." She links premenstrual depression to mourning over loss of the potential baby. She then relates the lore of the sphinx to the mystery that our generative organs are to ourselves. We look inward, and thereby enhance our empathic capabilities. But we need a man to solve our riddle, that is, we need intercourse and pregnancy to discover our sexual bodies' potential. Freud confused penis yearning with penis envy.

### PSYCHOLOGIC IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP

As women have become increasingly active, speaking with earned authority, we challenge the myths of our childhood, the images on which we were raised. The Lone Ranger and his sidekick Tonto ride in and solve the problem, calming the anxieties. The beautiful chaste young woman pleads with the Lone Ranger to stay with her, but he reminds her that her place is on the ranch, helping her father, and he is needed elsewhere. When we form our own quests, we take the man's role. If we quell the man's anxieties, we risk giving him to feel put in skirts. Meanwhile, we stir our anxieties about our gender identities. Women still rarely make it to the front page of the *New York Times*. All too often when we do, it is as anonymous tearful mourners reacting to a military or natural disaster.

Women are, however, often featured on the first page of the *New York Times* science section. "The Double Life of Dr. Swain: Work and More Work," Sept. 27, 1994, is an example. Judith Swain, M.D., director of cardiology and of a molecular biology lab and professor of genetics at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, is the only woman to direct a cardiology department at a major medical center. She is president elect of the prestigious American Society for Clinical Investigation, the first woman to hold this post in a society founded in 1909. Her twin sister Julie is the first female chief of surgery in the U.S. Julie Swain, however, reminds the reporter that it is a very small medical school. These sisters' motto is not: "Can I compete?" but "Can I be the best?" They are portrayed as free of conflict, but perhaps this was hard-won, as the following vignette suggests.

### CLINICAL VIGNETTE

A patient of mine recalled a terrifying experience when she was 14. Lying in bed, reading a book on the history of mathematics, taking a break from preparing for a national mathematics competition, and playing with herself as she read, she felt something in her vagina. It was smooth and convex. It seemed to have an opening right in the middle. It didn't seem to be a foreign growth, but to be part of her own body. What could it be? Suddenly, she thought she recognized it. It resembled the head of the penis, as pictured on the plastic anatomy pages in the encyclopedia. Maybe she was growing one. Maybe she had been studying too much science and math. Maybe her friends were right, sticking with the fashion magazines and novels for their leisure reading, watching their diets, and getting the boys to like them. Maybe she had somehow caused a hormonal or cerebral imbalance by striving too hard to become an engineer, aspiring to attend MIT.

With trepidation, she conveyed her fears to her research biologist father;

her mother was too erratic to be entrusted with her doubts. He reminded her of the anatomy lesson he and his wife had given her, adding, "You probably felt your cervix." However, he did not address the other part of her panic. In the course of her treatment, she gradually recognized how much she had needed a clearer expression from him of his pleasure in sharing scientific interests with her. His obsessional defenses, his own incest anxieties prohibited him from reassuring her of her femininity, and sharing his confidence that she could be both a woman and a mathematician. Much later, she discovered the writings of Evelyn Fox Keller, who taught, "Women, men, and science are created, together, out of a complex dynamic of interwoven cognitive, emotional and social forces" (Keller, 1985, p. 4).

As her analysis progressed, she often revisited that day, acknowledging her own misogyny, her scorn of generic womanhood, viewing this category as "only" interested in home decor and child-rearing, which she felt meant "son-rearing." Her terror had been fueled in part by a wish to be so transformed, as if this would be a necessary prerequisite for success in mathematics. She didn't simply want to become a man, however. She simultaneously yearned for a family of her own some day. She wanted both masculinity (that is, empowerment, the tools for success, the sense of direction, the confidence to "rise above" the crowd) and generativity. She wanted to maximize her creativity both mentally and biologically. She wanted a womb with a penis growing from it. Did it mean she was homosexual? If she were to follow in her father's footsteps, would the path lead to her mother's bed, or some younger equivalent? She knew she wasn't thinking about these issues as a young teenager, but she felt sure she was worrying about them somewhere in a part of her brain that did not use so many words.

She was mired in attitudes toward femininity that were strongly challenged by the women who were among the spiritual or actual founders of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, the trio of Karen Horney (1967), Clara Thompson (1950), and Frieda Fromm-Reichmann (1935). Each would have supported her quest and her explorations as part of healthy femininity. Their ideas have entered the mainstream of theories of female psychosexuality. It is not news, however, that women, even feminists, still expect a more passive stance from their daughters and the girls they teach, as compared to the boys they influence (Bem, 1993; Mann, 1994; Orenstein, 1994). Girls struggle with envy toward boys who are allowed more freedoms.

### DISCUSSION

As we become leaders, we relinquish our envy, and with it the depression and tearfulness that accompany it. Early in my work at Chestnut Lodge, I was supervised by Dexter Bullard, Sr., who had retired from his

post as medical director. I would ask, "How're things going?" and he would answer, "I can't complain." I would quip, "I could help you with that." I felt that I as a woman had a greater capability when it came to complaining, and could encourage his practicing this skill. Of course, he couldn't complain *because* of his leadership position. A leader, especially one who has followers breathing down his or her neck, must maintain an attitude of self-assurance and confidence. Self-doubt, while necessary for credibility if kept within bounds, can jeopardize the progress of the initiative. Thus, in the process of taking on leadership, women find themselves behaving like traditional males, inhibiting their tears, speaking with more authority than they at first feel, and shifting in Deborah Tannen's depictions of communication style from the more feminine one to the more masculine one. This contributes to a sense of masculinization.

A more complicated process simultaneously occurs. As we move out of the realm of envy and petulance, we relate to men differently, no longer so relatively ingratiating and supportive, but now as fellows, as co-equals, as buddies, comrades in arms, in the military sense. Our style of interacting with other women also changes, as we sense other women's envy and petulance directed at us.

An often neglected but complex and crucial aspect of women's leadership involves lesbianism and homophobia. I am not limiting my remarks to a presumed heterosexual readership. Jennifer Downey and Richard Friedman have written eloquently on the role of homophobia in the lives of lesbian women as well as heterosexual or presexual women. We cannot comfortably raise our daughters to lead until we can let them be "tomboys," and this can only occur if we are comfortable with their becoming tough and assertive women. I do not mean to imply that being a tomboy connects with later lesbian choices, but highlight the ramifications when the parents' homophobia causes them to cast doubts on their daughters' assertive energetic behaviors.

I now understand that the 1970s leadership of the National Organization for Women was correct to see women's rights and lesbian rights as inextricably joined. Until a woman's sexual life can exist with as much independence from work life as has evolved for men, we will continue to burden ourselves with concerns about our images of femininity. We will squander our energies trying to ingratiate ourselves toward men in power, rather than simply accomplishing tasks and enlisting the help of others. As Noreen O'Connor and Joanne Ryan have explicated in their vitally important new book, *Wild Desires and Mistaken Identities: Lesbianism and Psychoanalysis* (1993), psychoanalytic theory has supported a patriarchal system by a misinterpretation of clinical data, defining lesbianism as necessarily pathologic, and thus inferior, as if women who choose to love another woman are thereby frustrated or delusional males. As illustration:

An openly lesbian professor I will call Maggie described to me a painful experience she had in an analytically oriented workshop. After the group's two men left for prior appointments, the group found itself constituted only of women. Someone said, "That's all right. We have Maggie." Everyone but Maggie laughed. This group of mental health professionals, in a sophisticated analytic community, felt anxious or temporarily flustered when it could not defer to the males who presumably would make authoritative comments. They nervously but with clear hostility turned to a lesbian woman to play the man's role with them. They looked to her to get her point across, while they could receive her wisdom appreciatively. As long as we view articulate teaching as masculine, we inhibit our present women teachers and we limit our girls, the future women authorities.

Whenever we do *not* walk to the microphone to challenge, to contribute or to pose a question, whenever we do *not* answer a call for papers, whenever we do *not* pursue a potential promotion, we must question our own inhibition. Why do we hold back? Do we fear the label "masculine"? Do we fear the label "lesbian"? Quoting Joyce McDougall, "Reflection has led me to the conviction that the creative process . . . depends to a considerable extent on the integration of bisexual drives and fantasies. Our intellectual and artistic creations are, so to speak, parthenogenetically created children. A breakdown in the capacity to work creatively frequently involves an interdiction concerning unconscious homosexual identifications, as well as unresolved conflicts attached to the significant inner objects involved" (McDougall, 1989, p. 210). Thus, we should strive to free words like *leadership* and *authority* from the resonance of male domination. Perhaps universally, we (women and men) want "it" *both* ways: we want both to lead and to follow, and to have the mental equipment and the generative organs of both genders.

#### SUMMARY

This essay reviews aspects of historical and cultural changes that now permit women increasing opportunities to lead both women and men. Women assuming leadership responsibilities undergo psychic reorganization, reworking their personal histories and their modes of interaction. The author challenges women who inhibit their leadership potential to scrutinize their attitudes and to consider the implications for the next generation of women.

#### REFERENCES

- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate on Sexual Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Benjamin, J. (1988). *The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Cantor, D., and Bernay, T., with J. Stoess (1992). *Women in Power: The Secrets of Leadership*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Koven, R. (1965). *A Prayer Book with Explanatory Notes*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc.
- Downey, J., and Friedman, R. (1995). Internalized homophobia and the negative therapeutic reaction. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 23: 99-113.
- Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Fromm-Reichmann, F. (1935). Female psychosexuality. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 1995, 23: 19-32.
- Fromm-Reichmann, F. (1956). Reminiscences of Europe. In A-L. Silver (ed.), *Psychoanalysis and Psychosis*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press, 1989, pp. 469-481.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilman, S. (1993). *Freud, Race and Gender*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Harris, B. (1984). The Power of the past: History and the psychology of women. In M. Lewin (ed.), *In the Shadow of the Past: Psychology Portrays the Sexes; A Social and Intellectual History*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1-25.
- Horney, K. (1967). *Feminine Psychology*, H. Kelman (ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Keller, E. F. (1985). *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Manegold, C. S. (September 11, 1994). Shannon Faulkner: The Citadel's lone wolf. *New York Times Magazine*, pp. 56-59.
- Mann, J. (1994). *The Difference: Growing Up Female in America*. New York: Warner Books.
- McDougall, J. (1989). The dead father. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 70: 205-220.
- Muncy, R. (1991). *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform 1890-1935*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Connor, N., and Ryan, J. (1993). *Wild Desires and Mistaken Identities: Lesbianism and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Orenstein, P., with the AAUW (1994). *SchoolGirls: Young Women, Self-Esteem, and the Confidence Gap*. New York: Doubleday.
- Otto, W. (1991). *How to Make an American Quilt*. New York: Ballentine Books.
- Rittenberg, S., and Rittenberg, E. (1993). Self-creation fantasies in women. Presented at the December 1993 meeting of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, New York.
- Roberts, D. (1994). The 99s: The right stuff then and now; Men didn't have to prove they could fly, but women did. *Smithsonian*, August, pp. 72-81.
- Smith, J. C. (1990). *Psychoanalytic Roots of Patriarchy: The Neurotic Foundations of Social Order*. New York: New York University Press.
- Spender, D. (1989). *The Writing or the Sex? Or Why You Don't Have to Read Women's Writing to Know It's No Good*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Spurlock, J. (1986). Notes on the history of women in psychiatry. In J. Dickstein and

- C. Nadelson (eds.), *Women Physicians in Leadership Roles*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, pp. 29-44.
- Stern, M. (ed.) (1928). *Daily Prayers*. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Thompson, C. (1950). Cultural complications in the sexual life of woman. In *Feminine Psychology: Its Implications for Psychoanalytic Medicine, Symposium Proceedings, March 18-19*. New York Medical College-Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals.
- Young-Bruehl, E. (1990). *Freud on Women: A Reader*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.