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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In December 1990 Ohio Governor Richard F. Celeste granted clemency to twenty-five women who were incarcerated for killing or assaulting abusive husbands, lovers, or fathers. Calling the cases genuine tragedies, Celeste cited the "battered woman syndrome" as grounds for his decision (Walker 1984). The clemencies shocked and angered prosecuting attorneys and other detractors, but were greeted with astonished applause by supporters. Whether angered or pleased, few who were aware of feminist activism of the 1970s and 1980s or who followed the events preceding the decision should have been surprised.

In 1974 Celeste was elected Lieutenant Governor. The following year, as he began his term, a group of feminists formed an ad hoc committee to promote the creation of a shelter for battered women. In 1976 the Celestes rented their home to the group for use as the first battered women’s shelter in Ohio, the third in the nation. The shelter was named Women Together. Dagmar Celeste had been active in the women’s movement since the early 1970s, and both she and the Governor carried their concern for women’s issues to the Governor’s Mansion, when he was
elected to his first term in, beginning in 1982. Despite this concern, prior to 1990 a
mass clemency of battered women convicted of murder in Ohio would have been
difficult to justify to the public. Before then it was impossible for battered women
accused of murder in Ohio to present a jury with expert testimony regarding battered
woman syndrome. In January 1981, in the case of State v. Thomas (66 Ohio St. 2d
518), the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that the admission of expert testimony on behalf
of Defendant Kathey Thomas, who had murdered her common law husband, was not
necessary because, as the Court held, "The jury is well able to understand and
determine whether self-defense has been proven in a murder case without expert
testimony such as that offered here" (1981:4). In March 1990 that decision was
overturned by the Ohio Supreme Court in the case of State v. Koss (49 Ohio St. 3d
213). Later, in August of the same year, House Bill 484 was signed into law by the
Governor. Both recognized the scientific legitimacy of battered woman syndrome and
the right of defendants to introduce expert testimony at trial. Although Celeste's
decision was clearly unpopular among his detractors, as evidenced by editorials,
sheriffs, and prosecuting attorneys accusing him of creating an open season on men, it
continues to stand. Further, Maryland has since granted clemency to eleven women
in cases related to battered woman syndrome, California has reduced the sentences
of two women after a review of sixteen cases, and twenty other states including
California, Connecticut, New York, and Texas have begun consideration of similar
decisions, making the events in Ohio the first in what appears to have become a
national trend.
The 1980s and 1990s have been described by casual and academic observers alike as a period of "post-feminism," general political apathy on the part of feminists, (Bolotin 1982; Friedan 1985; Stacey 1987; Steinem 1983). Further, academic literature on the battered women’s shelter movement has asserted that it has been coopted, with shelters moving away from feminist goals and philosophy toward a mental health model and acceding to funders’ expectations of a professionalized, bureaucratic approach to the provision of services (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Tierney 1982).

If the women’s movement has entered a period of lethargy and the shelter movement has in fact been coopted, why was it that battered woman syndrome gained greater recognition throughout the 1980s? Given the current "backlash" against women in the United States, why would any governor take the politically risky move\textsuperscript{10} of pardoning women who had murdered or seriously injured their partners (Faludi 1991)? And given current conservative attitudes toward crime, what is it that has made it possible for other states to move forward in their consideration of similar decisions?

The goal of this dissertation is to document the history and process of the Celeste clemencies, with a particular focus on the role feminists played in promoting greater awareness of wife abuse and the legitimacy of battered woman syndrome and in advancing the decision. I will identify current trends in the battered women’s movement and in so doing, will join others who have shown that the women’s movement has not entered an era of post-feminism (Whittier 1991). I will
demonstrate that the shelter movement is only one component of the larger battered women's movement. I will show that feminist shelters continue in their activism, and that together with a second community of non-shelter activists, the movement has continued to work toward feminist goals. Throughout, I will focus on the influence of feminists both within and outside the domains of legal rational authority.

Theoretically my goal is to demonstrate weaknesses in and to expand upon resource mobilization theory by integrating into it the strengths of new social movements theory (Cohen 1985; Epstein 1990; Friedman and McAdam 1992; Jenkins 1983; McAdam 1982; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977; Melucci 1981, 1984, 1985; Oberschall 1973, 1979; Taylor and Whittier 1992). The strength and major contribution of resource mobilization theory has been to inform an understanding of the structural dynamics of social movement success and failure. Its major weakness has been its tendency to overlook activists and the cultural components of movement participation. New social movement theory has identified numerous cultural elements of social activism, including collective identity, collective action frames, and social movement communities which, when integrated into resource mobilization theory, provide a more comprehensive analytical framework (Beuchler 1990; Cohen 1985; Epstein 1990; Friedman and McAdam 1992; Melucci 1985; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992; Taylor and Whittier 1992a, 1992b, 1992c). The result of such integration is a more dynamic and explanatory theory which combines the structural factors of social movements with the cultural components of activism.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Early research on social movements focused on the social psychological roots of dissent, with limited study of social movement organization and outcome. Organizational studies focused on the life cycle of movements, the impact of organization on goals, and the myriad of possible organizational outcomes of social movements (Zald and Ash 1966; Zald and Denton 1963). Study of the social psychology of dissent has been categorized into three areas in what has since been labelled "classical social movement theory" (McAdam, et al 1988). The first area, "collective behavior," focused on the analysis of crowds, the emergent nature of collective behavior, and later a structural analysis of the sources of strain believed to be precursors of a variety of forms of collective action (Blumer 1946, 1955; Lang and Lang 1961; LeBon 1960; Smelser 1962; Turner and Killian 1957, 1972). The second area, "mass society," focused on the breakdown of norms at the structural level and the impact of rapid social change on individual actors as participants in collective behavior (Arendt 1951; Kornhauser 1959). Finally, the third area, "relative deprivation," focused on deprivation in relation to another group, another period of time, or to perceptions of a discrepancy in the level of deserved versus received social rewards (Davies 1969; Geschwender 1964; Gurr 1970).

Because little empirical evidence was found to support classical theories, a paradigm shift occurred in the 1970s (Jenkins 1983). In the United States, the result was the resource mobilization paradigm, which assumed discontent to be pervasive in all societies, and thus not an important factor in the emergence of social movements.
(McCarthey and Zald 1973). As a result, theoretical concerns shifted to understanding how and under what conditions social movements were most likely to emerge and flourish, with little attention to the social-psychological dimensions of social movement activity (Gamson 1975; Jenkins 1983; McAdam 1982; McCarthey and Zald 1973, 1977; Oberschall 1973; Perrow 1979; Tilly 1978).

Resource mobilization theory has been categorized into two areas (Perrow 1979). The first, the "political process" or "resource mobilization II" model, focuses on macro-level structural and political conditions and changes likely to be conducive to the emergence, maintenance, and success of social movements (E. Klein 1984; McAdam 1982; Oberschall 1973; Tarrow 1982, 1983, 1991; Tilly 1978). The second, "resource mobilization I" focuses on the internal dynamics of social movements and social movement organizations to determine the organizational structure most conducive to movement success (Freeman 1975; Gamson 1975; Zald and Ash 1966). Resource mobilization provides a framework for the analysis of the mobilization of tangible and intangible resources, including funding, members, conscience constituents, organizational networks, the support or sympathy of political leaders, public sentiment, and the consciousness of participants and potential participants (Freeman 1973, 1975; E. Klein 1984; McAdam 1982, 1988; McCarthey and Zald 1973; Morris 1984; Oberschall 1973). It does not examine the relationship, if any, between structural conditions and discontent; rather, it focuses on organizations and examines the presence or absence of an opportunity structure in
which the movement may emerge and survive or flourish (Eisinger 1973; Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982).

Among European scholars, a "new social movements" paradigm has emerged, seeking an understanding of the structural roots of the new "postmaterialist" forms of discontent (Cohen 1985; Inglehart 1977; Klandermans and Tarrow 1988; Melucci 1985; Offe 1985; Pizzorno 1978; Touraine 1985). New social movements theory has focused on the politics of a "new class" of professional "knowledge workers" and educated youth and college students (Brint 1984; Flacks 1971; Inglehart 1977, 1979, 1986). These groups, because of their higher levels of education, relative affluence, and work-related autonomy, are believed to comprise the activist base of social movements in the post-World War II era. Their grievances have shifted from the "old" material and class based concerns of labor unions and socialists to "new" lifestyle concerns, brought on by the modernization of the capitalist state and its interference in previously private matters, such as sexuality, gender relations, and environmental concerns (Habermas 1975; Melucci 1980, 1981, 1984; Offe 1985; Tilly 1988). Klandermans and Tarrow (1988) have suggested that new social movements theory seeks to understand the "why" of social movements, while resource mobilization theory seeks to understand the "how." The two, therefore, are complementary.

Recent social movement literature has tended to focus either on the macro-level opportunity structure of movement emergence or on the micro-level of recruitment to, participation in, and structure of social movement organizations
(McAdam, et al 1988). While this scholarship has provided important information regarding the emergence and maintenance of social movements, a focus on the micro-mobilization context will permit the integration of individual participation with to the macro-level structures. Thus, the study of social movements may include, but not be limited to, the analysis of organizations and social structures. The model set forth by McAdam, et al (1988) presents a more dynamic conceptualization of social movements than that allowed by resource mobilization I or II. Nonetheless, the lack of consideration of the process by which social movements develop and change makes the model somewhat static.

The groundwork for an examination of continuity in social movements has been laid by scholars who have found that movements often go through latent periods, when survival becomes an important goal. Subsequently, the attainment of the goal of survival becomes an important resource during more active periods (Rupp and Taylor 1990; Taylor 1989). In addition to providing a framework for the analysis of movement continuity, such research raises the issue of how social movement goals, once attained, may be used as resources in subsequent phases of the movement.

Social movement success is an elusive and controversial topic. As Mueller suggests, "the question of whether a consequence of social movement activity is defined as a 'success' in its own right or merely as a means to some other goal that serves the ends of either protesters or elites" (Mueller 1987:90-91) remains unresolved. When the goal of a social movement is tangible goods or legislative reform, Piven and Cloward (1977) assert that successes are easily reversible. Thus,
the success of "old" social movements are generally ends in their own right. However, when the social movement is oriented toward less tangible goals, such as change in the collective identity or dominant ideology, what was a goal at one moment in the history of the movement may later serve as a resource in the attainment of further goals, whether tangible or intangible. Goals attained may be used as resources as the movement develops. Although social movement theory has been moving in the direction of a more hermeneutic model, while maintaining an interest in social structure, it remains mired in static conceptualizations of success and failure. In short, a more dialectical model of social movements is needed.

One of the limitations of current research on the battered women’s movement has been the tendency to focus on shelters, with little focus on the movement’s influence on institutional political decision making or mainstream culture (but see Tierney 1982). The assumption has been that if the ideological commitment at the organizational level shifts away from feminism, the movement’s ability and willingness to promote social change will be compromised. This assumption may be based in some element of fact; nonetheless, it tends to overlook a diversity of philosophical commitments and strategies, and to assume that if organizations are coopted, activists either change or quit the movement. It overlooks the possibility of activists moving to non-coopted organizations or finding alternative means of advancing movement goals. Shelter organization or treatment approaches do not necessarily affect the movement’s ability to bring about social change. In fact, the ability to present ideas and advance goals from diverse philosophical perspectives may
enhance the possibility that the movement’s ideas will be more widely accepted. In short, diversity may have the effect of broadening the discourse, thus persuading those who might otherwise have rejected the movement’s ideas.

Gerlach and Hine (1970) suggest that a movement is strengthened by its diversity and the looseness of its organization. Following their model, the advocacy for social change among numerous groups with a variety of strategies would stand to strengthen the movement. However, as I will show, diversity advances a movement only insofar as goals remain complementary and non-contradictory. Within the battered women’s movement, there are differences among the groups involved, with the goals and beliefs of some occasionally contradicting those of others. Such differences, where they exist, have the impact of creating factions and ultimately of weakening the movement. Nonetheless, as long as differences remain relatively minor and the focus remains on social change, the movement as a whole will benefit from its diversity. Thus, I will demonstrate that the movement’s influence on the Governor was enhanced by the coalitions that emerged within the movement and that the overlapping of efforts among groups was a source of movement strength.

Specifically, I will address the following weaknesses in resource mobilization theory by drawing upon elements of new social movements theory. First, I will address the assumptions inherent in the shelter movement literature that a shift away from feminism has led to the cooptation of the movement. These assumptions will be challenged on two levels. First, the data will show that the shelter movement is only one component of the larger battered women’s movement. Despite their organization
or underlying philosophy, shelters have provided an important resource to battered women and their children. Secondly, the data will show that a diversity of strategies has strengthened the movement by addressing issues on numerous fronts. By looking at activists and their communities directly, rather than focusing exclusively on social movement organizations, I will demonstrate that the movement has not been coopted and that it is far more complex than previously described.

Secondly, I will challenge the bifurcated conceptualization of social movements and institutionalized politics. Gamson (1975) has suggested that social movements consist of outsider challengers against insider authorities. I will expand on Gamson's ideas, showing how a movement may continue to work outside the system of authority, while simultaneously infiltrating the system, bringing influence to bear from within. This refinement of Gamson's work will be made possible by focusing on the micro-mobilization context as it exists between activists and institutions, as well as within and outside government agencies. Because of the diversity of the battered women's movement, activists work as insider authorities and outsider challengers. Further, those working from within institutions may or may not be accepted as spokespersons, thus providing evidence of the importance of a third category of "ideological outsiders within systems of domination" and their role in advancing movement goals. I suggest that acceptance of one's agenda for change is not necessary to working within the system and that resistance from within the domains of legal rational authority is an new strategy used by new social movements and an important component of movement dissemination and success.
Thirdly, resource mobilization theory has tended to assume that activism is something one does rather than to address the important elements of collective identity, collective consciousness, and collective action frames (Boggs 1986; Cohen 1985; Epstein 1990; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; E. Klein 1984, 1987; Melucci 1985, 1989; Morris 1989; Mueller 1987; Oliver 1989; Pizzorno 1978; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992; Taylor 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992b; Touraine 1985; Walsh and Warland 1983). While structural and organizational elements represent important factors of movement dynamics, resource mobilization theory has lost sight of activists and many of the important cultural factors inherent in social movement participation. By incorporating the elements of ideology, collective identity, and consciousness, a more dynamic and less bifurcated model of social movement participation emerges. Because belief systems, consciousness, and identity are inherent elements of activism, everyday resistance and career activism may be used as strategies, thus further challenging the assumption of outsider challengers versus insider authorities (Collins 1990; Daniels 1991; McAdam 1988; Oliver 1989). The data will show that the activism of participants in the battered women's movement was based on the development of collective identity and the internalization of a collective action frame and carried over into their careers and private lives and into institutionalized political settings. The new theoretical framework that emerges demonstrates that activism is much more than what one does, it is a way of thinking of self and a way of life. Activists' recognition of the centrality of identity to social movement success has led to the emergence of a new social movement strategy.
Finally, in examining social movement success and failure, resource mobilization theory has tended to focus on the structural and material elements of social movement success, and therefore to promote a static model. As Gamson (1975) suggests, a social movement is successful if it is accepted as a legitimate spokesperson or is able to attain new advantages for its constituent group. Piven and Cloward (1978) suggest that when material or legislative gains are achieved by a social movement, they may be easily rescinded during subsequent time periods. Although both Gamson (1975) and Piven and Cloward (1978) are undoubtedly correct in what they examine, their structural focus has led them to overlook the importance and dynamics of individual and cultural change that result from activism. Further, both fail to acknowledge the ongoing nature of activism. Literature that has incorporated cultural elements into an examination of social movements has demonstrated that movement goals and successes are more ongoing and fluid than that suggested by the resource mobilization paradigm (Gusfield 1989; Morris 1992; Tarrow 1992; Whittier and Taylor 1992). Drawing on the work of Cohen (1985), Collins (1990), Daniels (1991), Kauffman (1989), and McAdam (1988), I propose to develop a dialectical model of social movement success, in which the goals of one period, once attained, are used as resources in subsequent periods. Specifically, I will demonstrate the importance of developing a collective identity and how that is used to build social movement networks and change institutions. The data will demonstrate that once goals are achieved they may later serve as resources and create the possibility of striving for and achieving goals not previously imagined.
THE HISTORY OF THE BATTERED WOMEN’S MOVEMENT

Legally sanctioned violence against wives is a phenomenon that has existed at least as far back as the late Roman period (Dobash and Dobash 1979). Throughout history, such violence was a manifest expression of the right of husbands to control and discipline their wives (Dobash and Dobash 1979; Martin 1981). Beginning in the mid-19th Century in the United States, state Supreme Courts began to declare physical violence against wives illegal, but they failed to provide protection for victims, and most were reluctant to sanction perpetrators (Dobash and Dobash 1979; Martin 1981; Steinmetz and Straus 1974). Throughout most of the 20th Century, wife abuse was perceived as a personal problem. Violent families were believed to deviate from the "normal" family, held to be a haven of physical and emotional support (Lasch 1977; Martin 1981; Schechter 1982).

Despite abundant evidence that husbands’ violent behavior toward wives has existed for centuries, the social problem of "wife abuse" was not recognized until the early 1970s (Bush 1992; Dobash and Dobash 1979; Ferraro 1981b; Martin 1981; Pizzey 1977; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982). The battered women’s movement began in 1972 as feminists in Chiswick, England renovated an abandoned house and opened a women’s center (Dobash and Dobash 1988; Pizzey 1977). During the course of their activism, these early feminists began to encounter women in need of a place to escape violent relationships. As a result, the center was transformed into the first shelter in the world specifically for women seeking refuge from violent relationships (Dobash and Dobash 1988; Pizzey 1977; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979, 1982).
The first shelters in the United States were sponsored by Al-Anon groups to assist families of alcoholics and focused on alcoholism as the cause of violent behavior within the family (Ferraro and Johnson 1985; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979). They did little to publicize the problem or to promote public awareness of violence within the family. The "creation" of wife abuse as a social problem, rather than a personal one, was the result of feminist activism (Bograd 1988; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982). As awareness of the problem began to spread, services for battered women proliferated. As shelters emerged, the need for stable funding sources became more apparent. Shelter providers were overwhelmed with the demand for refuge, and in an effort to provide twenty-four hour a day, 365 day a year services, they were forced to turn to foundations, mental health boards, charitable organizations, and government agencies for funding to pay for rent, utilities, supplies, and staff (Schechter 1982).

In the United States, what is believed to be the first shelter specifically for battered women (as opposed to spouses of alcoholics) was established in St. Paul, Minnesota in 1974 by a feminist group calling itself Women’s Advocates\textsuperscript{11} (Johnson 1981; Martin 1981). The shelter was an outgrowth of a consciousness raising group, established in 1971 (Schechter 1982). In 1976, two formerly battered women living in Boston, Massachusetts opened their apartment to women seeking refuge from violent relationships.\textsuperscript{12} They were soon joined by members of Cell 16, one of Boston’s earliest radical feminist groups (Schechter 1982). In 1975, a group of feminists in Cleveland, Ohio, from a diverse array of women’s groups, including the
Free Clinic, the Rape Crisis Center, and WomenSpace (an umbrella organization of women's groups in the area), began meeting to decide how to provide emergency shelter for battered women. In 1976 they set up a hotline to provide support and information to battered women. In December of the same year, the new group--Women Together, Inc.--received its first foundation grant and opened the first shelter in Ohio in what was to be a series of temporary locations, the Celeste home.

According to Ferraro (1981a), fewer than half of the existing shelters in the United States during the 1980s were founded by or directly related to feminist groups or ideology. Of the remainder, approximately 25% were founded by church groups, and 25-30% by YWCA or other civic organizations (Johnson 1981). Although it is apparent that feminists were responsible for the establishment of more shelters than any other single group, the fact remains that as others brought with them new ideological orientations, the provision of services became more diverse (Schechter 1982). The presence of shelters that employed scientifically recognized methods of therapy and hierarchical forms of organization put pressure on feminists to alter their service model (Schechter 1982). The presence of non-feminist shelters has led to assertions that the movement has been coopted.

IDEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS IN THE BATTERED WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Tierney (1979) contends that there are three broad but identifiable philosophical orientations in the battered women's movement, with widely intermingled goals. She identifies these as "feminism and civil rights, legal advocacy, and social service/community mental health" (Tierney 1979:80). The feminist
perspective focuses on the social structural and cultural context of wife abuse, asserting that the patriarchy, sexism, and misogyny are the major causes of violence against women, both within and outside the family (Bograd 1988; Dobash and Dobash 1979; 1988; Fine 1989; Martin 1981; Schechter 1982). Feminist shelters have differed from those initiated by other groups in their assumptions regarding the cause of wife abuse, their organization, and treatment approaches.

The assumptions underlying feminist shelters are that wife abuse is only one form of violence against women in a sexist and patriarchal society (Bograd 1988; Dobash and Dobash 1979; Martin 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979). Accordingly, men beat their wives because they believe they have a right to control them and because they have learned by observation or experience that society will do little in response to such abusive behavior (Fiora-Gormally 1979; Ford 1983; Gelles 1983; Geiles and Strauss 1988; Ptacek 1988). Because men have historically been granted the right to control and dominate women, as documented by the long history of laws permitting men to "discipline" their wives, feminists believe that patriarchy is the root cause of wife abuse (Dobash and Dobash 1979; Martin 1981; Pleck 1987). Many, therefore, assert that with a safe place to stay and a supportive environment, battered women can begin to rebuild their lives (Ferraro 1983a). Thus, empowerment, or the ability to understand one's life within the greater social and cultural context, achieved through peer counseling, and assistance in taking control of one's own life through such means as assistance with finding a job or getting on welfare, are the "treatment" modes employed (Fine 1989; R.D. Klein 1983). Society,
not the victim, nor her family, is the focus of change. Legislative reform measures may be advocated and used by some feminists to address the needs of battered women, but others contend that such reforms are limited because they maintain the patriarchal social structure and may contribute to the revictimization of women who are dependent on the state to intervene on their behalf (Bush 1992; Davis 1988; D. Klein 1981). Because of the power issues inherent in patriarchal forms of organization, some feminists have strongly asserted the need to break down all such hierarchies. One expression of this belief has been shelter organization, which has tended to be based on principles of egalitarianism and self-help among residents, volunteers, and workers, many of whom are formerly battered women (Schechter 1982).

By contrast, the social service model of abuse, employed by many Al-Anon, church, mental health, and social welfare based shelters and treatment programs focuses primarily on family dynamics and the problems of individual family members (Burgess and Draper 1989; Gelles 1974; Gelles and Straus 1988; Giles-Sims 1983; Saunders and Azar 1989; Sonkin, et al 1985; Straus, et al 1980). This model assumes that wife abuse and family violence are aberrations from the norm of family tranquility and advocates treatment of the victim, the perpetrator, and in some cases, the relationship (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981). Individuals or family systems, not society, are the focus of change, although legislative changes may be sought as a means of addressing the needs of victims or perpetrators. Social service oriented shelters tend to employ a professional, licensed staff of administrators and treatment
providers, and are organized in a hierarchical, bureaucratic manner (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981).

Because of the need for regular funding sources and to present an air of accountability and professional legitimacy, many feminist shelters have given way to a social service/mental health model (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982). Thus, to receive grants from mental health boards and government agencies, shelters have incorporated hierarchical forms of organization, scientifically legitimated models of treatment, and licensed professional care givers into their programs (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982). Most accounts suggest that by the early 1980s, the majority of shelters in the United States had shifted away from a feminist model, or were newly created based on a social service model, resulting in the professionalization of shelters (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979). Despite this trend, Tierney (1982) contends that the continuing agenda of the movement has been legal reform, with adherents of all three ideological orientations joining in the struggle.

Throughout the 1980s and continuing into the 1990s, the movement has had continued success in bringing about changes on behalf of battered women. More concretely, efforts have focused on improving the legal protection provided to battered women. This has been done in a number of ways, which include establishing spouse abuse as a separate crime under the law, filing class action suits to encourage better police response, instituting mandatory arrest laws in domestic violence cases, allowing misdemeanor arrests without the police witnessing the offense in domestic
violence cases, changing police training procedures to encourage officers to arrest the assailant and assist the victim, making protective orders more readily available, educating police, prosecutors, and judges about wife abuse, raising gender issues in self-defense law, and most recently, gaining legal recognition of battered woman syndrome and releasing from prison battered women who have killed or assaulted abusive partners (Browne 1987; Creach 1982; Edwards 1985; Fiora-Gormally 1978; Gillespie 1989; Schechter 1982; Younes 1988). As these efforts suggest, the battered women's movement has shifted from one in which solutions to the problem of wife abuse were sought outside the established institutional structure, via an underground railroad of safe homes and shelters, or in which shelter was the primary focus of the movement, to one in which solutions are sought within established social institutions, with social and legal change as the major agenda item (Ferraro and Johnson 1985).

Most analyses of the battered women's movement have focused on shelters and other social movement organizations, rather than the "micro-mobilization context," defined as "any small group setting in which processes of collective attribution are combined with rudimentary forms of organization to produce mobilization for collective action" (McAdam, et al 1988:709). Clearly, many feminist shelters have undergone a dramatic transformation from the early days of hotlines and safe homes, and in the eyes of many analysts and early activists, they have been coopted, shifting their focus from structural change to individualized treatment (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981). Nonetheless, a focus on shelters assumes that organizations, not activists, are what comprise the movement. Although there has been a shift in the feminist
philosophical foundation of some shelters, the assertion that the movement has been coopted is, in large part, a function of the resource mobilization paradigm employed by most movement analysts. A focus on social movement organizations, such as shelters, rather than activists, consciousness, identity, ideology, social movement communities, acts of everyday resistance, or career activism leads one to conclude that early shelter activists have either lost sight of their original goals of social change or have left the movement.

BATTERED WOMAN SYNDROME AND THE DYNAMICS OF VIOLENT RELATIONSHIPS

Research throughout the 1970s and 1980s has provided a clear idea of what battered women encounter in abusive relationships. Much of this research has been conducted by psychologists, with a focus on understanding the mental state of the abused and the dynamics of the battering relationship. Other research has focused on the structural and cultural context of the abusive relationship, focusing on gender biases in all major social institutions, dominant ideologies, and socialization patterns of children. The result has been a body of literature with components that have been, for the most part, complementary.\textsuperscript{13}

Studies focusing on battered women and the abusive relationship have identified a number of patterns and behaviors particular to abusive relationships, including the cycle of violence, learned helplessness, and the battered woman syndrome (Waiker 1977-78, 1979, 1984, 1987). The battered woman syndrome has become an important focal point in the convergence of mental health and criminal justice systems in their response to wife abuse, as well as one which has brought
together activists from the three movement orientations identified by Tierney (1982). This convergence has been made possible by the syndrome's dependence on psychological, social-psychological, cultural, and structural explanations of wife abuse. The syndrome places the battering relationship, the victim, and her response within the patriarchal social context. It not only explains the unique psychological and behavioral response of the victim, but demands an understanding of the inequality that exists between women and men within intimate relationships as well as in society. (See Browne (1987), Fiora-Gormally (1978), Gillespie (1989), and Walker (1987) for excellent discussions of the cultural, structural, and legal contexts of battering relationships and their impact on battered women.) To fully comprehend the battered woman syndrome, one needs to understand why battered women stay with abusive partners, and to do that, one needs to examine gender inequality.

Research has identified several factors common to abusive relationships, including an escalation in the frequency and severity of abuse over time, the cyclical nature of the relationship, the "learned helplessness" of the victim, the extreme jealousy of the batterer, and the extent to which he will go to control his partner (Browne 1987; Martin 1981; Walker 1979, 1983, 1987). Abusive relationships frequently begin with minor forms of violence, such as a push or slap. Such incidents are usually followed by excuse making or apologies, along with promises that it will never happen again. Over time, the violence tends to increase in severity and frequency, with incidents often being followed by the same apologies, excuses, and promises. This results in a cyclical pattern of behavior, referred to as the cycle of
violence (Walker 1979; 1983; 1987). The cycle is comprised of a tension building phase, resulting in a violent incident, followed by a "honeymoon" phase, wherein the abuser becomes apologetic, contrite, attentive, and loving, or in which there is simply an absence of tension or violence. During the honeymoon phase, the abuser becomes the type of person the victim wants him to be, giving her hope that he really will change and that the relationship will work. Over time, the tension building phase becomes more common, the abuse more frequent and severe, and the honeymoon phase declines, but by the time she realizes that his promises are false, it is too late (Walker 1983). She has been caught in a trap of violence, threats, and false hope. Throughout the relationship, abusers often attempt to control and isolate the victim in an effort to guard the secret of abuse and because of their extreme jealousy of any attention she may show to or receive from family, friends, or co-workers. Just as commonly, however, the victim will isolate herself in an effort to conceal the abuse, placate the abuser, and to control any unexpected circumstances that might provoke his anger (Browne 1987). This isolation eventually results in the victim being cut off from any source of support or potential escape she may have had.

Many battered women experience "learned helplessness," a mental state that results when battered women attempt to avoid or control abuse by altering their behavior to please or placate the abuser. After numerous attempts, these women eventually learn that nothing they do will prevent or decrease violence (Browne 1987; Walker 1977-78, 1979, 1983, 1987). In fact, efforts to placate the abuser or to defend herself frequently exacerbate his anger and the intensity of the violence
(Walker 1987). Similarly, when battered women try to escape abusive relationships, their partners frequently hunt for them and threaten them with worse harm or death if they try to escape again, making severely battered women perceive their partners as omnipotent, capable of finding them no matter where they hide (Browne 1987; Walker 1987). Battered women are more likely to be killed after they have escaped a violent relationship than while they are living in it, providing evidence that the extreme terror with which these women live is not an irrational reaction (Walker 1987). Women soon learn that they are unable to predict the outcome of their behavior, primarily because the abuser’s response is random and unpredictable.

The battered woman syndrome is a subcategory of what psychologists have termed "post traumatic stress disorder" (Walker 1987). Researchers have found that after experiencing unexpected and severe trauma, or being repeatedly and unpredictably exposed to abuse, people tend to develop psychological characteristics that continue to affect their behavior long after the original trauma has ended. Believing they have no control over the situation and that they are unable to escape or predict the outcome of their behavior, individuals experiencing post traumatic stress disorder engage in behaviors that have a high probability of ensuring their safety (Walker 1987).

Before a clinical diagnosis of battered woman syndrome may be applied, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 3rd ed. revised (DSM-III-R) mandates that the following four criteria must be met: First, there must be a recognizable traumatic stressor that would be expected to evoke major symptoms of
mental illness to those exposed to it. Second, the individual must reexperience the past traumatic events, without willfully thinking of them. This might include daydreams, flashbacks, recurring nightmares, or intrusive thoughts, involving a sense of powerlessness or loss of control. The third criterion is a numbing of emotions and an avoidance of reminders of the abuse. This criterion will frequently result in a disturbance in interpersonal relationships, including efforts to isolate oneself from friends or family. The last criterion involves a combination of symptoms which results in a heightened arousal response. This may involve generalized anxiety, panic attacks, fears that evolve into full-blown phobias, sexual dysfunction in individuals who have been sexually abused, and a hypervigilance to cues of further violence or trauma (Walker 1987).

The specific psychological and behavioral characteristics of battered woman syndrome include psychological denial of the severity of the abuse; a sense of imminent danger, resulting in constant anticipatory terror; an acute awareness of the body language and cues of the abuser; a preoccupation with the abuser and efforts to placate him; and efforts to conceal the abuse, resulting in a disruption of interpersonal relationships. The victim becomes preoccupied with avoiding danger. Because she has learned over time that the violence is random and unpredictable, she will engage in behaviors with the greatest probability of ensuring her safety. Some of the behaviors engaged in by individuals experiencing post traumatic stress disorder, such as assault or murder of the abuser, might strike unaffected individuals as extreme or irrational. If the individual has been punished for trying placate the abuser, escape,
or defend herself, murder may take on the characteristic of a behavior with a high probability of ensuring safety. Battered women who commit homicide generally do so when they believe the level of violence in the relationship has escalated to a point when their own survival is no longer likely. Even if they kill the perpetrator when abuse is not taking place or is not imminent, they have learned that escape is not possible and believe they have acted in self-defense (Browne 1987).

Battered woman syndrome is gender specific. It is related to a woman's inability to defend herself against a spouse who is generally larger and stronger than she is; to her economic dependence on her spouse and the difficulty she would face trying to support herself and any children on her own; and to her socialization to be passive and dependent and to put the needs of others before her own (Gillespie, 1989; Gilligan 1982). Most importantly, battered woman syndrome is related to the criminal justice system's inadequate response to victims of domestic violence and to gender biases in the law (Browne 1987; Fiora-Gormanly 1978; Gillespie 1989).

Although improvements have been made in police policy and response, problems continue to abound, and battered women often perceive that the police are unwilling to help (Ford 1983). Frequently they find the criminal justice system difficult to understand and inadequate to protect them from men whom they perceive to be omnipotent (Ford 1983; Martin 1981; Walker 1984, 1987). Even with a responsive criminal justice system, it is difficult, if not impossible, to protect an individual from someone determined to harm or kill her. Battered women often stay with abusive partners out of fear of what will happen if they leave (Browne 1987;
Walker 1984). Although the physical and psychological abuse that is inherent in their daily lives is frequently immense, many women feel a greater sense of control when they live with the abuser than when they leave (Walker 1984, 1987). Further, when help is available, it is most frequently the victim, not the perpetrator, who is required to leave home and live with family, friends, or in public shelters. In short, the battered woman perceives that she has no where to turn for adequate help, and that if she takes a chance and tries to escape the relationship, a worse fate awaits her. She is trapped.

Many battered women live with violence and abuse for years, and it is only when they feel their lives, or the lives of their children are endangered that they act in "self-defense" by killing or assaulting the abusive partner (Browne 1987; Walker 1987). Frequently, however, the homicide does not meet the legal criteria of self-defense which include the following: (a) the use of a reasonable amount of force to (b) repel the immediate danger of unlawful bodily harm, and that (c) the use of force is necessary to avoid danger (Gillespie 1989; Thyfault 1984). In some jurisdictions, unless a person is in her or his own home, the defendant must further demonstrate the lack of an escape route (Browne 1987; Fiora-Gormally 1978; Gillespie 1989). Although an individual is not legally required to escape from her or his own home, society continues to expect that a woman should retreat and is uneasy when she takes action to defend herself, even if she is in immediate danger of serious bodily harm (Browne 1987).
Frequently battered women kill men who have abused them for years. However, they tend to do so at a time when they are not in immediate physical danger. Prior experience has taught the majority of battered women that fighting back or trying to escape will bring on worse violence or death threats, so many wait until the man is unarmed and in a state where he is unable to defend himself. They wait until the man is drunk, passed out, or asleep, all times when the women are not responding to immediate danger, when they could escape, and when they are not responding to an immediate provocation or attack. Nonetheless, battered women who kill abusive partners resort to such violence as a desperate final attempt to protect themselves from further physical or mental harm or when they believe their lives are in imminent danger (Walker 1984). Because battered women become expert at "reading" the verbal and non-verbal cues provided by their partners, they are frequently able to predict if and when a beating is imminent (Walker 1979, 1984). Believing a beating is imminent and that it will result in death, many battered women strike first to defend themselves from potential (and to them very real) future violence. They believe they are acting in self-defense, even though according to the criteria established in law, the homicide frequently meets the criteria of premeditated murder.

An understanding of the state of mind of the woman who murders an abusive partner is essential in establishing the reasonableness of her actions. Therefore, it is necessary that battered woman syndrome be explained to a jury at trial. Achieving the right to introduce such evidence at trial and promoting justice for battered women
incarcerated for killing abusive men have been an important accomplishments of the battered women’s movement. It has only been through the cooperation of the feminist, mental health, and legal reform orientations of the movement that such advances have been possible.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Following this Introduction, Chapter Two discusses research methodology. The third chapter outlines the history of the Celeste clemencies and the impact of the battered women’s movement on the legitimation of the battered woman syndrome and on the decisions. Drawing upon components of resource mobilization and new social movement theories, Chapters Four outlines and discusses the elements of the Ohio battered women’s movement that kept it from being coopted. In Chapter Five, I discuss the centrality of identity in the strategy used by the battered women’s movement. Drawing upon Margolis’s (1985) idea of the renegotiation of gender, I develop the concept of reclaiming identity. Further, drawing upon Collins’s (1990) concept of acts of everyday resistance and Daniels (1991) careers in feminism, I develop the concept of career activism, demonstrating how feminists carried on their activism in the work place and in their intimate relationships. Drawing upon these ideas, I develop the concept of "capturing" as a central strategy of the movement. In Chapter 6, the Conclusion, I summarize the major findings and theoretical contributions of my research.
NOTES

1. In subsequent reviews, one additional woman also received clemency.


D. Iseman, "Clemency: The Decision Heard 'Round the 'World" Youngstown Vindicator (Jan. 6, 1991).
A. Rooney, "Celeste Declares Open Season on Ohio Men" Columbus Dispatch (Dec. 12, 1990), p. 11A.
R. Yocum, "Womens' Clemency Angers Prosecutors" Columbus Dispatch (Jan. 27, 1991), p. 5F.


"O, My Darling Clemency" Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dec. 26, 1990), p. 8B.


13. A prominent exception to this trend includes efforts by the American Psychiatric Association to include diagnostic categories in the DSM-III-R, including a "masochistic personality disorder" and later a "self-defeating personality disorder," both of which contain criteria which could easily have been confused with battered woman syndrome. Feminists from numerous fields have opposed such an inclusion (Walker 1987). Where battered woman syndrome suggests that the psychological characteristics of battered women result from abuse, the masochistic and self-defeating personality disorder diagnoses suggest that tolerance of abuse rests in an abnormality in the personality structure of the victim.

14. The question most commonly faced by battered women who have killed or assaulted abusive partners is, "Why didn’t you leave?" This question posits the assumption that it is the victim, not the perpetrator, who has a duty to retreat from the home.

15. Schneider (1986) argues that the use of expert testimony in the defense of battered women furthers sexist stereotypes of women as passive victims and increases women’s dependence on experts rather than empowering them to speak in their own voices. She asserts that lawyers and judges have come to look upon battered woman syndrome as an impaired mental state defense, rather than evidence of the reasonableness of battered women’s response to violence, thus reinforcing old stereotypes. One of the problems inherent in this strategy is that feminists are not always able to control the way expert testimony is used or interpreted.
CHAPTER II

METHODS

The purpose of this study is to examine substantive and theoretical issues of the Ohio battered women's movement and its impact on the Celeste clemency decisions. The large scale of these clemencies was a precedent to the national trend of granting clemencies to women incarcerated for killing or assaulting abusive partners. My research focuses on Ohio for two reasons. First, Ohio was the home to one of the first shelters for battered women in the country. Established by a coalition of representatives of feminist organizations, the shelter and the majority of its founding groups continue to flourish to this day. Second, Ohio was the first state to grant multiple clemencies to battered women convicted of assault or murder, and as the dissertation will show, the early shelter founders were instrumental in paving the way for the clemency decisions.

The events in Ohio represent change and continuity in movement goals, strategies, and philosophy. The movement's steadfast commitment to eliminating inequality and injustice toward battered women and women in general is indicative of its continuity; but continuity has been mixed with change. Efforts to achieve the goal
of ending violence toward women have shifted from the initial focus of creating alternatives to abusive relationships. Shelters and legal change were initial strategies that, once achieved, became resources to advance personal and cultural change. Further, personal and cultural transformation have paved the way for further institutional change. Theoretically, the events in Ohio represent movement continuity, as well as a shift in focus from creating and maintaining alternative institutions for women to working within arenas of legal rational decision making and promoting structural and cultural change with and on behalf of battered women. By tracing the movement from its early origins to its impact on the clemency decisions, we can gain an important understanding of changes in the battered women’s movement, as well as information about movement continuity, transformation, strategy, and success.

THE DATA AND SAMPLE

The data for this research come from thirty-four intensive, semi-structured, tape-recorded interviews with people representing sixteen social movement organizations (including five shelters), four government agencies, all three branches of government, two task forces, two professional organizations, one professional regulatory body, and the office of the First Lady. Many of the people I interviewed represented more than one group. The data also include archival materials that were provided to me by informants. Archival materials include correspondence, newsletters, meeting minutes, executive orders, calendars of events, speeches, drafts of proposed legislation, Parole Board clemency recommendations, reports to the Governor, and summaries of historical events, legislation, and clemency organizing
actions. Because many of the people I interviewed represented organizations and agencies where maintaining the confidentiality of residents, clients, or members was of utmost importance, I was given unlimited access to the archives of only two groups. In the remainder, I was dependent upon the generosity and judgment of the people I interviewed. Representatives of currently active groups provided me with copies of materials that related to the topics we discussed, but did not allow me access to their files. Representatives of the movement in the early days provided me with copies of newsletters and meeting minutes. The archival data I was able to obtain were an invaluable source of accurate dates and the names of organizations and actors. I have used these archival records to triangulate the information I gathered through interviews.

I interviewed people who represented seven categories of participants. Most of the people represented more than one category. The first included key informants and participants in the Ohio battered women’s movement during the mid- to late-1970s. The second was made up of women and a few men who joined the movement in the late-1970s or early-1980s and who are currently involved in the provision of shelter and other direct services. This group included program directors and volunteers. The third group included members of the Celeste Administration, the First Lady’s Unit, the Governor and First Lady, and a statewide task force established by the administration to promote greater understanding and awareness of family violence. The fourth category included legislators responsible for introducing and promoting legislation on behalf of battered women. The fifth was made up of
national social movement organizations, responsible for gathering, coordinating, and disseminating information on legislation, court decisions, and clemency actions, as well as providing a critique of the movement and developing new ideas and strategies. The sixth group included activists who worked with incarcerated women. The last group was made up of the women who were granted clemency. With the help of one of the activists in my sample, I was able to locate and interview five of them. Although a larger sample would have been desirable, after hearing from many of the activists in my sample how the women had been hounded by the media, and that some of them wanted to be left alone to begin rebuilding their lives, I decided to respect their privacy by not making contact with them myself. My requests for interviews were made through people known to them. Of the seven contacted, five agreed to talk with me. One was too ill.

My interviews ranged in length from thirty minutes to five hours. I conducted six interviews over the telephone and twenty-eight in person, going to homes, offices, restaurants, and coffee houses to meet with people. I asked everyone I interviewed in person to choose a place where they would feel most comfortable talking with me. An interview with a judge, who was gracious enough to fit me into an already overbooked schedule, took me on a tour of Cleveland’s open market. She answered my questions while selecting items needed for a campaign party. Another interview took me to the apartment of one of the women who received clemency. She told the person who arranged the interview that she "didn’t get to entertain much," and would love to have me to her home. We talked leisurely over a wonderful dinner of
spaghetti and greens with ham hocks. One activist allowed me to stay in her home for two days while I interviewed her and three of the women granted clemency. During that time she fed me lunch, brought me tea, and helped me process the strong emotions I had after hearing the women’s stories. Everywhere I went, I received gracious hospitality. Everyone I met was anxious for me to know as much of the story as they could provide.

To trace the history of the Ohio battered women’s movement from the first shelter to the Celeste clemencies, I used a snowball sampling method, proceeding from the first shelter forward and from the clemencies backward. I began by interviewing the First Lady who provided the names of those involved in the "early days," those on the Governor’s and First Lady’s staffs, and those who served in both capacities. This list provided the basis of a snowball sample that led me not only forward from the beginning and backward from the end, but deeper within that group of activists. I asked each person I interviewed to provide the names, phone numbers, and addresses of others involved in the movement. All but one person made suggestions for further contacts. I continued sampling until the names provided became redundant. Ultimately, the sample moved away from the core group of initial activists and insiders in the Celeste Administration to those with no contact with either group. That group included shelter directors and other direct service providers who had been actively involved in monitoring legislation and lobbying on behalf of battered women.
In scheduling all of my interviews, except those with the women granted clemency and the First Lady, I made the initial request for an appointment by letter. There I explained the nature of my research and assured everyone except elected officials and the First Lady that their identities would remain confidential. After making contact by mail, I telephoned to request an appointment for an interview. Of the people I was able to reach by telephone, all but one agreed to be interviewed. That person cited personal reasons for declining. There were two I was not able to reach by telephone after sending letters and leaving numerous voice mail messages. After making verbal requests and submitting a research proposal to the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, I was not granted permission to interview members of the Ohio Parole Board or employees of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Therefore, their position on the clemencies is difficult to ascertain. Any information about corrections officials has been provided by former employees, activists, the women granted clemency, or members of the Governor’s and First Lady’s staffs, or derived from archival data.

I asked the people I interviewed to serve as key informants about historical events, the groups or agencies in which they were involved, and their own personal activism. This strategy permitted me to focus both on activists and organizations. This dual focus allowed me to address the issue of movement cooptation by examining organizational goals, strategy, tactics, and philosophy, as well as the continuity or transformation of personal beliefs and commitment of the activists themselves. It also allowed me to address the idea that activism is part of identity
and may be carried out on the job and in one's personal life, and that one need not overcome barriers such as getting time off work in order to participate in a social movement (Collins 1990; Daniels 1991; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Taylor and Whittier 1992b).

DATA ANALYSIS

My data analysis was qualitative in nature and employed a combination of inductive and deductive methods. Initially, my research and analysis were guided by two theoretical frameworks--resource mobilization and new social movements theories. However, the research and analysis proceeded inductively, allowing new information, categories, and theoretical issues to emerge from the data. I conducted my analysis in five stages. First, I coded the data to identify the history and process of the clemency decisions, looking toward the sources of influence identified by the Governor and First Lady, but also including other historical events identified by other activists. Next, I coded the data into broad topical categories, such as "early activism," "strategies," or "network relationships." Following this stage, I coded the data into more specific and theoretically focused categories and trends, such as "career activism," "ideological outsiders within," "everyday resistance," or "capturing." Once I had identified categories of theoretical importance, I sorted through them to identify themes in movement continuity and transformation, as well as those common to individual activists. From this series of steps, I was able to enter the last stage, drawing theoretical conclusions from the data.
With the exception of actions that are part of the public record and some statements made by the Governor, First Lady, and legislators, I have made every effort to preserve confidentiality while presenting as much of the richness and detail of the data as possible. Occasionally it may have compromised confidentiality to give complete information about particular quotations or respondents. In those instances, I have provided less than complete background information. In a few cases, it has been impossible to disguise the identity of the speaker. I have minimized the use of such quotations as much as possible, and where they have been used, I have tried to remove any potentially sensitive or damaging material. Where respondents referred to other people, I have omitted their names in the quotations used, except where the reference is to the Governor, First Lady, or legislators.

ISSUES IN FEMINIST METHODOLOGY

For the past decade or longer, feminists have criticized science as a male dominated, androcentric institution that has, for the most part, excluded and overlooked issues of importance to women and interpreted research about women from a masculine perspective (Cook and Fonow 1986, 1990; Harding 1986, 1987; Keller 1985, 1990; Lather 1986; Mies 1983; Reinharz 1979, 1983; Smith 1974, 1987; Westcott 1979, 1990). Nonetheless, feminists practice science. One of the agenda items of feminist scientists has been to develop feminist methodology. However, in this debate, methods are frequently confused with methodology (Harding 1987). Methods are the techniques by which data are gathered. Methodology includes assumptions about ontology and epistemology and an analysis and theory regarding
how research should proceed (Harding 1987). Harding (1987) has argued, and I agree, that all methods may legitimately be used to conduct feminist research. What makes research feminist is that it recognizes the pervasiveness of gender in our social experiences, emphasizes empowerment and social transformation, and is done not just about, but for women (Cook and Fonow 1986, 1990; Harding 1986, 1987).

Positivists have avowed aspirations of objectivity and value neutrality, basing their methodology on the assumption that there is an objective, knowable reality that exists independently of the knower (Ashley and Orenstein 1990). By employing research methods that do not interfere with that reality, positivists assume that scientific, or "objective" knowledge may be attained. Feminists have challenged these assumptions at many levels. First, despite positivists' efforts at objectivity, feminists have repeatedly demonstrated androcentric biases in positivist research agendas, findings, and interpretations of "objective" data (Gilligan 1982, 1987; Harding 1986, 1987; Keller 1985, 1990; Kelly-Gadol 1987; Millman and Kanter 1987; Sherif 1987). Second, some base their methodology on the assumption that reality is socially constructed and is not a domain that exists independently of the knower (Richardson 1989). One of the most basic tenets of those who espouse such hermeneutic assumptions is that there is no separation between the subject and object (Cook and Fonow 1990; Harding 1986, 1987; Lather 1986). Feminists have encouraged greater interaction in the research process, arguing that it is desirable to answer questions and share information, that an analysis of one's experiences as a researcher is desirable, that subjects should be given opportunities to shape the research project, and that
research may be used to advance social change (Daniels 1983; Fine 1989; Lather 1986; R.D. Klein 1983; Mies 1983; Oakley 1981; Reinharz 1983). Because of the privileged position of the researcher, feminists argue that reflexivity in the research process and report is desirable. By placing oneself within the research, the researcher loses the anonymous voice of authority and becomes "a real, historical individual with concrete, specific desires and interests" (Harding 1987:9). By owning one's biases and opinions in the research report, they are opened to public scrutiny, and the researcher is put on the same plane as those who are researched.

My goal in this dissertation has been to document the struggles of women whose activism might otherwise be lost to history and to provide information to those in other states who are mounting clemency campaigns. By looking at what did and did not work in Ohio, my hope is that others might learn from these activists' experiences, and that other states' efforts will, in some small way, be enhanced. In conducting my research, I encouraged the people with whom I spoke to have input into my work by asking them what else I should focus on, beside what we had already discussed. Most gave me the names of other activists or suggested that I examine other aspects of the movement. One insisted that I include an examination of batterers' treatment programs in my research. Although it did not directly affect the clemency decisions, it is a major issue in the battered women's movement and one worthy of examination. The work she suggested is included in Chapter IV. To give the people I interviewed greater input, I also asked how my research might be put to use after its completion.³ Of those who had an opinion, most said simply, "Publish!
Publish!" One other suggested that I produce a video of the movement because, as
she suggested, many people do not take the time to read. It would be a way to
disseminate information quickly. I have not yet pursued that option.

None of the people I interviewed had an overview of the events of the
movement and how the clemencies happened. Many were involved in numerous
aspects of the movement while some participated only during one time period or in a
particular group or agency. No one was involved at all times and all places. I have
tried to provide here an accurate account of the history of the Celeste clemencies and
to show how the battered women's movement laid the groundwork that made them
possible. However, as Richardson points out,

...all knowledge is socially constructed. Writing is not simply a "true"
representation of an objective "reality"; instead, language creates a
particular view of reality (1989:1).

The events as I have described them represent a sociological narrative (Richardson
1989). I have tried to be thorough in my research and accurate in my description of
events, but I do not claim to have discovered the "truth" about the Ohio battered
women's movement. My work is one interpretation of a series of historical events.

During my research, I tried to reduce the separation between myself and those
with whom I talked, in the ways described above. When I interviewed the women
who were granted clemency I felt, as one of the activists I interviewed put it, that it
was just a "happy accident" (for her and me) that I was conducting the research and
not being interviewed. In listening to their stories I realized how easily what
happened to the women who had been incarcerated could happen to any woman,
myself included. Throughout my research I was awed and inspired by the strength, commitment, and vision of the people with whom I talked. In doing this work, I have gained immeasurable insight and strength from the people I met. From their experiences I have learned that, as one of the women I talked with said, "It takes a lot of work to move forward a little bit, but once you get a momentum going, it’s almost impossible to stop it." She was speaking of prison reform and the clemency decisions. For me, the statement reflects possibilities for personal change. Within the lives of the women with whom I spoke, as well as within my own, I was repeatedly struck with the way that small changes built upon each other, gathering momentum as they went. Within the movement, those personal changes evolved into a social movement that has had a major effect on our nation’s collective consciousness regarding wife abuse and the way that institutions now respond to battered women.

SUMMARY AND LIMITATIONS

This study draws on interviews with activists and key informants in battered women’s organizations from the 1970s through the early 1990s, the Governor’s and First Lady’s administrations, a group established by the Governor to promote awareness of domestic violence, national and state battered women’s organizations, direct service providers, legislators, and the women granted clemency. It also draws upon archival documents provided by activists, organizations, and governmental agencies. The variety and depth of the data sources provide an excellent picture of one aspect of the Ohio battered women’s movement and its impact on the Governor’s clemency decisions.
Despite the richness of the data, its focus limits it in some ways. First, because I concentrated on the linkages between the activists who started the first shelter, located in the Celeste home, and the clemency decisions I have focused on the groups, organizations, and activists who were initially members of what later became a "core group" of activists and administrative insiders. Although I have made efforts to look at the movement broadly, including direct service providers and national groups, by my focus I have omitted an examination of other potentially important groups, such as the National Organization for Women's Task Force on Family Violence or shelters so strained for resources that the idea of participating in public debate over wife abuse was out of the question.\(^5\) Additionally, I have not examined the efforts of mental health shelters or activists not affiliated with the early community of activists, the state wide coalition, or national organizations.

The focus on the battered women's movement in Ohio provides an in-depth view of a highly committed group of activists involved in a movement with a great deal of continuity. Substantively it makes a contribution to the historical literature on the battered women's movement by documenting the role of feminists in promoting the clemency decisions. Because Ohio is a precedent setting case, one must ask how representative it is of present and future actions in the nation as a whole. Although I have placed Ohio within the national context and have included a discussion of actions taken or currently pending in other states, without a nationwide comparative study of the movements in those states, it would be unwise to generalize beyond Ohio.
Despite these limitations, I believe my data to be at least partially
generalizable to the movement as a whole. For example, respondents’ explanations
about the importance of networks, informal communities, friendship ties, and
empowerment in advancing movement goals and guarding against cooptation are
consistent with the literature on the battered women’s movement in particular and
social movements in general (Epstein 1991; Gerlach and Hine 1970; McAdam 1988;
Oberschall 1973; Schechter 1982; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). Also consistent with
the literature on the women’s movement, many early activists have described their
involvement in the battered women’s movement as being a natural outgrowth of their
involvement in the anti-war and civil rights movements (Beuchler 1990; Cassell 1977;
Evans 1979; Freeman 1973, 1975). Similarly, many activists reported that their
consciousness of women’s issues influenced their career decisions and the way they
conduct their personal lives (Collins 1990; Daniels 1991; Oliver 1989). Beyond these
trends, however, is the fact that activists in numerous other states are advancing
legislation to require a review of the cases of inmates who can establish an ongoing
pattern of violence in their lives or are pressing the Governors of their states to
consider clemencies for battered women who have killed or committed other crimes
as a result of ongoing abuse. The full story of the trend toward clemency for battered
women will only be told by a more far-reaching, national study. In the interim,
historians, sociologists, and activists alike may learn from the Ohio experience.
NOTES

1. I am unable to disclose the nature of the reasoning without potentially violating confidentiality.

2. The rationale given for denying me access was that litigation was pending regarding ten death penalty commutations granted by the Governor in January 1991.

3. This question was inspired by Dagmar Celeste’s challenge that my research should do something other than just get me a Ph.D. She suggested that the research should be of pragmatic use to the movement and in the lives of battered women.

4. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 5, 1992.

5. I do not mean to imply that these shelters are not politically active, since the provision of shelter to women escaping violent relationships is a political move. In many shelters, however, resources are so strained that all effort must be put into direct service, thus making it impossible for activists to participate in testifying on behalf of legislation or other public political debate.
CHAPTER III

THE BATTERED WOMEN'S MOVEMENT AND THE CELESTE CLEMENCY DECISION, OHIO 1974 - 1990

The Celeste clemency decision not only marked a crescendo in sixteen years of activism within the battered women's movement in Ohio, it was symbolic of the convergence among feminist, mental health, and legal advocacy perspectives within the movement. Early research on the women's movement found that it was made up of distinct branches, one of older professional women with a liberal orientation, the other of younger, more radical women from the civil rights and student movements (Carden 1974; Ferree and Hess 1985; Freeman 1975). Recent research has found that these branches have become less distinct and that the new "feminist faultline" entails the question of whether feminism should transcend gender or affirm femaleness, with female difference now informing much feminist organizing (Echols 1989).

Research on the battered women's movement has focused on its emergence and allegations of its subsequent cooptation. This trend follows a tendency in the social movement literature to examine the conditions under which movements begin and how they end, with little analysis of movement development. This chapter will address an
approximate ten year gap in the research on the battered women’s movement and a theoretical void in the social movement literature by examining the development of the Ohio movement as it pertains to the Celeste clemency decisions.

The battered women’s movement has followed trends similar to those identified in the women’s movement. First, there has been an overall convergence of philosophy and strategy in the movement, with some exceptions, as discussed below. Second, a feminist analysis of wife abuse has been marked by a focus on "female differences," including an emphasis on women’s unique response to battering, their less violent nature, and their subordinate position in society. Interestingly, programs that have assumed gender equality by focusing on issues such as mutual combat between partners, or which have offered counseling for abusive women¹ have been accused of being anti-feminist, with their proponents frequently labelled batterers.

Currently, the major schism within the movement appears to be related to the assumptions underlying the services offered. Feminist shelters focus on unequal power relations between women and men, both in the relationship and society. They believe women are most often victimized, that if they become violent it is in self-defense, and that wife abuse is an issue of social control and power (Bograd 1988). Treatment is oriented toward helping women to understand the dynamics of abusive relationships, learn the skills needed to live without violence, and become empowered through understanding that their problems are not due to individual shortcomings (Saunders and Azar 1989). Mental health based programs assume that abuse is an issue of individual pathology or dysfunction within the family system. Women and
men are treated as equals, with each being as prone to violence and injury as the other. Treatment is oriented toward helping individuals deal with individual pathologies, such as substance abuse or uncontrolled aggression, and helping the family system become balanced (Saunders and Azar 1989).

A review of the literature on the battered women's movement suggests that initially feminists were suspicious of the inclusion of therapeutic treatment as part of shelter services (Ahrens 1978; 1980; Andler and Sullivan 1980; Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979). Saunders and Azar have identified a tendency to differentiate between "grass-roots, self-help, para-professional" and "mental health" models, arguing that the distinction is "probably unfortunate because of the similarity of goals and overlap in methods of the two approaches" (1989:496). Despite these tendencies, throughout the 1980s the feminist analysis of wife abuse began to draw together structural, cultural, and psychological components of violent relationships and to encourage a feminist response at all three levels. One result was the greater inclusion of counseling services in feminist shelters. Another was the scientific legitimation and legal acceptance of battered woman syndrome.

The emergence of a feminist psychology of wife abuse has drawn together somewhat divergent perspectives, one calling for social change, the other for treatment. The exception to this convergence is evident in feminists' opposition to programs which assume women and men to be equally violent and whose sole focus is on individual or family therapy. Although distinctions remain among feminist
shelters, with some offering more counseling than others, the differences tend to be more a matter of emphasis, or as one shelter director explained it, "style."²

The strength of the Ohio battered women's movement derives from its unified diversity. Although there are differences and disputes within the movement, there is an overall recognition that wife abuse is an issue of social control, exacerbated by inequality in heterosexual relationships and all major social institutions. In most of the movement there is a recognition of the need for social change as well as women's need of counseling or other mental health services. The movement has recognized that until gender equality is attained, there must be an awareness of women's unique response to domestic violence. Battered woman syndrome entails a feminist psychological perspective, thus legitimating those who advocate for social change as well as the need for counseling. Drawing upon a recognition of women's disadvantaged social position, it recognizes their unique mental response to battering and calls for changes in the legal system, the dominant culture, and other aspects of society.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

New social movements theory posits that the social movements of the post-World War II era have become less concerned with class divisions and the reallocation of power and more oriented toward the transformation of dominant values and systems of meaning (Eder 1985; Offe 1985; Touraine 1985).³ Further, it emphasizes that "new" social movements have a grass roots base, are loosely organized, and follow democratic principles (Cohen 1985). Conversely, resource
mobilization theory focuses on the structural and organizational components of social movements and is based upon the assumption that movements entail attempts by "challengers" to wrest concessions, primarily in the form of tangible goods or power, from "authorities" (Gamson 1975). In their examinations of the social movements of the last three decades, resource mobilization theorists have focused on political opportunity structures, effective means of organization, resources necessary to movement success and the best means of mobilizing them, and the importance of networks to social movement emergence and success (Freeman 1975, 1979; Gamson 1975; Gerlach and Hine 1970; McAdam 1982; Morris 1984; Oberschall 1973; Piven and Cloward 1977; Snow, et al 1980; Tilly 1978; Useem and Zald 1982). Resource mobilization theory, with its organizational and structural focus, does much to inform our understanding of social movements, but as with any paradigm, it has blind spots. These weaknesses may be supplemented by concepts offered by new social movements and collective behavior theories, including collective action frames, collective identity, and social movement community (Beuchler 1990; Cohen 1985; Epstein 1990; Friedman and McAdam 1992; Gamson 1989; Klandermans 1992; Melucci 1985, 1989; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992; Tarrow 1992; Taylor 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992b).

Current trends in social movement research and theory have focused on an integration of these perspectives. The strength of this strategy is that it incorporates the social psychological elements of collective behavior theory, incorporated within new social movements theory, with the structural focus of resource mobilization
theory (Mueller 1992). Drawing upon these perspectives, I shall set forth the following definitions. A social movement, as used in this paper, refers to a set of collectively held opinions or beliefs that represents a desire to change some element of the social structure and/or the dominant culture (Eder 1985; Epstein 1990; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Melucci 1985; Offe 1985; Touraine 1985). The social movement may seek to redistribute resources or to redefine the dominant ideology through which the public perceives and defines social life (Gamson 1975; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992). The battered women’s movement seeks to accomplish both. The resources it seeks to reallocate are power and material resources, for both battered women and direct service providers. It has also worked successfully to alter the framework through which domestic violence has traditionally been interpreted, transforming it from a personal and very private problem to a public issue in need of social redress and challenging definitions of public and private spheres (Bush 1992; Pleck 1987; Tierney 1982). The definition of a social movement organization as used herein is a complex or formal organization which identifies its goals with that of the larger social movement or an ongoing, loosely organized group based on collectivist principles (McCarthy and Zald 1977; Rothschild and Whitt 1986). The social movement industry is comprised of the social movement organizations within the movement (McCarthy and Zald 1977).

In focusing on activists themselves, resource mobilization theory has set forth a series of definitions that is dependent on their level of involvement in social movement organizations and commitment to movement goals (McCarthy and Zald
1977). While informing an understanding of the organizational aspects of social movements, the theory may be strengthened, once again, by incorporating elements of new social movements theory, particularly as it pertains to social movement communities (Beuchler 1990; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). Even when activists leave social movement organizations, they tend to take with them their ideological commitment to the movement and to continue to advance social movement goals (McAdam 1988, 1989; Rothschild and Whitt 1986). Central to the phenomenon of an ongoing commitment to the movement are the concepts of collective identity and a social movement community (Beuchler 1990; Cohen 1985; Taylor 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). Collective identity is defined as a shared definition of the group that derives from members' common interests, experiences, and solidarity with each other (Taylor 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). Collective identity is the foundation of the social movement community. Beuchler contends that the social movement community is parallel to a social movement organization,

in that both concepts refer to groups that identify their goals with the preferences of a social movement and attempt to implement those goals. Whereas the social movement organization does so by recourse to formal, complex organizational structures, however, the social movement community does so through informal networks of politicized individuals with fluid boundaries, flexible leadership structures, and malleable divisions of labor (Beuchler 1990:42).

Insofar as a social movement is focused on cultural change rather than the reallocation of resources, organizational membership is less central to movement analysis than is collective identity and membership in the social movement community. Nonetheless, analyses of social movements from a new social movement
perspective assumes that movements are either oriented toward cultural change or the reallocation of resources. Although new social movements tend to be oriented toward challenging dominant belief systems, many have advanced their goals by demanding their share of public resources. Because they seek to achieve both "old" and "new" goals, the social movement organization and community are both important units of analysis.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A number of studies have asserted that during the 1980s the battered women’s movement was coopted into the larger social service bureaucracy with a greater emphasis on therapeutic goals, a tendency to refuse to help disruptive or uncooperative clients, and a movement away from goals of empowerment and social change (Ferraro 1981a, 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982). Studies of the battered women’s movement in Ohio have mirrored these national and regional findings (Ferraro 1981a, 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979, 1982). Although some of its social movement organizations have become more oriented toward conventional social service goals with less emphasis on feminist concerns, many shelter providers in Ohio, as elsewhere, have tried to balance their efforts to provide services with their desire to build a social movement (Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982).

As the movement has developed, its diversity has derived from the micro-cohorts and communities of which it is comprised. The concept "micro-cohort" refers to "groups within a political generation that emerge at each distinct phase of a social
movement" (Whittier 1991:62). This concept informs an understanding of differences in collectivities which join the movement in different contexts, but does not address the possibility that individual groups might react differently to similar circumstances. It is here that the concept of community is instructive. Taylor and Whittier define a social movement community as "a network of individuals and groups loosely linked through an institutional base, multiple goals and actions, and a collective identity that affirms members' common interests in opposition to dominant groups" (1990:107).

By drawing upon both concepts, an analysis of similarities and differences among communities and micro-cohorts is made possible. Both enhance an analysis of groups within the larger social movement. Micro-cohorts are linked together by shared experiences, social networks, the political opportunity structure, and available resources (Whittier 1991:62). Communities are linked together by shared identity and a common collective action frame. Although micro-cohorts come to the movement at the same time, differences in identity and frame will make crucial differences in their activism. To draw these two concepts together, I will use the term cohort community to refer to a group linked together by shared experiences, social networks, political opportunity structure, collective identity, collective action frame, and common goals. A cohort community may or may not stand in opposition to dominant groups. Those that do may be in agreement with and enhance the movement; those that do not may have the impact of neutralizing or reversing the movement’s accomplishments. The integration of the elements of micro-cohorts into the community concept highlights Whittier’s (1991) idea that changes in a social movement may represent a natural
evolution. However, rather than assuming that all changes are inevitable transitions, the concept of cohort community enhances an understanding of the impact that groups with non-oppositional definitions of the problem may have on the movement.

The first cohort community of the battered women's movement was made up of feminists committed to providing an escape route for battered women and working toward social change. They challenged the supremacy of the "family ideal"--the belief that the family is private and sacred and that it should be protected from government interference and should, whenever possible, be preserved (Pleck 1987). Drawing upon the model of consciousness raising groups, they believed that once women realized their experiences were not unique to themselves, they would be empowered to change their lives and later, society. I have labelled this group "founders."

Founders were responsible for naming and creating wife abuse as a social problem. The micromobilization context in which they entered the movement was one of few available resources, a general lack of awareness of the prevalence or complexity of wife abuse, and lack of feminist literature on the issue. They were motivated and sustained by an emergent feminist community and the feminist organizations that had been established during the 1960s, including the Rape Crisis Center, Cleveland Women Working, Cleveland Women's Counseling, and the Cuyahoga Women's Political Caucus. Many of the activists in the early movement had backgrounds in the civil rights and new left movements, as well as the liberal and radical organizations of the women's movement. The opportunity structure they
encountered was enhanced by friendship networks, including many members' acquaintance with government officials and potential sponsors. Founders were predominantly white, upper middle class women, aspiring to careers in politics, law, medicine, psychology, and other areas of public service. Their social class background and concomitant connections gave them opportunities that might not have been available to less well positioned activists.

In the late 1970s, the micromobilization context in which the second cohort community entered the movement was one of greater public awareness and governmental concern over wife abuse, greater availability of funding, and an emergent feminist literature on the issue. As these feminists joined the movement, they were faced with the realization that the founders' model was not always adequate to meet the needs of the women they wanted to help. Faced with a changing context, including resources, opportunities, networks, and an emerging understanding of the issues, they maintained a feminist commitment to empowerment and social change, but realized that women were sometimes in need of professional services to help them deal with issues such as clinical depression or substance abuse. Thus, they were more willing to incorporate feminist counselors into their staff of formerly battered women and paraprofessionals. Although these women have modified the strategy from the first group, the founders I interviewed concurred with their approach. For that reason, I have labelled this cohort community "joiners."

Joiners differed from founders in background. They were not as well connected to government officials or potential sponsors as were founders. Some were
trained as administrators and others as counselors, but many received their only
training on the job, in the course of volunteer work, or while surviving a violent
relationship. They have carried on the movement in a variety of settings, including
shelters, hotlines, advocacy programs, and prisons. They come from both feminist
and non-feminist backgrounds, but share in common a commitment to social change
and empowerment of battered women. Although many of these activists came to the
movement with little feminist consciousness or identity, they gradually adopted a
strong belief that wife abuse is an issue of power and control. They believed that
wife abuse is perpetuated by a patriarchal society and that individual change through
empowerment is one strategy for achieving social change at the structural level.

Many joiners staff or direct shelters that were initially founded by non-feminists. In
such settings they have had the impact of incorporating a feminist analysis and
strategies, thus coopting non-feminist shelters into the movement. Like founders,
joiners carry their commitment to social change with them, even when working alone
in environments hostile to feminism. In addition to being linked by formal networks
and informal relationships, this cohort community is marked by an intellectual
connection among women and men who may have never met. A common collective
action frame, which emerged and developed through feminist research on wife abuse
throughout the 1980s, has made it possible for even isolated activists to be connected
with the movement and, in many cases, to make dramatic contributions.

As the issue of wife abuse gained legitimacy, funding sources began to seek
programs to sponsor, with less interest in giving money to feminist programs and a
greater attraction to those employing scientifically legitimated treatment programs carried out by degree professionals (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981). Program developers and non-feminist mental health workers began entering the movement at the same time as joiners. As the third group to enter the movement, they sought money to address issues of family violence at the same time that sponsors began looking for programs. I have labelled this group "agency maintainers." Although they have entered the movement during the same time period and within the same micro-mobilization context as joiners, they represent a separate community, due to differences in their collective identity, collective action frame, and community of orientation. Although some members of this group self-identify as feminist or pro-feminist, their analysis of family violence is based on a presumption of gender equality in the family, with women and men equally capable of violence. This cohort community has failed to challenge the family ideal. Although they have been successful in mobilizing public resources, their efforts have had the effect of re-privatizing family violence. Through many such programs batterers have been diverted from courts and potential prison terms into treatment programs and couples counseling. These programs represent efforts to keep the couple together, whenever possible, and to minimize government involvement in the family.

Evidence from the Ohio battered women’s movement suggests that the 1980s were a time of development and growth, with the emergence of a feminist analysis of wife abuse that incorporated theories and research from a variety of disciplines. As shelter and program directors worked to provide services while maintaining a focus
on social change, the movement was advanced through the actions of its founders, most of whom, by the early 1980s, were no longer associated with direct service agencies. Founders went on to constitute a major component of the battered women’s social movement community through their activism as legislators, cabinet members, directors of government agencies, judges, doctors, psychologists, and the First Lady. This cohort community has been a crucial, but overlooked element in the advancement of the battered women’s movement’s goals. In fact, while many direct service providers have made an intentional effort to keep the movement alive and focused on social change, the most crucial contributions to the battered women’s movement in Ohio, particularly in relation to the legal recognition of battered woman syndrome and the clemency decision, came predominately from founders.

The collective action frames applied to wife abuse by each of these cohort communities are an outgrowth of the collective identity of each group, and specifically of the group processes through which they defined the problem (Taylor and Whittier 1992b). Founders and joiners’ collective action frame defined wife abuse as an expression of violence toward women in a misogynist society that is the result of the dominant ideology that men have a right to control women and that violence in the home is private and thus distinct, from violence in the so-called public domain. According to this analysis, all women are potential victims of violence; therefore, there are no boundaries or differences between victims and non-victims. Shelter founders and joiners, whether or not they had ever been beaten, defined themselves and battered women as members of a larger group--women. This
collective action frame and collective identity had a major impact on movement goals and strategies and how programs were staffed and operated. Although joiners differed from founders in their greater focus on providing counseling and individual therapy for battered women, they did not lose sight of the need for structural and cultural change.

In contrast, agency maintainers adopted an alternative frame. They attributed domestic violence to individual pathologies, such as substance abuse and mental illness; social psychological phenomena, such as frustration aggression, social learning, low self esteem, or improper attribution; or a dysfunctional family system. This frame implies that victims of domestic violence are somehow different from those who have not been battered.

SUCCESS OR COOPTATION

The dilemma of defining success and cooptation is discussed by Ferree and Hess (1985). The difficulty inherent in determining when a movement has been coopted is related to its success. As a movement is successful in redefining dominant belief systems and/or acquiring power and resources, its accomplishments may soon appear so "natural and normal that they will no longer be seen as the result of feminist action" (Ferree and Hess 1985:176). When this occurs, the movement is not associated with the change, a phenomenon referred to as "failure-through-success" (Ferree and Hess 1985:177).

When one considers that the first major goal of the battered women’s movement was to provide safe spaces for women escaping violent relationships, the
movement has achieved high levels of success. However, the provision of shelter was only one aspect of early feminists' goals. They also sought a redefinition of the problem from a private to a public issue, challenging the concept of the family ideal (Bush 1992; Pleck 1987). Shelter was seen by them as a temporary means by which women could be protected until men were prosecuted and evicted from the home. Social change, including effective prosecution of violent men and a redefinition of gender relations, was the goal, and shelter was one means toward that end. Keeping the family intact was not a concern to founders. The establishment of programs that focus solely on the provision of shelter or treatment is an example of "co-optation by partial success" (Ferree and Hess 1985:177). Such programs privatize wife abuse by focusing on providing safe space and counseling, but not social change. For them, the means is converted to the final goal. They uphold the family ideal by working to keep the family intact, if possible, through individual therapy and couples counseling.

Solely therapeutic programs represent partial changes in the dominant ideology about wife abuse. Before the battered women's movement a commonly held belief was that a man had a right to beat his wife (Dobash and Dobash 1979; Martin 1981; Pleck 1987). Now that belief has changed. Men no longer have a right to beat their wives; instead, it is now believed that women whose husbands abuse them have an obligation to leave home, as evidenced by the commonly asked question, "Why do they stay?" (Gillespie 1989; Pleck 1987). Acceptance of the legitimacy of battered women leaving abusive relationships and the need for society to provide refuge represents a partial feminist success--institutionalization of the means. However,
feminists advocate that family violence is a public issue by emphasizing the need for social change and public redress. Shelters represent the belief that family violence is wrong. Nonetheless, solely therapeutic programs also represent the belief that family violence is private and inherently different than public assault. Such programs frequently divert offenders away from the public sphere of courts. They fail to confront the patriarchal order of the family and society and frequently work to convince women that personal therapy is the solution to their problems.

Although agency maintainers have played a crucial role in providing safe space for battered women and their children, they played little role, if any, in laying the groundwork for, or otherwise advancing, the Celeste clemency decision. Therefore, my primary focus will be on the first two cohort communities. Nonetheless, I do not mean to underestimate the important work agency maintainers have done over the past decade in providing and institutionalizing safe space for women and their children. Such programs represent a partial success.

When the level of social movement analysis is the social movement organization, there is evidence to suggest that the battered women’s movement in Ohio has been, in part, coopted. However, when the analysis includes individual activists, as members of social movement organizations and cohort communities bound together by common experiences, a very different picture emerges. A shift of focus to groups of activists permits an examination of efforts to advance social change through group and aggregate efforts, as well as throughout individuals’ lives. In
short, it challenges prevailing dichotomous assumptions about outside activists and insider authorities.

Recent feminist literature has challenged the assumption of public and private spheres (Benhabib and Cornell 1987; Bush 1992; Collins 1990; Elshtain 1981; Nicholson 1987; Young 1987). Similarly, a recent trend in the social movement literature has been a consideration of activism and its impact on one’s biography and career (Daniels 1991; McAdam 1988, 1989). Concepts developed within new social movements theory encourage a consideration of activism as an essential component of identity and community (Beuchler 1990; Epstein 1990; Friedman and McAdam 1992; Melucci 1985, 1989; Taylor 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). This trend has had the effect of challenging the assumption that activism is solely rooted in association with a social movement organization. It has also brought into question the assumption that challengers and authorities are discrete categories.

I contend that activism is a central part of one’s identity. As such, it is carried out within the domains of social movement organizations and organized activities, as well as in one’s personal life and on the job. Further, I believe that the two groups—challengers and authorities—overlap to a much greater degree than has previously been assumed. This breakdown of discrete categories may be a direct result of the movements of the 1960s and 1970s, which created greater opportunities for challengers to enter the arena of legal rational authority. As they have entered, the evidence from my research suggests that rather than being coopted, they have
maintained a strong allegiance to "the cause," and have become frontrunners in the social movement, albeit no longer as official members.

MOVEMENT HISTORY

The Ohio battered women's movement played a central role in changing policy, law, and public opinion regarding wife abuse. Feminists created and set in motion a system by which violence against women was criminalized and public response to wife abuse and other forms of family violence was improved. At the state level feminist efforts resulted in the institutionalization of funding for shelters through a tax on marriage licenses, the criminalization of wife abuse, legal recognition of battered woman syndrome, and an improved coordination of the services offered by family violence programs. Through a system that was created and operated by feminists, consideration of clemency for 115 incarcerated women was set in motion, resulting in the release of twenty-six women involved in the murder or assault of abusive partners. In the following sections, I document the history of the battered women's movement, its impact on creating legal recognition of battered woman syndrome, and its role in the clemency decisions.

The Movement is Founded

Similar to the national trend, the battered women's movement in Ohio was a direct outgrowth of the victim rights and anti-rape movements and was predominately advanced by feminists in the nascent women's movement (Ferraro 1981a, 1983a; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979, 1982). These movements were couched within what McCarthy and Zald (1977) have termed a social movement sector comprised of
activists previously involved in the student anti-war, new left, and civil rights movements, as well as upper middle class professional women seeking to address the plethora of injustices and inequalities facing women at the time. Although they appear to mirror early conceptualizations of the liberal and radical branches of the women’s movement, in Cleveland these two groups overlapped and worked closely with each other (Carden 1974; Cassell 1977).  

The battered women’s movement in Cleveland began in 1973 when two women, whose friend had been brutally raped, found that while assistance was available for perpetrators, no services were available to help victims of crime understand or negotiate the criminal justice system. Learning of the availability of newly created Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) seed grant money, they decided to write a proposal to establish a Victim Assistance Unit within the Cleveland Prosecutor’s office. The unit was funded and established in 1974. Having achieved that goal, these founders quickly became aware of the prevalence of violence against women in intimate settings, and of a general tolerance and acceptance of such violence by officials whose job it was to prosecute perpetrators and protect victims. An early worker in the Victim Assistance Unit explained to me that when the office was first established, the staff was generally unaware of the prevalence or severity of wife abuse. In fact, as many founders explained, the terms "wife abuse" and "battered woman" had not yet been established. Early feminists naively assumed that women who had been beaten by their husbands would be assisted by police, prosecutors, and judges. A member of the staff explained to me how their
consciousness began to be raised, as well as how the job of assisting battered women
fell to them. She said,

We had an office...downtown. And it was just amazing. We would sit
there and all these women would come in and say that their husbands
had beaten them, and the prosecutor that we were next door to, we
could hear say to them, "Well a man has a right to do this." I mean it
was really an amazing, amazing education for us....So we talked to him
and asked him if he please would send those people over to talk to us.
And all of a sudden every prosecutor around, who clearly didn’t want
to deal with women with these kinds of complaints, we started to get all
these referrals of domestic violence and it was totally out of keeping
with what we thought we would be doing.8

At the same time, a worker at the Free Clinic, herself a survivor of wife abuse, was
being confronted with battered women and the task of educating health care workers
on how to handle such cases. Simultaneously, the recently formed Rape Crisis Center
began to receive inquiries from women involved in abusive relationships.

Founders’ goals for the Ohio battered women’s movement were to obtain
resources and to document and redefine the problem of wife abuse. Aside from
getting police to arrest perpetrators and convincing prosecutors to take such cases, one
of the most pressing problems facing activists was providing women with safe space.
Their first goal was to secure funding to rent motel rooms for women until the
perpetrator could be evicted from the home. Realizing that achieving this goal would
require a new set of attitudes among police, prosecutors, and judges, the Victim
Assistance Unit began a series of educational programs while simultaneously talking
to people in the feminist community about what they could do about the problem.
The result was an _ad hoc_ organizing committee to address the problem of providing
safe space for women seeking to escape violent relationships. Drawing activists from
the feminist and new left communities, it included women from the Rape Crisis Center, the Free Clinic, the Victim Assistance Unit, and organizers of a nascent coalition of women’s groups, WomenSpace. The committee called itself Women Together, the name subsequently given to the shelter they founded.

Although they were faced with an increasing demand for help, these early feminists had little idea of the problem they were facing, nor the types of resources needed to adequately respond to it. As one founder explained,

It was kind of serendipitous, you know? We had a need, and in the meantime, [another activist] had visited a program in Toronto....We clearly had no resources and we began to talk to people in the community about what we could do with this. We had no concept of a shelter at all....And [she] had seen this thing in Toronto that was a shelter where battered women--and that concept was barely out there then--could go and be safe, and nobody knew where it was, and they had some counseling, and she thought it would be a really good idea. As I recall, she was the prime mover of it all, and somehow we all got together in the Victim Service Unit and started talking about shelter.  

Although involved in the early discussions about the need for shelter and safe space, women who were not directly confronted with helping other women escape violent relationships lacked a consciousness of the prevalence or severity of wife abuse.

Even among workers in the Victim Assistance Unit, Free Clinic, and the Rape Crisis Center, who were receiving more and more requests for help, there was little understanding of the complexity of wife abuse and the needs of battered women. Their response was based on an emergent understanding of the issue.

Similar to trends elsewhere in Ohio, the women’s movement in Cleveland experienced a resurgence in the early 1970s (Whittier 1991). By the mid-1970s, efforts were being made to coordinate the work of nascent feminist groups. At the
same time that Women Together began to organize, a second group, WomenSpace, was being formed, whose goal was to be an "umbrella" organization, that provided resources to and coordinated the activities of grassroots feminist organizations. In October 1975, as part of their organizing efforts, WomenSpace set up a booth at the Ohio International Women's Year (IWY) convention, held in Cleveland in anticipation of the International Women's Year Convention to be held in Houston in 1977. One of the goals of WomenSpace at the time was to establish a women's center. True to the collectivist ideals of the time, they used the IWY booth to seek input from women regarding their vision of a women's center, and ultimately received approximately 45,000 responses. Although suggestions varied widely, including a place to receive political and economic information, counseling, or to hold creative writing workshops, the area of input with the greatest response pertained to issues of safe space for women and their children. A founder involved with this research explained the process of setting up a booth and collecting input from women, as follows,

*We had our WomenSpace sign up and came and said, "Put your wish here on the bulletin board," and they would write on green slips and we stuck it, and then we analyzed all those wishes....A place where women could go and be safe, that's what I remember....Crisis housing, immediate free housing, these are, this is a compilation of the green slips. Immediate free housing for women and children in crisis, a place of refuge for women that have no other place to go, accommodations for women who have left home, 24 hour refuge, shelter for women and children in need of immediate help, temporary living quarters for crisis, sanctuary for battered wives, coop housing for women.*

One of the difficulties faced by early shelter organizers was getting potential funders to believe there was a need for such a service (Mies 1983). Because the problem of wife abuse was, until feminists "created" it in the public consciousness, a
hidden and highly privatized problem, activists in the battered women's movement faced a dilemma. They needed to document the existence, prevalence, and dynamics of a problem they did not fully comprehend, while simultaneously trying to convince others to sponsor their efforts. Recognizing the need to convince non-believers that the problem existed, Women Together organizers requested that women's organizations keep track of all requests for help they received from battered women. Although unscientific in nature, this proved to be an important aspect of documenting the problem and securing funds. Secondly, they needed to raise public awareness of the problem of wife abuse, while simultaneously continuing to understand the complex issue themselves. In May 1975 WomenSpace, who at the time was playing a major role in helping Women Together get organized and funded, sponsored a Battered Woman Forum, or "speak out," held at the YWCA. The speak out provided a forum in which women who had been beaten by intimate partners could tell their stories. It encouraged survivors to not feel ashamed of their experiences, helped those who had not been directly confronted with such violence to understand the problem, and served as a vehicle of public education. One of the founders explained the process, as follows,

We tried to do things that would draw media attention, because that's the way that we could reach the public....It was easy to get media attention at that time because [the issue] was new....WomenSpace...organized a speak out on battered women, a public speak out. And that was really good, because then the whole concept was that women who had been battered got up and said, "This happened to me. I'm not ashamed of it. I want other women to know so that they will come forward and know that we're trying to establish ways to help each other"....It was in the early days of WomenSpace....It helped establish them as an organization...because they became publicly known because
of the publicity and that helped support the battered women’s
movement.¹¹

By 1976, at the same time they were opening their own offices, WomenSpace
was playing a major role in addressing the needs of battered women and their
children. In conjunction with Women Together, whom they were helping to get
organized, WomenSpace established a hotline, recruited Cleveland Women’s
Counseling to arrange shelter for battered women and their children in private homes,
rented a room at the YWCA where women could be housed temporarily in emergency
situations, actively worked to raise public awareness about wife abuse, and assisted
Women Together with writing grants for funding from both the Cleveland and
Bingham Foundations. WomenSpace members’ efforts in part, conflicted with the
organization’s goal not to become a direct service organization. However, their
efforts did further the goal of helping nascent women’s groups get organized and
thrive. Their work played a principle role in helping Women Together get off the
ground, and once funded, WomenSpace relinquished control of the shelter.

A stable source of funding was, and continues to be, an essential element in
the creation and operation of a shelter. By mid-1976 a grant proposal had been
written and submitted, but it had not yet been formally reviewed. Nonetheless, when
WomenSpace member Dagmar Celeste offered to rent her vacant house to Women
Together, the organizing committee mounted a campaign to seek donations from
women’s community members to fund the shelter temporarily until foundation money
was allocated. On December 1, 1976, the shelter opened its doors. The fact that it
opened without a secure funding source attests to the grass roots nature of the feminist
community and the battered women's movement, and, to some extent, the general faith and naiveté of the organizers. Before Dagmar's offer, founders worried that they would be funded, but be unable to find a landlord willing to rent to them or a neighborhood open to the idea of a home for battered women. When Dagmar offered her house, founders knew they needed to do whatever was necessary to raise the funds to rent it, since something else might not become available. One of the founders compared the difficulties the group anticipated to those faced by founders of group homes for mentally retarded or mentally ill people. She said,

I was so afraid, I thought, we're going to get this money and then we're never going to be able to find a house, because nobody wants this thing in their neighborhood....I knew people who were working in mental health at the time that were trying to find locations for group homes and they had been looking for a year and every time they tried to buy a house they were blocked. So I was afraid that was going to happen to us. And then Dagmar and Dick Celeste said, well, they had a house....The problem was that we had informally been told that we were going to get the grant, but it would be four months before the money actually would be there. And they said, "We need you to start doing this now, because we can't keep it empty"....I went to a friend of mine and...she said, "Well I would be willing to make a commitment of $50 a month for four months to help you keep that house, and I'm sure other people would, too. Why don't you ask?"

So I started asking and I called...everybody I could think of. By the end of the day I had enough money committed to cover the mortgage, to cover utilities, and even to pay somebody part time to staff the place.12

In addition to asking everyone this founder could think of, Women Together also advertized in the WomenSpace Newsletter, asking for donations and volunteers.13

As stated in an undated WomenSpace Newsletter, published sometime in early 1976, Women Together envisioned that the shelter would be staffed by
non-professional women with access to professional services through referrals. Their self-help orientation is reflected in the following quote from the same newsletter.

The emphasis will be on providing a breathing space for each woman to reassess her situation and herself, on helping her to develop and utilize her own strengths for her life, and on encouraging women to support each other both during and after their stay at Women Together.\textsuperscript{15}

When the shelter opened it had a full-time paid staff of three, including a coordinator, advocate, and resident manager. The shelter was also heavily dependent on volunteers recruited from the feminist community.\textsuperscript{16} As the shelter grew, feminists maintained a commitment to hiring formerly battered women. This decision was based on a belief in self-help and empowerment and the assumption that only someone who had survived the experience could fully understand what a battered woman was going through. This practice provided formerly battered women with jobs and residents with valuable role models.

During the 1970s, Women Together functioned, to the extent that it was possible, as a grass roots, change oriented social movement organization, guided by feminist principles of egalitarianism and empowerment. In addition to providing shelter, they worked to educate police, prosecutors, and other members of the criminal justice system about the seriousness of domestic violence, advocating that it be responded to as a crime, rather than a private dispute or a civil matter. In 1978 they lobbied for the criminalization of domestic violence, and on March 27, 1979 saw their work succeed with the passage of House Bill 835 which made domestic violence a crime and outlined civil and criminal procedures for such cases. In an effort to
ensure ongoing funding to replace foundation support, activists successfully advocated the passage of Senate Bill 46, which placed an additional $10 tax on marriage licenses, the proceeds of which would be used to fund shelters.

Activism Enters the Judicial System

From the beginning, the battered women's movement in general, and Women Together in particular, placed a great deal of emphasis on public education and social change. Although Women Together's challenges to institutionalized sexism were common, possibly their most public challenge, and certainly the one with the most visible impact, occurred in 1978 when Kathey Thomas shot and killed her common-law husband.

The case of State v. Thomas (66 Ohio St. 2d) involved a young, African American woman who had lived in Cleveland with her abusive partner, Reuben Daniels, for approximately three years. On January 12, 1978, during the course of an argument, Thomas picked up Daniels's gun and shot him twice, once in the forehead, and once in the left arm. Thomas's attorney shared a house with activists in the battered women's community, several of whom had been involved in the founding of Women Together, and members of other social movements. Because Thomas was African American, poor, and on welfare, her case appealed to the sympathies of feminist and non-feminist activists, alike. Thomas's case had the potential to symbolize systems of power and domination based on gender, as well as race and class. Feminists were sensitive to the judicial system's biases toward minorities and the poor, as well as the ways in which the stereotypes of a "black
welfare mother" could be used against Thomas. Although feminists' consciousness of the ways in which other systems of domination might play themselves out in the lives of minority or poor women, they had not yet developed a broader analysis. That would come later. In the Thomas case their effort was to show why, as a woman, Kathey would stay with and ultimately murder a man who had systematically abused and beaten her. Because the feminist analysis at the time focused exclusively on gender domination, the case was identified with the struggles and issues of the battered women's movement. Kathey Thomas became a rallying point. Feminists' efforts focused on educating the public about the issues involved in wife abuse, including the failure of the police and judicial system to respond to victims' pleas for help, as well as gender biases in self-defense law. One founder explained their response to the case, as follows,

We were all into the same kind of political attitudes. It was an exciting time....I mean we were on the news all the time, and it was fun. It was very exciting. We thought we could change the world....So [the attorney] had this case with Kathey Thomas and we realized that it...had the opportunity to be a landmark case for battered women, and it was important to get as much community support. Without community education, she didn't have a chance....So we formed this committee with the purpose of doing a lot of community education because we thought if the community understood better the issues, there would be a better chance that she would have at least a fighting chance in court....and we called ourselves the Goldflower Committee.17

Loosely affiliating itself with Women Together, the Committee was made up of women associated with the shelter and its board and members of the larger women's community. The Goldflower Committee focused specifically on the Thomas case, using strategies designed to educate the public about wife abuse and women who kill
abusive partners. Their efforts followed a national trend, beginning in the early 1970s, of women defendants asserting their right to defend themselves against assaul
tive spouses and arguing in the courts that their actions were justified (Gillespie 1989).

The larger issue being raised by such defendants was the gender bias inherent in the "reasonable man" standard of self-defense law. By challenging this standard, defendants and the feminist groups who frequently supported them advocated an introduction of mitigating circumstances surrounding the homicide, including a full understanding of the state of mind of the defendant at the time the killing took place (Gillespie 1989). In addition to introducing evidence of a long history of violence and abuse by the deceased, Thomas's lawyer attempted to introduce expert testimony regarding battered woman syndrome. The purpose of expert testimony was to help the jury understand that, given her state of mind at the time, Thomas reasonably believed she was in imminent danger of death or serious bodily harm, and therefore reacted in a reasonable manner by shooting and killing Daniels. Although a licensed psychologist on the WomenSpace board and a psychologist on the Women Together board were willing to testify, and despite the presence of an alternative expert witness, the trial court disallowed the testimony. On June 24, 1981, Kathery Thomas was convicted of murder.

The organization and tactics of the Goldflower Committee are exemplary of founders' commitment to social change at three levels: empowerment of the individual, changes in the dominant belief system regarding wife abuse, and structural
change, in this case, in the legal system. By befriending Kathey Thomas, they
demonstrated the support of the women’s community and helped her understand the
patriarchal context in which the years of abuse and subsequent homicide took place.
This definition of empowerment was common among early feminists (Mies 1983).
One of the activists on the Committee explained their efforts to help Kathey while
working for social change, as follows,

We monitored the whole trial. We attended as much of it as we were
able to attend. And we supported Kathey Thomas through this whole
thing. Like I said, we kind of befriended her and we raised money to
help her because she didn’t have any money and helped make sure that
she had a place to live and that she was okay. She was a very nice
person, very warm, and you know, she would speak to groups, too,
herself. Once again, you’re educating the community and getting
community sympathy....I mean all this education that was going on was
exceedingly beneficial to [Women Together] as an organization,
because it was dealing with their very issue that they were working so
hard on. I mean, when you’re taking care of services for battered
women, you don’t have a lot of time to do all of those kinds of things
that this ad hoc committee was doing, even though you want to.19

While the Goldflower Committee worked on the Thomas case, Women Together and
the Rape Crisis Center sponsored a “speak out” for women who had defended
themselves against violence. The event was moderated by Yvonne Wanrow, a Native
American woman from Washington state who had been “convicted of murder for
shooting a known child molester who broke into her house in the early hours of the
morning, drunk, and attempted to attack one of her children. Yvonne was on
crutches in a cast with a broken leg at the time.”20

Wanrow’s case had become a feminist cause, and was conceptually related to
Thomas because it argued that the standard of reasonableness had an inherent
androcentric bias. After Wanrow was found guilty of second-degree murder, attorneys for the Center for Constitutional Rights in New York assisted her lawyer by submitting a brief to the Washington State Supreme Court. The brief asserted that women have been discriminated against in their access to sports and self-defense training and have been socialized to equate femininity with helplessness and being protected. Therefore, they argued, the only fair standard by which to judge the reasonableness of a woman’s actions when defending herself is one that incorporates the woman’s perception of the danger she faced (Gillespie 1989). The Washington Supreme Court found in Wanrow’s favor in 1977, asserting that the defendant’s actions were to be judged against her own subjective impressions and not those which a detached jury might determine to be objectively reasonable (State v. Wanrow, 559 P.2d 548 Wash). By sponsoring the speak-out and recruiting Wanrow to moderate it, the feminist community worked to raise public awareness of the inherent inequity in the reasonable man standard and the need for an understanding of the state of mind of the defendant at the time she committed the crime.

Kathey Thomas was ultimately found guilty and her conviction was upheld by the Ohio State Supreme Court. Nonetheless, her case and countless others like it in other states raised the issue of the gender bias inherent in self defense law and demanded legal recognition of the traditional cultural acceptance of wife abuse and the social support given to men who beat their female partners. In Ohio the Thomas case, like others nationally, instigated legal discourse about whether the state of mind of the defendant should be considered at trial. The question most commonly raised
by jurors, prosecutors, judges, and others involved in addressing the issues of battered women is, "Why didn't she just leave, rather than killing or trying to murder the abuser?" (Gillespie 1989).

Addressing that question requires an understanding of gender biases in all major social institutions and dominant ideologies, an examination of assumptions regarding the sanctity and privacy of the home, and differences in the socialization of male and female children. It is at this level that the philosophical connections between the battered women's movement and the larger women's movement become most apparent. First, research has shown that girls are socialized to be more passive and dependent than are boys and to look to others for protection (Davis 1984; Hansen and Hansen 1988; Mayes and Valentine 1979; Weitzman, et al 1972; Zern 1984). In sports and recreation, girls have historically been exposed to fewer opportunities to develop physically or to learn self-defense skills (Bird and Williams 1980; Jones 1980; Theberge 1989; Wilmore 1974). Whether from fairy tales, the movies, or role models, young girls are socialized to believe they will one day marry and have children and be dependent upon a husband for protection and support. Further, research has shown a pattern of "cooling out" girls from subjects, such as science and mathematics, that are required for entry into demanding and high paying positions (Ernest 1976; Hall and Sandler 1982; Kelly 1984; Lummis and Stevenson 1990). Where women enter into competition with men for well-paying jobs, discrimination plays a crucial role in limiting their access and upward mobility (Dubnos 1985; Frank 1988). One result has been that throughout the latter half of this century, despite
women’s increasing participation in the labor force, they have been ghettoized into a few low-paying positions, and even when they do enter traditional male occupations, they tend to take home a fraction of what men earn (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 1990).

Making it on one’s own goes against women’s socialization and cultural expectations and is made difficult by their low wages and concentration in jobs with little opportunity for upward mobility. But many would argue that money is certainly no reason to stay with an abusive mate. We need to look still farther. Religions of the Judeo-Christian heritage have depicted women as "help mates" to men, to be protected as long as they behave properly, but vilified if they step outside established decorum (Reineke 1989; Richardson 1988). Many battered women report going to their religious advisors and being told to pray for guidance, become better women, and go home and help their husband find the Lord (Walker 1979). Dominant ideology about women’s inferiority to men is pervasive in American society. It impacts upon women’s aspirations for themselves as well as on the possibilities society offers them. Gender biases, combined with the belief that the family is private and that government should not interfere, have been shown to affect the willingness of police to respond or arrest in cases of domestic violence, as well as prosecutors’ and judges’ ideas about how cases of wife abuse should be handled (Browne 1987; Dobash and Dobash 1979; Gelles and Straus 1988; Gillespie 1989; Martin 1981; Walker 1979, 1987). Feminists contend that women’s pleas for help have not been taken seriously.
Although they help to explain why battered women stay with abusive partners, all of these factors assume that the woman is free to go at any time she chooses and that leaving will put an end to the abuse. Research has shown that men use violence as a form of control over their partners and that when they are challenged by separation, they become enraged (Browne 1987; Gagné 1992). Fifty percent of women who leave abusive partners are found and further terrorized and over half of all female homicide victims have been murdered by abusive former mates (Browne 1987; Moore 1979). Further, abusive men frequently threaten their partners or family members with worse violence or death if they make an effort to leave, and women have every reason to believe the threat is not idle (Browne 1987; Walker 1979). Leaving does not end the violence; in fact, it may make it worse.

All of these factors suggest that women experience violence differently than do men. Therefore, an understanding of the dynamics of abusive relationships and the state of mind of the woman who has been systematically beaten is essential. The debate over the legal admissability of battered woman syndrome appears to reduce the issue to a psychological matter. However, the campaign for its scientific legitimation and legal acceptance incorporates the feminist collective action frame to explain why women do not "just leave" and convince jurors that women’s actions meet the criteria of self-defense.

Between 1981 when the Supreme Court decision was handed down in State v. Thomas and 1990 when that decision was reversed in the case of State v. Koss (49 Ohio St. 3d 213), the struggle over legal recognition of battered woman syndrome
took place on two fronts. The first entailed changing public awareness and opinions about wife abuse and battered women who kill. The second worked toward scientific legitimation and legal recognition of the syndrome, initially through case law, and later through legislation.

_A Transition in the Movement: Feminism and Therapy_

By the early 1980s, most founders had left Women Together to pursue their careers. In their new positions, they continued to advance the goals of the battered women’s movement and other feminist issues. Before and after they left, they were joined by a new cohort community of activists. Joiners came to the movement in search of jobs. Most were hired initially as shelter advocates, a title applied to one who is required to do and know everything. Joiners eventually moved into positions of authority as shelter directors and managers. Like founders, they came to the movement with strong feminist beliefs. Unlike their predecessors, however, most of whom never worked in the shelters, joiners’ analysis of the problem was quickly modified by direct contact with residents. They were overwhelmed by the constant demands of feeding, housing, clothing, and otherwise providing for women and their children and they quickly became cognizant of the fact that safe space was only the first step in providing for the needs of battered women and their children.

As greater understanding of the dynamics of abusive relationships and battered women’s response to violence began to emerge in the movement and the social science literature, joiners moved to professionalize shelter services. They were faced with the seemingly untenable task of improving services for battered women and their
children while avoiding cooptation. Some were successful, others were not. What was apparent in Women Together and many other feminist shelters during the 1970s and early 1980s was the effort it took to balance the professionalization of services with the feminist goals of social change and empowerment. At times Women Together came precariously close to advocating an individual change orientation, but always managed to turn back even when doing so seemed impossible. One joiner explained the tension between these polarities and how it shaped the changes that occurred at Women Together as follows,

We started out like every other shelter, with just the basic services. You know, providing a place for women to stay, and that was about all that we were doing....We didn’t have the staff to do much beyond that....I don’t think that we ever thought that was enough....I also think that the needs of the women that we dealt with were really extensive. So if I had a woman who came into shelter who was chemically dependent and who wasn’t dealing with her chemical dependency, chances were pretty good she wasn’t going to be able to accomplish any of the other things she wanted to be able to accomplish...because her focus was going to be on her use. So to some degree I think we did have to kind of change our priorities.23

The provision of counseling and other professional services was perceived, among joiners, as a means of helping women work through problems that might prevent them from leaving abusive relationships. Some of the issues counselors worked on with the women were correcting the belief that battering was deserved, learning to perceive the batterer in a realistic light, learning to direct and express anger appropriately, and overcoming insecurity about being able to confront the abuser or to make it as an uncoupled person.
In addition to physical abuse, most batterers systematically demean, threaten, and terrorize their partners, interjecting such treatment with episodes of kindness (Graham, et al. 1988; Walker 1979, 1987). Battered women are frequently isolated from family and friends and blamed for their own abuse (Dobash and Dobash 1979; Gagné 1992; Rosewater 1988; Walker 1979, 1987). In a society and situation that do not permit the direct expression of the anger that results from abuse, women tend to direct their rage inward, developing feelings of alienation and creating the appearance of learned helplessness (Graham, et al. 1988; Rosewater 1988; Walker 1979, 1987).

Rosewater's research on the MMPI profiles of battered women found that they indicate a "reactive behavior set to being a victim of violence, which includes anger, confusion, fearfulness, weakness, and a sense of pessimism" (1988:211; emphasis added).

Joiners believed that battering caused behavior problems, not that they were the result of a personality disorder. Therefore, the goal was not to help the woman overcome a mental disorder, but to assist her with achieving a violence-free existence. Nonetheless, because the problems of battered women often render them combative or highly unmotivated, some shelters began to make demands of residents and to implement rules for behavior (Ferraro 1983a). The same person quoted above continued her explanation, as follows,

It became a requirement in the shelter that you couldn’t just come and stay. You needed to come and stay and do things. You needed to be busy during the day. You needed to be out in the community. You needed to be getting your life together, so to speak. So you needed to be going to welfare, and you needed to be looking for housing, and you know, all those other things. I think [these requirements are] a
perception of what empowerment means. And I think that that’s where we were coming from. We wanted the women in the shelter to start feeling like they had some power over their lives, and so what we would do is we would encourage them to start taking some action to change the situation that they were in. I think in some instances we probably jumped the gun...I think this is something that I came to [realize] after I left the shelter. I think the shelters, depending on how they function, are very controlling places.24

One of the difficulties confronting feminists during the 1980s was redefining wife abuse as a social problem. They were successful in convincing lawmakers and enforcers that wife abuse was wrong and mobilizing the resources necessary to establish an institutionalized response to the problem. However, feminists have been less successful in redefining the etiology of wife abuse. Before the movement, research had explained battering as resulting from psychological disorders or masochism (Pleck 1987). Feminists contend that wife abuse is rooted in patriarchy. As a result of their challenges, masochism has been largely discarded as an accepted explanation, but because the behaviors exhibited by battered women so closely resemble those of schizophrenics or individuals with borderline personality disorder, there has been a tendency to lose sight of the direction of causality (Rosewater 1988). Where cooptation has occurred, it has not tended to result from sponsors’ demands for hierarchy and professionalization. Rather, transformation away from feminism is a form of ideological cooptation, where activists lose sight of etiology and fall back into dominant paradigms, or where non-feminist professionals step in and take over. The tendency to "slip" away from feminism is, in part, a result of professional training, particularly in individual-oriented fields, such as psychology and social work and is most prevalent where feminist networks are weak or workers are isolated from
a feminist community. Even in shelters where the majority of workers maintained a feminist orientation, a weak or non-feminist director had the ability to impose an orientation that would be interpreted by feminists as "victim blaming." During the 1980s, some shelters offered professional services while maintaining a social change orientation. Others lost sight of feminist principles and became focused on individual change in its own right.

For a time, Women Together recognized that it had become a "controlling place," and became more flexible in its requirements. Activists encouraged and facilitated, but did not require, self-help. However, as leadership shifted to women whose identity was oriented more toward professionalism than feminism, the day-to-day operation of the shelter became separated from administration. With a decline in administrators' contact with residents, the emphasis on individual change reemerged, shifting the focus away from social change. When this transition occurred, the distinction between good battered women and bad battered women became obvious: A good battered woman was one who was willing "to do things," "to be out in the community." A bad battered woman was one who could not or would not work to improve herself or her situation. The shift is subtle, but when a recognition of the way that battering is related to the social inequality of women gives way to an expectation of individual change, the shelter has been coopted. By the mid-1980s, most joiners recognized that the tide had turned. Although they struggled to retain a feminist orientation, some of those who resisted the change felt that they were manipulated or coerced out of the shelter.
The professionalization of services that emerged in the shelter system during the late 1970s and early 1980s has been identified by some as the cooptation of the movement (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981). Joiners, however, approached the provision of therapeutic services as one means to achieve the goal of eliminating violence against women. If battered women needed counselors to help them understand the dynamics of abusive relationships and achieve their goals, joiners saw the provision of such services as a "right to treatment." Their willingness to do whatever was necessary to provide high quality services to battered women and their children was not perceived by founders as a violation or cooptation of the original goals of the movement. Rather, it was a natural response to an emergent understanding of a complex problem. As one founder explained,

I mean, in those days we really didn’t, especially in the beginning, we had no idea how to provide services in a feminist way. Talk about an issue where women were decimated! I mean, these were wrecks....Emotionally, I mean they were, you know, depressed, they couldn’t get out of bed, they wouldn’t change the diapers on their own kids, they would get into battles with you....Then at that point, the Women Together organization learned, you know. And they discovered, they and others around the country trying to provide similar services, sheltering women from abusive relationships, began to discover a lot of things, including the battering syndrome....And in the process we began to learn some of the lessons we needed to learn in terms of how to provide any kind of services to these people.  

Movement Maturation

Shelter cooptation was a particularly painful experience for joiners, even those who had moved to professionalize services and implement rigorous rules. However, rather than relinquish the movement to therapists, joiners, like the founders before
them, sought out other opportunities to continue their work, primarily in other shelters or in emergent social movement organizations.

The 1980s was a period of experimentation and growth. Joiners worked to define what they meant by empowerment and to balance professional services with a feminist model of organization. Although some shelters maintained a philosophical commitment to social change, most worked exclusively for change at the local level. The difficulty in working toward social change while doing what essentially amounted to running an agency was that resources were quickly exhausted trying to keep pace with the demands of daily operation. Time was what shelter workers most lacked, and as a result, social change was advocated on a purely pragmatic basis. Although they desired an opportunity to network with other shelters, particularly those oriented toward social change, most shelter workers ended up feeling isolated and overwhelmed with work.

During the 1980s a statewide network of social movement organizations became one potential avenue through which shelters might advocate for change. However, by the late 1980s, many shelter directors concluded that the network had become so diverse as to make it difficult to focus on social change on behalf of battered women. As the director of a former member shelter explained,

[The coalition] had been so diluted that there were lots of people in decision making positions that weren’t dealing on a day-to-day basis with victims. And there were many of us who believed that we really needed to come together and make sure that domestic violence service providers, being primarily shelters, really had a real voice, a voice that was speaking for [shelters]. 26
In 1988, many shelters left the network, feeling their needs were not being addressed, and formed a coalition of providers of direct services for victims of domestic violence, the Ohio Domestic Violence Network. The motivations for forming the Network were the belief that there is strength in numbers and the support of like-minded activists, and that the state-wide change that was needed could probably only be achieved through the coordinated effort of many. As the same director explained,

I think the first interest [in forming the Network] is a recognition...that a united voice on behalf of victims of domestic violence is certainly much stronger....That's one issue. And these are not in priority....Second is the recognition that it is important to network across the state. I mean, truly what happens in Dayton, Ohio, as an example, can affect [my town], and vice versa. That's very important....And the opportunity to really share and be...able to network with people and know that you have someone who philosophically may do things differently, but philosophically is there....And I think then the third issue would be certainly recognition...that there were some real wrongs, there are still some wrongs out there in our state, and that we were committed, and our organizations were committed, not just to work with victims locally, but also to try and improve the plight of victims across Ohio, and you can only do that in a united kind of way.27

After deciding upon what their organization and mission statement would be, the Network launched headlong into advocating for change on behalf of battered women. Their first task was to organize support on behalf of House Bill 484, the law in Ohio that ultimately granted legislative recognition to battered woman syndrome and the right of defendants to introduce expert testimony at their trials. Although the second cohort community never directly joined forces with the founders, it was at this point in laying the groundwork for the clemency decision that their efforts overlapped the most. The work of these two groups was aided by the work of feminists, often
working in isolation in state agencies, and by emergent groups of inmate activists and those who worked to support them. It is this conjoining of efforts that laid the groundwork for the Celeste clemency decisions.

Entry Into the Courts

While joiners continued to provide services for battered women, raise public awareness, and work to improve and coordinate the response of the police and judicial system, founders began to infiltrate all three branches of state government where they mounted a feminist campaign that included the elimination of gender inequality and family violence. The campaign included formalized, hierarchical groups; informal, egalitarian groups; and individual efforts connected through an informal community of activists. All drew heavily upon the founders cohort community for leaders and membership. The founders worked both within and outside institutions and agencies of legal rational authority, bringing pressure to bear on formal decision makers and working to alter public opinion whenever possible.

One arena in which the struggle to address the issue of gender biases in the law and society was carried out was the courts. This entry began precariously with Kathey Thomas's case. Two of the shelter founders held degrees in psychology. One had a Ph.D., and the other a master's degree. Both volunteered to serve as expert witnesses on Thomas’s behalf. The judge would not allow them to testify, saying that what they might have to offer lacked scientific merit, was not beyond what the average person could understand, and that its probative value was outweighed by its prejudicial value.28 One of the founders explained what happened, as follows,
Kathey Thomas [had been] a resident of Women Together. She then killed her common law husband...I then got asked if I would testify....And actually [it] was a very poorly prepared case because it was right in the beginning and we know a lot more now than we knew then. And the biggest mistake that was made...is that the lawyer never did what's called the voir dire [sic]...it’s a legal term, and if your witness is not allowed to testify, what you do is you read into the record what they would’ve said. And then you can say for appeal purposes the jury did not get a chance to hear this [testimony]. ...[After Thomas was convicted], the Ohio Supreme Court ruled that it was irrelevant to your murder trial whether or not you were a battered woman. It was not beyond the ken of the average juror to understand.  

Some of the difficulties faced by feminists were a product of inexperience.

 Nonetheless, their problems were exacerbated by misogynist assumptions about a man’s right to beat his wife, women’s inability to tell the truth, and deep seated fear of women’s anger. The same founder continued,

And one of the things that came up, that was throughout the country, 'You’re giving women a license to kill. Any woman will now say she was battered.' It also says something about the bias that exists around feminists, that somehow you’d come to court and lie through your teeth. You’d say anything....It presumes no ethics whatsoever. And in the questioning at the Supreme Court level, one Justice remarked, "Well doesn't a man have a right to hit his wife if she's out of line?"  

The founders involved with the case were not daunted in their efforts to help Thomas or other women in similar circumstances. As they went on in their careers, the majority of them continued to focus on wife abuse as an important social problem. One of them left the shelter determined to win the right to introduce expert testimony regarding battered woman syndrome. She explained her decision to leave Women Together, as follows,
I didn’t have my doctorate at the time and I wanted to get my doctorate. And a prime motivator being because I wanted to be able to testify in court, and I could get in without my doctorate, but you know, unfortunately if you have ‘doctor’ in front of your name, people think you’re smarter than if you don’t. And I wanted to do that. That was a priority for me.\textsuperscript{32}

This founder earned her doctorate and went on to become one of the most active expert witnesses on behalf of battered women in the state. Her doctoral dissertation established the psychological profile of battered women, as identified by use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), thus contributing to its scientific legitimacy. Nationally her work fit with the emergent work on battered women and the battered woman syndrome. Using the information established in her research, she went on to challenge the idea that battered women have borderline personality disorders and to train therapists to help battered women and to act as expert witnesses. Ultimately, she was asked by the Ohio Supreme Court to conduct a training seminar on battered woman syndrome for judges throughout Ohio.

Throughout the 1980s, increasing public understanding of family violence and gaining legal recognition of battered woman syndrome became strategies employed by feminists, both in Ohio and nationally. Although the struggle to gain legal recognition of battered woman syndrome and the gender bias in self-defense law was waged on a case by case basis, there were national efforts to provide information and resources and to coordinate individual efforts. The National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women, founded as a small grass roots organization in 1987, collected information on cases and legal strategies nationally and redistributed them to defense lawyers, expert witnesses, and others interested in the issue.\textsuperscript{33} As the
Celeste Administration researched the legal issues involved in a large scale clemency, they consulted with the Clearinghouse, which provided them with information on what other states had done regarding legal recognition for battered woman syndrome and clemencies for individual women. In addition to their focus on case law, they also collected and disseminated information on legislative efforts on behalf of battered women. Since the Celeste decision, they have distributed information on the efforts of activists to promote "mass" clemency decisions, the strategies used, and the status of each effort. Additionally, an informal community of attorneys and expert witnesses, interested in the issue of the defense of battered women who kill, began to emerge. Through this network of legal advocates, information was shared informally at professional meetings and conferences and through strong friendships that ultimately emerged among activists. Individuals involved in gaining legal recognition of battered woman syndrome in case law did not limit their efforts to the courtroom. Many, like the individual described above, also engaged in extensive public speaking, including appearances on radio and television talk shows, to raise public awareness about wife abuse and battered women who kill. Ultimately, this collective effort paid off in Ohio when the state Supreme Court reversed the Thomas decision on March 8, 1990.

In addition to influencing the courts as expert witnesses, a community of judges emerged out of the founders cohort community and legal professionals they recruited. Their efforts were underscored and at times propelled by joiners in the shelter community and the founders in the victim rights movement. Ultimately, these
groups played a central role in recognizing and providing for the needs of battered women at both local and state levels. With the assistance of joiners, judges and prosecutors worked to coordinate the local response to domestic violence by encouraging an even application of the law in all cases. This effort entailed extensive education of judges and prosecutors to help them understand the dynamics of abusive relationships and the need for a consistent response to the problem. At the state level, Governor Celeste, at the request of the First Lady, Dagmar Celeste, commissioned a Task Force on Family Violence, headed by a judge known to be sensitive to the problem because of her early involvement in the movement as a provider of safe space. The Task Force, like local judges and prosecutors, worked to coordinate the efforts of the myriad of social service and mental health agencies, medical care providers, shelter providers, police, judges, prosecutors, and social movement organizations in order to provide a clearer understanding of the issue of family violence and a more unified response to the problem.

*Entry Into the Political Process*

In addition to infiltrating the courts, founders launched political careers, ultimately leading some of them into the legislature where they continued to work on behalf of battered women. One founder explained her metamorphosis from activist to legislator as follows,

I left [WomenSpace] at the end of November in 1979. I went to try to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. I went to be on the staff of ERA America, which was the national organization, coalition organization working with trying to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. So I was working out of Washington. I was in every state when it was
defeated… That’s when I decided to run for the legislature. I said, "I
 can do this better than these turkeys. This is not a problem."37

In the legislature, founders did not forget their early experiences with battered
women. One founder told of her efforts to secure a clemency for Kathey Thomas.

From very early in Celeste’s administration I was trying to get him to
let Kathey out, because I stayed in contact with her while she was in
jail. Not very reliably, but I did stay in touch with her….And she
made the best of… an experience, you know, being in jail is not your
basic good experience. She went to, got her high school equivalency,
did some college work, learned a trade building houses….And I was
trying to get Dick to pardon her or commute her sentence or do
something….And they ultimately did get it done.38

In addition to continuing to support specific battered women, founders and other
feminists have played key roles in sponsoring and supporting legislation on behalf of
women.

In addition to their direct contributions as sponsors and co-sponsors of
legislation, founders have played a key role in raising their male colleagues’
consciousness regarding women’s and battered women’s concerns. Throughout the
1980s, women were underrepresented in the Ohio legislature. As a result, feminists
were often targeted by women outside their districts as representatives who would be
sensitive to their problems. This situation, if not addressed, might result in the few
feminists in the legislature trying to represent women throughout the state, in addition
to their own constituents. Rather than try to address everyone’s needs, feminists
adopted the tactic of educating their colleagues about women’s issues. The following
story was offered by way of example of the strategies used to encourage others to
become more aware of the issues faced by female constituents.
I had this one woman [who was not my constituent] who called me who was trying to figure out how she could get prenatal care because she was working but she wasn’t having any health coverage and she didn’t want to quit her job and she wanted to figure out could she sign up for Healthy Start. So I put her in touch with her representative, who came back to me and said, "This is crazy! These people are nuts!" ... And it was when we were trying to do a piece in the legislature to [simplify the application process]. So I got this great ally out of it. I mean the lady got what she needed, and I got some male person who was in the legislature who understood what I was talking about. 39

Educating and creating allies was a primary feminist strategy throughout the 1980s. Ultimately, it had the impact of drawing together founders working through the courts with those in the legislature. In 1988, Representative Joe Koziura heard one of the founders, a leading expert on battered woman syndrome, on the radio, talking about the fact that Ohio did not allow expert testimony regarding battered woman syndrome. After hearing her speak, he went to one of the founders in the legislature and learned that, indeed, what he had heard was true. When he said he was going to fix it, she offered her assistance, but let him take the lead. The tactic resulted in the creation of a feminist ally in the legislature, one whom joiners felt comfortable calling upon when they needed assistance. The founder explained his "conversion," as follows,

He came in one day and he had heard [the expert] on the radio. And she was doing a call in show, talking about this whole question....And he came in and he said, "I heard this on the radio coming down to Columbus, and I think this is horrible, and don’t you think this is terrible?" And I said, "Oh yea, I know a lot about it." And he said, "Well, god damn it! I’m going to change it." He said, "I think it’s good for a man to do it because they’ll think of it differently and," and he said, "I’m going to introduce the bill." I said, "Go for it." And you know, I gave him some names and helped him but he really did it. He got very interested in it...He actually did most of the work himself. I mean I helped him in whatever way he needed it, but he really took it
on and he had a woman in his office who worked real hard on it who was very committed to it.40

In May 198941 Representative Koziura introduced House Bill 484, which ultimately was signed into law in August 1990. Despite the fact that legal recognition of battered woman syndrome had been established in State v. Koss, Koziura and feminists in the legislature and throughout the state wanted to establish legislative recognition to prevent Koss from being overturned at a later date. Within the legislature, Koziura's greatest support came from founders. Throughout the state, it came from joiners and the community of judicial activists, including defense attorneys and expert witnesses. However, an opportunity structure in which such legislation might pass and ultimately have its greatest impact, was being laid by founders who had infiltrated the executive branch of government, led by none other than the First Lady, Dagmar Celeste.

When Governor Celeste was elected to office in 1982, Dagmar Celeste, as the new First Lady, called together feminist friends, including many who had been involved in WomenSpace and Women Together, to help her create a First Lady's agenda. The First Lady explained,

When Dick became Governor I brought together about twenty women in my life for a retreat and basically asked them to develop an agenda with me, for me, as First Lady...Well we went through this big process and they tore me apart and put me back together again and basically said, "Well here's what great First Ladies have done." ...And we basically came up with a four tiered agenda. And I worked for the eight years that I had, that I was there then, on these four areas. They were recovery...women...education, and peace. Now the interesting thing about this issue, domestic violence, it touches on all four.42
This agenda became the foundation for eight years of feminist activism that would infiltrate and influence not only the Governor’s administration, but numerous state agencies, as well.

Similar to the relationship espoused by President Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton, Governor Celeste and Dagmar Celeste treated their administration as a partnership. Dagmar had her own "First Lady’s Unit" with offices adjacent to the Governor’s. She worked to staff her unit with individuals sympathetic to her agenda and goals. Feminism was not a requirement for being hired, but as one former staff member explained,

I think that [a feminist consciousness] was something that happened naturally, because of who Dagmar is. Dagmar, being the feminist that she is, if someone was totally unaware of what was happening to women, whether it be women or men or whomever, just by talking to her, you gained a knowledge of what was happening in the world...and that kind of thing. I mean she touched people’s lives that way. I mean you couldn’t help but gain a greater understanding for what it was all about.\(^{43}\)

The First Lady was viewed by the Governor as a valuable source of leadership. He asked her to chair many commissions and councils during his eight years in office, including the Recovery Council, the Commission on Volunteerism, and the Holocaust Commission. Through their partnership, they worked toward the achievement of numerous feminist goals, including establishing pay equity between women and men who were employed in state government, establishing day care for state employees, creating greater access to employment opportunities for women, improving the prison system and addressing the issues of incarcerated women, creating greater awareness of women’s issues in mental health and addiction, attaining
public recognition and scientific legitimation of post-partum depression as a
psychiatric syndrome, and advancing the clemency process. The Governor described
the First Lady’s efforts, as follows,

Over and over again she did these things. She was not paid for any of
that work. In addition, she had things she was interested in and a large
number of requests coming from around the state to be involved in
issues that were important to her, and usually important to me. Her
issues weren’t issues I didn’t care about, I mean, that she had to
impose on me. It was helpful to me that she could take an interest in
some things, and I could count on her doing a lot of the getting
educated and understanding that what was happening around Ohio and
being able to share that with me in the same way that I would count on
a cabinet member or someone else to help me.44

By Executive Order the Governor created the Women’s Council, comprised of
representatives from each government department and agency. The Council’s purpose
was to address the issues of women in Ohio, create policy, and critique the
effectiveness of state programs in responding to women’s needs. It also created a
network of people from state agencies and departments, giving feminists a forum in
which to exchange ideas and coordinate efforts. In addition to these two manifest
purposes, the Women’s Council was also effective in breaking through the barriers of
state bureaucracy and creating unity among women in government. The importance
of the First Lady’s Unit, the unity created by the Women’s Council, and the
commitment to partnership should not be underestimated when seeking to understand
the clemency decisions. As the Governor explained,

We had within the Bureau of Employment Services, a Women’s
Division that was trying to identify priorities…and they were strong
advocates….And of course, Dagmar was the strongest advocate of all.
I mean no one was better than she was on this issue….We had a
Women’s Council within state government, who worked on an agenda
for women that criticized the budget and looked at where money was going in the budget....I mean, in my view I was an enormous beneficiary of women in the political process.45

With the assistance of feminists on the Governor’s staff and her own, as well as those in the various departments and agencies of state government, Dagmar went to work on her four agenda items. At times her work was done independently of the Governor. For example, early in the administration she began visiting the Ohio Reformatory for Women in Marysville. Although initially interested in the issues of women on death row, it soon became apparent to her that a great proportion of women in prison had, at some time in their lives, been victims of family violence and that many were in need of services to help them in their recovery from abuse. To address their needs, she advocated the implementation of more support groups and the programs available to women inmates were expanded. In 1990 there were four family violence groups available to the women incarcerated at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The four programs were the Victims of Domestic Violence Educational Group, the Survivors of Domestic Violence Support Group, the Living without Domestic Violence Support Group, and the Domestic Violence Agency Referral Program.46 The First Lady’s interest in incarcerated women also created an opportunity for self-help groups to emerge in the prison. These groups were central in raising the consciousness of battered women regarding the dynamics of wife abuse and issues of power and control. The empowerment women achieved by talking with other survivors was a crucial factor in helping to work toward their own clemencies.
Before women could start to help themselves, they had to stop blaming themselves for the violence they had endured.

Women serving life sentences were not eligible to participate in recovery groups or most other prison programs. To help address their needs, in 1984 a group of women, under the sponsorship of a staff member who was a survivor of wife abuse, formed a support group for all women serving life sentences. They called themselves the L.I.F.E. Group, an acronym for Looking Inward For Excellence. One of the women granted clemency, also a former L.I.F.E. Group member, explained the group’s mission as follows,

It was made up of all women that were doing life and it was sort of like a big support system within itself, because...when you’re doing life, you had nothing there. All the programs are made up for people with short time. You know, it’s always about getting you educated or whatever cause you’re moving on to society. And we were not going back....And so they needed something to kind of get through.47

The L.I.F.E. Group not only served as a support system for women who had no access to other services, as it evolved, it also became a center of activism regarding the issues of incarcerated women. The same leader continued,

The L.I.F.E. Group got into big issues of what happens in the institution, discussing what we could do about it, how we could write letters to make it better, or whatever.48

Because many of the women serving life sentences had killed their abusive partners, domestic violence and the clemency decisions became important issues for the group. Ultimately, the L.I.F.E. Group and the prison domestic violence groups became important factors in promoting the clemency decisions. But to understand that
connection, we must turn once more to an examination of the relationship between the Governor’s and First Lady’s staffs.

Throughout his two terms in office, the Governor actively endorsed and was grateful for his wife’s work. He made symbolic gestures, such as housing her office next to his own, and instrumental decisions, such as giving his Chief of Staff a mandate to cooperate with Dagmar Celeste and her staff, all designed to demonstrate his support. However, as is often the case when wives of elected officials demonstrate strength and have agendas of their own, resentment can emerge among the staff of the designated office holder. Although the Governor promoted the First Lady’s work and was in agreement with her goals and actions, tension sometimes arose between their staffs. The relationship that emerged between the two groups was one where Dagmar or members of her unit would initiate ideas, generally by bringing them to the attention of the Governor, or by raising questions about new or ongoing projects. Issues might be raised by the First Lady over dinner, but more frequently, they were discussed during one of the regularly scheduled meetings attended by Dagmar Celeste, the Governor, the Governor’s Chief of Staff, and appropriate members of their staffs. A former member of the First Lady’s Unit explained the process as follows,

She would have meetings with the Governor on a regular basis. It had been monthly, and sometimes, it wasn’t always monthly, but just review projects. And it was usually Dagmar, the Governor, and the Chief of Staff, and sometimes, depending on what was on the agenda, and each of them would bring things to the agenda to discuss. And then sometimes they would bring in staff members to do status reports on that or a written report or whatever, and they would discuss and you know, ask questions. She would ask questions, "Well what about this?
You know, what about that? Where's this going?" That kind of thing.49

If an issue or the problems raised by Dagmar Celeste required action by the Governor's staff, once the Governor's support was expressed, the project would be assigned to one of his staff members or aides. However, when ideas originated with the First Lady or her Unit, they were frequently perceived as less important. Such was the case with the clemency decisions.

Mobilizing for Clemency

Neither the Governor nor the First Lady can recall precisely when the idea of a large scale clemency was raised, but both agree that the idea was hers. She recalls reading an article about another governor in another state considering clemencies, sometime in 1984 or 1985. Once the idea was raised, the project was given to an aide in the Governor's administration to research. The aide conducted the research in a timely fashion, but found nothing. Between 1985 and 1989 the idea of clemency languished among the Governor's staff.

During this time period, Dagmar Celeste remained active in the prison, visiting women on death row and promoting greater opportunities for recovery. During the summer of 1989, with only a year and a half left in the administration, the First Lady's Unit began to apply pressure on the Governor's staff to proceed with the clemency decisions. She promoted the formation of a committee to determine how many women were incarcerated for crimes related to domestic violence. In December 1989, the project was assigned to a member of the Governor's staff and a committee was formed to research the issue. However, it was assigned to an individual with
little knowledge or interest in battered women's issues. As with other projects
initiated by the First Lady, it was deemed a lower priority than those coming from the
Governor himself. The Governor explained,

[The person assigned the project] who became very involved in this
eventually, initially was very cold to it, just because there were other
things that seemed to be more important...And once she understood
that [it wasn't just a passing fancy] she became very very good at
pushing the process along.50

Once the individual charged with the project understood that clemency
research was a priority for the Governor, she requested time to educate herself about
the legal, social, and psychological aspects of the issue and worked diligently to learn
all she could. As part of her educational process, she accompanied the First Lady to
the prison to meet with members of the L.I.F.E. Group and the other support groups
that had formed. Here the women told their stories and answered questions about
their trials, the sentences they were serving, and their inability to adequately defend
themselves because the jury could not fully understand their cases. The women's
consciousness of their experiences with battering and the importance of sharing their
insights with the Governor's aide was enhanced by the work of another group, which
had befriended the L.I.F.E. Group.

Two years after the formation of the L.I.F.E. Group, a small group of
individuals, sensitive to the issues of family violence, began to visit them on a
monthly basis. The group was comprised of a Marionist Brother, a Catholic Sister, a
woman who had been serving a life sentence until she was granted clemency by a
former governor, and a shelter volunteer active in, among other things, supporting
incarcerated women through correspondence. Calling themselves the Friendship LIFE Group, they varied between social visits and bringing with them speakers in whom the women had expressed an interest. When House Bill 484 was introduced in 1989, the Friendship LIFE Group arranged for Joe Koziura and two co-sponsors of the bill, one of whom was also a Women Together founder, to come and speak to the group. This interaction became an important source of education for the women and furthered the politicization of the identity of battered woman for many members of the L.I.F.E. Group. A former member and clemency recipient explained,

Well I guess that when House Bill 484 first was introduced...[a Friendship LIFE member] knew the people who wrote the bill. And I said..."it'd really be nice if we could have them visit and tell us about the bill, so we'll know exactly what it means and what it is saying and how it relates to us...." Because you know that you're, you know what the word domestic violence is. And so after it all goes down and it happens and it's over, you knew that you were a victim, but you're being punished for being a victim. This was how we explained it. 'Well you know, we were a victim of the abuse from our husbands or boyfriends, so we're still going to be a victim still, because the state is going to punish us for being a victim'....And then we unfolded and got into the Bill to find out what it was saying and how it pertained to us and our situation and so we started learning about the cycle of violence and applying what had happened to us through the different stages. You know, like tearing the cycle of violence apart and looking at it. 51

As they began to understand what had happened to them, members of the L.I.F.E. Group began talking to other women in the prison. Their understanding of the issues, together with the information being shared in the domestic violence groups, had an empowering effect on many of the women. When research for the clemency decisions was conducted, staff members drew upon the insight and understanding of women in these groups to help them with the process.
Within the prison, the institutional research for the clemency decisions, ordered by the Governor, began with the work of a staff member, a formerly battered woman, charged with looking through the files of all women incarcerated for violent crimes. On February 15, 1990 she sent a summary of her findings to a member of the committee assembled to research wife abuse and its relation to women's crime. The researcher found "97 cases where the Battered Woman issue was verified or claimed by the inmate but not verified."52 Two days after the summary was sent, applications were distributed to the women included in the summary. The cover memo to the women stated,

As you may be aware, there have been some changes in the law regarding battered women [sic] testimony.
An examination of your file gave some indication that your crime possibly involved domestic violence. Therefore, it is my desire to assist you in the writing of a request for clemency hearing. Make no mistake about this. This does not guarantee that you will receive a parole or release! All this does is indicate that you feel the facts surrounding your crime should be reexamined for the elements of battered woman syndrome.53

Subsequent to the applications being distributed, members of the L.I.F.E. Group began talking with women throughout the prison about their cases and urging anyone who believed they fit the profile and could document their case to come forward. Subsequently, eighteen cases were added to the initial group of ninety-seven.

The L.I.F.E. Group was central in helping other women understand wife abuse, overcome denial, remember incidents of battering, and recall where documentation of their experiences might be found. Once the clemencies were filed, the L.I.F.E. Group was also central in encouraging women to write follow-up letters
to the Governor or Representative Koziura regarding forgotten or omitted events, or
to express their dissatisfaction with the length of time they were able to spend before
the Parole Board. Although limited in the extent of their activism, these women were
not passive recipients of mercy. Rather, they were activists on behalf of themselves
and others, engaging in resistance and efforts for change whenever possible.
Recognizing that a clear understanding of the dynamics of wife abuse was important
to their recovery and understanding the clemency process, they actively worked to
educate themselves. One member of the group, a clemency recipient, explained what
they did, as follows,

We started reading, we were gathering information from everywhere
about domestic violence. We were sending out for articles and just
sitting and reading the stuff, and we would share it. When you’re in
the institution, you get to be kind of secret....They get stuff and they
hoard it because they think this is the magic key, and so they’ll work
the magic key and maybe they’ll let you use it later. But as we started
to get information, we would put packets of stuff together. Illegally
xerox stuff and kind of under the cover, "Read this, you know, this is
good reading."54

In addition to empowering themselves through education, the L.I.F.E. Group
monitored the length of Parole Board hearings and mobilized a letter writing
campaign to make sure the Governor had all the relevant facts in their cases and to
make sure he was aware of what they believed were unfair practices. The same
woman, quoted above, continued,

Some of the women came out of the Board feeling real upset, as if their
story was no good....And we were sort of taking inventory about how
many minutes did you stay in that [hearing] room when you went?
Some women said three minutes, four minutes. Well how could you
tell a life story in three or four minutes?...We started watching....And
we were timing them....And I wrote a letter to Joe Koziura and...I
wrote a letter to Celeste about people being in the Parole Board room five to eleven minutes and how can they tell their story....So my advice to [the other women] was "If you can think of anything that you did not mention, send it to Governor Celeste," because we knew that no matter what that Parole Board decided he was still going to get the stuff and read it. And that's exactly what happened. Women started sending stuff, and we know that it went in the files.55

Within the prison a nascent feminist community developed. It was comprised of program directors and other staff members, inmates, and volunteers and was supported by the feminist battered women's community throughout the state. During the arduous process of waiting for the clemency applications to be reviewed, the Friendship LIFE Group sponsored a workshop on domestic violence. They brought in members of the battered women's community from shelters and other direct service organizations, as well as formerly battered women who had received clemency. Kathey Thomas was the keynote speaker, and talked about her experiences as a survivor of wife abuse. Her story has been a particularly empowering one for battered women who have killed abusive mates. She is a living example of someone who successfully survived a violent relationship. While serving her entire sentence, she took control of her life and later went on to work in the prison system, training women to access traditionally male occupations. She has also been an important spokesperson for women who have killed abusive partners.

At the same time cases for review were being identified, the Governor's aide charged with implementing the clemency process ordered that the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction conduct two studies, one to identify the number of women incarcerated for violent crimes related to domestic violence and the other to
provide a profile of women who had experienced battered woman syndrome. Among other things, the study found that of the 421 women inmates then incarcerated for violent offenses, 203 of them were directly related to "victimization by domestic violence" (Black 1990:2). The second study was conducted by a feminist researcher. When the researcher went in to gather her data, she encountered no resistance. She attributed the cooperation of the administration to the opportunity structure Dagmar Celeste’s work and the Governor’s authority had created. She explained,

[Being able to conduct my end of the research] in itself was a miracle, really because people in Corrections are very reluctant to let [people] …futz around, let alone to futz around with the knowledge that this might lead to somebody getting out. But it came down from the Governor’s office that they were to cooperate, so it paved the way. It really did. It came down from the Governor’s office to the Director, to the Deputy Director, and it was really the Deputy Director, you know, saying "You have to do this."56

Working with counselors assigned to work with domestic violence groups, this researcher identified thirty women for inclusion in her study. Semi-structured, tape recorded interviews were the source of her data.

Despite the cooperation of the prison administration, non-feminist members of the research department were not as supportive of the study’s findings. Immediately the validity of the study was challenged by the senior researcher who had originally written the memo suggesting the study. It was his opinion that because the women’s stories had not been corroborated with information in their written records, the study’s validity was less than adequate. He wanted her to include a disclaimer to that effect in the report. It was her belief that because people assume that incarcerated and battered women lie and exaggerate, such a statement would ruin the paper’s
integrity. She refused to include the statement. She explained what happened as follows,

[My boss] wanted me to put in this little blurb that...said,..."These are interviews. We didn’t have any way of checking up on the validity or the truth of them."...I sat there in his office and I said, "No. I won’t do that." And I was shaking...I said, "It threatens the integrity of the paper. You’re basically saying, "Don’t believe any of this." ...And then, apparently sometime in there, he showed that little blurb to [his boss]....I mean, I was so invested in this thing maintaining its integrity that I was, I was really like almost ready to quit over it....And what I did instead, which was a really good strategy...I went to Angela Browne’s book, which has...this little blurb that was great because it shut them both up. Here, [reading from her paper], "Since statements made by the women interviewed for this study have not been verified against other sources, one might question the reliability of these self-report data. However, in studies of battered women who kill, when self-report data have been checked against police, hospital, and witness records, if discrepancies were found, they were in the direction of understatement. Women tended to underreport abusive incidents."^57

Even when women like the researcher conducted their work alone, their efforts were supported by feminists in government, the battered women’s community, and the inmates themselves. Frequently, activists found themselves sustained by two things: their commitment to feminist goals and membership in the battered women’s community.

The report ultimately was submitted to the Governor, and was used to illustrate the impact wife abuse had on women’s lives and the relationship of battered woman syndrome to their crimes. It also became a resource used to train Corrections personnel and Parol Board members about battered woman syndrome. In addition to helping the Governor and his staff better understand the issue, the study was reported
upon at a conference on post-partum depression and battered woman syndrome, organized by the First Lady’s Unit and held at the Governor’s Mansion in June 1990.

MAKING THE CLEMENCY DECISIONS

Two people were officially involved in reviewing each application for clemency. One was the Governor and the other was the aide who had been assigned to implement the process. The Governor, however, was solely responsible for all decisions. Once the requests for clemency reached them, their consideration of the cases was dependent upon a full understanding of a highly complex issue. Their education was aided by the work of feminists in government, the courts, and the corrections system, and the women themselves.

After reviewing the cases, both the Governor and his aide made numerous efforts to document and verify alleged incidents. They used five criteria in evaluating each case. First, they needed to be convinced that women had been battered to a degree that if a jury had heard about the abuse and then heard expert testimony about battered woman syndrome, they would have made a substantially different decision. Second, they looked for some evidence that the women had come to terms with the syndrome, such as participation in a domestic violence group or other recovery group. Third, they looked at the women’s behavior in prison, and fourth they examined their prior criminal record. The Governor was unwilling to grant clemency to women who had a history of disruptive behavior in prison or had been convicted of previous violent crimes. Last, he and his aide looked at the length of time served,
believing that no woman should be released until she had served at least two years.

As the Governor explained,

    I established a minimum of two years, because I felt, in any case, these people were involved in a violent act where some punishment might well have been adjudged by a jury, but not the punishment that was handed down because these women hadn’t been able to defend themselves effectively.\textsuperscript{99}

After an extensive and exhausting review of 105 cases, in December 1990 twenty-five women were granted clemency. In ten of the cases, the Governor overrode the recommendation of the Parole Board. Six women were eligible for immediate release. The evidence I was able to obtain suggests they were released the same day they were informed of the decisions. Fifteen were scheduled for release after a final visit with the Parole Board. These women left the prison the following April. Four were left to serve the remainder of the mandatory two year term, and were then released. After the initial decision, seven additional cases were reviewed, with one woman granted clemency.\textsuperscript{60} All women granted clemency were ordered to serve 200 hours of community service in a shelter for battered women.

**MOVEMENT DISSEMINATION**

Of the five women I interviewed, two had been disabled by their experiences in prison and were unable to serve their required 200 hours of community service. One was serving her 200 hours, despite the fact that she was in constant severe pain and required major surgery, and two had completed their service. Of the women who had done their volunteer work, one had stayed on as a paid shelter advocate. One woman, who had completed her service, explained that she felt she was able to give
shelter residents a type of empathy others would be unable to provide. By way of example, she explained her understanding of why women go back to abusive partners, as follows,

When I went to the shelter to work, I saw women that were beaten and were leaving to go back [to their husbands] because they weren’t ready to let go. You know, and until you are, it don’t work. No matter what good anybody does or what they try to tell you, you have to, you as the person who’s involved with this man, has to let go. Until you let go, nobody can help you.61

Through their empowerment in prison programs and community service, some of the women have become important resources to shelter residents and many to their own daughters. My data suggests that an emergent point of resistance in the battered women’s movement has become mothers who have survived abusive relationships, whose daughters are currently battered.

Through self-help and peer counseling, women learn that they are not to blame for their own victimization. They also learn that their daughters are likely to become victims, primarily because they have witnessed their mothers’ abuse. Through the process of escaping violent relationships, many women learn the legal system and what is required to survive. Others have learned the process through paid or volunteer work in shelters. By establishing the 200 hour stipulation, Celeste put women in contact with the battered women’s community. Through their volunteer work, their own recovery was facilitated, but many were formally or informally trained as legal advocates, as well. For women whose daughters were being beaten, this knowledge was invaluable. One of the women granted clemency explained how she reacted to her daughter’s boyfriend’s violence, as follows,
I have a daughter who is in a situation, and she got into the situation while I was gone....And so when I came home, the boy thought that he could still give some abuse. And she was pregnant at the time, and she called me and she was crying....I called the police before I left home...and so when I got to her house the police came and they arrested him. She did not know what was going on....Even though she lived it, she didn't have the education about the DV or the cycle of violence or nothing. But I knew. 62

This woman took her daughter, first to the hospital, then to a Victim/Witness counselor. She succeeded in having the boyfriend prosecuted and put on probation.

When her daughter returned to him, she understood why, but remained vigilant in her determination to see the violence end.

As the knowledge of the dynamics of violent relationships, escape, and survival has been disseminated, the movement has moved into "the trenches" where women are able to advocate on behalf of their daughters, mothers, sisters, and friends. Through the clemency decisions, Celeste set free twenty-six women with the potential to empower women to escape before someone gets killed.

CONCLUSION

Without the work of feminists throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the Celeste clemency decision could not have gone forward. In Ohio, each cohort community of the movement made its own contribution, aided by lone feminists in government agencies and an emergent group of incarcerated activists. What is most striking about the founders as a cohort community was their commitment to become institutional insiders, while at the same time maintaining an oppositional feminist stance toward the status quo. By doing so, they became ideological outsiders within the institutions of legal rational authority that they sought to challenge. A strategic key to the
movement's success was activists' ability to create relationships among social service agencies, government agencies, social movement organizations, and feminists both within and outside arenas of institutionalized decision making. This cohort community, true to feminist values of the 1970s, did not respect formalized boundaries. By creating linkages and crossing barriers, they were able to lay the groundwork for the clemency decision of 1990. Their efforts were underscored during the clemency review process, as well as throughout the 1980s by joiners who worked to raise public awareness of wife abuse at the local level and later, acceptance of battered woman syndrome at the state level.

As the clemency process emerged, it was pushed forward by feminists, frequently working alone in environments hostile to women's issues or feminist goals. Their commitment to the struggle and willingness to stand their ground gave greater integrity to the process. Pushing the entire process from behind were the incarcerated women, those who ultimately gained their freedom and those left behind. Their willingness to open old wounds, to examine experiences they had tried so hard to forget, to encourage, support, and help one another through the process, together with the empowerment that came with raised consciousness, is what gave the clemencies their true political meaning. As women begin to understand the dynamics of abusive relationships and the way society has failed them, both by socializing them to accept such behavior and failing to provide protection, they become empowered and emboldened to demand change. The State of Ohio's 1990 clemency decision was about much more than granting freedom to twenty-six women. It was about
recognizing the historical injustices faced by women in a misogynist and sexist society. It is the recognition of the need for fundamental change, expressed in the clemency decision, that has kept the battered women’s movement from being coopted.
NOTES

1. Research has shown that when women become violent with men, it is usually in self-defense and that cases of exclusive female to male violence represents a minority of all incidents of violence in intimate relationships (Dobash, et al 1992; Kelly 1988). However Straus, et al (1980) have argued that when actual blows are counted, women are more violent than men. Nonetheless, Berk, et al (1983) have demonstrated that women are much more likely than men to be injured as a result of altercations with an intimate partner. Further, Jones (1980) has demonstrated that women are more likely to be killed by an intimate partner than by anyone else.

2. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on May 6, 1992.

3. See Gamson (1992) for a discussion of the problematic bias in this analysis.

4. See Pleck (1987) for a discussion of the focus on masochism and psychoanalysis in the literature on wife abuse in the 1970s.

5. The difference in language here is important, as wife abuse connotes violence specifically by men against women, and family or domestic violence connotes the idea that both women and men may be violent in the home and that children and elders are also subject to abuse. Researchers and professionals who adhere to a family violence perspective often maintain that women and men are equally violent. As we will see, domestic violence is often substituted by feminists for woman or wife abuse. However, feminists maintain their focus on issues of power and control and contend that if women become violent, it is usually in self-defense. For further discussion of this debate, see Gelles and Straus (1988) and Bograd (1988).

6. See Burgess and Draper (1989) for a full discussion of these theories of family violence.

7. During interviews the only reference made to distinctions among groups related to ideological orientations, with the Junior League being compared with radical lesbians. Despite this difference, the formation of WomenSpace marked the successful accommodation of groups with vastly divergent philosophies.

8. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 28, 1992.

9. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 28, 1992.

10. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 10, 1992


12. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 7, 1992.

14. The majority of newsletters cited herein are undated. One of the founders explained that, unfortunately, they were not very good at dating their publications. I have made an effort to determine approximate publication dates by referring to event dates listed in articles and announcements.


17. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on July 21, 1992.


22. See Fiora-Gormally (1978) and Gillespie (1989) for a discussion of these issues.

23. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on July 9, 1992.

24. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on July 9, 1992.


26. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on May 6, 1992.

27. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on May 6, 1992.

28. State v. Thomas, (66 Ohio St. 2d 518) (1981). Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on May 30, 1992. In this interview, the psychologist explained that probative value refers to the information that testimony will reveal and prejudicial value refers to the probability jurors will become biased as a result of expert testimony. As this founder pointed out, "You wouldn’t bring an expert in unless you hoped to sway them."

29. The proper legal term for the process described here is to "proffer" evidence or to "offer evidence as a proof."


32. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on May 30, 1992.


34. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 5, 1992.


37. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 3, 1991.

38. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 3, 1991.

39. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 3, 1991.

40. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 3, 1991.

41. "AM. SUB. H.B. 484," summary of the history of House Bill 484, Columbus, OH (Undated).

42. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 26, 1991.

43. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on November 9, 1992.

44. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 13, 1992.

45. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 13, 1992.


47. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1992.

48. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1992.

49. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on November 9, 1992.

50. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 13, 1992.

51. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1992.
52. "Memorandum" to Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Central Office from The Ohio Reformatory for Women [Marysville, OH] (Feb. 15, 1990).


54. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1992.

55. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1992.

56. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 14, 1991.

57. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 14, 1991.

58. This factor, while rooted in the pragmatism of avoiding the release of women who might commit more crime as a result of a lack of recovery, is similar to the dichotomy set forth by agency maintainers, that there are good and bad battered women.

59. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 13, 1992.

60. I was unable to determine in which category this woman belonged.

61. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 31, 1992.

62. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1993.
CHAPTER IV

THREATS OF COOPTATION AND ELEMENTS
OF NON-COOPTABILITY IN THE BATTERED WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Movements start out with goals, definitions of the issues, and strategies that change as the movement evolves. Assertions of cooptation may be levied by those who disagree with changes. Yet such allegations, while sometimes legitimate, may be based on assumptions that any deviation from the initial analysis is a sign that the movement or its leaders have sold out. Movements are not static entities. They adapt to changes in the social movement industry and the larger opportunity structure and to newly acquired knowledge and ideas about the issues over which activists struggle.

Examinations of movement cooptation have been predominately oriented toward the organizational level, with a nearly exclusive focus on the role of funding sources in rechanneling or subverting movement goals (Helfgot 1981; Jenkins and Eckert 1986; Johnson 1981; McAdam 1982; McCarthy, et al 1991; Oliver and Marwell 1992; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982). One point of controversy has been over whether the level of grass roots control or professionalization in the movement
has an impact on its integrity. In this vein, the literature has distinguished between professional and classical social movement organizations. Professional social movement organizations are those "which direct resource appeals primarily toward conscience adherents and utilize few constituents for organizational labor" (McCarthy and Zald 1977:1223). Conversely, a classical social movement organization is dependent "largely on the volunteer labor of direct beneficiaries" with funding coming predominately from indigenous sources (Jenkins and Eckert 1986:813).

Although McCarthy and Zald (1977) have contended that the sponsorship of conscience constituents facilitates movement growth and allows representation of those who would otherwise be unable to mobilize on their own behalf, the majority of research suggests that government or other outside sponsorship has a tendency to compromise movement principles and to end in cooption. For example, McAdam argues that while elite patronage may facilitate movement growth, it is also conducive to directing grievances to "proper channels," leading to cooption (1982:26).

Similarly, Marwell and Oliver (1992) suggest that movements that rely on outside sources for money are constrained to act like charities. Elite patrons have a tendency to donate to more moderate, less radical organizations within the movement and large scale donors have a tendency to exert control over what is done with their money (Helfgot 1981; Jenkins and Eckert 1986; Johnson 1981; McAdam 1982; Tierney 1982). Once a particular mode of fundraising has been adopted, it is difficult for an organization to change to another (Oliver and Marwell 1992). The literature suggests that movements that seek or accept funding from non-constituent sources are very
likely to find they have lost control of how the problem is defined, and that once such sponsorship is accepted, it is extremely difficult to break free. Although I concur that sponsors do have the potential to exert a great deal of control over their benefactors, I also believe there is more to the interplay between funders and activists than this analysis portrays.

Cooptation refers to the redirection of movement goals away from demands for structural or cultural change. During the cooptive process, the movement’s collective action frame becomes redefined in accordance with dominant ideological systems and the institutionalized means by which demands may be accommodated. Within the battered women’s movement, cooptation refers to a shift away from feminist principles and goals to a social welfare or mental health model (Davis 1988; Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981). However, because feminist principles encompass everything from goals to organization, any deviation from the ideal may be construed as evidence that the movement has sold out.

In an analysis of changes within the battered women’s movement, Davis (1988) has identified ten elements of the feminist shelter ideology, and has systematically compared these with the principles of a social welfare or mental health model. Her comparisons are replicated in Table 1. Feminist principles include the belief that wife abuse is caused by male oppression and that the battered woman is a self-determining person, perfectly capable of making rational choices. The purpose of the shelter is to protect and assist women to achieve autonomy through self-help and identification with other women. Financing should come from women’s
contributions, with shelters remaining unaffiliated with major contributors. The movement’s goals should focus on radical change in the political and economic structures and policy changes on behalf of women. Men should be excluded from the movement, both as leaders and clients, in order to allow women to achieve their full potential and to avoid slipping into the therapeutic goal of treating the family. The greatest limitation on the success of the movement is battered women’s resistance to independence and autonomy (Davis 1988).
### TABLE 1

Opposing ideologies in women's shelters: feminist model and social welfare model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feminist</th>
<th>Social Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cause of problem</strong></td>
<td>Male oppression</td>
<td>Poverty and personal pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of battered woman</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Woman&quot;--a self-determining person</td>
<td>&quot;Victim&quot;--a dependent personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of shelter</strong></td>
<td>Protection; client transition to autonomy</td>
<td>Protection; return to family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant principle of intervention</strong></td>
<td>Self-help; identification with women</td>
<td>Social casework; therapist/ client mode of relating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelter organization</strong></td>
<td>Non-hierarchical</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of financing</strong></td>
<td>Unaffiliated; women's contributions</td>
<td>Affiliated; state and community-funded programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of men</strong></td>
<td>Excluded; virtually total separation</td>
<td>Included; couple counseling, male collectives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Politics</strong></td>
<td>Women's advocacy; radical change in political and economic structures</td>
<td>Family advocacy; unity and renewal of family unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major limitations of programs</strong></td>
<td>Client resistance to shelter's autonomy goals</td>
<td>Failure system; victim's cycle of dependency (e.g., on husband and agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term goals</strong></td>
<td>Social policy solutions to women's political and economic independence; and violence against women</td>
<td>State-supported, permanent shelters incorporated in welfare system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Davis 1988:358)
Cooptation of the battered women's movement has been frequently alleged, but seldom clearly defined. Drawing on Davis's model, I argue that there are elements over which the movement has compromised, without being coopted, and factors that once compromised virtually assure cooptation. I argue that on structural elements, including funding sources or degree of hierarchy, the movement has compromised, without being coopted. On most cultural issues, including perceptions of battered women, the purpose of the shelter, mode of intervention, and political and long term goals, the movement has resisted shifting to an individual or mental health orientation. It is upon these elements that the battered women's movement is most centrally defined. The movement's philosophy regarding the cause of wife abuse has expanded to include additional forms of domination, including classism, racism, heterosexism, and ageism. This movement's frame of analysis has permitted it to address the needs of battered lesbians, as well as child and elder abuse.

In the case of the battered women's movement, two trends have been the focus of allegations of cooptation. The first has been the greater inclusion of professionals in shelters and other programs, with a trend away from self-help and empowerment and toward therapy (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1982). The second has been the focus on the institutionalization of legal responses to wife abuse, including mandatory arrest and diversion programs (Bush 1992; Davis 1988; Schechter 1982). Accordingly, it has been argued that mandatory intervention deprives battered women of any control they might have over the situation and makes them dependent upon the state for prosecution and protection (Davis 1988; Schechter 1982). This gives the state greater
authority over the individual and diminishes the capacity of the movement to define
the problem (Bush 1992; Davis 1988; Schechter 1982). As Davis suggests, the shift
to a social welfare model or dependence on state intervention "reconstructs" the
woman battering problem and shifts societal responses away from primarily a
community oriented approach to the state (1988:360). Interestingly, it appears that
when therapy becomes the primary goal, the allegation is that the issue has been
reprivatized. When state intervention becomes the standard response to family
violence, the concern becomes that government interferes too much, thus depriving
women of power.

My data suggest that founders and joiners in the Ohio battered women’s
movement have advocated that feminist counselors be made available through shelters
and other programs. Further, they have worked at the legislative, judicial, and local
levels to criminalize domestic violence and to ensure that laws are enforced. The
movement has worked to provide greater economic and political opportunities for all
women, thus helping them break free from potential dependence on family members
or the state. The movement has recognized that in the short run, battered women
often need state intervention to help them escape violent men who are often
determined to prevent them from living independently. They know, from experience,
that professional counselors are often needed to help women recognize and break free
from a cycle of violence that has entrapped them. They have learned how to use the
welfare system, when necessary, to provide temporary support for women on the run.
But they have not been limited to short term solutions. They have also recognized the
historical, cultural, and structural contexts in which violence against women has continued to exist, and they have worked to change those contexts at the individual, cultural, and structural levels. The movement has advocated that a diversity of family forms, including single parent and same sex parent households, be included in the definition of family. Their argument is that families should be evaluated according to function rather than form, and that the state should intervene only to assist families in meeting the functions of nurturance, socialization of the young, and economic support. Egalitarianism is celebrated, patriarchy is vilified.

Shelters have been the single most effective social response to battering, embodying principles of female strength and autonomy and giving a symbolic message to society that woman abuse will not be tolerated (Davis 1988). Despite the feminist ideal that money should be raised from the contributions of women, this goal has been virtually impossible to attain. Even when non-battered feminists contribute, the expenses of meeting the daily needs of women and children on the run are prohibitively high.

A non-dictatorial sponsor is a resource that will greatly enhance a movement’s ability to avoid cooptation. Nonetheless, as the literature has shown and my research demonstrates, finding such a source is difficult. Shelters and other services are dependent upon steady sources of income. Although they have used the small scale fundraising efforts of volunteers, and most recently development officers, shelters have been primarily dependent upon what Oliver and Marwell (1992) have labelled professionalized technologies (Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney
1982). That is, they seek large scale donations via grants from foundations, charitable fundraising programs, and the government. This trend would suggest that the movement is highly susceptible to cooptation. Nonetheless, the continued activism of feminists throughout the 1980s, culminating in the clemency decisions, suggests that cooptation may not be as widespread as the literature would lead one to conclude.

In this chapter I argue that while compromises have been made and changes have occurred, cooptation has been actively resisted by feminists throughout the movement and that their continued activism has been enhanced by five factors. The first has been a collective identity that has created unity among battered, formerly battered, and never battered women. This identity has been inclusive enough to tolerate diversity within the movement, yet restrictive enough to create cohesion and solidarity. Feminist identity has been nurtured by the second factor, a strong, informal community of activists, linked together in many situations, by lasting friendships, and in others by the feminist analysis of wife abuse present in the literature. The feminist analysis of wife abuse emerged during the late 1970s and 1980s\(^1\) and moved the issue out of research on the family and into the larger arena of gender politics (Davis 1988). Thirdly, the movement has been carried forward by the strength of its conviction to a feminist analysis of wife abuse; this is its oppositional collective action frame. Feminists believe wife abuse is rooted in systems of domination. Any therapeutic approach or effort to change the legal system must confront power. This analysis has allowed feminists to be flexible but firm in their conviction that women are not to blame for their own abuse. The movement has also
been advanced by the fourth factor, a network of feminist shelters and service organizations. The network has helped overworked service providers pool their resources to work for change on a statewide level, rather than simply putting out brush fires in their own back yards. Finally, the movement’s success and avoidance of cooptation was enhanced by the support of a pro-feminist Governor and First Lady who implemented policy aimed to empower women, both economically and politically, throughout their eight year administration.

I have divided the chapter into three sections. In the section titled "The Challenge and Lessons of Funding" I draw upon a batterers’ treatment program to exemplify what may happen as a result of dependence on government funding. In this section, I demonstrate that the impact of government sponsorship is exacerbated by the role of foundations and the men’s movement in redefining the cause and cure of family violence. In the next section, titled "Funding and the Feminist Model," I examine the funding decisions made by numerous shelter and program directors to show how their commitment to feminist ideals have permitted them to pursue and accomplish feminist goals, despite compromises and encumbrances. In this section, I demonstrate that the unwillingness to compromise on the issues of causality, perception of the battered woman, the purpose of shelter, the dominant principle of intervention, movement politics, and long-term goals has kept the movement from being coopted, despite dependence on professional modes of fundraising. In the third section, titled "Elements of Non-Cooptability," I discuss how the collective identity, action frame, community, and networks of the movement have helped it resist
cooptation. This section focuses on the activism of shelter workers and feminists working in isolation on the job in sometimes hostile environments. Included in this section is a discussion of the opportunities created by Dagmar Celeste and feminists throughout the government and state. Here I demonstrate how founders, as policy makers, worked to create a political context in which long term feminist goals were more likely to be achieved. I demonstrate a continued commitment to radical feminist goals, including changes in the social response to family violence, political empowerment and economic independence for women, and freedom from violence for all less powerful family members.

THE CHALLENGE AND LESSONS OF FUNDING

Oliver and Marwell (1992) argue that the two major resources social movements need to mobilize are time and money. As they contend, "When money is raised for collective action, it is used mostly to buy time," the time of others (1992:257). Thus two dominant mobilization patterns emerge, similar to the professional and classical models discussed above, with the former seeking funding to pay activists and the latter working to mobilize grass roots constituents (Jenkins and Eckert 1986; McCarthy and Zald 1977). As has been shown, the battered women’s movement arose out of feminist grass roots activism, but shelters rarely adhered to the classical social movement organization model. Neither organizers nor those in need of help could be depended upon for the level of support required for year round, uninterrupted services. Therefore, although feminists volunteered and encouraged residents to share in the day-to-day operation of the shelter, they were dependent upon
outside sources to pay a small staff, as well as for rent, food, and other necessities. Although they continued to seek private donations, the fundraising method they adopted was oriented toward seeking large contributions from foundations and government agencies, placing the majority within the category of a professional social movement organization. Organizationally, most resemble a social service agency more than a group oriented toward social change (Ferraro 1981a). Most shelters and programs for battered women have adopted a mental health orientation and adhere to a social welfare model (Ferraro 1981a). Nonetheless, resistance to non-feminist analyses remains and it is among these activists that the movement has survived and continued to advocate for change.

Nationally, in the 1970s, the establishment of shelters and other direct services for battered women and their children was facilitated by a general availability of monies from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Community Development Block Grants, HUD’s Rent Subsidy Program, the Economic Development Administration, Displaced Homemakers, ACTION, Title XX of the Social Security Act, and other government sources (Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982). Organizations that availed themselves of such monies were required to provide services and meet standards of accountability, as dictated by the sources.

The literature has identified two trends that resulted from decisions to seek funds from government or other large scale sponsors. One was that feminist shelters
became more hierarchical and professional, shifting from a focus on social change to individual therapy (Ahrens 1978; 1980; Andler and Sullivan 1980; Ferraro 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982). The other was that social workers, mental health and criminal justice professionals, and program planners seized upon the availability of funds to establish social service agencies geared toward treating family violence (Schechter 1982).

These analysts have focused on the creation or cooptation of programs and how they have been made to fit within the structure and definition of the problem offered by criminal justice and mental health systems (Bush 1992; Davis 1988; Johnson 1981). By focusing on the organizational level, they have overlooked the potential impact of feminist resistance to cooptation within such programs. Institutionalization is not necessarily synonymous with cooptation. Rather, the routinized provision of services demanded by the movement may represent its success. When the provision of services is perceived as "normal," it may be that the movement has experienced "failure through success" (Ferree and Hess 1985:177). That is, public sentiment shifts to encompass what were once perceived as radical demands and the movement is not credited with programs it has advocated.

My data suggest a third trend wherein shelters and programs become more hierarchical, incorporating feminist therapists and advocates, adhering to a feminist definition of the problem and working to achieve feminist goals. In providing help to battered women, feminists have had to steer a narrow course, sometimes compromising organizational principles to survive, and other times scaling back the
services they could offer to maintain control. Even when therapy is offered, hierarchies are established, or enforcement of stricter laws is demanded, many programs and activists within the movement have maintained a commitment to feminist principles. Activists have learned to "capture" definitions and structures and use them to advance their own agendas.

_Funding, Legal Advocacy, and Family Violence Therapy_

Walking the "thin line" between feminist ideals and the chance of cooption, direct service providers in the Ohio movement were constantly faced with the possibility of extinction. As early as the mid-1970s some programs in the Ohio movement became institutionalized as a result of trying to survive. For example, in 1976 LEAA funding for the Victim Service Unit, the organization whose founders were responsible for organizing the _ad hoc_ Women Together shelter committee, had run out. The Unit had become a resource to activists in the anti-rape and battered women's movements. The feminist community then faced a choice: They could allow the Unit to disband or they could advocate for continued funding, despite the fact that money came from a government source. They decided the Unit was a valuable resource, and the Victim Service Unit became a rallying point for the groups involved in the International Women's Year in Cleveland. Ultimately it was saved, but not without becoming institutionalized as part of the county agency. One of the founders explained the effort to save the Unit, as follows,

'It's like here you have this huge exposition that was sponsored by all the major women's groups in the Cleveland area, the Cleveland Junior League, as well as the Rape Crisis Center and the action kinds of agencies. And they sort of latched onto us as a cause, I mean,
something that they could do in a concrete fashion that could come out of this exposition. And so there was a great deal of lobbying and all this stuff with City Hall and they were able to get us funded.²

Later that year, as a result of the lobbying efforts and the need to avoid a duplication of services, the city-wide, grass roots Victim Service Unit joined with the LEAA funded, county-wide victim services agency that had been founded by the County Commissioners. The result was the Cuyahoga County Witness/Victim Service Center. By avoiding extinction, the organization became more institutionalized and more vulnerable to control, not only by the LEAA, but by County Commissioners, as well.

Nationally, LEAA-funded Witness/Victim Service Centers were founded as a means to help victims of "sensitive" crimes, such as rape, child sexual abuse, and family violence, survive the criminal justice system (Schechter 1982:186). As a result of feminists' activism, in the late 1970s, the United States Department of Justice began to realize the importance of family violence as an issue and offered funding for pilot programs to address the problem (Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982). In 1979 the LEAA tripled its allocation for domestic violence programs to $1 million per year, and agency officials publicly spoke out about the growing incidence of wife beating (Schechter 1982; Tierney 1982). One result of this growing concern was the formation, in 1978, of fourteen family violence programs, with an additional seventeen in 1979 (Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982). One of these projects was the Family Violence Program, housed within the Cuyahoga County Witness/Victim Service Center. It began as a small program within the Center to counsel victims and
perpetrators of family violence and was closely monitored by the feminist director of Witness/Victim. While on guard against cooptation by the government, the battered women's movement was subject to the influence of groups they perceived as allies.

With few exceptions, the social movement literature has identified a pattern whereby activists and social movement organizations seek funding, while foundations and other sponsors wait to be approached (Oliver and Marwell 1992). What has been overlooked is the tendency of foundations and other social movements to join in the effort to address the issues raised by the original movement. In Cleveland, feminists' success in creating wife abuse as a social problem led foundations and the men's movement to jump on the bandwagon, and in the process try to redefine the problem as one of dysfunctional family systems and individual pathologies, rather than cultural or structural sexism.

The Challenge of Success: Maintaining Control

Avoidance of cooptation has been, in part, a matter of being aware of sponsors' requirements and finding alternatives to those sources, whenever possible. However, the political landscape is far more complex. Activists need to realize that "safe" sponsors may unwittingly play a role in subverting movement goals by soliciting and financing other programs. Further, even movements that consider themselves allies of the women's movement may undermine essential philosophical tenets of the movement, all the while maintaining a pro-feminist stance. Unless sponsors and other movements within the social movement industry share the same collective action frame, they may intentionally or unwittingly redefine the issues.
In 1979, at the same time the family violence treatment program was implemented through Witness/Victim, a nascent men’s movement was forming in Cleveland. As part of their mobilization efforts, they submitted proposals to the Cleveland and Gund Foundations for money to establish a men’s center. At that time nationally, a small number of treatment centers for abusive men had begun to emerge, with programs in Boston, St. Louis, and Duluth, Minnesota (Schechter 1982). In Cleveland, one foundation that had sponsored shelters became interested in the possibility of providing treatment for batterers. When the Men’s Center of Greater Cleveland submitted its grant proposal to the foundations, it was turned down by the Cleveland Foundation. However, as a former foundation worker and counselor in a batterers’ treatment program explained, the Gund Foundation was not so recalcitrant.

Gund was interested in addressing the needs of battered women by developing treatment programs for abusive men. The fact that such programs at the time were resisted by feminists was not something the foundation took into account. Rather, it made sense to them to treat abusive men, so they presented their ideas to the men’s movement. The counselor explained how the men’s movement became involved in treating abusers, as follows,

There was sort of an early men’s movement in those days....There was a small program called the Men’s Center of Greater Cleveland who had submitted a grant to the Gund Foundation and to the Cleveland Foundation, just for support of a men’s center, an actual kind of a drop-in center where peer counseling would be provided and they’d be talking about various men’s issues. And Cleveland was not at all interested in funding it. Gund wasn’t particularly either, but they kind of did a carrot and a stick. "We’ll fund some of the Men’s Center needs if you will look at directing a proposal to us to provide treatment for domestically violent men."
The treatment program was ultimately funded, giving foundations and the men’s movement input regarding the direction the battered women’s movement would take and how the issue would be defined. The program formed a board and sought representation from the battered women’s shelters in the area. It began receiving referrals from shelters and by word of mouth. At this time, batterers’ treatment was not without controversy, but was seen by many as a resource for men who wanted to alter their behavior. It was also viewed as a way for the battered women’s movement to avoid dealing with men and a resource for women who were not ready to leave the relationship. Initially, the program confronted men with their violent behavior and worked in conjunction with feminist shelter workers so that treatment enhanced women’s safety. As the program progressed, however, it began to redefine battering as a mental health issue and to embrace the ideology of "mutual combat," that is, that women and men are equally violent in relationships (Berk, et al 1983).

A profeminist model of batterers’ treatment recognizes that wife beating is controlling behavior that works to create and maintain an imbalance of power between an abusive man and the battered woman (Adams 1988; Martin 1981; Schechter 1982). The profeminist model defines violence broadly, including physical, psychological, and emotional abuse, as well as all efforts to prevent the woman from doing what she wants, or forcing her to do something she does not want, or provoking fear (Adams 1988). The first step in profeminist programs is to ensure the safety of battered women and then to confront men with the excuses they commonly use to explain their violent behavior. Once a man has demonstrated a commitment to non-violent
behavior, he is then helped to understand how his attitudes, emotions, and expectations have contributed to the abuse (Adams 1988). The primary focus in the profeminist model is to ensure the safety of the battered woman.

In addition to the profeminist model, Adams (1988) has identified four mental health modes of batterers’ treatment. First, the insight model focuses on internal psychological and emotional conflicts that result in violent behavior. This impaired ego function is the result of early developmental issues, such as parental rejection or abuse as a child. This model assumes that a resolution of early conflicts will reduce the need to abuse others. Second, the ventilation model assumes that violence is the result of repressed emotions. Couples are encouraged to communicate honestly and openly with one another, or to argue fairly, thus diminishing the anger that leads to violence. Third, the cognitive behavioral and psychoeducational models make violent behavior the primary focus of treatment. These models assume that since violent behavior is learned, it can also be unlearned. Battering is viewed as resulting from a deficiency in social skills. Thus assertiveness training and help in developing interpersonal and communication skills are important elements in teaching men to abstain from violence. Violent men are frequently encouraged to keep journals to help them identify what triggers their anger. The belief is that once men know what makes them angry, they can learn to control or redirect their behavior in nonviolent ways. Last, there is the interaction model. This is similar to the ventilation model because treatment of both the abuser and the abused is considered an essential component in improving marital communication, resolving conflict, and ending
violence. Drawing upon the family systems literature, the interaction model assumes that anger and violence within the family builds upon the behaviors of both the abuser and the abused. This model assumes that each partner is equally responsible for family violence, and that women must recognize how behaviors such as nagging or withholding sex contribute to violence. Similarly, men must recognize that abuse causes the partner to withdraw further. As Adams explains, "It is this tendency of couples counselors to equalize responsibility for violence between the man and the woman that has been at the heart of the feminist criticism of the interaction model" (1988:185).

In the early 1980s the Men's Center disbanded. By 1985 the batterers' treatment program Director wanted to expand and institutionalize it as part of the criminal justice system. What he envisioned was a court ordered diversion program, in which batterers would be ordered into counseling in lieu of other punishment. As he explained,

In 1985, '86, somewhere in there, I was really interested in expanding treatment. It was a very small, limited program. And one of my concerns as a program planner was that domestic violence is a very large issue....I didn't see any potential for developing a sizeable program in a small agency kind of context. So I responded to...the Director of the Witness/Victim Service Center, and she was looking for a new person to run the Family Violence Program. And my goal became to...turn it into a...court mandated treatment program, which was a lot easier to do as a county based program--more access to the criminal justice system, especially through the Witness/Victim Service Center.5

As batterers' treatment programs developed nationally, they became a source of controversy (Schechter 1982). The debate was over the proper way to address the
needs of battered women. Batterers’ treatment programs were advocated by LEAA and others in the criminal justice system in the early 1980s, despite a lack of scientific evidence that they were effective in reducing violent behavior (Schechter 1982).

Some feminists believe treatment of batterers is one strategy to empower women. In my sample, three groups with varying perspectives on batterers’ treatment emerged from the data. The first was made up of treatment providers who believed that men’s violence was related to environmental factors, such as stress, a lack of resources, or their own victimization as children. They perceived violence as a mental health issue and focused on counseling and individual behavior modification as the answer. The second group was made up of founders who were no longer involved in direct services. Like batterers’ counselors, they tended to believe that men’s violence toward family members was a result of environmental factors. They believed family violence is directly related to the isolation and lack of social support systems for nuclear families. They focused on the need for change, in order to bring about more social supports for families. They believed that batterers’ treatment was one way to confront men with their violent behavior while helping them to understand their problems and teaching them to be non-violent. Most of the founders who expressed these beliefs had moved into policy making positions. One feminist expressed founders initial resistance and subsequent belief in the need for batterers’ treatment, as follows,

The problem…is we will never have enough money to be able to put away in safe places all the women and children who are threatened by all these men….In the early days of the women’s movement, we didn’t have any empathy and sympathy for [the abuser]. WomenSpace called
a public hearing...and women came out of the woodwork to this hearing....We also had this young guy...who kept listening and listening....And then during the question and answer period he kept raising his hand....These were the early days of the women's movement and we were not going to really take questions from men anyway. But this guy kept raising his hand. And so after they exhausted the questions in the audience that all the women had, they finally let him speak. And he got up and he said..., "You know, I'm one of these guys. I always find myself beating up the woman I love. I don't know why. Can you girls...tell me why I'm doing that?" And again, I mean these were the early days, and we said, "Fuck you!" I mean, "Who needs this? We have not enough energy to deal with women's problems. We're going to deal with your problem? Go away."6

Initially, founders blamed men for abusing their wives. Later, however, their assertion of the need to treat abusive men incorporated a greater challenge to the patriarchal family, in which all less powerful members, including children and elders, have the potential to be victimized. In order for batterers' treatment to be construed as feminist, it needs to focus upon and challenge inequality in power arrangements. Founders have expanded the feminist analysis to include power used against children and elders and within lesbian couples. The difference between founders and non-feminist therapists is that for the former the confrontation of the misuse of power remains central, while for the latter, the focus shifts to issues of learned behavior and ego dysfunction. Further, founders have focused on the need for structural change to empower those who are abused, while confronting and treating perpetrators. Non-feminists focus exclusively on treatment.

Some feminists believe treating abusive men reprivatizes the problem by treating wife battering differently than stranger assault. In my sample, those who held this opinion were joiners, the feminists involved in trying to shelter women with
inadequate and frequently precarious funding. Joiners took a more pragmatic approach to batterers’ treatment. They recognize that the judicial system has been reluctant to prosecute and incarcerate batterers. Further, they know that many women are unwilling to have their husbands incarcerated and are reluctant to prosecute. They remain dubious that batterers’ treatment programs are effective but tolerate them as a resource that will at least help women adjust to the idea that their partners will not change, despite their promises. Nonetheless, joiners doubt that the effectiveness of therapy outweighs its costs and strongly advocate that violent men should have to pay for treatment. This group fears that batterers’ treatment will drain scarce resources away from programs for battered women, and has been stalwart in its resistance. One shelter director expressed her opinions about batterers’ treatment programs, as follows,

The federal money, the Family Violence Prevention Services Act money...comes to the states through the Department of Human Services....And in fact, the Department encouraged programs to apply for batterers’ treatment money. I mean that’s exactly what happened. It’s like this money that very specifically says in the federal regulations "for victims of domestic violence" specifically, "grass roots, community based shelter and related services," thirty percent of it in our state has gone to batterers’ treatment programs.7

Joiners believed that treatment should not replace punishment and that whenever women wanted it, arrest should remain an option. One shelter director summarized joiners’ resistance to batterers’ treatment programs, as follows,

[On the review board] what I saw was too many batterer treatment programs trying to come in and get victims’ money....one of the proposals I reviewed, they wanted to reimburse the therapists at $60 an hour, and then I set that next to another proposal where a shelter worker is getting $5.50 an hour. I mean that really is the metaphor for
The whole thing for me....I support batterer treatment, but I really think there are some models out there that are really bad. There are a lot of people doing that sort of psycho-ed model, you know, where you teach people how to walk away when they get mad...and my view is that something a lot deeper than that needs to happen....The other thing is I think batterers need to be involved in their own therapy and I think they need to pay for it if they can, because they're non-committal people. You know, they're real self-focused people. They don't want any consequences, and that's real beneficial to them to realize there are consequences to hitting people. It's very expensive. It should be expensive....I [also] think that arrest is something that should happen with every batterer if the victim is able to sign the witness statement.8

The amount of money allocated to batterers’ treatment programs is indicative of the power sponsors have to redefine an issue and co-opt the movement. Nonetheless, joiners have not sat idly by while the problem has been redefined and resources drained. One strategy to stem the flow of money away from services for battered women has been for feminists to volunteer to serve on the review boards of sponsors who have recruited or funded proposals for batterers’ treatment programs.

One shelter director explained the following strategy as a coordinated plan of action. She said,

Well, one of the ways we’re trying to change it is to get some of us on the review committee for the funding. And that’s happening this year for the first time. And I am not going to be recommending any [batterers’ treatment programs]. I mean I’m on one of the committees that has...nine proposals, four of which, can you imagine? Almost half the proposals that came in are for batterers’ treatment programs. For this one pot of federal money that was specifically for shelter. Half of the proposals have come in for batterers’ treatment programs, and my response is going to be to not recommend them.9

By remaining active, feminists have worked to ensure that programs confront batterers with their responsibility for violent behavior and that their collective action frame is not compromised. When the Family Violence Program proposed introducing
couples’ counseling and group therapy for violent women, feminists were an important point of resistance, opposing the issue in meetings and through interpersonal dynamics. One member of the batterers’ treatment team explained,

[The feminists have] been angry with me lately, mostly around this issue of violence of women....I have been somewhat stubborn about putting some of these issues out on the table. And they haven’t been well received....I still have a good relationship with [the director of a mental health oriented shelter].....The Director [of a feminist shelter] is pretty mad at me, has been for a couple of months.10

The treatment of family violence has become institutionalized, with many controversial programs being introduced as the subject of experimentation. Feminists have been put in the position of having to be vigilant to avoid having others redefine the issues. They have advocated a continued focus on inequalities of power in the relationship and society and have resisted any tendency to blame the victim. The resistance to couples’ counseling is rooted in a belief that power differences in violent relationships put women at a marked disadvantage during and after treatment sessions. Because women know it is likely that they will be punished for talking about the abuse during therapy, the incentive is to cover for the abuser, pretending that everything is all right. Couples’ counseling endangers the weaker partner in abusive relationships. Further, in an interaction model, part of couples’ therapy is helping the woman to understand her role in provoking the violence. Feminists call this victim blaming (Greenblat 1983). Counseling for abusive women has been resisted because of its tendency to treat all abusers alike. The literature has clearly demonstrated that men tend to use violence as a form of control, whereas women tend to use it as a form of self-defense (Adams 1988; Dobash and Dobash 1979; Ptacek 1988; Saunders
Further, it has shown that women in violent relationships tend to be injured far more than men (Berk, et al 1983; Dobash and Dobash 1979; Kurz 1989; McLeer, et al 1989; Stark et al 1979). The fear among feminists is that the issues will become clouded and the collective action frame compromised. Resistance has been oriented toward preserving feminist principles. One shelter director expressed her disapproval of couples’ counseling and therapy for violent women, as follows,

I know there’s a big movement in Cleveland to make everybody equally as violent, but this is like the big thing now. "Everybody’s violent, so let’s just treat everybody." And I really come from the position of: A. treating people is not going to stop the violence in the long run. You have to do more than just treat people. I mean, first of all, you have to treat it as a crime. And second of all, you have to change society. You know, I mean we can treat people ad nauseam for the centuries, for the eons, and we’re not going to stop this problem....The whole goal of batterers’ treatment should be to protect women and protect victims. And there’s not like this whole kind of mish mash of, 'Oh my god, everybody’s a batterer, and everybody’s equally violent and we got to just treat everybody and put everybody together and it doesn’t matter.'

According to feminists, one of the difficulties with counseling victims and couples and treating batterers in non-confrontive ways is that it overlooks power differences between the couple and assumes that conjugal violence is a deviation from the normal, loving, patriarchal family. Any effort to provide treatment must confront power.

FUNDING AND THE FEMINIST MODEL

One of the central issues over which feminists have grappled has been the role of professionals and formerly battered women in the movement. Initially, founders believed that formerly battered women would serve as peer counselors and role models to shelter residents. The belief has been that only someone who has been
through the experience can fully empathize with battered women. Further, serving as a peer counselor and role model empowers both the victim and the survivor. When battered women talk to survivors, they start to realize that they too may live violence free lives. By observing what other battered women have attained, they begin to tap into strengths they did not know they had and to take control of their own lives.

Survivors as peer counselors and advocates are important resources for the movement. As joiners came to the movement, they began to realize that sometimes battered women have other problems that require professional help. Founders’ strategy had been to refer such women to other programs for help. Sponsors, however, wanted a more professional model of treatment, with the employment of licensed counselors. Some shelters acquiesced to the demands, and gradually shifted to a therapeutic orientation. Others resisted, either by avoiding sponsors who made such demands or by hiring professionals with a feminist perspective on wife abuse. The fear among feminists was that professionals would compromise the feminist collective action frame, shifting the analysis to a mental health model. One shelter director, herself a survivor of wife abuse, explained her resistance to the mental health model, as follows,

You know, we aren’t licensed by the Mental Health Department....Lots of my folks have bachelor’s degrees in social work and then took the test and got the license. But you know, some of my staff are also formerly battered women, high school graduates....And truthfully, one of the things that I really think is very important....is to let formerly battered women empower other battered women....I feel very strongly that in the whole concept of feminist and peer counseling, formerly battered women make very good counselors....I mean you walk a thin line....There’s a lot of different ways of being coopted in this movement. One is through funding and having to be quote, more
professional. The other way is as you become more professional, you become more social service oriented as opposed to social change oriented. And I think that's happened to a number of programs... I very specifically talk about that issue of social change to all the new folks that come... We even have in our personnel policy... a very specific paragraph that says that we give equal credit to life experiences and education and that we value the experiences of formerly battered women.\textsuperscript{12}

This shelter director would not apply for mental health funds or money from any other source that encouraged a "social service orientation." Her decision meant the program was in a perpetual state of near financial crisis. The day I interviewed her, she told me she had just learned that President Bush had "cut the emergency shelter line item budget seventy-six percent." If that line item made it through the Senate, it would mean an annual loss of $60,000 to $80,000 for the program. To fight back, she was in the process of organizing a "telephone tree" of people in Ohio and throughout the United States to call their Senators to protest the cuts.

Program directors' commitment to self-help, empowerment, and social change is testimony to their feminist principles. Empowerment has been a source of growth in the movement, taking activism out of shelters and other organizations, and into the homes where violence takes place. As women have learned to survive their own victimization, they have gained the skills necessary to help others. One program director illustrated this point with the following story. She explained,

My favorite story is that... a woman got battered... and she called a friend of hers who happened to have been one of our former clients. And our client had gone to her house, helped her get all of her important papers together, gotten the police on the phone, told them what they needed to do, you know, because we give everybody a copy of the statute, because the police always tell people these terrible stories. And you know, victims don't know the law, so we give them a
copy of the law. We explain to them how to get things enforced. So this other survivor goes in and does the whole intervention, like helps her pack up, calls the police to get the offense report taken. They’re off to the hospital to get the injuries recorded and treated, and by the time that she called us, you know, she really didn’t need very much. And that to me is the greatest thing. You know, there are thousands of these women out there in the community now who are trained.\textsuperscript{13}

Empowering women to help themselves and others frees them from dependence on professionals or the state and is an effective means of movement dissemination. Although shelters are important components of the battered women’s movement, their success will ultimately lead to a reduced need for their services.

Funding may have been one means of coopting some programs, but it appears that directors and activists have learned its pitfalls and found ways to avoid selling out. Some directors have had the luxury of being able to avoid controlling sponsors; others have not had that privilege. In some programs, particularly rural shelters, securing funding without "strings attached" can be particularly difficult. Because the majority of marriages occur in urban areas, city based programs receive most of the revenue from the marriage license tax. Further, when government funds are allocated on the basis of population, rural areas often come up short. They are, therefore, heavily dependent on funding from other sources, including charitable fundraising organizations and the State Department of Mental Health. For rural programs, deciding not to apply for Mental Health funds would, in many cases, be paramount to extinction. Directors had learned to compromise on issues of organization and the inclusion of men as board members. Despite these compromises, they adhered to the
feminist collective action frame with regard to all the other elements set forth by Davis (1988). (See Table 1.)

In my data I found abundant evidence that resistance to sponsors' demands for the hiring of professionals and a hierarchical model were incorporated without compromising feminist principles. In shelters that depended on dictatorial sponsors, funders took their greatest toll in their tendency toward bureaucratic rationality. Although they were not all this way, some sponsors appeared to lose sight of the goal--helping women--and to get caught up in a concern for the rules. Dictatorial sponsors took their toll, particularly in using up activists' time and energy. For example, at the time of my research, the Ohio Department of Mental Health had recently imposed shelter standards on recipients of funds. Among other criteria, their standards included adherence to building codes. When one thinks about people living and sleeping in unsafe buildings, this does not seem like an unreasonable requirement. Certainly, it is one meant to protect women. Conversely, one must also realize that shelters frequently operate on insufficient budgets and have found ways to address women's needs through in-kind donations, such as space to hold meetings. One of the services many shelters provide is support groups for non-residents. These groups often meet in churches or other donated space. Especially in rural areas where women must often drive long distances to attend meetings, it is essential to hold them in accessible areas. The buildings in which such meetings take place are likely to be utilized by the shelter no more than two hours per week, and space is usually donated. One director explained the quandary of a rural-based program as follows,
I just talked to [a colleague] at [a rural shelter]....This is just to give you a little example of how ridiculous it is. She deals with six rural counties. Has six support groups in each of those rural counties in some kind of public building--some churches, a senior center, one's a municipal building, all donated space, all for two hours a week. The Mental Health Board has said that for each of those spaces she must have a building inspection and a fire inspection and it has to pass their standards for her to hold those groups there, to get money for them. Now to get any of those things, including a building inspection is about between $200 and $550. When she called the State Mental Health Board and said, "And who are your certified building inspectors in these counties?" Guess what? There aren't any.14

The impact of sponsors' demands has been to diminish the amount of time activists are able to devote to social change, not to eliminate a commitment to feminist goals and principles. Among the shelter directors I interviewed, there was consensus on the desire to spend more time working for social change and the recognition that performing mundane chores was vital to survival.

In addition to compliance with building codes, many sponsors insist upon a hierarchical form of organization and scientifically established treatment modes. In my sample, however, not all hierarchies resulted from sponsors' demands. Some shelters have used hierarchies as a way to ensure that services for battered women are not threatened or compromised. In such settings, administrators are expected to focus on public relations, grant writing, fundraising, and dealing with sponsors' demands. Administrators also work for social change at the local level. Those who are members of the statewide network also advocate for change at that level. Shelter workers provide high quality services to women and work toward change through empowerment, as well as at the local level by pressuring officials to meet women's
needs. One director explained that this division of labor enabled shelters to survive during the Reagan/Bush years. She said,

What happened in the Reagan era is that there needed, for organizations to survive, many of us had to do some protection of the clinical people, recognizing that things were so bad and were taking so much more time. I mean, housing began to be very, very limited, benefits were cut. I mean that stuff hasn’t stopped now. But those kinds of things. And so the work with clients was even more intense. And those people just could not do what needed to be done with clients if we were also expecting them to do a lot of the other...administrative work, too. So this organization has...put a layer...surrounding those people. And they’re asked to do very little...in terms of the [administrative] functioning.¹⁵

Acquiescence to demands for the use of scientifically established treatment modes and the inclusion of licensed professionals has been mixed. Some have done this by employing advocates and referring women with substance abuse or mental health problems to other programs. Others have made an effort to integrate feminist professionals with advocates. Those who have replaced survivors and advocates with non-feminist professionals have been the most likely to shift, over time, from a feminist to a mental health orientation.

Throughout the state, the emergence of strategies to meet the letter of the requirements while maintaining a feminist orientation has resulted in a diverse array of styles, each the product of adaptation and resistance. One shelter director, a leader in the Ohio Domestic Violence Network, a statewide coalition of direct service providers, explained differences in organization and strategy as simply a matter of style. She said,

Battered women’s shelters were primarily started by former victims. I mean, historically the literature talks about a lot of former victims and
a lot of advocates for women and feminists who really, and some
lesbian women who really banded together, and the whole movement
really started out of that. So there's a real strong feminist perception
and perspective, in all of our work. Now whether we are, how we
may use that philosophy, I mean my definition of feminism may be
different than [another director's], as an example, but there's that
recognition that the differences are the style, not the real core value of
that. And I think the other piece that kind of binds us all together is
the recognition of how pervasive domestic violence is in our society
and our real belief that that's real wrong....I mean, [my Board] really
wanted this [shelter] to be operated in a business-like way,
understanding we were non-profit, because if we don't, if we can't pay
our bills then we're not going to be able to serve victims. And my role
is that. There are other directors [who are more egalitarian]....We have
all made a commitment that we need to accept those differences....So I
really feel like that one of the things that we can do as women
empowering other women who are directors and who are staff members
is, yes, recognize that there are differences, but appreciate those
differences rather than letting those get in the way on behalf of
victims. 16

The major difference between feminist shelters and social service agencies is not
based on funding, the provision of counseling, organizational patterns, or even the
employment of professionals. The divide between the feminist and mental health
models comes from the way organizations and activists define the issues. Although
organizational issues are important in any examination of movement cooptation, the
fact feminists have been unwilling to compromise on the definition of the issue as one
of power and control suggests that non-structural factors also need to be considered.
Cultural factors, including a collective identity, collective action frame, and activist
community are central elements in the Ohio battered women's movement's resistance
to cooptation.
ELEMENTS OF NON-COOPTABILITY

Collective Identity and the Collective Action Frame

The concept of collective identity draws its impetus from Marx’s idea of the transformation of a class in itself to a class for itself. Inherent in this transformation is the development of a class consciousness that will ultimately lead to social action. Consciousness is emergent with the group’s analysis of its commonality of social position and interests. With the emergence of group consciousness a collective identity is formed, based on its members’ common interests, experiences, and solidarity (Taylor 1989). Collective identity is an emergent, socially constructed property that cannot be reduced to individual identity, attitudes, consciousness, or ideas (Taylor and Whittier 1992c). Like Marx’s class for itself, collective identity is dependent on a common attribution of the problematic situation, or collective action frame (Snow, et al 1986; Snow and Benford 1992). It emerges, develops, and is sustained within social movement communities that set themselves apart from others with boundaries, consciousness, and a movement culture that symbolically challenges and redefines existing systems of domination (Taylor and Whittier 1992b).

The concept of collective identity has been set forth in the social movement literature as one way to reincorporate individuals into the organizational and structural concerns of the resource mobilization paradigm. Resource mobilization’s move away from a focus on consciousness, grievances, discontent, and social psychological motivations for collective action was, in part, a desire to remove the irrational actor assumptions inherent in classical social movement theory (Jenkins 1983; McAdam
1982; McAdam, et al. 1988; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977; Oberschall 1973; Tilly 1978). This paradigm shift resulted in resource mobilization theory, which focused predominately on organization and opportunity structures and very little on actors' motivations. Subsequently, in more recent literature, efforts have been made to reintroduce actors, this time with the assumption of rational action, inherent in resource mobilization theory (Fantasia 1988; Fireman and Gamson 1979; Ferree 1992; Ferree and Miller 1985; Gamson 1992; Klandermans 1992; Klandermans and Tarrow 1988; Klein 1984; McAdam 1988; Morris and Mueller 1992; Oliver 1989).

The salience of reintroducing activists and focusing on collective identity lies in the impact the unit of analysis may have on research conclusions. In examinations of the battered women's movement, the focus has been on the effect structural factors have had on social movement organizations. This analysis has included an examination of the effect sponsors have had on the inclusion of professionals in shelter programs, as well as changes in the criminal justice system (Ahrens 1978, 1980; Andler and Sullivan 1988; Bush 1992; Davis 1988; Ferraro 1981b, 1983a; Johnson 1981; Schechter 1982; Tierney 1979, 1982). An exclusive focus on organizational and structural elements obscures and potentially loses the impact of activists' resistance. By focusing on collective identity, a more contextual analysis is possible and a more holistic picture of activism and resistance emerges (Dobash and Dobash 1983). Such an analysis permits an examination of how activism, as a component of identity, plays itself out in a myriad of settings, including one's personal life and career, as well as during the course of what would traditionally be
considered protest. In this way, a focus on the effect of collective identity permits an examination of career activism and the politics of everyday resistance (Collins 1990; Daniels 1991). It further challenges the dualistic assumptions that social movements and activism challenge, but do not take place in, the legal rational political arena, and that activism occurs only in public settings. One of the central tenets of radical feminism is that the "personal is political" (Cassell 1977). A focus on collective identity allows an examination of activism in social movement organizations, the legislature, the courts, friendship groups, the family, and on the job. Just as feminists have challenged notions of public and private domains, the focus on collective identity challenges the notion that activism is a public activity, separate from one's personal life (Elshtain 1981).

The battered women's movement focuses on social change through individual empowerment, change in political and economic structures, and a radical alteration of the systems of gender and familial systems of domination. Recent research has focused on the relationship between collective consciousness and collection action, or the way that inequality in the social structure and dominant meaning systems is translated into subjectively experienced discontent (Fantasia 1988; Ferree 1992; Ferree and Miller 1985; Fireman and Gamson 1979; Gamson 1992; Klandermans 1984, 1992; Klandermans and Tarrow 1988; Klein 1984; McAdam 1988; Morris and Mueller 1992; Oberschall 1973; Taylor and Whittier 1992c). The development of the collective consciousness among women in the contemporary women's movement arose out of the experience of subordination in the civil rights and student movements and
in politics and on the job. Awareness of the cultural and structural elements of subordination arose in consciousness raising groups and through the research and activities of the Commission on the Status of Women (Beuchler 1990; Cassell 1977; Evans 1979; Ferree and Hess 1985; Freeman 1973, 1975; Rupp and Taylor 1987). The basis of liberation is a recognition of the social, political, economic, historical, and cultural elements of oppression (Freire 1970). As women began to develop a consciousness of the context of their subordination, the collective identity "feminist" began to develop and they began to take action.

Within the battered women’s movement, a central element in avoiding cooptation and disseminating the movement has been the development among battered women of a consciousness of the structural and cultural elements that permit and perpetuate wife abuse. Here the development of a collective, as opposed to individual, identity is dependent on an oppositional collective action frame. Feminists believe wife abuse is the result of domination in the family, social structures, and the culture. This foundation of the collective action frame informs all other aspects of the movement, including perception of the battered woman, purpose of the shelter, dominant principle of intervention, politics, and long-term goals (Davis 1988).

Feminists define battered women as part of the group "women" (Davis 1988). One purpose of the shelter is to protect women and through self-help and empowerment help them to achieve autonomy. Conversely, shelters and programs with a mental health orientation believe wife abuse is caused by social stressors and
personal pathology. They define battered women as "victims,"17 thus setting the client population apart from the professionals who treat them (Davis 1988).

As a survival strategy, battered women, like prisoners of war, tend to identify and bond with their captors and to blame themselves for beatings and other abuse (Dutton and Painter 1981; Ferraro 1983b; Finkelhor and Yllö 1985; Graham, et al 1988; Hilberman 1980; Miller 1976; Ochberg 1978; Walker 1979, 1984). When battered women try to escape abusive relationships, they often find it difficult because of their extreme identification with the perpetrator. In any program, this tendency needs to be addressed. Elsewhere, I have argued that a mental health approach to wife abuse encourages the social construction and internalization of a victim mentality, whereas the feminist analysis focuses on structural and cultural factors that have inhibited women's freedom to live free of violence (Gagné 1990). Battered women who are counseled to believe they have personality disorders internalize blame and become dependent on professionals to "treat" them. As a result, dependency is transferred from the abusive partner to the therapist and potentially to the state, upon whom the "victim" becomes dependent for protection and support (Davis 1988). Conversely, women who are helped to understand the social system and dynamics of the relationship are more likely to be empowered to live independently and to later serve as advocates and role models for other women caught in abusive relationships (Gagné 1990).18

In feminist shelters, the dominant principle of intervention is self-help and identification with other women. Battered women, in support groups and one-on-one
conversations with other survivors, begin to understand that their situations are not unique. Through this process of consciousness raising, the battered woman begins to drop the identity of "victim" and to think of herself as a "survivor" and to identify with other women. Some women do not adopt a feminist identity, but in feminist shelters they learn the skills necessary for independent living and how to use the law to protect themselves and other women. Through the development of a survivor identity, the movement is disseminated into the everyday lives of all women with whom survivors come in contact.

Kathey Thomas is a prime example of the impact survivors may have within the movement. After serving her sentence, she was granted a pardon by Governor Celeste. She has since gone on to testify on behalf of House Bill 484, has appeared on nationally syndicated talk shows, was a keynote speaker in the domestic violence workshop sponsored by the Friendship LIFE Group in the summer before the clemencies were decided, participated in the conference on battered woman syndrome and post-partum depression at the Governor's Mansion, and has spent her career teaching women how to access jobs traditionally dominated by men. Thomas is exemplary of the personal growth that may come as a result of the feminist goal of empowerment.

Feminist shelters, programs, and social movement organizations may have compromised by becoming more hierarchical, but they have continued to work to encourage survivors to act as spokeswomen and movement activists. In feminist shelters, the job of administrators, directors, shelter workers, and volunteers is to
facilitate the empowerment, input, and leadership of survivors. Feminist programs encourage survivors to share their stories with each other, helping women realize that their experiences are not unique or the product of personal characteristics. One very soft-spoken woman, who was granted clemency, told me about her experiences as a speaker at the domestic violence workshop organized by the Friendship LIFE group. She explained,

> It was so emotional. I told my story there and, you know, it was really hard listening to me talk. And then listening to some of the other ladies that was even worse than mine. You know, you think yours is bad, then you listen to someone else and, I don’t know, people don’t think it, but instead of being weak, I think we were really strong because we put up with so much.\(^{19}\)

Through peer counseling and support women offer one another encouragement and strength and the realization that they are not alone. Some women work through the process quickly and become sources of strength to others. For some the process is slower. The woman quoted above tentatively thought of herself as a survivor, but had not yet internalized that identity. She explained,

> I’ve always thought everything was my fault. I don’t know, it’s probably because he told me it was my fault so much. But I felt like that if I had left him, that it [the murder] wouldn’t have happened. But I know now that even if I had left him, it still would have happened because he was the type, he wouldn’t let go. He would’ve hounded me. He wouldn’t let me get a life....So I know now that no matter what I would’ve done, it probably would’ve eventually came to one of us. And he always said that he wouldn’t let me have any peace, and he was right. He’s not letting me have any peace. I still don’t have no peace. It’s something that I’ll always remember and I’m always going to think about [crying], no matter what....And I still blame myself.\(^{20}\)

When I spoke with other clemency recipients, some offered the opinion that it would take this woman a while longer because of some of the more unique aspects of her
situation, to realize that the abuse and the murder were not her fault. The Friendship LIFE Group has facilitated the organization of a support group for the women who were granted clemency. With the assistance of other women in the group, this woman and others have a greater chance of understanding the context of their relationships. In a mental health program, she might receive treatment that would reinforce her belief that everything was her fault.

The collective identity fostered by the battered women's movement is dependent on the collective action frame—that wife abuse is rooted in patriarchy. Because all women are affected by patriarchy, battered women and never battered women have an overlapping commonality of experience rooted in womanhood. Feminists' opposition to treatment that focuses on individual pathologies is a central component in maintaining their oppositional collective identity. In order to maintain the definition of battered women as "women" and to foster empowerment and the development of a feminist consciousness and survivor identity, concepts that suggest that battered women are somehow different than never battered women must be avoided. Feminist shelter directors have worked to incorporate survivors and professionals who advocate a feminist analysis of the issues and to filter out any who advocate a personal pathology perspective. One shelter director strongly stated her commitment to hiring survivors and her opposition to "co-dependency"—the term used in the popular self-help literature to summarize a long list of personal characteristics, including a desire to take care of others, even at great personal risk. She said,

It's real hard to understand domestic violence unless you've been through it.... When I interview people to work here, we give them
many opportunities...to disclose that they are survivors. And if they are survivors, and if they are clear about those issues, they are the best people. It's hard to, the kind of empathy you can have for people, once you've been there is just, it's so different, and it's really hard to believe how bad it is....I mean it is really unbelievable unless you've been there. And there's a tendency for professionals, people who are professionally trained to sort of create pathology around the victim, to explain why she's so stuck. You know, because that's what professional training will do for you. You learn how to diagnose and treat. But if you've been there, then you go, "Well that's why she's not leaving, because there's no place for her to go, because the police won't enforce her protection order, because, you know, she can't support three kids on her own,"...and it's hard to train that kind of reality into people, and it's just so much easier to have them know it from their own personal perspective....We're trying to train people against co-dependency theory here. I mean when people come on the staff, they have to make a commitment they will not use that model. If they want to use that model, they got to work some place else, because I just hate it.  

Consciousness raising and peer counseling is not a panacea. Women bring different issues to the process, making it necessary for advocates and counselors to look at the context in which the woman's life has taken place. The feminist perspective considers the patriarchal context in which battering occurs, and when women exhibit traits of learned helplessness or co-dependency, they search further to determine what caused those characteristics. The training the above shelter director offered is exemplary of the feminist perspective. She drew a diagram of concentric circles to explain her philosophy. She explained,

This will just show you what my perspective is. Like when I do trainings, here's the person, and then we do these rings, and there's like a whole bunch of rings around....And the outside ring is, the first place that we train people to look is at how the systems have responded to this person. Look at the police, look at church, look at doctor, look at family, you know, look at the places where the victim has reached out for help and what has happened in their situations. And usually you can stop your investigation. Right there is the reason why this
person is stuck....Look at the external, how the community has responded to her, you can start to understand why she's blaming herself, because everybody else is. And then the second ring is socialization as a woman, family rules in her family of origin, what she was told to expect from intimate relationships...how she was socialized as a woman....And then like the third ring is her own internal life, her own behavior, thoughts, feelings about the battering, her own psychological responses to it. And then finally is childhood issues....You know, there are some women who...just can't leave....And for those women, if you go all through all these layers...usually you find that they're incest survivors.²³

Community

Social movement communities are set apart from other groups by boundaries, consciousness, and a movement culture that challenges and redefines existing systems of domination (Taylor and Whittier 1992b). Members of the battered women's movement community are set apart from non-members based on adherence to the feminist collective action frame. Those who adhere to feminist principles are considered members, those who do not are suspect and may be "frozen out" of the community.

Boundaries within the movement are flexible. Since its inception, the movement has had a tendency to compromise on issues less central to the collective action frame, such as hierarchy and funding, but to remain firm in its commitment to more central issues such as cause, perception of battered women, dominant mode of intervention, politics, and long term goals. Personal demeanor and program organization, while ideal elements of feminism, are not central components of the culture of the Ohio battered women's movement. Rather, the movement is made up of a diverse array of personal and organizational styles. Members believe that
diversity contributes to the movement's autonomy and strength. One shelter director, who was very active in the battered women's community and also a member of the Ohio Domestic Violence Network explained that the primary boundary of the battered women's community was an understanding that wife abuse and domestic violence are issues of power and control, and that organizational style and personal demeanor were not important. She said,

There are some organizations that very much, they're very much by consensus model....And there are others of us, I mean, we're not like that around here....That does not mean though that I can't accept and respect that another organization does things different, and that in no way makes us different in terms of how we get the issues and how we try to understand and work with victims....When we have our statewide meetings, I mean some people come in and you know, we laugh, just in terms of dress. I mean, some of us wear suits and some of us look more social workish and some are in jeans and some sit rigidly at tables and others curl their feet up under them....So even though there are those differences, we have all made a commitment that we need to accept those differences....So I really feel like one of the things that we can do as women empowering other women who are directors and who are staff members, is yes, recognize that there are differences, but appreciate those differences rather than letting those get in the way on behalf of victims.24

The boundaries of the battered women's movement are established through the collective action frame—the need to focus on empowerment, social change, and issues of domination and control. Those who focus on personal pathology or ignore differences in power are ostracized. With two exceptions, the people I spoke with did not express or acknowledge any pressure to conform to the feminist model. This suggests that most feminists have internalized the feminist analysis, perceiving it and the need for high levels of commitment as natural. The two who expressed a
perception of pressure to conform identified as feminists, but adhered to a mental health analysis. Both were involved in batterers' treatment programs.

Activists who adhered to the feminist analysis questioned "how good a feminist" community members were who adhered to a mental health model or did not demonstrate full commitment to feminism. One member of the community expressed this tendency in her tenuous acceptance of a member she had recruited.

I mean [this person] is now the expert on [battered woman syndrome and clemency]. She goes around the country and she gives talks. But [she] in many ways is not much of a feminist.25

Within the feminist community, commitment to feminist principles and ideals is under constant scrutiny, and conformity is expected. New members were given time to understand the feminist model, but were expected, over time, to internalize it. Those who deviated beyond tolerable limits were "frozen out," meaning personal pressure was put on the person to conform or leave.

One woman who was "frozen out" was a licensed counselor who had worked in the early 1980s as a shelter director. During her tenure there, she advocated greater professionalization of services, believing feminism was not something battered women could understand. She later left the shelter and ultimately began working in batterers' treatment. She was a self-avowed feminist who believed battered women were resistant to autonomy. She advocated treating batterers as one means of meeting the needs of dysfunctional families and empowering women. She explained how her decisions caused her to be ostracized by the feminist community. She said,

You know, I have a lot of responsibility to women that are battered....And one of the ways that I have to look at that responsibility
is trying to work with that person who is assaulting her. Because if I don’t look at him, and I don’t figure out why he’s doing what he’s doing and try to help him to change that, whether it’s coming out of sexism, whether it’s coming out of learned behavior, whether it’s coming out of the fact that he lives in a neighborhood where he had to fight to survive. Whatever it’s coming from, if I’m not paying attention to him, I can’t do anything for her. Nothing. And she is never going to get to a place where she feels empowered. Because she’s still going to be with somebody who’s beating her up. So I can’t just ignore that. And I feel really strongly about this, because when I left the shelters, it’s like…God, when I left them and I started to work here, I lost relationships. I lost friendships with people….Because I’d been coopted….I lost important relationships because… I saw one side of the issue, and then I started to work with the men and I started to see a different side of this issue….You know, I started to see that person who was in an enormous amount of pain about his own behavior.28

Pressure within the community to conform to feminist principles is one way that the movement has avoided cooptation. However, the community has moved far beyond those involved in shelter or direct service work. Because the battered women’s movement is one component of the women’s movement, its members are linked together within the larger feminist community.

The mobilization of protest is facilitated by a group’s ability to develop and maintain a set of beliefs and loyalties that contradict those of dominant groups (Taylor and Whittier 1992c). In the battered women’s movement, one of the major obstacles to movement success was redefining wife abuse as a social problem (Tierney 1982). Prior to the onset of feminist research in the 1970s, the majority of scholarship on wife abuse attributed the problem to women’s masochism (Pleck 1987). When shelters first began forming, they had very little feminist research upon which to draw, either to understand or validate the problems experienced by battered women.
Social science had established an androcentric understanding of wife abuse, which feminists began to challenge. One of the founders, who went on to direct an organization serving battered women and later served as a member of the Celeste Administration explained the problems the movement faced in the early 1970s. She said,

I remember going to the library to try to do some research to figure out if anybody had written anything on battered women. Like I said, I don’t know when we started calling them battered women, but we didn’t back then. And I mean, there really wasn’t anything.27

"Research as praxis" is a concept applied to scholarship that strives for emancipation (Lather 1986). Although most early research did not apply all of the principles of "praxis," its goals were emancipatory and it did play an important role in redefining wife abuse as a social problem. This redefinition began in the late-1970s with work such as Del Martin’s Battered Wives and Russell and R. Emerson Dobash’s Violence Against Wives. Using established research methods, they began to challenge and redefine the issue from a feminist perspective.

In the positivist tradition, social science has long aspired to an objective detachment from the "subject" studied (Harding 1986; Keller 1985; Lather 1986). Despite a professed commitment to objectivity, scholars make judgments throughout the research and writing process, including choosing the topic, the perspective from which it is examined, how the report is written, and the goals of the project (Gusfield 1976; Harding 1986; Keller 1985; Lather 1986; Richardson 1990). Feminists have argued that objectivity is a myth (Harding 1986; Keller 1985; Lather 1986; Richardson 1990).
Taylor and Whittier assert that "all social movements are, to varying degrees, culture producing" (1992c:1). Within the battered women's movement the research report has become an important "cultural artifact" (Gusfield 1989:22). Through the research report, feminist social scientists have contributed to the movement by identifying, documenting, conceptualizing, and offering theoretical analyses of problems facing women and battered women. Within the battered women's movement, the social scientific literature has helped to define and disseminate the movement's collective action frame. Further, because the research report is a scientific artifact, it has the impact of bringing scientific legitimacy to the issues (Gusfield 1989).

Prior to the establishment of its scientific legitimacy, even licensed psychologists who had encountered battered woman syndrome clinically or who understood the issues as a matter of gender bias in the law were not permitted to testify about what they knew. In Kathey Thomas's case, two founders, one a licensed psychologist, another with a master's degree in psychology, tried to testify about what they understood as battered woman syndrome. The licensed psychologist explained,

I was prepared to testify on behalf of Kathey and spent many an hour outside the courtroom and was not allowed to testify on what we are now calling the battered woman syndrome....The judge would not allow an expert witness....I was prepared to say that...it was self defense, delayed self-defense. I mean it's the timing they always get you on, you see. And that was going to be my line of reasoning. That this was just a totally self-defense initiated behavior.28

An example of the impact scientific legitimacy may have on people's lives and movement goals comes from two Ohio Supreme Court decisions. In 1981 in State v.
Thomas the Court found, "The 'battered wife syndrome' is not sufficiently developed, as a matter of commonly accepted scientific knowledge, to warrant testimony under the guise of expertise" (66 Ohio St. 2d:518). Nine years later, in 1990, after the research of Walker (1977-1978, 1979, 1983, 1984), Rosewater (1988), and others, the Court found, "The battered woman syndrome has gained substantial scientific acceptance to warrant admissibility into evidence" (State v. Koss 49 Ohio St 3d:213). During those nine years, feminist social scientists and other activists remained committed to the feminist analysis. They were adamant that battered women did not suffer from masochism or personality disorders and that their inability to leave abusive relationships was the result of feminine socialization, cultural expectations, and structural barriers. Feminists such as Angela Browne (1987) and Cynthia Gillespie (1989) demonstrated the androcentric bias in self-defense law and the criminal justice system, challenging the practice of holding women accountable to a legal system designed for men. In social science and activism, social change, not personal therapy, was the focus of intervention, goals, and movement politics. Some women were drawn into the movement through friendship networks and organizations. Others came from their reading of the feminist literature.

Within the battered women's movement, the collective action frame was the "glue" that held the community together, establishing its boundaries, consciousness, and important aspects of its culture. Although this analysis was generated directly from activists, it gained scientific legitimacy and was disseminated outward to potential activists through the cultural artifact, the research report. Some feminists
were drawn into the movement through the feminist literature and women's studies programs. Some of the women I interviewed were activists in the battered women's movement, yet belonged to no social movement organizations. Most were too busy in their careers to belong to organizations. One woman was active through her research and work in the courts. Her work was performed primarily alone, although she was integrated into a national community of feminist lawyers and psychologists. Another worked in the prison system. She was usually isolated on the job in her commitment to women's issues, but during the clemency process, came into contact with other feminists, who had also read the literature. In addition, she recruited a colleague's support by suggesting that she read Lenore Walker's work on battered woman syndrome and Angela Browne's work on battered women who kill. This woman's feminism derived from sociology and women's studies courses and her reading of the feminist literature. She had never worked directly with battered women and did not belong to any feminist organizations, yet she was highly committed to the goals of the movement. Other activists were secretaries, cabinet members in the Celeste Administration, judges, public defenders, doctors, survivors, legislators, retired teachers, and Sisters and Brothers of the Catholic Church. Some, who were founders, had worked to establish the first shelter, but had done little direct service. Others had never had any formal affiliation with the movement. In the prison, women were drawn to the feminist analysis through support groups where they read and responded to the literature. The research report is a powerful social movement artifact.
Through these cultural elements—identity, community, and frame—the movement has withstood cooptation, despite the pressure of funding. Nonetheless, a focus on purely cultural elements overlooks two important structural components in the movement's success. These are the formation of feminist networks and the opportunity structure established by the First Lady's Unit.

Social Movement Networks

The importance of social movement networks has been established in the resource mobilization literature. The presence of a "cooptable network" is an important component in movement mobilization (Freeman 1973; Morris 1984; Oberschall 1973). The major debate over movement organization has been between those who favor a centralized bureaucratic model and those who prefer decentralization (Gamson 1975; Gerlach and Hine 1970; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977). A centralized, bureaucratic organizational model is more conducive to movements that are liberal in orientation, seeking modification of the existing structure, whereas groups seeking personal or cultural change are better served by a decentralized model (Freeman 1979; Gamson 1975; Jenkins 1983; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977).

Because the battered women's movement has sought liberal change through the law and public policy, as well as radical change, through its challenge of established systems of domination and the cultural meanings traditionally attached to battered women and the conceptualization of public and private, it has benefitted from both formalized networks and informal movement communities. Formalized networks may
enhance efforts toward radical and liberal change. One example of the way radical change has been enhanced by a centralized network is the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV).

NCADV formed in 1978 as a grass roots organization, made up of local direct service programs and statewide coalitions. Its mission was social change and social action. In addition to the establishment of the collective action frame in shelters and other direct service programs, as well as in the social science literature, NCADV contributed by drawing women together at the national level. Here the movement’s collective action frame was critiqued and refined, often by consideration of the needs of frequently overlooked populations, such as women of color, lesbians, children, and Jewish, disabled, and rural women. The purpose of NCADV was not to provide practical advice to shelters, but to establish philosophical guidelines on how to address the needs of a diverse array of battered and formerly battered women. Philosophical statements were generated by members of task forces, comprised of underrepresented groups of women, established to look at topics of interest to themselves. One member of NCADV explained the goal of their work, as follows,

By having underrepresented groups, what we are trying to do very much is model leadership. The idea is social change through grass roots organizations, through leadership development of disempowered women and underrepresented women. Those task forces are, there’s six right now, there’s a battered/formerly battered women’s task force, and the real impetus of NCADV has always been to have battered women at the forefront of the movement....There’s a women of color task force. There’s a lesbian task force. There is a child advocacy task force and a Jewish women’s task force. There are a couple other, like for example, within the women of color task force there are some other caucuses that meet when we have people to meet...Native American, Latina, et cetera, et cetera.
NCADV, as a formal network, did more to define issues than to coordinate efforts. Despite the direction it gave to the movement, members often had difficulty attending meetings, primarily because of the shortage of resources that has been pervasive among shelters and direct service providers. Neither shelters nor the national coalition had the funds to underwrite members' expenses. One shelter director and NCADV member explained,

Actually, I'm the first person that's ever gone from Ohio on any kind of regular basis. In the past we may have sent one person every year or every couple years to a meeting....I mean, in Ohio it's just hard. I mean, you know, shelters are incredibly understaffed. They have incredibly little money. It's a lot of time--three full weeks a year [to attend annual meetings], I mean to leave your program, to leave your home and family, if that's necessary....It's difficult to do this organizing work on the kinds of budgets that our programs, state coalitions and national coalitions have. I mean, the national coalition is in incredibly serious financial situation at this moment in time, as is my own program.\(^30\)

Efforts toward liberal change were enhanced by the formation of a state wide coalition of direct service providers, the Ohio Domestic Violence Network (ODVN). In Ohio, until 1988, the statewide network to which many shelters belonged--ACTION for Battered Women in Ohio Coalition--was a government funded network (Schechter 1982). Although it began as a mix of feminist and non-feminist service providers, by the late 1980s, many feminist shelter directors believed the latter had taken over the organization. One shelter director explained why many feminist shelters left ACTION. She said,

About ten or fifteen people left the board of ACTION, sort of en masse, feeling that the organization was going in the wrong direction....In the battered women's movement, you've probably heard this from other people, there's sort of the mental health/treatment/rehab
people and then there's the grass roots people who believe that anybody can get battered and that people who get battered are basically healthy. I think that was the main perspective difference. You'll see in sort of the non-grass roots movement a lot of licensed people and a lot of people with master's degrees and all that, and certainly you'll see those people in our part of the movement, too, but we don't talk about that because we don't think it really means anything. We think that the most we've ever learned is from our clients and that school, you basically unlearn what you learn in graduate programs to really do this work. So the perspectives are kind of the professional versus grass roots, and you'll find less survivors in the...professional group.³¹

This lack of unity in ACTION made it difficult for battered women's programs to work toward feminist goals at the statewide level. Further, with the funding cuts that were implemented during the Reagan Administration, many shelters became more focused on survival, with efforts to advance social change oriented toward the local level. In addition to philosophical differences with ACTION, some shelters had an added incentive to drop their membership because of what they believed were prohibitively high annual dues in the amount of one percent of a program's annual budget. Another shelter director explained,

I mean we really tried very, very hard [to make things work], and there were other things as well, some philosophical things. Their dues structure was inordinately high and continues to this day to be one percent of your budget. So of a budget of $200,000, you'd pay $2,000. I mean, that's like outrageous! Particularly since they don't do anything. It's outrageous.³²

In 1988 approximately fifteen programs left ACTION over what they perceived to be philosophical differences, inordinately high dues, and the president's lack of willingness to share information with members. They formed the Ohio Domestic Violence Network to work on behalf of victims of domestic violence. Their "mission statement" is made up of language that is deliberately gender neutral. It says,
The Ohio Domestic Violence Network believes that all people have a right to a violence free life. ODVN is a cohesive, inclusive network of individuals and organizations from across the state which advocates with and for battered persons, produces and shares information, educations about options, and advocates social change.33

The movement toward gender neutral language, evidenced in ODVN and expressed by some shelter directors was the result of a recognition of survival needs. Despite the gender neutral language, the Network recognized that the vast majority of "battered persons" were women and that the issues behind "domestic violence" were power and control. A shelter director explained her position on the issues, as follows,

I talk about victims of domestic violence, I don’t talk about battered women a lot. That’s one of those compromises. I mean, I’m real clear that 95 to 98% of the victims are female, and I’m real clear that the power and control issues also have a sexism in the center. I also know that I can get people to listen to me a whole lot quicker if I talk about victims of domestic violence....So I talk about elder abuse and I talk about domestic violence....The last male we sheltered was an older man whose adult son and his wife were both beating him....We provided shelter and all the other services.34

Not all shelter directors were in agreement with the use of gender neutral terms, but as long as the Network was clear on the issues of power and control inherent in family violence, a compromise was possible.

Among joiners, the use of gender neutral language and the shift from being battered women’s shelters to domestic violence programs was, in part, a result of budget cuts in the 1980s. Some shelters began to realize that in order for battered women’s needs to be met during a time of financial constraints, the wider community was going to have to be held accountable for providing services. This forced those
with the most precarious funding to become more mainstream. A director of a rural shelter explained,

I think the Reagan era forced some of [the focus on family violence]. I mean we had to really take a long look at who and what we were and how we could survive.... We could not be seen as totally isolated in this community. We had to spread the accountability for battered women to lots of segments of this community.... We had to involve mental health people and... children services people and churches.... At times there are some mental health people that don’t [understand the issues]. We know that there’s some judges.... We’ll sometimes see people who are trying to provide marital counseling because the issue is domestic violence. Well that is just like, it’s trying to mix oil and water together. I mean, for marital counseling to work, people got to be equal. And so our responsibility is to hold mental health practitioners accountable and say, "You can’t do this. These are the issues." But I think that’s been a plus in terms of how we’ve been forced to do some more collaborative things, just to survive. I think we’re stronger for victims because of that.35

The goal of ODVN was to coordinate efforts for social change at the statewide level. Their goals have been oriented toward liberal change, and their most active committee has been the Legislative Committee, created to monitor and lobby on behalf of battered women. The first major project of ODVN and the Legislative Committee was House Bill 484, the bill that would make into law the right of battered women to introduce expert testimony regarding battered woman syndrome at their trials for assault or murder. Activism on behalf of HB484 began after its introduction, in 1990. Whether the bill’s sponsor, Joe Koziura, asked ODVN to organize testimony or the Network offered their services is unclear. Nonetheless, ODVN worked to bring together survivors, service providers, experts on battered woman syndrome, lawyers, and others to testify before the Legislature about the need for this law. None of the women in ODVN had ever done this type of work, so they
turned to Representative Koziura, his aid, and a feminist public relations expert who had volunteered her services to the group for direction. They recruited whoever was available, particularly soliciting people whose testimony they thought would be most powerful. Sometimes they had to try to get people to testify on almost no notice. Like the founders of the first shelters, they learned by doing and were empowered in the process. One of the organizers explained,

We were able to get Kathey Thomas to lead off.... We had some other victims talk.... We had some Legal Aid attorneys. As the hearings progressed... we just kept saying, "Okay, now what do we need? What do we need?" And it was because we didn’t know going into it, we were, I was really naive. I mean I was so naive! And my peers were so naive, because we’d never really done a lot of this work before... [Joe’s aide] would call me like on Monday and say, "We really need somebody doing this... by Wednesday." And I’m saying, "Jeez!... What do you want me to do? Pull them out of the air?" You know, but we, I’d start making calls. We had clinicians from Dayton, people in Cincinnati have done some work... on the Stockholm Syndrome... there’s a woman in Cleveland who’s a psychologist by the name of Lynne Rosewater who has done some expert testimony across Ohio, across the nation.... So how it worked was we had established this network out there of people who one, were committed that this was an important thing, that when [the aid] called and said, "We gotta have"... that we were all committed to drop what we were doing and try to make that happen.36

Having learned from their experiences, ODVN has since gone on to lobby against and on behalf of other pieces of legislation. Due to a lack of funding or staff, this group has been primarily reactive. They had successfully blocked some pieces of legislation and failed to block others. Despite inevitable failures, the Legislative Committee has continued to grow. In 1991 they developed a system whereby legislative alerts are sent to member programs telling them of bills that look threatening or promising, and coordinating action as needed. In addition, ODVN has
worked to broaden the network, drawing together activists and service providers from a variety of perspectives. The belief is that there is a need for a united voice on behalf of battered women. They believe that having mental health workers and feminists each claiming to speak on behalf of this population is counterproductive to all concerned. One of the Legislative Committee members explained,

We did a networking meeting with the Ohio Coalition Against Sexual Assault and ACTION and Ohio Victim/Witness Association, and NOW. We sent a letter to like eight organizations and said, "Let's all sit down, all of our legislative committees, and we'll just talk about what bills are you watching and here's the bills we're watching and what bills are we all watching?" And we found that we were all watching about four bills that we all felt pretty strongly about. So I think we're going to do some joint legislative committee work together, which I think is really powerful. That's how Senate Bill 3 got passed [giving, among other things, fathers automatic right to joint custody], because we were not connected....And we didn't have allies, and ACTION Ohio had signed off on that bill...and then ODVN comes in and we don't want this bill and they think we're nuts....Because the Legislature doesn't understand all our different disciplines and our different perspectives, and it's really important for us to try to speak in a common voice, when we have one.37

By compromising on issues of language and style and focusing on power and domination, direct service providers broke free of one network that lacked a feminist perspective and created another that incorporated the feminist collective action frame. Networks alone are not sufficient to project the movement forward. However, collective action frames, identities, and communities that lack some organizational structure are less effective. Within the battered women's movement, avoidance of cooptation and success has been facilitated by cultural and structural factors, but neither is sufficient to bring about social change in a hostile opportunity structure. Just as ODVN has worked to create greater unity among direct service providers,
Dagmar Celeste, as First Lady, worked to coordinate the efforts of government agencies and officials, social movement organizations and activists to address the problems of battered women and family violence.

Opportunity Structure

The social movement literature has widely established the importance of the support and constraint that the larger political and cultural context has on the emergence, success, and demise of social movements (Jenkins 1982, 1983; McAdam 1982; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Piven and Cloward 1977; Rupp and Taylor 1990; Skocpol 1979; Tarrow 1982; Tilly 1978). Pervasive in this literature is the tendency to focus on the ability of activists to draw in elite support, sidestep repressive measures, or take advantage of political realignments. The literature assumes that social movements represent "politics by other means" and that activists and authorities are two discrete groups (Gamson 1975; Perrow 1979). My data show that many founders have established themselves in government positions, as well as in numerous other professions. Founders and joiners have used their careers as a forum in which to strive toward feminist goals, including the goals of the battered women’s movement. In short, my data suggests that although activists may sometimes have to wait for the opportunity structure to open, in the case of the Ohio battered women’s movement, they created it themselves.

The battered women’s movement is most accurately defined as a social movement community, held together by formal organizational networks, professional affiliations, friendship networks, and a commitment to the feminist collective action
frame. Like the wider Ohio women’s movement, many women who had been part of feminist programs in the 1970s found employment in governmental and social service agencies, or as private contractors in the 1980s (Whittier 1991). One issue that became apparent as founders became doctors, lawyers, prosecutors, public defenders, judges, agency directors, cabinet members, and the First Lady was the lack of coordination of societal responses to family violence.

During the 1970s, feminists challenged the notion that violence in the home is different than violence in so-called "public" arenas. As feminists, their focus was on women. However, during the 1980s, most public/private challenges expanded to include all abuses of power in the family, including child and elder abuse and violence in lesbian and gay relationships. During that time, the family violence literature convincingly demonstrated that the family of origin is an important determinant in violence in the family of procreation (Gelles 1983; Gelles and Straus 1988; O’Leary and Arias 1987; Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz 1980; Steinmetz and Straus 1974). During the 1980s all forms of family violence were drawn into the feminist analysis as a challenge to abuses of power and the notion that the home is private and the family is a haven. Dagmar summarized this perspective best when she said,

I’ve always tried to talk about this issue in terms of, you know, the sort of militaristic lingo, because domestic violence has been relegated to the, anything that gets trivialized, and so if somebody gets attacked in their own home, then it’s supposedly less of an assault than if somebody gets attacked on the street....They had White House hearings...and I went and testified at these White House hearings on violence. It was basically violence in America. And one of the things they did at the federal level then was split domestic, and I don’t know
what the opposite is, away. A lot of people came in and said, "No, you shouldn’t do that. I mean, the penalty should be the same, the due process should be the same, at least the same. In fact, isn’t it worse when somebody you trust and know well comes after you?" To no avail obviously. 39

Feminists maintained their focus on domination and control, recognizing that in cases of heterosexual spouse abuse, women are the victims in the vast majority of cases. Within that frame, they turned their attention to addressing the need for a coordinated response to family violence. One of the members of Dagmar’s staff compared the process of coordinating the agencies, social movement organizations, and activists responsible for or interested in responding to family violence to spinning a spider’s web, where connections reach outward, but are held together by one continuous fiber. He said,

They were constantly trying to bring people together, cross department boundaries, and talk to one another, and you know, web with one another. And they encouraged that, and the Governor did, too. . . . I guess the feminism that I admired in them is... recognizing the worth of individuals, being open to people’s talents, not necessarily because of the role that they’re in or that they’ve been assigned to... but because of the human value that they can contribute to something. 40

The concept of webbing goes beyond the idea of organizational networking. It includes the notion that social change is created by drawing together diverse individuals and drawing upon their individual talents and strengths, irrespective of status. In this way, social change comes from within, and in the process, activists are further empowered to take charge of their own lives and advance other movement goals.
The webbing apparent in the First Lady’s Unit was pervasive throughout the state. Feminists’ commitment to recognizing the worth of individuals and their talents and to empowerment created change at the individual level. Their ability to look beyond status and role and to cross institutional boundaries and challenge the *status quo* enabled them to work toward social change and draw in feminists and potential recruits in agencies and organizations throughout the state.

In relation to family violence, the first "web" that Dagmar advocated was the creation of a Governor’s Task Force on Family Violence. She announced the Governor’s intent to establish the Task Force in December 15, 1983 when she testified before the United States Attorney General’s Task Force on Family Violence. The Task Force was established by Executive Order on February 27, 1984 and held its first meeting on March 3, 1984. The Task Force was created as an "action work group" to research the existing family violence infrastructure and develop a comprehensive plan to provide a coordinated approach in addressing family violence. In addition, a group called the Intergovernmental Work Group on Family Violence was formed and began meeting on February 14, 1984. Its function was to implement the Task Force’s recommendations. Figure 1 represents the organization of the Task Force and the Work Group.
FIGURE 1

Organization of the Governor's Task Force on Family Violence and the Interdepartmental Work Group on Family Violence
The Task Force and the Work Group were both structurally attached to the Governor’s Office of Criminal Justice Services. The Task Force was made up of three cluster groups, including child, spouse, and elder abuse. Not shown in Table 2 is the geographic clusters that were established in the Task Force. These were made up of individuals from various regions within the state. When research was conducted, this gave members an opportunity to be involved closer to home. As the Task Force concluded its investigations, members made recommendations for improvements in research, educational efforts, and the legal response to family violence. As recommendations were generated, they were transferred to the Intergovernmental Work Group on Family Violence, which was established to bring together representatives from the Departments of Public Welfare, Education, Mental Health, Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Youth Services⁴⁹, the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, the Ohio Commission on Aging, and the Office of the Attorney General. Within the Task Force there were thirty members, ten representing the legal system, sixteen representing private health and service organizations, two representing statewide organizations, and two representing religion and private business.⁵⁰ A member of the Task Force explained the rationale behind bringing together individuals from such diverse backgrounds. She said,

We specifically decided to cover child abuse, elder abuse, and domestic violence, all three and treat them under the category of family, as they seem to have a great deal in common. There was not much attention in those days to what has now been called elder abuse. There was a growing attention to child abuse and there was a lot of commotion around domestic violence. But at the time we started, there were not a
lot of legislative responses to domestic violence, so a lot of our recommendations were legislative. And there were a group of citizens around the state selected to be on it who came from a pretty diverse background across those three areas in our Task Force of elder, child, and domestic violence. And they also carried with them a kind of rich diversity in terms of coming from rural areas of the state, as well as urban areas, and including people who worked in the grass roots organizations and people who worked institutionally. People from law enforcement, and people who worked with victims. It was a very conscious effort to try and gather as many points of view and as rich a diversity as possible.⁵¹

Drawing on the feminist premise that those who have been through the situation know best, the Task Force conducted its research by "circuit riding."⁵² That is, they tried to get as much of a first hand experience as possible of what victims, perpetrators, police, judges, doctors, shelter providers, and others in the system go through in their efforts to secure or provide services. One member explained the rationale and described her experiences as she and a colleague were processed for incarceration at a county jail. She said,

We wanted to do the stuff that we did, like going out and riding in police cars and getting ourselves closer to the thing. All of us had some tie in, but none of us could tie in all the way around. So it was part of sensitizing us and educating us and letting us basically see this from many more perspectives....But no one I'd ever heard of had ever done the kind of stuff we did, like staying in shelters overnight.....And we weren't curiosity seekers. We were really trying to get a sense of what this was about....I got myself and another Task Force member locked up in a jail in Athens, Ohio with the cooperation of the Sheriff, but no one else knew that we weren't domestic violence perpetrators, and we were locked up overnight. We were fingerprinted and all our clothing was taken and we were deloused and put in jail uniforms and locked into a cell so that we would understand what it's like for a perpetrator who's arrested. It's not exactly the same, because we knew it wasn't real, but it's a lot closer than just reading a lot of articles.⁵³
Research was one way of gaining an understanding of what happens within "the system." Bringing Task Force members together for open discussion was another. In these forums, they could share their successes, talk about their problems, and openly confront each other regarding perceived shortcomings. Despite its other accomplishments, including lobbying on behalf of legislation designed to address issues of family violence and seeing it passed, creating a statewide resource manual, and developing recommendations for the improvement of services, perhaps the most dramatic accomplishment of the Task Force was its ability to bring together individuals with diverse and often opposing perspectives to communicate openly with each other. Animosities were not solved, but alliances were created. I asked members of each organization or group I interviewed what its greatest accomplishments had been. One member of the Task Force explained what she thought that group's accomplishments were, as follows,

Criminalizing domestic violence and child abuse and elder abuse. Making it off limits. And I think the other one was gathering the perspectives of so many people who felt they were at odds with each other and then putting it together. When you can create allies between the people who serve victims and the people in the system who, between the grass roots people and the institution people, and get them to work together to solve problems together, oh, that's powerful stuff. Because normally they're just hacking away at each other all the time.54

The position of the Task Force and the Work Group are representative of the radical position that the family is not a domain separate from the public sphere. Although it might be argued that state intervention into the family, as in any other domain, should be something done cautiously and conservatively, founders and the
Task Force contended that greater social supports are needed to help family members function, to protect those who are victimized, and treat perpetrators through confrontation and support. The notion that the family is private and exempt from public scrutiny has been a major source of strain to families, particularly in urban industrial and post-industrial societies, where kinship connections have been circumvented and broken by the demands of the capitalist economy (Gelles and Straus 1988; Hewlett 1986). By establishing and coordinating a support network for families, issues of inequality based on class, age, gender, race, or disability could be addressed. State support had the potential of reducing power differences by creating options for all family members. Family members could exercise their choice to either work on problems or escape. One of the Task Force members explained her position on family conflict and the nuclear family, as follows,

Violence isn’t a really good comprehensive term for what goes on. A lot of it is a kind of oppression, not a violence. A lot of what we’re being responsive to is people who don’t use their full gifts and their autonomy because they feel frightened to do it....And it isn’t so much, violence to me connotes open wild aggression. And a lot of what goes on in human relationships in families is not at all open and it doesn’t appear to be violent, but it’s very oppressive. It is controlling by one person of another, the...misuse of one person by another, instead of the other face of human interaction, which is that people work together in a way that makes the people working together all sort of be able to use their own capacity....It’s so unnecessary, this other side of it. It’s the dark side of human interaction.55

Challenging the privacy of the nuclear family and institutionalizing the means by which the needs of its members might be addressed is a concept far more radical than hiding women until they can get on welfare or find jobs and file for divorce. It assumes that all family members have the right to be free of oppression, and that
when that freedom is violated, the state should provide an institutionalized mode of intervention. This position is, not surprisingly, representative of the founders' perspective. Although not all Task Force members were founders, Dagmar played a strong role in selecting members. Two had been actively involved in the founding of the Witness/Victim Unit and Women Together, and others, though not all, were members of the feminist community.

The web that was spun during the Celeste Administration went far beyond the Governor's Task Force or Interdepartmental Work Group on Family Violence. The successes of one group were dependent on connections to allies in other arenas. For example, the legislative successes of the Task Force were enhanced by feminists' contacts in the legislature. Some of the Task Force's allies were founders, others were long time friends of the women's movement. As the Task Force issued its recommendations, copies were sent to all members of the Ohio Legislature. The Task Force then followed up by visiting legislators on key committees or those they thought might have an interest in sponsoring legislation. Throughout the process, one of the goals of the Task Force was to coordinate and institutionalize a state wide response to family violence.

In order to fully consider issues of family violence, gender inequality must be addressed. As a feminist, this was one of Dagmar's strong suits. The second major component of the web she and her staff members spun was the Women's Interagency Network, established as a means of communication among feminists and sympathizers in all government branches and agencies. The Network was created by Dagmar and
carried forward with the assistance of founders and other feminists throughout state
government. A feminist Cabinet member explained,

Dagmar's office was always into advocacy, thinking up new programs,
plagued by the problem all spouses have that are married to politicians,
that's...no line, authority, influence only. So she used that office very
well. I mean, she tried to create that office. We had wives of
governors that were never seen or heard of before that by anybody. So
she tried to make an office out of it and dedicate in what way she could
to women and children's issues. I worked very closely with her
because I knew her and [my bureau chief] knew her and so we did a lot
of things behind the scenes, making plans to get this connection. What
we wanted to do was connect all these little programs in the state that
had any money for women. And we did that. We called it the...
Women's Interagency Network. And out of that grew a collaboration
with women's groups on the outside for the first time in history, to
look over the budget, scrutinize the budget as it went through the
process, both Houses and the Governor's office, for what it did or
didn't do for women.56

The Women's Interagency Network gave a voice to women throughout all agencies in
state government, giving them input in budget matters regarding how much money
was allocated and how it would be spent. At the state level, this was economic
empowerment at its pinnacle.

Throughout state government, efforts were made to better understand and
address the needs of women. The Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, for
example, mounted a project to establish pay equity for state employees. An
Executive Order was put in motion in 1983 setting a goal of 6.9% in the hiring of
women by construction contractors who received state money. In major urban areas,
programs were established to recruit women into non-traditional jobs, and in
depressed rural areas women were assisted in setting up small businesses as
homemaker health aids. On-site day care was established for state employees.
Research on post-partum depression was encouraged, and defense attorneys and judges were provided information regarding it and battered woman syndrome at a special seminar held at the Governor’s Mansion in 1990. Dagmar herself investigated the special needs of women inmates, and toward the end of the Administration, pressed for and won the establishment of a Governor’s Task Force on Incarcerated Women.

In an era of restricted federal funds, and a backlash against feminism, the opportunity structure set forth by the First Lady and other founders set in motion a loosely organized community of feminists whose energy and commitment were virtually limitless. Throughout the state their efforts combined with the activism of joiners who worked at the individual level to empower women; all were empowered in the process. At the local level, they challenged practices related to domestic violence, educated judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys; they experimented with new programs and resisted those with which they disagreed. At the state level, founders and joiners together have worked toward and won criminalization of domestic violence, the institutionalization of funding for shelters, and judicial and legislative recognition of battered woman syndrome. At the state and national levels, feminists have successfully gained scientific legitimacy for their claims of gender bias in the law and for battered woman syndrome.

From the Governor’s perspective, feminists played a key role in the clemency decisions in two ways. First, they served as a source of education and advocacy. He explained,
Once I became Governor I had a fair number of feminist advocates inside the Administration, and I certainly had feminist advocates outside the administration, in my family and elsewhere, who made sure that I was paying attention to what was going on. Several people who were domestic relations judges were strong advocates, and of course, Dagmar was the strongest advocate of all.\textsuperscript{57}

Secondly, the feminist community had become a strong constituency that would support the decisions. He said,

I think there was a lot of encouragement from what I would call the feminist community....I would say almost all of the women in that network were supportive of an action that...I knew there was a community who would support my action. There was never a question in my mind about whether I was doing some lonely act that would be, you know, where I would do this and everybody would throw up their hands in horror and say, "Why in the world are you doing this?" I knew quite a bit about the growing organization that involved a network of shelters across the state. And we had provided assistance to them through the additional fee on marriage licenses, so I knew that there was a constituency for this.\textsuperscript{58}

CONCLUSION

During the 1980s the Ohio battered women's movement went through a number of changes. Some programs shifted to a mental health model, providing therapy for battered women, abusive men, violent couples, and violent women. Some feminist shelters became more hierarchical and became more inclusive in the language they used to talk about violence in the home. Many incorporated feminist professionals in their staff of survivors and other advocates. Among feminist shelters and direct service providers, there has been a tendency to compromise to avoid extinction during an era of "pro-family" values, anti-feminist backlash, and diminishing resources. Founders have become more oriented toward family issues, as well, incorporating an analysis of the problems of children, elders, and lesbians into
their examination of battered wives. As policy makers, they have recognized the potential to ameliorate the problems of families and their members by creating, institutionalizing, and coordinating support programs and resources. Founders have recognized that many of the problems in families are the result of larger systems of domination, such as classism, racism, ageism, sexism, or heterosexism, and that in order to end violence in the home, the issue of interpersonal and societal power must be addressed. They have shown a greater willingness than joiners to treat violent men, perhaps because they no longer operate programs whose funding is threatened, because they are far enough from the issues to see the "big picture," or because they are in a position to do something about it.

Despite these changes and compromises, the Ohio battered women’s movement has remained focused on the issues of power and control central to wife abuse and family violence. During the 1980s, a giant "web" was formed, drawing in women from social movement organizations, government agencies, the legislature, judiciary, and executive branch of the government, as well as incarcerated women who became activists as they learned about the battered woman syndrome and gender biases in the law. Although most groups within the "web" were unaware of what was being done in other domains, together they advanced the clemency decisions by challenging the law, changing public opinion, altering the practices of police and the courts at the local level, and raising the consciousness of incarcerated women to work on their own behalf. Collectively, this community of feminists created and set in motion the wheels by which the clemency decisions were ultimately made. They comprised a
constituency large enough that the Governor knew his decision would not be "some lonely act." Despite the attacks the Governor faced from prosecutors, sheriffs, and the press, change had been institutionalized and the clemencies were one part of a larger trend toward equality by and for women.
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CHAPTER V

THE CENTRALITY OF IDENTITY IN NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT STRATEGY

In advanced industrial societies the social movements of the Post-World War II era have been increasingly concerned with what have been labelled "post-material," "cultural," or "identity" issues and less with traditional class-based or material concerns (Cohen 1985; Epstein 1989; Habermas 1975, 1985; Inglehart 1977; Kauffman 1989; Klandermans and Tarrow 1988; Melucci 1980, 1981, 1984, 1985; Misztal and Misztal 1988; Ofte 1985; Pizzorno 1978; Tilly 1988; Touraine 1985; Taylor and Whittier 1992b, 1992c). Although these movements draw their membership predominately from the ranks of the "new middle class," participants do not base their involvement on a class identity (Bell 1976; Brint 1984; Cohen 1985; Giddens 1973; Habermas 1985; Ofte 1985). "New" social movement activists have moved away from material concerns and the particularistic issues raised by interest groups and have articulated more universalistic values, including concerns about the environment, human rights, and social biases against racial and ethnic
minorities, women, and lesbians, gays, and bi-sexuals (Epstein 1989; Faganis 1993; Habermas 1985; Melucci 1980).

New social movements work to challenge contested social identities by creating and acting upon new collective identities (Cohen 1985; Taylor and Whittier 1992). By openly adopting and renegotiating a stigmatized identity, new social movement activists challenge dominant social ideologies about who they are "supposed" to be and how they "should" behave, as well as the structural aspects of society that reify their status and perpetuate unfair treatment (Cohen 1985; Epstein 1989; Margolis 1985; Offe 1985; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). The central goal of new social movements is cultural change, beginning at the individual level, and carrying on to challenge the dominant belief systems that ultimately underlie the social structure. As individuals begin to redefine themselves, they renegotiate identity, including others' response to the new presentation of self (Margolis 1985).

Feminists challenge the notion that institutionalized politics are separate from personal life (Acklesberg 1988; Alonso 1992; Cassell 1977; Elshtain 1981; Kauffman 1989; Morgen and Bookman 1988; Mouffe 1992). In the 1960s, the women's movement was central in reconceptualizing politics to include the systematic domination that may occur in one's personal life (Kauffman 1989). This rethinking of the meaning of "politics" led to the now famous *dictum* that the "personal is political" (Cassell 1977; Kauffman 1989). Through this new framework, feminists began to consider their personal experiences as resulting from the political domination of the patriarchal order (Kauffman 1989). Part of the original feminist agenda was personal
liberation, but such transformations were never construed as sufficient to bring about political change. Rather, liberation, or empowerment as it later came to be called, was one means by which the social system would be challenged (Kauffman 1989). As Morgen and Bookman assert,

...empowerment begins when [women] change their ideas about the causes of their powerlessness, when they recognize the systemic forces that oppress them, and when they act to change the conditions of their lives (1988:4).

Empowerment, as a process whereby the identities "woman" and "battered woman" have been politicized, has been a central strategy of the Ohio battered women's movement. As battered and never battered women have been empowered, they have internalized the feminist collective action frame and adopted the identity "feminist."

The central thesis that will run throughout this chapter is that social movements are not separate from personal lives and problems, jobs and careers, or institutionalized politics. All of these components are threads in one common tapestry.¹ My goal here is to demonstrate first that "activist" is an identity one carries everywhere she or he goes. As feminists have created and taken advantage of expanding opportunities in politics and careers, it is inevitable that the feminist agenda would follow. Further, because of the feminist belief that the personal is indeed political, I will demonstrate how the goals of the women's and battered women's movements are being advanced in women's personal lives and relationships. Secondly, I will show that the reason the Ohio battered women's movement has been successful in addressing the problems and issues of battered women who kill or
assault abusive partners is the fact that the movement drew its strength and momentum from the lives of its members.

Building upon their early commitment to self-help, feminists have come to recognize that women come to the movement at varying stages of personal growth and development. Founders came to the movement while their own feminism was in its earliest stages of development. During my interviews with them, many made comments to the effect that they didn’t know they were feminists at the time Women Together was being founded, but in hindsight, they guessed they were. The feminists in the movement further understood that women involved in abusive relationships may come to the movement ready to leave their partners and take on new challenges, while others arrive depressed and confused, full of self-blame. Some women came to the movement unsure of what it was about but wanting to get involved in something that would make a difference. Others, like aides to the Governor, were directed to participate. They came with a willingness to learn, but were precarious of what they would find. They read, asked questions, and absorbed as much as possible and went on to be active in the movement.

The strategy adopted by the Ohio battered women’s movement has incorporated elements from consciousness raising, recovery, self-help, and empowerment. Feminists are committed to building upon the strengths of women while helping them to understand and overcome their weaknesses. Feminists have worked to avoid establishing unnecessary hierarchies or criteria for when a woman is “ready” to “become” an activist. Anyone willing to work is an activist. Drawing
upon the strengths and talents each woman possesses, the movement has created itself from within, while developing the expertise of individual women, providing training, and in the long run, empowering its members.

RECLAIMING IDENTITY

New social movements differ from "old" movements in that they work toward change at two interrelated levels. They encourage and develop personal transformation as a means to social change. The battered women's movement has emerged, developed, and been disseminated through the empowerment of women who have gone on to challenge dominant ideologies and change the law and public policy regarding women and battered women. Their endeavors, successes, and even their failures have been sources of growth and further empowerment. I have called this strategy, which uses personal transformation as a source of social change, "webbing."

I have drawn the term from an analogy created by Gloria Steinem. She says,

...like the spider spinning her web, we create much of the outer world from within ourselves...We make progress by a constant spiraling back and forth between the inner world and the outer one, the personal and the political, the self and the circumstance. Nature doesn't move in a straight line, and as part of nature, neither do we (1992:8).

Feminists' recognition of the need for both personal and political change informed the strategy used by the Ohio battered women's movement.

Whether it has involved changing laws, coordinating volunteers to visit women in prison, operating shelters, or researching the clemency decisions, the battered women's movement has sought the expertise of whoever wanted to join, with a special respect for those who had lived through the experiences the movement worked
to address. The clemencies in Ohio were not done for battered women, they were done with them. At each step, as survivors have been included as the real experts, they have been empowered to help themselves. Along the way they have begun to understand the context of their oppression and learned to help others. The strength of the Ohio battered women's movement has come from the personal experiences and collective identity of women united to help themselves and other women.

Herman and Miall (1990) argue that being labelled deviant has the potential for both negative and positive outcomes. Sociologists have tended to focus on the negative aspects of stigma and labelling, particularly when the label acts as a master status or works as a self-fulfilling prophecy (Becker 1963; Herman and Miall 1990; Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968). Stigma may be managed defensively by retreating into institutions, passing as a non-stigmatized individual, or capitulating to society's labels or offensively through therapeutic disclosure or political activism (Herman and Miall 1990). Drawing on their research with two stigmatized groups, Herman and Miall (1990) found that offensive strategies had "positive implications for identity transformation" (Herman and Miall 1990:255).

One of the central strategies of the battered women's movement, has been for survivors to reclaim the battered woman identity, and to do so without disgrace or self-blame. By so doing, they reclaim a stigmatized identity and renegotiate its meaning. This reclaiming of identity occurred in the privacy of shelters, where survivors and residents talked in groups or one-on-one, sometimes late into the night. It also took place publicly, in the speak outs held early in the movement, in testimony
favoring legislation, in prison support groups, at training seminars, on television news magazines, and on the numerous talk shows that are now pervasive on television.

The importance of reclaiming identity is three-fold. First, as Mies (1983) suggests, it is only at points in a woman's life where there is a "rupture" in normalcy, like a crisis caused by divorce or the end of a relationship, that there is a chance of that woman becoming conscious of the fact that the relationship was oppressive or exploitive. Privately discussing the violent relationship with a woman who has positively reclaimed the identity "survivor" helps the "victim" to reinterpret her experiences and begin to redefine herself. Further, through public affirmation of a stigmatized identity, the woman claims it as her own, redefining it from one of weakness to one of strength. As the victim redefines herself as a survivor, she realizes her own strength. Second, as spectators to public affirmations witness the reclaiming and public identification with what was defined as a stigmatized status, old stereotypes and definitions are challenged and the identity is publicly renegotiated and ultimately redefined. Third, by publicly discussing and redefining the issues, the private nature of wife abuse is challenged.

Early in the movement, survivors were encouraged to talk publicly about their experiences with violence at the speak outs that WomenSpace and Women Together sponsored. One of the speakers at such an event was a woman who had taken a job at WomenSpace. She had recently left a violent relationship. Her willingness to talk openly about herself and her experiences helped her to redefine her situation and
herself and helped others to understand, as well. One of the Women Together founders explained,

One of the original staff people at WomenSpace was herself a battered woman...and then ended up working there, which was very good, because it got her out of her house, because she had a job then. And it gave her a tremendous amount of support and she became very knowledgeable...I mean, she was a wonderful example of it could happen in any part of society, it was not just people who are poor and downtrodden who are acting out their frustrations. Here was a man who was powerful in the labor movement in the State of Ohio, and even nationally. He had a lot of personal power. Even so, he felt a need to be totally dominant of her...WomenSpace had speak outs....And I'm sure [she] was probably the first speaker...because she could get the ball rolling, because she was working there at that time. It saved her and it was a nice thing for the movement that she was there in a visible place, having first-hand experience of getting out.²

The strategy of reclaiming and renegotiating identity did not die out with the tactic of public speak outs. Instead, feminists simply moved the strategy to new forums.

_Incarcerated Activists and the Social Movement Web_

Talking about their experiences, both publicly and privately, was central in helping the women in the Ohio Reformatory for Women at Marysville reclaim their identity. As they redefined themselves, their willingness to share their stories with others played a major role in the renegotiation of public definitions of battered women who have killed. The testimony provided by women in Marysville was an essential aspect of the Ohio battered women’s movement’s efforts to educate members of the judiciary, legislature, and the Governor’s staff regarding battered woman syndrome. However, until they began to see the injustice of their circumstances, the Marysville inmates could not articulate to others what they had been through and why they should be released.
Most battered women blame themselves for the violence and abuse they have endured (Walker 1979, 1984, 1987). They internalize a stigmatized identity that, until challenged and redefined, leaves them in a state of paralysis, dependent upon others to define them. Victims do not want to be abused, but they often believe they have done something to deserve their treatment, whether that entails a beating, imprisonment, or death. An extreme example of this self-blame was provided by Dagmar Celeste. She described one of the women she visited on death row, as follows,

She was on death row for the following: Her husband had been battering her all her life. When her daughter got married and left home, he started raping [the wife] and sodomizing her and just doing horrible things to her sexually, as well as just beating the shit out of her. So she finally related her experience to her daughter....Her daughter got so enraged...didn’t know how to help her mother, so she went to her husband. And her husband decided to hire somebody to knock this guy off, and they killed him. The kids ended up, I think, with life sentences...and she ended up on death row....Now when I first visited...her, she was so drugged up. I mean, it was hard to even communicate with her, and that’s a whole other story about our own system....This woman was hardly coherent...she could hardly sit up in bed. I said, "[Name], are you on something?" "Oh yea"... And I said, "How many pills do you take?" "Oh about a dozen a day." Shit! You know? And she could hardly move and I said, "Well why do you take that stuff? I mean, look at you. You can’t even sit up." "Aw, honey," she said, "I don’t want to sit up. I want to die. I’m a bad woman....I got everybody in trouble. I don’t want to live. I want to die." It would have been no sweat to execute that woman. She would have been grateful.³

Although this woman’s willingness to be executed was extreme, it is reminiscent of the woman quoted in Chapter 4 who believed that everything was all her fault and that maybe if she had divorced her husband, the killing would never have happened.
The strategy of helping incarcerated battered women reclaim their identity came together in 1989, as a result of efforts within the prison and a directive from the Governor to expand opportunities for recovery. In 1984 the L.I.F.E. Group was formed as a source of support for women serving life sentences. By 1986 the group had begun holding regular meetings where wife abuse was the topic of discussion, and by 1989 wife abuse and battered woman syndrome had clearly become topics of focus. Between 1984 and 1989, other projects had begun at the prison that worked to empower women. Some efforts, like the "Prisoner’s Rehab Project," were successful even without intervention from the Governor or First Lady. This project involved renovating old, rundown houses that churches in the community had bought. Women inmates were transported to and from the work site everyday and in the process they learned trades, including carpentry, plumbing, and electrical wiring, skills they could use to find well-paying jobs when they were released. Another group formed was a gospel choir, "Wise Women of the Word." In addition to addressing the spiritual needs of participants and those who came to hear them, their goal was to raise money for an Interfaith Chapel, to be used, among other things, for recovery group meetings. There women could share their stories with each other and begin to understand the social roots of their substance abuse or other issues they were trying to resolve. Wise Women’s ministry had been successful, but efforts to move forward with the Chapel had floundered. The leader of the choir asked Dagmar Celeste to be on the committee to found the Chapel and to expand recovery groups for inmates. It is here where the need to help women address their
experiences with violence merged with alcohol and drug recovery programs and those aimed at economic empowerment.

For many women, drug and alcohol abuse is related to their dependent status in society and their inability to express rage (Ettorre 1986, 1989). During the 1980s, the Celeste Administration directed that research be conducted to determine the number of women incarcerated in Ohio who had been abused, either as children or adults. The research showed that most of the women in prison had, at some time in their lives, been subjected to abuse.7 With that knowledge and new information about the connections among violence, women’s inability to express anger, and substance abuse, greater efforts were made to address the needs of battered women, to help them understand the battered woman syndrome and reclaim their identity. Expanded recovery services included support groups for battered women. They became forums in which empowerment took place and identity was reclaimed.

After Dagmar Celeste became involved with the Interfaith Chapel committee, she asked her staff to research how many recovery groups were offered at the prison. As one of her aides explained,

[One of the administrative assistants] began doing some talking to people at the prison, particularly at Marysville,8 about how many meetings were being held. And I really can’t go back to how many were being held a week and so forth. But we felt that it was very inadequate. We felt that, you know, if a woman wanted to go, they were told, "Well, you went to one on Tuesday, you can’t go to the one on Thursday because we can only have so many people there because of security reasons"....So that was really the first action that the Governor took....When we gave this report to Dagmar and she gave it to the Governor, he sent a directive to the Department of Rehab and Corrections that he wanted a report on how many meetings were being
held and he wanted to make sure that more meetings were being included for the prisoners.9

Through her position as First Lady, Dagmar Celeste in effect facilitated the creation of a social movement network within the Ohio Reformatory for Women. However, until women began to understand the experiences through which they had lived, these interrelated programs and groups would remain a network. Empowerment turned the network into a powerful web.

Often women who are regularly beaten and abused do not realize they are battered. They think they have done something wrong to deserve the treatment and that if they change their behavior, things will be all right (Walker 1979, 1984, 1987). Because their lives are so chaotic, they often forget much of what they have endured, and because the experiences are unbearable, they repress much of the rest (Browne 1987; Walker 1984, 1987). For battered women, part of the recovery process involves making sense of what they have survived and learning that they were not to blame for, nor did they deserve, their abuse. Until they begin to understand the systemic forces that oppress them, many of their experiences remained locked in unconscioueness, and confusion and denial reign over the rest. This is why expanding recovery services and support groups for battered women was an essential component of the clemency process. One of the women granted clemency explained how the group to which she belonged empowered her. She said,

I joined [name of leader]’s group. I think that was the greatest group....It was a support group for battered type women. She was not informed as much as a lot of people, okay? But she was caring. And see, that’s what a lot of people overlook....Her meetings were one on one, let’s deal with the group. Let’s talk about our hurts. Let’s try to
help one another. She wasn’t, like she said, she wasn’t one who knew how to do these things, but she was willing to give up her time to try to help us....And I think the best part of her meeting was when we, as women, sat and talked and allowed each woman to, however she felt, if you wanted to talk about it, talk about it. If you didn’t, leave it alone. If you wanted to cry, cry.

I asked her if hearing other women’s stories helped her to understand her own. She replied,

No, not make me understand, but make me realize....I could relate to her [story], you know, because it was like, we weren’t the same type of thing, but a lot of it, the situations, the control, the isolation, the, where they want to cut you off from the world, that type of thing, yea. I could relate to that. I could relate to how she felt about that, because I went through that, you know? How they want to control your whole life and they don’t want you to have any friends and...your whole world’s just you and the abuser, you know, that’s how it becomes. Yea, I could relate to that part. And most of the women, no matter what the situation was, however it was, it was always that control that they have and the fear that you lived through.10

The survivors I interviewed did not clearly articulate, in a text book sense, what battered woman syndrome was. When I asked them how they came to understand the battered woman syndrome, all referred to the cycle of violence, as if that were its only component. Nonetheless, each woman knew, from talking with other women and listening to their stories, what they had in common, and at a gut level, what battered woman syndrome was. Theirs was an alternative knowledge system, one that entailed an understanding attained from lived experience and shared with others. They were the real experts. And once their knowledge was unleashed, they were able to teach others. They began by educating legislators about the need for legal recognition of battered woman syndrome.
When House Bill 484 (the legislation that established in law women's right to introduce expert testimony about battered woman syndrome) was being debated, the women at Marysville learned about it and asked that some of its sponsors come to the prison to explain what it was and how it might affect their sentences. At the same time, some legislators sought a better understanding of what battered woman syndrome was and how it affected women trapped in violent relationships. Some of them talked to psychologists and legal experts, read books, and gathered information from shelter directors and other direct service providers. Several decided to visit Marysville. Ironically, while the former inmates I talked with portrayed the visit as an opportunity for them to learn about the legislation, legislators saw it as a chance to better understand the syndrome. One of the legislators explained,

I went to Marysville and I actually met with women who were lifers there....I wanted to get some input from, other than just, shall we say different organizations that sometimes don’t see the forest for the trees. I wanted to really talk to a real person who's been through this. And a lot of the conjecture on most people's part is, "Why didn't she leave? I mean, come on, you know, why would you put up with this? It's crazy."....In talking to these women, most of them, you know, one woman told me how the windows were nailed shut. When the guy left, he had a phone in the house...he took the phone with him and warned her that if she left the house...or if she contacted the authorities, that her children were going to be in serious harm's way....And this had gone on for a decade. So one day, he came home and that was it....He was going to abuse her physically, sexually, too....And so she...shot him dead with a shot gun. And she was in her...ninth year of incarceration at Marysville....There's a lot of those women, and in Marysville, most of them. It's amazing how many have been in there because of abusive partners.11

The understanding legislators gained from listening to the "lifers" stories matched real lives with the theories and put faces on the statistics. With what they learned in
prison, supporters of the bill were able to successfully overcome efforts to change the
language of the bill from "battered woman syndrome" to "battered person syndrome"
and to motivate those who did not take the legislation seriously to support it.

Throughout the early months of 1990, the women continued to be an essential
source of information, particularly when the Governor gave the order to research the
possibility of granting clemencies. It was up to them to make others understand why
they stayed with abusive and sadistic partners, only to feel in the end that they had no
alternative but murder, yet did not deserve to be incarcerated. By this time they were
anxious to talk. One of the women who received clemency told me about a meeting
she and several other members of the L.I.F.E. Group had with Dagmar Celeste and
one of the Governor's aides. During the meeting, the women told their stories so that
the aide would understand what they had endured and the injustice of being
incarcerated for surviving the only way they believed possible. She said,

When Dagmar came that day and we did the interview...she sat next to
me...and I knew we were only going to be dealing with a [short] time
frame. The institution's not going to allow us to chit chat with Miss
Celeste forever, because there was the Deputy Warden standing right
behind us, watching everything we were saying. And so they
introduced themselves and I thought, now we didn't figure out how we
were going to handle this. You know, five women....So I thought,
"Well, I'm going to be first, whatever, you know, it don't matter." So
when [the aide] said, "Well just introduce yourselves," she still didn't
give us no guide, because we were looking for the guidelines of the
conversation to come from them, but it didn't....She said, "Just tell me
who you are." So I started. I told them my name, my age, how many
children I had, how long I was married....And what kind of sentence I
had and talked very short and brief about the history, which was the
highlight. I told about the sexual abuse and about jumping out of the
window [trying to escape a beating] and the child abuse....And then
Miss Celeste tapped me on my leg and she said, "I read all about
you"...And so all the other women followed that, the way I did mine, and we got through it.\textsuperscript{12}

Those charged with implementing the clemency review process needed to take time to understand gender biases in self-defense law, the inadequacy of the legal response to family violence, the battered woman syndrome, and why women so often stay with men who beat them. Like the legislators before them, they talked to legal scholars and psychologists and read their books. Ultimately, however, it was the women's own narratives that helped them to really comprehend their experiences and the social context in which their lives had taken place. One of the Governor's aides explained her efforts to educate herself and others who would be involved in the clemency review process. She said,

Well in law school...there wasn't much about battered women being talked about....And so based on conversations with people in the area and just research, Law Review articles, any book that I could find, Lenore Walker, Angela Browne, and some of the other, that was the beginning of my...research to try to understand the nature of the problem. Then, of course, the next step was to try to figure out a way to take the research and make it practical to the clemency process, because there are a number of persons involved....And I wanted first of all the prison officials, because...their role generally is to keep people in prison and not let people out of prison. So I had conversations with the Director...and he was very cooperative....He gave me complete access to the staff....And I met with them on a couple of occasions. I gave them materials to read. And fortunately, at that particular time, there was a young woman who was a researcher there who was interested in this and was ready to proceed....And I turned over my research to them and in essence asked them to conduct a couple of studies for me. I wanted a demographic study and I wanted what you'd call a narrative, a random sample narrative of some of these women. Women who would fit...a battered woman profile.\textsuperscript{13}

The research demonstrated the prevalence of women incarcerated for crimes directly related to battering as well as their experiences, the lack of societal response, and
psychological reactions involved in battered woman syndrome. The narrative research used the women's stories to bring the statistics and theories to life. Although the women did not meet with all of the officials involved in the decision making, through the research, their stories were used as an educational tool in the prison and beyond.

In June 1990, when the conference on post partum depression psychosis and battered woman syndrome was held at the Governor's Mansion, the voices of incarcerated women and former inmates who had killed or assaulted abusive partners were included. The purpose of the conference was to educate defense attorneys about how to successfully use these psychological profiles as mitigating circumstances in defending their clients and to help judges, mental health professionals, shelter directors, the Parole Board, and other professionals better understand women who had experienced battered woman syndrome or post partum depression psychosis. One of the conference organizers explained the significance of the training, as follows,

We wanted people who were dealing with those people who have been battered to have a better understanding of what the battered woman syndrome is. And also, they're the people who when, I mean the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction includes within it the Pardon and Parole people. And so people who are going to be looking at these cases for the review process should understand it....They have two different reasons to be there. One, they need to understand it because they'll have an opportunity, I mean not just in the cases already reviewed...but for a while yet we're still going to see women who defend themselves against their batterers...and we're going to...need people who understand that to be looking at those women's sentences when it's time for parole and things like that. They also need to understand those women so that they can help them while they're in prison....We also invited people from mental health agencies too, because these are all people who are dealing with women who are dealing with being battered....So we tried to invite people who were
going to have opportunities to help women who are in those situations.\textsuperscript{14}

Although the women in prison could not be released to attend the conference and testify on their own behalf, through the research their voices joined with those of experts and other survivors to alter the way battered women are perceived and treated and to improve society’s response. The women incarcerated in Marysville began by trying to understand their own lives and ended helping themselves and others.

From prison, women who had reclaimed their identity carried on a campaign to educate the public about battered woman syndrome and the injustices they had endured in their relationships and in prison. For most, these efforts involved letter writing campaigns. For others, it involved talking with the media. Some of the stories about them helped in the process of renegotiating identity; others hurt. One survivor told me about two clemency applicants appearing on the nationally syndicated television news magazine, \textit{48 Hours}. On the show, the story of one woman who was later granted clemency was juxtaposed against that of another who was not released. She explained,

Well, that was a hell of a tape. The one woman, she was fighting, we were fighting for clemency at this time. They taped two women from our penitentiary. They took a strong case, they took a weak case. The weak case was denied, the strong case was given, and she got her freedom. She had been in the penitentiary fifteen years. The abuse she went through for \textit{beaucoup} years with her husband and all that. The other one was denied, and that was a very difficult thing for her to live through….She felt very down, depressed. It showed her on there as a big liar. It showed where her children had denied her and that hurt….And God knows that part should’ve never been allowed to even be taped….Yes, you can show children and we can talk with them, but don’t have a child get on there and say, "Hey, Mom, I’m so glad you’re in the penitentiary. Enjoy your life there." That about killed
her. And this was someone who talked about her kids and had little pictures and everything all over....It showed her in a very guilty type situation. Maybe she wasn’t, but her husband didn’t die, see?¹⁵

The media’s proclivity to present stories in dualisms of "good and bad," "deserving and undeserving" was one potential barrier to the process of renegotiating identity. Men who survived assaults, although few,¹⁶ were also important in stalling the renegotiation process, as were prosecuting attorneys and the families of those who died. After the decisions were announced, the Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association publicly objected to the decisions, and the Franklin County Prosecutor was quoted as saying, "It’s just a lot of baloney, and if the governor [sic] had taken the time to contact us,¹⁷ he would have known that."¹⁸ As the women’s cases were being reviewed, family members of the men who had been killed and prosecutors from throughout the state were quoted in newspaper articles, where they decried the clemencies as "licenses to kill" and called the women such things as unfit mothers, alcoholics, and abusive women who picked fights with their husbands and abused their own pets.¹⁹ Despite the pain involved in losing children, being called a liar, being portrayed as a "bad battered woman," or hearing repeatedly that the clemencies amounted to "licenses to kill," the women at Marysville continued to assert and reassert themselves and to draw attention to the injustices they had endured.

Once empowered, inmates’ activism expanded to other forms of woman abuse. As they reclaimed their identity as battered women, they began to think of themselves as survivors and were no longer willing to endure any kind of abuse. A powerful example of the everyday resistance that resulted from empowerment was told to me
by one of the women who was granted clemency. Most of the women who received clemency told me that sexual abuse by some of the guards was a problem in the prison. Some women traded sexual favors for cigarettes, drugs, or illegal privileges. For those who did not want to be a part of such exchanges, refusing demands for sexual favors could be dangerous. Resisting sexual assault was often impossible.

Figuring out what to do and whom to tell after a rape could present an impossible conundrum for the woman who was violated and anyone who witnessed the assault. Despite the risk of further harassment or punishment, one of the women who was later granted clemency decided she had had enough when her roommate was assaulted. She explained,

I had a roommate that was very heavy. A little, short shit, but she had breasts out to here [holds arms straight out]....She was real sweet....And this one guard, he was after her....And many a times, he’d make nasty insinuations about her breasts and what he would like to do to them and how he would like to do it and what he’d do to her. I mean, gross things, okay?....And the girl across the hall, she was our friend....And she said, "Oh, there’s something wrong here"....I said, "I know, but we’re in the penitentiary and you know, you’re a little confined....Who do you talk to?" Well you don’t go talk to anyone. Who do you trust? You trust none of them....This man...threatened us. Cocaine, he’d put in our bag if we said anything about what he said to her....Well, you know, you get scared....Well it was one evening at dinner time and the only person in the building was him, downstairs, and us....And next thing I know, we hear screaming, you know, and the screaming was frantic....We ran....He’s coming down the third flight of stairs, you know? And he saw us, right? We run up the steps. She’s all ripped up. You know, she’s got semen all over her face. Her body here [around her breasts] is all red....And now we’re in the situation, what do we do? Who do we tell? Who do we trust? Where are we going to go?....We’re in the penitentiary. She’s crying. She’s frantic. I had to rock her, hold her....We decided we would go to [a female guard]....Scared to death, not knowing what’s going to happen....You know, we just had to take the chance. Are we going to have to take abuse forever? Are we going to go through
anymore shit or what? And I told them, I said, "Well I'm not for no more abuse. You know, I'm not going to allow it to happen to me no more. I'm willing to do whatever I have to for whatever it be. It may not be easy. It may not be the best, but that's my choice. And the other two decided we'd go together. We did."

The three of them filed a complaint with the prison officials, who asked if they would be willing to talk to the prosecuting attorney. They talked it over and decided they would go as far as needed to end the abuse. They testified before the Grand Jury and watched as the guard was arrested and escorted out of the prison yard in handcuffs.

As a result of their testimony, they endured harassment from women who had traded sex for favors and from prison officials who did not approve of what they had done. This woman told me that ultimately the guard was tried and convicted, but better than that, in her opinion, was that other women began to resist the abuse. I asked her where she found the strength to go through the entire process. She said,

I don’t know. It’s maybe just the healing and not wanting no more of any kind of abuse going to anybody. She was such a gentle girl, woman, you know?...And yea, she made a mistake, but that didn’t mean she had to go through that. And she was just hurt and afraid and scared, and together we united. And we could never clean up the penitentiary or never change a lot of people’s minds. But you get rid of one nasty apple...It was a funny thing after that happened. A lot of the nastiness and that vulgarness...was seeming to cease a little bit and to ease up a little bit, because they began to get nervous. And more women stood up and two other officers were escorted off because the women found enough courage to stand up. So you know, even though you have to go through some hurt and abuse, some good came out of it because...they found the strength to say, "Hey, if they can do it, why can’t we?" And they did.

The reclaiming of identity and empowerment that took place in the support groups and the L.I.F.E. Group were contagious. As women began to realize there were alternatives to abuse and that their actions could make a difference, they began
to resist abuses of power and demand justice. The reclaiming and renegotiation of identity began with battered women and expanded to the myriad other forms of woman abuse.

While the actions of the women in prison were central in the transformation of their identities and in making changes in the prison, their voices alone were not enough to alter the public perception of battered women, and especially those who had killed or assaulted their partners. The renegotiation of those perceptions took place in other arenas, paving the way for the clemency process. A central aspect of feminists’ efforts to renegotiate and reclaim the battered woman identity involved the scientific legitimation and legal recognition of battered woman syndrome. For that, the systems by which women had been dominated had to be appropriated and used to their own benefit.

**CAPTURING AS A SOCIAL MOVEMENT STRATEGY**

Just as there is a lack of separation between one’s personal being and activism, post-modernist, feminist, and new social movements theorists have suggested a merging between the political and non-political spheres of life (Acklesberg 1988; Alonso 1992; Bernstein 1985; Elshtain; Foucault 1979; Habermas 1985; Melucci 1980; Morgen and Bookman 1988; Mouffe 1992; Offe 1985; Touraine 1985; Taylor and Whittier 1992b). In advanced industrial societies, control over individuals has reached beyond the sphere of production and into the areas of consumption, services, and social relations (Melucci 1980). As informational systems increasingly dominate the formation of social symbols, they have assumed greater control over personal and
social identity (Melucci 1980). Increasingly, advanced industrial societies have turned to "experts" to define normality, leading to greater social control of identity and social relationships. Foucault (1978, 1979) refers to the encroachment of systems of control as the "carceral." Similarly, Habermas (1984) refers to the process whereby the rationality and lack of reflexivity of political and economic systems will come to dominate everyday life as the "colonization of the life-world." Whatever term one prefers, the goal of new social movements is to regain control over identity, taking the power of definition away from those who dominate and reclaiming the self according to the group's own preference.

New social movements theory provides a nice conceptual framework for understanding the politics of personal life, but frequently obscures the gendered dimensions of politics and activism. Further, it has been less than forthcoming about the strategies movements use when directly challenging systems of domination. Liberal theories of democracy narrowly define politics as separate from civic society, an arena individuals enter out of instrumental self-interest (Acklesberg 1988). Accordingly, politics is an institution to be entered into to seek structural solutions to public issues. This narrow definition affects people's perceptions of themselves and their problems, their sense of political efficacy, and their recognition that their concerns properly belong in the political arena (Acklesberg 1988). Because of the liberal democratic definition of the home as private, and because women's lives have centered around the home in a way that men's have not, women's political concerns have been obscured (Smith 1990). To address women's exclusion, the battered
women's movement has practiced a strategy of "self limiting radicalism" (Cohen 1985).

Self-limiting radicalism challenges the tenets of liberal democracy but involves an acceptance of the legitimate existence of the state and capitalist economy. It struggles to redraw the boundaries between public and private by creating democratic public spaces and transforming formerly private domains into social domains for the renegotiation of identity and demands (Cohen 1985:670). Self-limiting radicalism challenges the tenets of liberal democracy and the capitalist system, which respect the demarcations between state, the economy, and civil society and define politics and the economy as arenas separate from the private world (Acklesberg 1988; Cohen 1985). When politics is defined as separate from the everyday life world, women's experiences in the home are defined as falling outside the range of public authority; thus their experiences and activism are frequently overlooked (Acklesberg 1988; Morgen and Bookman 1988).

I believe there are two types of self-limiting radicalism. The first, outsider self-limiting radicalism, involves efforts to renegotiate the relationships among the state, economy, and civil society and to redraw the boundaries between public and private. However, activists who use this strategy while remaining outsiders to the systems they seek to change, are restricted in their ability to effect change. The strategy used by joiners is exemplary of outsider self-limiting radicalism. Their operation of shelters and other services for battered women is indicative of efforts to redefine wife abuse as a public issue. Through support groups and peer counseling,
joiners have played a central role in helping battered women reclaim identity. Further, through their support of House Bill 484 and other lobbying efforts, joiners have exhibited efforts to renegotiate the relationship between the state and civil society. However, the fact that joiners have remained outsiders to the systems they seek to change is indicative of the strategy they have used. Outsider self-limiting radicalism differs from liberalism in that the former seeks a renegotiation of identity and a redrawn of the boundaries between public and private, while the latter does not involve itself in identity issues and tacitly supports the public/private separation.

The second type, insider self-limiting radicalism, involves the same goals pursued by outsiders, but with a different strategy. Insiders work toward their goals by moving into the systems they seek to change. This strategy involves becoming part of the system the group seeks to redefine and appropriating it to achieve movement goals. Within the political arena (as traditionally defined), founders did this in their roles as judges, legislators, Cabinet members, and even First Lady of the State of Ohio. However, the feminist redefinition of politics extended to other systems by which women have been dominated, including science and medicine. By entering into these systems, feminists were able to "capture" the legitimacy each system had to offer while simultaneously working to achieve movement goals. I do not mean for the term "capture" to be used in a military sense. That is, feminists have not taken over the systems whose legitimacy they seek to appropriate. Rather, I have borrowed this terms from physics. In that field, capturing refers to the absorption of a particle by an atomic nucleus. Similarly, feminists have absorbed the
legitimacy of the systems by which women have been dominated, drawing their power into the feminist "orbit" or perspective. To capture a system, activists must remain ideological outsiders within systems of domination, drawing the legitimacy the system has to offer into the feminist analysis. The most common method of infiltration was through the career path.

*Capturing and Career Activism*

One of the outcomes of many of the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s was creation of job opportunities for activists (McAdam 1988; McCarthy and Zald 1973). However, as the "cycle of protest" wound down for many movements of the period, activists found themselves in an increasingly tight activist job market (McAdam 1988; Tarrow 1991). For some activists, this decline in opportunities created a period of crisis. For example, McAdam (1988) demonstrates that volunteers in the voter registration drive in Mississippi, known as Freedom Summer, experienced a disjuncture between activism and work. As whites were excluded from the civil rights movement and the new left began to decline, many activists found they had reached a point in their lives where they needed to change focus. Some men put the energies they had once devoted to activism into their jobs (McAdam 1988). However, the presence of the growing women’s movement gave women other outlets for their activism (McAdam 1988).

A major distinction between the experiences of men in the new left and feminists is that the former eschews participation in "the establishment," while many feminists have looked upon career success as one potential means to address the
economic and power inequities between women and men. Daniels (1991) has examined the work of liberal feminists who made their careers in the organizations of the women’s movement, government agencies, legislatures, and on their jobs, working to achieve feminist goals. One of the goals of liberal feminists has been for women to gain entrée into well-paying, high status positions, particularly those traditionally held by men (Beuchler 1990; Echois 1989; Freeman 1975; Rupp and Taylor 1990; Whittier 1991). Establishing such career paths has connotations of feminist success, but moving into a good job is not enough. Women who establish successful careers but fail to use them to help other women or to advance feminist goals have failed to achieve success in the feminist definition. Even among career feminists, the goal is to gain entrée into well-paying, high status, and powerful positions and help other women do the same (Ferree and Hess 1985). Feminist success on the job entails working to advance the goals of the women’s movement as part of one’s career.

"Career feminism" has expanded beyond that described by Ferree and Hess (1985). In the Ohio battered women’s movement, it began by women gaining entrée into jobs traditionally dominated by men. However, feminists have not been satisfied to stop there. They have gone on to use their jobs to advance the goals of the women’s and battered women’s movements (Whittier 1991). While joiners built their careers operating shelters and providing other services, founders and their recruits moved into careers in psychology, law, medicine, the government, and the prison system. Feminists were successful in using their authority and influence to raise their
colleagues' consciousness, change institutions, and educate the public. Until feminists gained entrée into the systems by which women have been dominated, they could have only limited impact upon them. Demanding entrée was a first step, using the job to achieve further goals was the second.

Within the Ohio battered women's movement, efforts to institutionalize change ranged from local municipal court systems, charged with hearing misdemeanors, to the Supreme Court. At the municipal level, feminist judges, attorneys, and shelter directors worked together to coordinate the courts' response to battered women. Throughout the state the Governor's Task Force on Family Violence and the Intergovernmental Work Group on Family Violence endeavored to understand and coordinate services for battered women and other victims of family violence.

Feminists in the Ohio Public Defender's Office were active in supporting House Bill 484 and organizing the Governor's conference on post partum depression psychosis and battered woman syndrome. After its decision in the Koss (1990) case, the Supreme Court created a Task Force to educate judges about domestic violence and battered woman syndrome. They called upon founders and their recruits to work with them.

Feminists' desire to pursue movement goals through their careers emphasizes the importance of identity in new social movements and is exemplary of the movement's insider self-limiting radicalism. Through their careers, they were able to work as "ideological outsiders within" and to capture the systems by which women have historically been dominated.
Capturing Science

Scientific experts have become an important factor in the social determination of deviance and normality, sanity and insanity, impacting on the definition of gender and heavily influencing the outcome of civil and criminal trials. (See Chesler (1986, 1989), Foucault (1979), Keller (1985), Rosenhan 1973, Schur (1984), Szasz (1974), and Weeks (1985) for examples and discussions of this phenomenon.) From the late nineteenth through the last quarter of the twentieth century, science has dominated definitions of women's nature and created and perpetuated the idea that masochism is an inherent part of being female (Pleck 1987). Because of the legitimacy attached to scientific findings and the de facto "evidence" that because women often stay with abusive men, they enjoy being beaten, it became necessary for the movement to challenge science and the apparent "evidence" it had to offer. This challenge has led to changes in the treatment battered women encounter in the courts and in therapeutic settings.

Science has been criticized by feminists as a knowledge system and institution that has dominated women, excluding them as researchers and subjects, and perpetuating androcentric conceptualizations of women's lives and experiences or excluding them from the research agenda altogether (Cook and Fonow 1990; Harding 1986, 1987; Hartsock 1987; Keller 1985, 1990; R.D. Klein 1983; Mies 1983; Millman and Kanter 1987; Smith 1987; Westcott 1979, 1990). Looking upon old subjects from a new perspective, feminists have demonstrated the androcentric bias that has been pervasive in social scientific research. (For examples, see Bart and

Nationally, a group called the Association for Women in Psychology has been important in capturing science to achieve feminist goals. One of the group’s goals has been to conceptualize and develop feminist therapy. As a component of that goal, some of the group’s members became focused on understanding battered women and developing feminist therapies for all women. They created the Feminist Therapy Institute for that purpose. One of the group’s members, who was also a founder in the Ohio movement, explained,

There was a real need for people that were doing feminist therapy to have a place where there were other advanced practitioners. There’s a group called the Association of Women in Psychology, and they put on conferences every year....And so [out of that group], the Feminist Therapy Institute was conceived of as a place for advanced practitioners who could come and develop theory and work in a stimulating kind of atmosphere....And the issues about treatment for women were real crucial because by and large, women are getting terrible services.
[They’re] overmedicated, not really dealt with in terms of why they were feeling so powerless and helpless. "Here, take an anti-anxiety pill. Here, take something for your depression." A lot of misdiagnosis was going on. In fact, what I did for my doctoral research was I used the family violence program, the Witness/Victim program, and the Women Together shelter, and developed a Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory profile for battered women, because I felt that traditionally these women are seen as...borderline personalities. And we’d say, "Wait...if there’s a history of violence, here’s what they’re going to look like....The greater the violence, the greater the elevations on those scales." So I really got interested in doing training for therapists for dealing with the treatment and the [expert witness] stuff.23

Despite the feminist critique of science as a 'knowledge system and institution, movement goals have been advanced through activists’ recognition of the legitimacy the scientific method would bring, and their willingness to use this aspect of the patriarchal system against itself. Throughout the late 1970s and 1980s feminist psychologists worked, using the scientific method, to establish the existence of battered woman syndrome and explain exactly what it entails. Ultimately, because of their work, the way battered women are perceived by the courts has been renegotiated. Evidence that the capture of science has had a direct impact on the judicial system comes from the Ohio Supreme Court itself, in Justice Alice Robie Resnick’s opinion in State v. Koss that, "The battered woman syndrome has gained substantial scientific acceptance to warrant admissibility into evidence" (1990:213).

Capturing Medicine

Like science, medicine has been criticized for excluding women as practitioners and research subjects, ignoring the problems women experience, medicalizing non-medical conditions, and interpreting women’s experiences from an
androcentric perspective (Fausto-Sterling 1985; Oakley 1986; Rothman 1983, 1989; Ruzek 1978; Scully 1980; Warshaw 1989). Having women move into positions as doctors, researchers, and administrators has been one tactic to bring about reform in the medical institution; however, women are not necessarily feminist health care practitioners. In order to achieve the goals of the women’s movement, it is necessary that feminists become ideological outsiders within. At least one founder of the Ohio battered women’s movement moved into the medical establishment as a doctor, where she continued to work toward feminist goals. Her consciousness of battered women’s issues and the inadequacy of the medical model in addressing their needs had been raised through her work with the Victim Service Unit and the founding of Women Together. As she began her medical career, she encountered patients with injuries that might be interpreted as resulting from accidents or assault. She explained,

When you’re in the emergency department, you begin to see all kinds of women, especially, that come in and say they fell down the steps, and they have a hovering significant other that does not want to leave their side. And you know they’ve been abused. And sometimes they tell you and sometimes they don’t. [Another founder] at the time was at Witness/Victim and I was just amazed at how much domestic violence I was seeing. And I started to work with her again a little bit. She in-serviced [trained] the people over at [the hospital where I worked] and then in-serviced some of the other emergency departments, just to make people more aware of the fact that it’s out there and the questions to ask and the resources that were available.

In addition to working on in-service training, this feminist physician developed pamphlets explaining the cycle of violence and outlining resources that were available to battered women, wrote a handbook for doctors, worked on committees to raise public awareness of family violence, and did public speaking. Ultimately she
moved from a position of influence in the medical establishment to one of authority, becoming a member of the Ohio Medical Board. There she continued to work on behalf of women, seeking tighter regulation and disciplinary systems for doctors charged with sexual abuse, empowering patients by educating them regarding their rights, and institutionalizing standards to which doctors would be held accountable. Her influence and authority within the institution of medicine was enhanced by what she called "the old girls’ network," made up of founders of the battered women’s movement who had advanced to positions of authority in the Governor’s Cabinet, in the legislature, and throughout the judicial system in Ohio. By maintaining her feminist identity and commitment to the goals of the women’s and battered women’s movements, this woman and numerous others throughout the nation have helped to capture the medical establishment, making it more responsive to battered women.

Evidence that feminists have made inroads at the national level is suggested by the American Medical Association’s June 1992 announcement that wife abuse had reached epidemic proportions. Their announcement was backed by U.S. Surgeon General Antonia Novella, who said,

Domestic violence is rampant and doctors are part of the problem. We have to retrain some of us to believe that domestic violence with a fist is as important as violence with a gun.27

At the time of their announcement, the AMA also established guidelines to be followed by physicians in routinely screening patients for evidence of abuse.28 Founders’ and other feminists’ desire to advance feminist goals on the job emphasizes the importance of identity in social movements and further demonstrates
that social movements are not entirely separate from institutionalized politics or other arenas of authority. One of the activists I interviewed, an African American lawyer, expressed the lack of separation between her career and activism, as follows,

Whether I could consider myself an activist, I mean it just depends on how you define it....My philosophy about law is that law is there to mitigate or reduce the amount of chaos and to ensure justice. And if there's an area where there is injustice and I can help to rid that injustice to some degree, then I'm going to be involved....I don't know that I went to law school because of my political interests. I can't say that. But I can't separate the law from my political interests....I don't have a very linear concept, mine is more spatial, circular, or maybe it's Afrocentric in that everything is a part of everything else....Because my professional and my personal is so intertwined....as I said, everything is a part of everything else....There's an old saying that the personal is political or the political is personal. I don't know which way it goes. I guess I just can't help to be involved in some way.29

Before and after the clemency decisions, founders played a central role in sponsoring legislation to address the needs of battered women. In the process, they also worked to raise their colleagues' consciousness regarding women's issues. The women's and battered women's movements have not taken over psychology, medicine, the Ohio legislature, judiciary, prison system, or the executive branch of government. But they have begun to appropriate them to achieve their own goals, and have brought others, both women and men, into the movement. On the bench, male and female judges have played central roles in working to coordinate the judicial response to family violence, both at local and statewide levels. Some of the people I interviewed worked in atmospheres conducive to movement goals; others worked in hostile environments. Women who had internalized the feminist identity and freely identified themselves as feminists were more likely to risk their jobs standing up for
principle than those who cognitively agreed but had not assumed the identity.\textsuperscript{30}

Regardless of the level of support they found or lacked, feminists’ unwillingness to leave their convictions at the workplace door brought the movement into the institutions by which women have been dominated. It may not be true of all movements. But because identity is central to the battered women’s movement, it is inevitable that as activists gain entrée to the systems by which they have been oppressed, the distinction between the movement, institutionalized politics, and other so-called public domains will become blurred. Career activism was one strategy used by feminists in the Ohio battered women’s, everyday resistance was another.

\textit{Intimacy and Activism}

"Everyday resistance" is a concept developed by Collins (1990) to conceptualize the acts of rebellion and efforts to renegotiate relationships used by African American women. Collins uses this term as a strategic application of the feminist expansion of the term politics. In short, the personal is political, and in the everyday life world the politics of everyday resistance is the strategy employed to achieve the goals of the oppressed group. For feminists, male domination in the home is a primary element of wife abuse. Even among activists who had never been battered, there was a recognition of the need to renegotiate relationships between women and men in heterosexual relationships and to establish greater equality in intimate relationships.

At the end of all but two of the interviews I conducted,\textsuperscript{31} I asked participants if there was a clear separation in their minds between their activism, their jobs, and
their personal lives. Every one of the women said no.32 One of them answered the
question by saying,

I think they’re all of a piece. I think we have to let our lives speak, basically. I mean I really believe that. You know, I can’t imagine
compartmentalizing life. I know it’s customary for people to do it, but
I can’t understand it. I really can’t do it. I think you’re the same
person and everything you do you’re really, it’s all part of the same
thing. Certainly it all flows into everything else....It’s one of the
delights of being alive to see that kind of thing happen. You’re acting
from a core of whoever you are.33

When I asked them to give examples of how their activism was carried on in their
personal lives, many women described their efforts to negotiate egalitarian intimate
relationships. Many women referred to their marriages as partnerships that they and
their husbands had worked to establish. One woman explained,

We look at our own lives and our own partnership and how the division
of labor happens and why it happens, and his role and my role and how
we raise our children. My son’s favorite song is "Daddy Makes the
Best Spaghetti." So [my husband] is trying and he’s still growing, too.
We’ve both been socialized....I’m one person and it’s all
connected....The personal is political and the political is personal. I
don’t know if you’ve heard that a million times yet or not.34

Some of the people I talked with referred to the music they would or would not listen
to and the movies they refused to see. Those with children referred to their efforts to
rear them to be socially conscious, non-sexist, and non-violent. The data I collected
was replete with examples of how women pursued feminist goals in their intimate
relationships and home lives. Such acts of resistance, collectively, have advanced
efforts to renegotiate women’s identities and lives. Sometimes the impact of everyday
resistance was limited to the immediate context of the relationship. In other
instances, being partnered with an individual who shared housework and child care
made participation in demanding careers possible for women who might otherwise be restricted. When women were married to men who held public office, the concept of partnership as an act of everyday resistance took on even wider implications. In such partnerships, women are empowered to carry on an activist agenda and the public really does "get two for the price of one."\textsuperscript{35}

\textit{Political Partnerships and Everyday Resistance}

Although the wives of public office holders have always exerted private influence over their husbands, the emergence of partnerships between officials and their spouses has permitted unelected spouses to publicly express their views and to take on work that has more than token value. Dagmar Celeste's partnership with the Governor empowered her to work toward feminist goals, but not without resentment and resistance from the public and other politicians. She explained,

> On the one hand you had a Governor who thought of himself as a feminist politically, but who also basically bought into the patriarchy in the sense that he was at the top of a hierarchy....Dick pretty much worked a very clear hierarchical process. And then you had a partnership between him and me, and I didn't work in a hierarchical process. I mean I had a unit in the Governor's office, at the bottom of that pyramid....And there was always what [one of my assistants] used to call "tensegrity"--tension and integrity between the people in my unit and basically the hierarchical staff in the Governor's office....And there was a little bit of...resentment of the fact that I was free to do this, because I was his wife, not his Chief of Staff. I was not in the hierarchy. You know, it's the personal being political....I mean, "Who is she?" I mean, "Why is she making decisions at all? What business does she have to influence this process? I mean, after all, we didn't elect her. We elected him."\textsuperscript{36}

Among politicians, there is a precarious separation that has historically been expected to exist between their personal and public lives. It is almost as if the public
expects office holders to be sequestered from their families. Conversations about political issues should, ideally, not take place among family members or between spouses. If they do, either no influence should be exerted, or any opinion expressed by the non-office holder should be ignored or denied. The public resents the privileged access family members have to office holders and demands that the division between public and private be symbolically maintained. Those who consider their intimate relationships to be partnerships challenge the separation between public and private. The Governor explained,

The staff of the Governor serves the Governor and thinks that anything else that intrudes is just that, an intrusion, and an unwarranted intrusion. That’s family, that’s First Lady, whatever it might be. It’s a pain, you know, here we are doing the business of the state, why do we need to worry about something that the First Lady’s interested in? And so I think it’s fair to say that there was never a wonderfully smooth relationship between the First Lady’s staff and the Governor’s office staff….I used her a lot for the benefit of the people in Ohio….She was not paid for any of that work. In addition, I mean, she had things she was interested in….Her issues weren’t issues I didn’t care about, I mean that she had to impose on me. It was helpful to me that she could take an interest in some things, and I would count on her doing a lot of the getting educated and understanding what was happening around Ohio and being able to share that with me in the same way that I would count on a cabinet member.37

Through their partnership, Dagmar Celeste developed the First Lady’s agenda that, among other things, focused on the issues of battered women and women in prison. Because of her position as First Lady, her partnership with the Governor, and his support of her work, she was able to carry out projects that he may have been too limited to do. It was her Unit that brought together influential people throughout the state to promote women’s issues. The First Lady and her Unit worked to create the
Governor’s Task Force on Family Violence and pressed for greater coordination of the services and public awareness of family violence. She was central in the expansion of opportunities for women’s recovery in Ohio prisons, providing the leadership to turn a network of support groups into a social movement web. It was Dagmar Celeste and her staff who provided motivation to the Governor’s staff to investigate the clemencies, and she who helped to educate the Governor’s aides by taking them to visit with the L.I.F.E. Group. Whenever the opportunity arose to educate the public about wife abuse and family violence, Dagmar Celeste and her staff were there. As First Lady, Dagmar Celeste and her staff had a freedom not available to the Governor. The First Lady compared their positions and relationship to the game of chess. She said,

I mean, it is like a chess game. [She laughs.] In fact, I’ve often viewed the role of the First Lady as the queen in a chess game….I mean it, you know, you’re not the king. But the whole god damn game and the hierarchy is built on protecting the king, including the queen, of course, who’s supposed to jump around and protect the king. And what’s interesting in chess, of course, is that the queen has a lot more mobility than anybody else, you know? I mean, she can move up…he can’t move at all! I mean he is really stuck!…And it’s still very much within the patriarchy. I mean, chess is not a feminist game. [She laughs.] Because there’s no point in having a queen, except to protect the king….And then, of course, people have political ambitions and professional ambitions, and when you cross their professional ambitions, I mean they really come out at you….That was not my position. I mean, I would make coalitions with people who didn’t serve his interests, if they served a feminist interest. And eventually he would come to see that they served his interest, because if he wanted to be what he said he wanted to be as a progressive feminist politician, eventually, it came to serve his interests.38
CONCLUSION

A central component of feminist strategy in the Ohio battered women's movement was the idea that the personal is political. This tenet was the foundation of the "creation" of the wife abuse problem, the empowerment of battered women within prison and out, and the capture of science, three branches of the government, medicine, and the correctional system. Feminist identity entails a willingness to challenge established social arrangements, gender relations, and definitions of women, and to apply a feminist analysis to the social settings in which women find themselves and desire to enter.

By redefining the experiences of battered women from masochism to a form of post-traumatic stress disorder, the movement successfully renegotiated a stigmatized identity. By using their positions in the courts and legislature, feminists successfully institutionalized this aspect of battered women's identity. By reclaiming that identity, women were empowered and change was inevitable. Finally, by working to secure the release of twenty-six women from prison on the basis of this renegotiated identity, they symbolically raised the issue of the injustice of keeping survivors of wife abuse in prison and established a precedent for other states to follow.39
NOTES

1. My thanks to Laurel Richardson, whom I believe first introduced me to this metaphor.

2. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on July 21, 1992.


4. This was the name by which the project was called in an interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 26, 1991.

5. After being rehabilitated, the houses were then made available at reasonable prices to families who would not otherwise be able to afford decent housing.

6. Within the Ohio prison system, women's efforts to enter into the trades was also advanced by a program offered at the Franklin Pre-Release Center that trained women how to enter jobs traditionally dominated by men. Outside the prison, the group Hard Hatted Women, a Cleveland based organization, lobbied to guarantee women's access into the trades and loaned them tools and hard hats until they could earn enough money to buy their own.


8. In addition to the Ohio Reformatory for Women, located in Marysville, there are two Pre-Release Centers for women in the State of Ohio.


10. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 31, 1992.

11. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 21, 1991.

12. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 17, 1992.

13. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 5, 1992.


15. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 31, 1992.

16. Of the ninety-seven cases originally identified by prison officials as being cases related to battering, eight involved the assault of a partner who lived. "Handwritten notes attached to Memorandum to Central Office from The Ohio Reformatory for Women," [Marysville, OH] (Feb. 15, 1990): pp.1-34.
17. According to the Governor’s aide who oversaw the clemency review process, the prosecuting attorneys were notified, as specified by law. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 5, 1992


20. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 31, 1992.

21. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on October 31, 1992.

22. Interestingly, one of the central tenets of positivism is the avoidance of tautological arguments. This is a case in point where the rules were overlooked.


24. See Warshaw (1989) for an excellent discussion of the limitations of the medical model in addressing the needs of battered women.

25. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on September 28, 1992.

26. The issues she worked on included elder abuse, child abuse, and wife abuse. She attributed her interest in all three areas to her early work in the women’s movement.


29. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 5, 1992.

30. None of the men I interviewed had been in a position where pursuing feminist goals had the potential to put their jobs at risk.

31. Because of time constraints, I was unable to pursue this line of inquiry with the Governor and one of the legislators I interviewed.

32. Of those I asked, all but three men said there was no separation. One of them considered himself pro-feminist; the other two did not consider themselves feminists and preferred other
philosophical labels. Interestingly, all of the women, but none of the men, said there was no separation between their personal lives, their jobs, and their activism. Although the number of men I interviewed was small, it appears that there may a gender split on this issue.

33. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on July 29, 1992.

34. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on November 9, 1992.

35. This idea was first publicly articulated by Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton when he was running for President of the United States.

36. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 26, 1991.

37. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on August 13, 1992.

38. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 26, 1991.

CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this research, I have had three goals. The first has been to document the activism of women and men whose work might otherwise have been lost to history. The second has been to draw together resource mobilization and new social movements theories and to demonstrate how using both enhances an understanding of the battered women's movement. My third goal has been to make theoretical contributions to the social movement literature, based on the data I have gathered. This chapter will summarize the movement and the theoretical issues raised by the analysis.

THE MOVEMENT REVISITED

Between 1975, when the committee was formed to found the first battered women's shelter in Ohio, and December 1990 when the Governor announced his clemency decisions, the Ohio battered women's movement has gone through changes, maintained continuity, and become widely disseminated. During the sixteen year history I have examined, the movement grew from a small group of highly committed
feminists to a statewide network and community with connections to the national movement.

The Ohio battered women’s movement began as an outgrowth of the women’s movement and feminists’ consciousness that violence against women warranted a social response. The movement’s founders were involved in the many organizations of the women’s movement of the early 1970s in Cleveland. For many, their feminist consciousness was an outgrowth of earlier activism in the civil rights and new left movements. Out of that early community of feminists emerged a cohesive feminist network, based on long lasting friendships. Many of the women in the early movement came from families that had been involved in local and state politics and the numerous foundations located in the greater Cleveland area. These women understood how politics and foundation funding worked. They had the knowledge and skills needed to make things happen and the connections, when necessary, to be able to talk to and influence the right people.

Founders were initiators. As a whole, they were not content to rest on their accomplishments, but willingly passed them onto the next generation of feminists, the joiners. Having established the precedent of shelter in Ohio, most moved on to build their careers as lawyers, psychologists, university professors, doctors, legislators, and judges, where they continued to pursue feminist goals. Other founders remained active in the women’s movement organizations they represented during the shelter’s founding.
Initially founders believed that providing safe space and help with finding jobs, housing, and legal assistance were all battered women would need to begin rebuilding their lives. They soon learned they were wrong. Almost as soon as the shelter opened, feminists recognized the need for peer counseling and empowerment, making those their central strategies in helping women reclaim their identities and their lives. With their emergent recognition of women’s psychological response to abuse and their experience with women who had killed abusive partners, they maintained their commitment to structural and cultural change, but also incorporated a greater focus on individual needs and responses. In Kathey Thomas’s case, feminists were denied the right to testify about society’s failure to assist and protect battered women and the mental state of a woman who had killed her partner. Out of this experience, feminists became committed to documenting the gender biases in self-defense law and establishing the scientific legitimacy of what they called battered woman syndrome. The two issues were closely intertwined. Once the syndrome was recognized as part of a legitimate knowledge system, it was incorporated into law, bringing about part of the structural change feminists desired.

As founders left Women Together in pursuit of careers, a new cohort moved into the shelter. Some within the new cohort adopted a mental health approach to family violence. Others maintained a feminist analysis. Among the joiners, a cohort community developed, similar to the founders’ "old girls' network." Joiners were set apart from others in their cohort by their continued commitment to empowerment and social change. During the 1980s, a time of increased competition for resources and
pressure to shift to a mental health model, they were the ones who resisted. Although joiners made some concessions, such as incorporating some level of hierarchy and hiring feminist therapists, they maintained their commitment to the feminist analysis of wife abuse. As the cohort community developed, they became frustrated with the lack of focus in the statewide network of shelter providers, which included feminist and mental health based models. These feminists left to form their own network. Immediately they became involved in supporting legislation that ensured that battered women charged with murder or assault would be able to introduce expert testimony about battered woman syndrome at their trials.

An understanding of battered woman syndrome, the dynamics of violent relationships, and society’s continued failure, despite improvements, to protect women from violent spouses, has been central in helping women who have been beaten and abused reclaim their identities and renegotiate public definitions of battered women who kill. While establishing battered woman syndrome in science and law, the movement worked with incarcerated women to help them reclaim their identities and began to press the Governor’s staff to investigate the possibility of granting clemency to women who were incarcerated for killing or assaulting men who had beaten them.

As the Governor’s staff did the work formally required to research and grant clemencies, feminists within and outside the prison, many of whom had no formal or informal contact with each other, laid the groundwork for the decisions by empowering inmates. These activists were drawn and held together by one thing: their commitment to the feminist perspective on wife abuse. In the strategy to
promote the clemencies, empowerment and the reclamation of identity were central. As inmates learned about the dynamics of violent relationships, society's failure to help them, and the battered woman syndrome, they began to redefine their experiences. They came to see themselves differently. Whereas some had believed they deserved to be punished, with empowerment many came to the conclusion that they were being punished for surviving the abuse that might otherwise have killed them. They knew that was wrong. By understanding their lives within the social context, they were able to confront the forces that had worked against them all their lives; they were empowered.

Inmates were a major resource in educating the Governor's staff, corrections personnel, and others involved in the decision making process. Their stories would later be used to educate professionals who would continue to encounter battered women. While in prison and after their release, they appeared on nationally syndicated television talk shows and news magazines and had innumerable articles written about them in local small town newspapers and major publications, including the New York Times. They were not always able to control the way their stories were interpreted, but they were strong in their conviction that they had survived a double injustice--first by being beaten and second by being incarcerated.

In December 1990 the movement achieved a major success when the Governor announced that he would release twenty-five women from prison. Since that announcement, members of his staff have gone on to serve as consultants to activists in other states who are promoting large scale clemencies for battered women and on
the newly formed Ohio Supreme Court’s task force on battered woman syndrome. The clemencies were an achievement on their own, but more importantly, they have drawn new recruits into the movement and served as a precedent for activists to follow in other states.

PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE: MAINTAINING CONTROL

The movement has had far reaching effects on the way wife abuse and battered women are perceived, on the institutions responsible for responding to and eliminating family violence, and on survivors and the activists themselves. Despite their widespread success, activists have failed to reach some of their goals and have reevaluated and redefined others. One of the difficulties feminists have continued to encounter is maintaining control over the issues they have raised. For example, after redefining wife abuse as a social problem, the movement began to lose control over the focus on patriarchy as the cause of wife abuse. Many shelters and programs have adopted an individualized, mental health approach to domestic violence, ignoring the role that sexism, misogyny, and patriarchy play in wife abuse. Although feminists have maintained their own focus on the need for social change, the tendency to individualize wife abuse is an issue with which the movement has continued to struggle.

Similarly, feminists have successfully defined battered woman syndrome as a response to long term abuse, women’s socialization to depend upon and defer to men, and society’s general lack of response to women’s pleas for help. Even as the syndrome has gained scientific and legal recognition, however, feminist scholars have
warned that one of the problems with it is that lawyers and judges have a tendency to interpret it as a form of mental illness rather than a normal response to long term abuse and societal neglect (Schneider 1986). One of the major challenges facing the battered women's movement in the wake of gaining recognition of the syndrome will be to prevent it from being interpreted as an individual mental health issue or a plea of temporary insanity. What makes battered woman syndrome a feminist concept is its focus on the social conditions that leave women no option but to stay with men who abuse them and subsequently result in women believing that killing their partners is the only way they will be able to survive.

Originally the movement sought to establish shelters where women could stay until their husbands were evicted from the home. Instead, shelters have become what appears to be an institutionalized response to wife abuse. Judges, prosecutors, and even shelter workers expect those terrorized by violence to leave their homes while perpetrators stay there. Although many feminists dislike this arrangement, little progress has been made to change it. Activists originally assumed that the courts would arrest, prosecute, and convict men found guilty of beating their female partners. Instead, diversion programs have been institutionalized so that men can be counseled and taught new ways to control their anger, a practice widely supported by founders and opposed by joiners.

Even when men are arrested and evicted from the home and women are awarded restraining orders or other orders of protection, the state has been unable to protect women from men determined to harm them. Feminist shelter directors and
advocates believe the answer to this problem is long prison terms for abusive men. However, they continue to face the difficulty that battered women often refuse to prosecute and prefer to have their partners ordered into counseling. Any acceptance of batterers’ treatment on the part of joiners has been solely in deference to the wishes of battered women.

Founders, on the other hand, have voiced much greater support for batterers’ treatment, referring to the fact that most batterers have been abused as children. Treatment for batterers, in their view, should involve confronting men with the ways in which they devalue women and assume they have the right to control them and then, making sure that violent behavior has ceased, helping them deal with childhood issues. Treatment for batterers was viewed by founders as a feminist issue, a way to allow women to leave shelters while their partners underwent mandatory residential treatment. Although I am unaware of any such mandatory residential treatment programs, the concept has become a goal for some founders.

The difficulty with batterers’ treatment is two-fold. First, as joiners are well aware, funding that goes to treat violent men is often drawn away from sources earmarked for services for battered women. Founders have argued that if men are taught not to be violent, batterers’ treatment is a service for battered women. However, my data have shown the difficulty the movement has had in controlling the way treatment is defined. At least within one program, treatment has gone from a feminist definition of confronting abusive men, to couples’ counseling, and most recently, to the proposal that abusive women also need treatment. Although the
counselors involved in this program assert that they are confrontational in their treatment approach, they have lost sight of the feminist analysis and have institutionalized the courts’ response to men who beat their wives. Maintaining control of concepts has proven to be much more difficult for the Ohio battered women’s movement than mobilizing resources.

AVOIDING COOPTATION

To explain how the Ohio battered women’s movement avoided cooptation and went on to achieve the success it has, I have drawn upon key concepts in resource mobilization and new social movements theories. Neither one of these theories by itself offers enough conceptual richness to provide a full understanding of the movement. However, because resource mobilization theory provides a framework through which to examine organizational and structural elements and new social movements theory focuses on cultural factors, together they nicely complement each other. However, whereas Klandermans and Tarrow (1988) suggest that new social movements theory seeks to understand "why," and resource mobilization explains "how" social movements emerge, my data demonstrate that new social movements theory, and specifically its focus on the importance of identity, offers insight into the strategies, the how, of new social movements.

Funding has been a crucial element in the provision of around the clock, year round services for battered women and their children. Without it shelters would not exist. My research has shown how foundations attempted to become active participants in the movement by seeking out organizations that would offer the
services they thought were needed. I have also shown that the men’s movement played a central role in redefining the appropriate legal response to family violence. Funding is much more complicated than sponsors dictating demands and social movement organizations deciding whether to accede or walk away. Whenever possible, feminists actively resisted funders’ demands by finding other sources. Where such sources were not available, they compromised by becoming more hierarchical and adding feminist professionals. Still, they maintained their focus on social change. When money began going to batterers’ treatment programs, feminists resisted having their resources funneled away by strategically having themselves appointed to decision making boards. Funders may make demands, but the interaction does not stop there. Feminist resistance has been an important part of the funding equation.

The two elements that held the Ohio battered women’s movement together were its collective identity and feminist analysis of the issues. The collective identity upon which the movement was based informed its strategy of empowerment and the ways in which shelter workers and residents interacted. Feminists’ assumption that battered women are self-determining people, capable of making rational choices, and that the only difference between them and never battered women is luck, worked to create unity among activists in all areas of the movement. Collectively, the movement is based on the identity “woman.” Its analysis of wife abuse as a social problem is a natural outgrowth of the assumptions underlying activists’ collective identity. Because they view wife abuse as the repression of all women, and not just
those with "personal problems," it is a feminist issue. Anyone who struggles against violence against women, whether in their homes, on the job, or in social movement organizations, can be an activist. Cohesion was enhanced by social movement communities. The feminist community in the battered women’s movement was enhanced by longterm friendships and strong bonds among colleagues. However, because its boundaries were established within the feminist analysis of the issues, it also reached out to include those who had been drawn in through the feminist literature and women’s studies programs that played a central role in researching the issues, developing theories, and disseminating information about wife abuse. Some women in the movement were isolated, working in environments hostile to feminism; nonetheless, by virtue of their feminist identity and commitment to the feminist analysis of the problem, they were members of the community. Conversely, women with strong friendship and organizational ties ran the risk of being "frozen out" of the community if they failed to demonstrate allegiance to the feminist analysis of wife abuse. Those who believed women to be as violent as men or who adhered to individual explanations for violence were driven out of the feminist community through interpersonal ostracism. Peer pressure is a very strong element in maintaining allegiance to the collective action frame, and tight knit communities were very successful in reducing the number of those who strayed.

Resource mobilization theory emphasizes the importance of networks among social movement organizations. My research suggests that networks are important, but that their members must agree in their analysis of the issues. One of the major
complaints against ACTION Ohio was that it lacked focus. When some of the network's member groups left to form the Ohio Domestic Violence Network (ODVN), they spent the time necessary to make sure they were in agreement on the need to focus on social change. Their goals were an outgrowth of the feminist analysis that drew them together in the first place. With the network to coordinate them and a collective action frame to guide them, the group went on to lobby successfully on behalf of House Bill 484. They have continued to monitor legislation affecting battered women and the programs that serve them. Networks serve the purpose of pooling resources and coordinating action, but without a common analysis of the issues, or a collective action frame to unite the group, organization is not enough.

In addition to the feminist networks that formed in Ohio, feminists were linked together by a strong collective identity that was inclusive enough to allow for diversity but restrictive enough to create cohesion. The collective identity informed the way shelter workers and residents interacted. The belief was that whether one was a resident, staff member, survivor, director, or never-battered woman, the fact that all were women made it simply a "happy accident" for some that they met under the circumstances that brought them together. Activists' analysis of battering was nurtured by a feminist community of long term and newly formed friendships and close relationships among colleagues. Shelter residents and survivors were always made to feel part of the community. Their approach was based upon the feminist analysis of wife abuse. As this analysis was disseminated through the feminist
literature, more activists were brought into the community, although many had no formal affiliations with the movement. They were activists in their daily lives and on their jobs and linked to the community by a sense of solidarity with others working toward the same goals.

Finally, resource mobilization theory has emphasized the importance of the opportunity for movements to emerge and thrive. Although some movements may have to wait for a chance to mobilize, the battered women’s movement, through the work of founders who had achieved high level positions throughout the state, created their own opportunities. Through the Governor’s Task Force on Family Violence, feminists worked to create alliances among police, judges, mental health workers, and shelter providers and to coordinate the system’s response to all forms of family violence. Through the Women’s Interagency Network, feminists gained input into all decisions made through the executive branch of state government, particularly as they affected women. This arena was used to empower women economically and politically and to facilitate a greater understanding of issues such as post-partum depression, battered woman syndrome, violence against women, and those affecting incarcerated women.

In order to understand how social movements succeed and avoid cooptation, we need to include an analysis of organizations, networks, and opportunities, but we must be careful not to assume that all relationships are one-way. For example, sponsors may demand that organizations who receive their funds behave in a certain way, but that does not mean they will get what they want. The activists in the
battered women’s movement have resisted cooptation through funding in creative and sometimes uncanny ways. For example, the shape of the organization may change, but that does not necessarily mean activists’ commitment to movement goals or principles have been reduced. Further, networks help to pool resources and coordinate activities, but only if the activists themselves are in agreement about the struggle. A network without a shared oppositional frame of analysis may turn out to be less effective than a group with a common analysis, but no network. And finally, it is nice when the opportunity to succeed is dropped in the movement’s lap, but that does not always happen. As with the mobilization of support groups in the Ohio Reformatory for Women, sometimes movements make their own opportunities. Some movements achieve one goal, such as access to powerful positions or the right to run for office, and then use goals achieved as resources to create further opportunities. That is exactly what the battered women’s movement did. As the women’s movement advanced political and economic opportunities for women, feminists who moved into such positions used them to further movement goals, including those of the battered women’s movement. Further, as women were empowered to escape violent relationships and live independently, they became important resources to the movement as peer counselors and advocates and as mothers, sisters, neighbors, and friends who were no longer afraid to confront abusive behavior. But in order to fully understand how the movement has pursued movement goals through careers and personal relationships, I have reexamined the centrality of identity in new social movement strategies. This, I believe, is where my theoretical contributions lie.
centrality of identity in new social movement strategies. This, I believe, is where my theoretical contributions lie.

THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

One of the major differences between "new" and "old" social movements is that the latter seeks structural change while the former works toward that goal as well as personal transformation as a means to social change. Personal transformation has been a central strategy throughout the history of the Ohio battered women’s movement. This strategy was used initially in the speak-outs that brought wife abuse into public consciousness. It continued through peer counseling and support group discussions within shelters and later in the prison. As battered women drew upon each other’s experiences to understand their own, they began to understand and challenge the social forces that worked to oppress them, thus working toward social change.

Reclaiming Identity

I believe that a central component of the dynamic of empowerment involves reclaiming identity. Historically, battered women have been stigmatized by assumptions that men have a right to discipline their wives, that women must have done something to deserve the beating, and that because they fail to leave the abuser, they must enjoy it. Throughout the violent relationship, battered women are stigmatized for being abused. If they try to escape, they frequently find themselves in worse danger, and if they defend themselves against an actual or anticipated assault, they are often charged with murder or attempted murder. The assumption then, of
course, is that they should have "just left," and that because they did not, they are cold blooded murderers. Because battered women internalize the stigma attached to "battered woman" and "battered woman who has killed," (along with all the other things their abusers have told them are wrong with them), helping them to reclaim and renegotiate those identities is no easy task. Nonetheless, that strategy has been central to the movement's success.

Within the prison, support groups helped women to understand the dynamics of violent relationships, the ways their partners controlled them and prevented them from leaving, and all the ways society failed to protect them or enable them to help themselves. As they began to comprehend all they had endured, they began to see themselves as survivors rather than victims, as strong rather than weak. The strength that emerged in these groups transformed the social movement network that had formed within the prison into a web: the strength that flowed from within created the opportunity for social change. Women wrote letters, distributed information to each other, encouraged others to remember their experiences and fight for their clemencies, educated legislators and aides to the Governor, and appeared on television, even when the potential for harm to their own cases existed. As they reclaimed their identity, they renegotiated it publicly and, as survivors, decided they were not going to put up with any more abuse, including sexual harassment and assault by prison officials.
Unlike some of the other movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the women’s and battered women’s movements have engaged in a strategy of insider self-limiting radicalism. That is, they recognize the legitimate existence of the democratic state and capitalist economy and have sought positions within those arenas where they have gained access to influence and authority. Whereas members of the new left have steered clear of involvement in the "establishment," upward mobility has been identified as a desirable movement goal by many feminists. As they have established successful careers, feminists have used their positions as judges, lawyers, cabinet members, legislators, researchers, doctors, psychologists, and First Lady to advance movement goals. Their activism in their careers has allowed them to "capture" the systems by which women have historically been dominated and use them to achieve feminist goals.

In the renegotiation of the identity of battered women who had assaulted or killed their partners, a central issue was to make the public interpret these women’s actions as reasonable. Certainly it does not seem reasonable to murder someone while he is drunk or asleep. A reasonable person would take the opportunity to run, or so the public and self-defense law has long assumed. In order to reconstruct what appear to be unreasonable, vicious acts as reasonable, one must understand the state the circumstances surrounding the assault. Yet, this was what the Supreme Court, in State v. Thomas, refused to allow. The Court based its decision on the lack of scientific legitimacy of the syndrome. In order to make the public, juries, and judges understand—to renegotiate identity from cold blooded killer to reasonable person—
feminists had to establish the scientific legitimacy of the syndrome. And although
feminists have long criticized science, and in particular positivist methodology, they
knew that was the knowledge system that would provide the most legitimacy for what
they knew to be true. So they used it, capturing science to achieve the movement’s
goals.

Feminists have used their careers and the influence and authority they have
attained to capture the legitimacy attached to institutions and systems that have
historically oppressed and discriminated against women. Doctors have worked to
ensure that their colleagues can no longer ignore signs of abuse. Researchers have
used science to make the voices of incarcerated women heard. Judges have used their
status to educate the public about domestic violence and their authority to coordinate
the legal system’s response to wife abuse and close the loopholes through which so
many batterers seem to slip. Cabinet members have worked to create job
opportunities for women, to ensure pay equity between women and men, and to
provide day care.

Intimacy and Activism

Drawing upon Collins’s (1990) concept of everyday resistance, I have
highlighted the ways in which feminists have extended their activism into their homes
and their intimate relationships. This is old news. The personal is political, as we
have now heard "a million times." However, when elected officials come to office
with spouses they consider partners, the personal moves into the realm of
institutionalized politics. Dagmar and Dick Celeste considered their marriage a
partnership. He drew upon her intelligence, energy, expertise, and wisdom to help him run the Executive Branch of the State of Ohio for eight years. Recognizing the resentment he would face ahead of time, he gave her an office in the State House, right next to his own. He provided her with a staff and instructed his own Chief of Staff to assist and cooperate with her and her Unit. The Governor and First Lady may not have always agreed on things, but their arguments were conducted openly and in front of their aides. She saw her job, as his partner, to do things he was constrained from doing and to protect him politically. He was not only appreciative of the work she did, but openly acknowledged it.

Deciding who does the dishes or takes care of the children, who cleans the house and whose career is more important seem like mundane, almost trivial issues to many people. But these are the issues upon which egalitarian or unequal marriages are established (Hertz 1986; Hochschild 1989). The partnership between Dagmar and Dick Celeste did not begin in the State House. It began in their home where they shared housework, reared their children in an ethos of egalitarianism, and shared power and responsibilities as equally as possible. When their partnership entered the realm of legal rational decision making, it was inevitable that they would continue to interact with each other in the same manner, despite pressure to act differently.

Electing a pro-feminist Governor was good for women in the State of Ohio; putting him and his partner in office was even better. Personal partnerships challenge traditional gender roles by freeing women from full responsibility for housework and child care, encouraging men to participate more fully in the home, and allowing each
partner to develop more completely. Feminists have long challenged dualistic assumptions about the separation between politics and personal life (Alonso 1992; Cassell 1977; Collins 1990; Elshtain 1981; Firestone 1972; Millett 1970). Personal partnerships, particularly when they are practiced by elected officials and their spouses, challenge the boundaries between public and private, personal and political, and represent a potentially powerful way for feminists to expand their range of influence.

CONCLUSION

The Ohio battered women’s movement has left an indelible mark on our national consciousness, the institutions responsible for responding to wife abuse, and the lives of all those it has touched. It moved into the Governor’s Mansion, the State House, the prisons, the legislature, science, medicine, the Ohio Supreme Court, and all of the lower level courts. As battered women have become survivors, the movement has moved out of the shelters and into our homes. Wherever women have been empowered and have come to the sense that they "just don’t want no more abuse," the movement exists.

According to Dagmar Celeste, empowered, organized women are the ones that those who opposed the clemency decisions fear the most. According to her, some men have good reason to worry. She said,

This is gender warfare….There’s an aspect of what’s happening now that I can understand why men feel, "Oh my God!" You know? "If women really get in touch with how we [men] organize ourselves in a patriarchy, to do everything and anything, including killing them and blaming them for it, they will be so enraged, they’ll all come after us." There is this sort of subterranean fear of women that comes out of
guilt from millennia of abuse that when you listen to some of the
guys...emote about the Governor's action [to grant clemency], it has
nothing to do with the real cases at hand. I mean, you know, these
[women who were granted clemency] are no threat to anybody. But the
bigger issue is...are we going to give women a license to kill men, just
because men have been killing them?!

The shelters have become hierarchical, professionals have been hired, networks have
formed, and webs have developed. A societal response to wife abuse has been
mobilized and institutionalized and campaigns are being waged to reverse past
inequities in the judicial system. As long as women work to empower other women,
the movement will survive.
NOTES

1. Interview conducted by Patricia Gagné on June 26, 1991.
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