



DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD

Feminism and Femininity in Almost Equal Balance

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
[Please share](#) how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation	Mandel, Andrew K. 2004. Feminism and femininity in almost equal balance. In Yards and gates: gender in Harvard and Radcliffe history, edited by Laurel Ulrich, 215-228. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Accessed	February 19, 2015 7:36:57 AM EST
Citable Link	http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4675148
Terms of Use	This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA

(Article begins on next page)

Feminism and Femininity in Almost Equal Balance

Andrew K. Mandel

At century's midpoint, Radcliffe College's leaders faced a dilemma of institutional proportions. Harvard, compelled by wartime necessity to mix women into its classrooms in 1943, soon found the arrangement efficient and surprisingly without objection among its notoriously stodgy alumni. Harvard's subsequent offer of permanent "joint instruction" in 1947 was at once joyous--gaining women access inside Harvard's gates had been Radcliffe's purpose since its inception in the 1870s--and frightening. Radcliffe officials worried that such an arrangement would eliminate Radcliffe's individuality, and ultimately its entire *raison d'être*. But by 1950 Radcliffe's leaders had refashioned their conception of the school's role. Radcliffe as an institution was more necessary than ever, its leaders argued, because it provided a space for women to nurture their separate identity within a mixed-sex environment. With this new theory in place--with coeducation not an admission of obsolescence but rather a new reason for Radcliffe to exist--the full merger of classes could move forward.

This equal-but-separate system, in which women would attend rigorous classes with the men at Harvard but be content with different social opportunities at Radcliffe, was unrealistic. Radcliffe's model of separatism bred latent resentment. Many female students found less and less reason to be cloistered at Radcliffe when increased excitement and opportunity, as well as the college's own educational and social directives, pointed toward further union with men at Harvard.¹ Some Radcliffe students

began to abandon their alma mater and make their way into previously all-male sanctums. But in their quest for an integrated community, they had to learn new rules to gain entry; they had to balance their infamous intellectualism and self-described “feminism” with femininity in order to become, quite literally, “part of the club.” The story of social integration and extracurricular merger at Harvard and Radcliffe shows how women tried to erase their in-between status as not-quite-equals, and how they ended up erasing women’s distinct voices in the process. Despite popular belief about total complacency during the 1950s, the silencing of Radcliffe students did not escape the notice and outrage of some campus watchers, but it was not until the 1960s that compromise bloomed into consciousness-raising.

Second-Class Citizens

Throughout its early history, Radcliffe was Harvard’s neglected, precocious, younger sister--mocked in the pages of the *Crimson* and the *Lampoon* for unsightliness and mannishness. When joint instruction emerged after a series of negotiations in the 1940s, the Radcliffe administration was excited about finally gaining the stability of a contractually guaranteed professoriat, but its students were wary of integration into the traditionally off-putting Harvard community. In fact, the student-run weekly, the *Radcliffe News*, reported soon after the deal was struck that if it had not been for the war, the student body would have protested the move, citing a desire to maintain a realm for educated women unfettered by men. “Under ordinary conditions, most Radcliffe students are opposed to coeducation, not only because it would necessitate a long walk to Harvard,

time-consuming and unpleasant during most of the Cambridge winter; but also because it tends to limit the freedom and spontaneity of classroom and round-table discussions.”²

Three years later, the discomfort led to an assertion of women’s rights. “Morale does not stay high nor enthusiasm for a given system of education strong when instructors always address their remarks solely to the men present and refer to themselves as ‘Harvard instructors’--never as ‘Harvard and Radcliffe’,” student editorialists opined in a *Radcliffe News* piece titled “Radcliffe Is Annoyed.”³ In 1947, as more female students poured into Harvard lecture halls thanks to increased “joint instruction,” assigned seating arrangements for men prevented women from sitting just anywhere--and, as the *Radcliffe News* noted, “acoustics become notably bad when one is squatting on the floor behind the last row of seats.”⁴ Female students were “embittered and frustrated” by the situation, noting that “no matter how fast they run between classes, they arrive to find the few seats that are theirs taken by the auditors. They pay their tuition, read their assignments and seldom cut lectures, but Harvard gets the seat.” Even if Harvard was, as one dean put it, only “slightly coeducational,” female students felt entitled to basic rights.⁵

Learning the Rules

Though they clamored for seats in the classrooms, Radcliffe students knew that access to Harvard Yard did not connote equal opportunity. Some women called themselves “intruders” and “invaders,” and they were known as such.⁶ The first tenured female professor in Harvard’s Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Helen Maud Cam, joined the History

Department in 1948. Her appointment, the Zemurray-Stone Chair, was financed by a grant to Radcliffe, not to Harvard. When Harvard officials refused to open the new Lamont Library to women in 1949, Radcliffe president Wilbur K. Jordan was satisfied that at least the larger Widener Library would be lifting all restrictions to Radcliffe students.⁷ Asking for full and equal access to traditionally all-male institutions felt like a labor in vain. “The . . . habits and ways of thinking of centuries, which all involve a distrust in woman’s thinking apparatus, are not easily broken down,” the *Radcliffe News* explained. “Once women realize the futility of it all this clamoring for instruction will cease.”⁸

Marriage loomed large in American society in the postwar era; spinsters and homosexuals both were scorned.⁹ Each engaged senior at Radcliffe was presented with a ring of pink rosebuds at a June luncheon ceremony, and the first graduate to become a bride received a set of Radcliffe china. The first baby girl born to a member of the graduating class received a silver spoon and became the mascot of her mother’s class. The class of 1948’s ten-year anniversary survey showed that 93 percent of the class was married, averaged 2.3 children, and three out of four were “busy housewives.”¹⁰ Radcliffe students were not thinking about the years after graduation, adopting a “cross that bridge when we come to it” stance. The Radcliffe yearbook from 1953 explains this day-by-day mentality: “The Korean war has had a decided effect on us--not only in that many of us are getting married early because of the menace of the draft, but also in our general attitude of dealing with things as they arise, with little real planning for the future.”¹¹ As

Elaine Tyler May shows in a larger study of the period, marriage and domesticity became safe options in an unstable world.¹²

[See Image 15: Tea in a Radcliffe Dorm]

Radcliffe College officials encouraged their students to pursue the marriage route. In fact, in their ten-year anniversary survey, the class of 1948's greatest complaint was the lack of counseling, both vocational and personal.¹³ The Harvard House system boasted faculty affiliates; Radcliffe dormitories were run by "House mothers," retired women unconnected with the networks that linked Harvard's seniors with their post-graduation employers. There was no official career advising at Radcliffe except for one interview during the last months of the senior year; the Appointment Bureau dealt largely with "placements" for summer jobs or temporary posts right after college. Those Radcliffe deans who did encourage academic pursuits were oriented toward Ph.D. work, stigmatized for loneliness and frigidity.¹⁴ And though he told his students to finish college first, President Jordan's prescriptive messages regarding marriage were clear: "I should like to see you all married on the day after graduation."¹⁵

To be sure, with articles in the *Radcliffe News* every year featuring graduating seniors' vocational plans, students did not abandon the notion that any future was possible: "Some of us consider ourselves tomorrow's hope. Others just hope to be tomorrow's housewives," the yearbook editors wrote.¹⁶ And, though officials clearly had their preferences about a woman's future, the college promoted the idea that every door

was at least theoretically open. The Appointment Bureau frequently reported the various jobs secured by recent graduates — but the Bureau collected most of its data only six months after graduation, before women generally had children, or when they were working to help put a husband through graduate school. The Radcliffe Appointment Bureau’s director also recognized serious costs of marrying: “employers seem to be more selective and, because they are more cost-conscious, are less willing to undertake the expense of training an employee who does not give some promise of continued success.”¹⁷ Since marriage connoted giving up full-time employment, all graduates could do was to find “the best solution within a rigid framework.”¹⁸

“Strategic Pointers”

Radcliffe students may have complained about seating arrangements, but they also began to cast themselves as helpless, seductive, and unconcerned with schoolwork. When Harvard announced that women would not be permitted to enter the newly built Lamont Library, the *Radcliffe News* did not fail to notice the restriction. But a winning song in a college contest, to the tune of *South Pacific*’s “I’m in Love With a Wonderful Guy,” illustrates the new Radcliffe shrug: “Tech men take us dancing in Boston / Dartmouth takes us to ski in Vermont / Yalies will wine us and Princeton men dine us / So who wants to get into Lamont?”¹⁹ The *Radcliffe News* batted its eyes when Theodore Ropp, a visiting lecturer from Duke, offered the first few rows of his classroom to the “fairest flowers,” his Radcliffe students. “Southern chivalry has become an exciting novelty in cold New England halls,” the *News* wrote.²⁰

It is hard to tell whether the women genuinely giggled and blushed at a professor's patronizing comments, or whether they grinned and bore the leers for the sake of a seat in lecture. Implying that the library was merely a venue to meet men--or, as the 1947 freshman issue of the *Radcliffe News* suggests, that classes were merely "date bureaus"--could have been a coping mechanism for discrimination.²¹ Barnard sociologist Mirra Komarovsky's research in the 1940s and early 1950s showed that half of her surveyed pool of female undergraduates purposefully hid their intellectualism on dates and in school so men would like them.²² Perhaps Radcliffe students were following the advice of elders like Barnard dean Millicent McIntosh, a guest on the NBC Lecture Hall on November 14, 1953: "I think one of the mistakes that young women who have been to college make is to expect to change their environment immediately to suit their own needs. . . . she can gradually win over her husband to giving her more freedom and more opportunity to pursue her own interests if she is sympathetic and tactful and does it gradually."²³ Rather than challenging an entire paradigm of gender roles, women searched vigorously for that "best solution within a rigid framework."

This search led Radcliffe students to pound home the importance of conspicuous femininity. In 1947 the *Radcliffe News*, "as a result of many requests," began a column to announce student engagements.²⁴ The Radcliffe handbook warned against wearing slacks, shorts, or blue jeans. "We know that beauty is only skin deep, but you don't have to look as though you lived only for things of the mind," the student handbook counseled. "Radcliffe girls ought to look like ladies; it is imperative that they be recognized as girls."²⁵ When students competed in the *Crimson's* annual "Miss Radcliffe" contest, the

goal seemed to be to change Radcliffe's image: "Socially, the 'did she go to Radcliffe or did a horse step on her face' is old hat, and 'why I would have guessed Wellesley' is the Harvard man's left handed compliment which we have learned to accept with good grace," the 1953 yearbook cheered.²⁶ Hyperfemininity was a way to attract attention and to gain acceptance and importance in the social community.

Indeed, the approach granted "feminine" women access to a previously all-male world and integrated them into the social world of Harvard. Suddenly, after "years of sneers," Harvard men were finding Radcliffe women attractive. "Former Aesthetic Nonentities Now Charm Harvard Eyes" read the headline of the full-page *Crimson* story on 'Cliffe beauty in 1951.²⁷ Harvard men also found it easier to scoff at women's academic success, claiming that they were intellectual lightweights; women feverishly and blindly copied down every single word a professor uttered, Harvard men claimed, implying that women lacked the acute analysis necessary to discern truly important information. In a 1960 *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* story, Mark H. Alcott 1961 wrote a wry column about "galloping feminism" at Radcliffe, suggesting how women sneakily "infiltrated" their way into clubhouses without the men realizing it.²⁸ Men felt less threatened by "feminine" women in their midst--a crucial ingredient to the later merger of extracurricular activities.

A Delicate Balance

But Radcliffe students, with their tradition of intellectualism, tried to maintain a balance between books and boys. In 1952, the college yearbook said that Radcliffe represented a

perfect blend of the two.²⁹ The 1954 edition explained, “This more than slight bluestocking interest in the intellectual is ridiculed . . . but it is this interest that brought us here, and we intend to get our stockingsfull.”³⁰ Indeed, there were some Radcliffe students who attempted to maintain their individuality and spurned affectations with their “green book bags, uncombed tresses [and] lipstick-less faces,” though these “grinds” were often mocked.³¹ More often, female students dressed with care, but tried not to let fashion consume their lives. The yearbook pointed out, “Where else but Radcliffe would a girl in high heels, hat and fur coat be seen on a bicycle?”³² This double identity led one Harvard professor to tell *Mademoiselle* magazine: “The Radcliffe girl carries feminism and femininity in almost equal balance. It’s enough to upset anybody.”³³

Radcliffe students were in a double bind: they would betray their intellectual tradition if they did not get their “stockingsful” of education, but both men and women measured the success of female students within a domestic context.³⁴ When author Rona Jaffe wrote her first successful book, *The Best of Everything*, the Radcliffe newspaper called the unmarried author “Miss Lonelyheart” and suggested that her smash hit had reaped the greatest reward, a slew of potential fiancés: “Big brown eyes, a Radcliffe degree, and a novel worth a speculated \$150,000 have succeeded in projecting this self-styled ‘bachelor girl’ into a land of leisurely success and a daily tide of marriage proposals.”³⁵ A headline in the *Crimson*, “‘Cliffedweller Dwelling at Kirkland House Shatters Precedent with Dean’s Approval,” sounds like glass-ceiling breaking rhetoric, but actually accompanies a story about Dorothea Hanson, an undergraduate who married a House administrator. “‘I was going to teach when I got out of college,’ the pretty

Radcliffe girl said yesterday. ‘But now I guess I’ll just be a Kirkland House housewife’.”³⁶ The Harvard administration also emphasized the degree to which women were “taking over” the campus. “I have been told that three out of every four Radcliffe graduates marry Harvard men,” Harvard president Nathan M. Pusey 1928 said in 1953. “If this continues it is clear that it is only a question of time until Radcliffe takes over Harvard. Here is infiltration indeed.”³⁷ The community conflated “infiltration,” or social integration, with equality, and such eliding allowed women to see themselves “on solid middle ground.”

In 1957 Harvard and Radcliffe agreed to allow joint extracurricular activities, a move previously stalled by Radcliffe administrators who feared that women would lose their sense of Radcliffe identity without separate activities. But many students were pulled toward Harvard; men’s activities were more exciting, representing more opportunity and freedom. Why work for the *Radcliffe News* when you could write for the better funded, better respected, and more widely distributed *Harvard Crimson*? “If you were any good at all, then you didn’t work for the *Radcliffe News*, you worked for *The Crimson*,” recalled Caroline G. Darst 1960.³⁸ With restrictions lifted, the *Radcliffe Yearbook* folded, and its staff joined the men at the *Harvard Yearbook*. The newly merged activities were proclaimed as entirely progressive: when WHRB allowed a female announcer on the air for the first time, *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* undergraduate columnist Mark Alcott proclaimed that man’s “will to resist has gone.” He concluded his article with the cheeky, if prophetic, “one can only hope that when the millenium [*sic*] comes and the two noble institutions become one, they will let us call it Harvard, rather than

Radcliffe, University.”³⁹ A *Crimson* photo feature similarly tried to suggest that, although women are “usually denied equality,” the “Cliffe girls play significant roles in College clubs.” The page pictures two Radcliffe students playing with children, two students portraying brides in *Trial by Jury*, and two others singing and dancing; a final picture shows that “a few work for us” at the *Crimson*.⁴⁰ What a perfect encapsulation of “integration” in the 1950s: describing social “merger” in terms of women in sex-segregated functions--and calling *that* equality.

Rowboats and Battleships

These contradictions did not elude some Radcliffe observers, including students who felt there was greater strength in separatism. Throughout the 1950s, some students saw value in single-sex activities. The *Crimson* and the *Radcliffe News*, for example, discussed merger in 1952. “A battleship has a large deck, and there may be room yet. Besides, while one can always be the captain of an independent rowboat, there always will be storms, and the bigger the ship, the more comfortable the going,” *Crimson* president Philip Cronin 1953 offered.⁴¹ But *News* editor Patricia Arens ultimately declined the union after her demands for significant editorial control were denied. Recognizing the inferior status available for women in a Harvard organization, Arens planned to retort to Cronin that “an independent row boat is better than the lower deck of a battleship.”⁴² The leaders of Radio Radcliffe grappled over whether to merge with WHRB, which had recently moved to the FM dial and offered more reliable broadcasting. “To merge would probably mean the end of any individuality . . . maybe I’m just biased, but it really would

take the spirit out of R2 if it became only part of WHRB,” one student wrote to the Radio Radcliffe president in 1957.⁴³ “Unless a miracle does occur before I graduate next year, one of Radcliffe’s few remaining claims to identity has vanished,” wrote another in the club comment book.⁴⁴ Although they were never specific about the value of separatism, students articulated a concern about an intangible “spirit” or “identity” placed in jeopardy by the mergers.

Once groups did begin to unite, *News* writers wondered where that independent spirit, once associated with the entire college, went. “Perhaps the pride went with the struggle,” lamented one columnist, noting that the student body no longer knew the words to Radcliffe songs but sang Harvard tunes with “great gusto.” “Did the fall come with complacency?”⁴⁵ The editors of the *Radcliffe News*, witnessing club after Radcliffe club fold as its members joined with Harvard, asked former Radcliffe president Ada Comstock her thoughts on the developments. “Fortunate insofar as it gives our students the opportunity of working on projects of greater magnitude . . . unfortunate if it makes it less easy for Radcliffe students to show initiative and carry responsibility,” Comstock replied in comments reprinted by the newspaper. “I should be sorry if the characteristic post for a Radcliffe woman in a Harvard-Radcliffe organization was that of assistant secretary.”⁴⁶ But indeed that is what happened. Some boasted that the *Harvard Yearbook* in 1958 became the first Harvard publication to elect a woman to its executive board, but the two female officers of 1959 held glorified secretarial positions: head of publicity and clerk to the corporation.⁴⁷ *News* writers recognized the false sense of equality achieved by Radcliffe students.⁴⁸ The *News* editor wrote a column for the *Radcliffe Quarterly*

about the change: “Harvard has no place in its social system for women except as the invited guests of its men. . . . Moreover, the overpowering discrepancy in numbers places a Radcliffe candidate for office or simply for membership in a merged club at a decided disadvantage.”⁴⁹ This private and public outrage at the status of the integrated, inferior Radcliffe woman represents a protofeminist impulse in the late 1950s, but not enough to keep the newspaper alive. The student body voted to make subscriptions no longer compulsory, cutting into the *News*’ budget. Its editors tried to sustain the operation under a new name, the *Percussion*, and aimed to “engender a spirit of liveliness and interest and to counteract the current Radcliffe apathy.”⁵⁰ But the *Percussion* too folded, in 1959.

Being a student at Radcliffe after 1943 meant negotiating two impulses: the feminist and the feminine. “Feminism,” as a term, was fairly out of vogue by World War II, reserved for old-fashioned suffragists. But there was a separatist sentiment, to have “a room of one’s own” to develop and grow, that grew out of the ghettoized nature of Eastern women’s colleges. When Harvard-Radcliffe transformed into a largely coeducational community after a series of politically slippery negotiations, students struggled to maintain a balance between their bookish, independent roots and the new hyperfemininity sweeping American teenage-dom in the late 1940s and early 1950s. To maintain a strict separatist community would have been too frigid during this period of “togetherness.” At the same time, women actively recognized the futility of attempting to secure an equal place at the table. Instead, with cultural directives guiding the way toward domesticity, they schooled themselves in femininity. The subsequent transformation of the Annex bluestocking into the Radcliffe girlfriend disarmed masculine insecurities and

ended up providing women access to a once-exclusive community, though the question of status within that community created a rift between separatists and integrationists. The integrationists prevailed at Radcliffe--until the rise of activism reminded women that they were being treated as inferiors and convinced them that things did not need to stay that way.

Notes

1. It is, of course, tricky to recreate a social landscape. As Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz discusses in *Campus Life*, there are many different kinds of students: grinds, rebels, extracurricular queens. Every student has a different story, and interviewing alumnae about four-decade-old events is not always effective, especially since hindsight often clouds memory. My conclusions stem from an extensive examination of period printed materials; I have focused on public expressions of social attitudes through newspaper and yearbook articles. When I refer to “Radcliffe students,” then, I am often allowing newspaper writers to speak for their classmates. Given that my argument discusses women who integrated into Harvard’s social sphere, the *Radcliffe News* writers who pursued a separatist activity were even less influenced by these forces, but enough to prove my points amply. My sense of the era has been enriched by limited recollections of alumnae who wrote their memories in reunion books and other published sources. As Alison Lurie’s chapter in *My Harvard, My Yale*, demonstrates, diaries may unlock extensive private articulation of frustration during this period. See Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures From the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987); Alison Lurie, “Their Harvard” in *My Harvard, My Yale*, ed. Diana Dubois (New York: Random House, 1982).
2. Anne Chisholm, “The Annex and Coeducation,” *Radcliffe News* (April 23, 1943), 2.
3. “Radcliffe Is Annoyed,” *Radcliffe News*, April 20, 1946, 2.
4. “Radcliffites Become Harvard D.P.’s,” *Radcliffe News*, Oct. 31, 1947, 1.
5. “Does Joint Instruction Mean No Seats?” *ibid.*, 2.

6. "Women Invade Hallowed Territory Via Thorny Path of Coeducation," *Radcliffe News*, Freshman Issue, 1947, 3; "Joint Instruction Flourishes in First Year: Begun During Wartime, Female Invasion Is Here to Stay," *Harvard Crimson*, May 6, 1948, 3.
7. Radcliffe College Council, Minutes, 2 May 1949, Radcliffe College Archives [hereafter, RCA].
8. Ann Ginsburgh, "Law School Advances Traditional Arguments for Refusal of Women," *Radcliffe News*, Nov. 2, 1945, 1.
9. For a period polemic against spinsters, see Ferdinand Lundberg and Marynia F. Farnham, *Modern Woman: The Lost Sex* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947); for commentary, see Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families During the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 94-95.
10. "Ten Years Later: A Statistical Report on the Class of 1948," *Radcliffe Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (Aug. 1958): 22.
11. *Radcliffe Yearbook, 1955*, 75.
12. May, *Homeward Bound*, 107.
13. "Ten Years Later," 23.
14. Jean Darling Peale, "Carving a Niche," *Harvard Crimson*, June 5, 1984, 13.
15. Wilbur K. Jordan, Opening of college speech, Sept. 28, 1949, WKJ Papers, RCA.
16. *Radcliffe Yearbook, 1955*, 75.
17. Wilbur K. Jordan, *Reports of Officers Issue, 1957-58*, 73.
18. Wilbur K. Jordan, *Reports of Officers Issue, 1959-60*, 64.
19. "We're the Girls," *Radcliffe Student Handbook, 1952-53*, 108.
20. "Radcliffites Become Harvard D.P.'s" 1.
21. "Women Invade Hallowed Territory," 3.

22. Mirra Komarovsky, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles," *American Journal of Sociology* 52 (Nov. 1946): 184-89.
23. Millicent Carey McIntosh, Transcript of NBC Lecture Hall (1953), Millicent McIntosh Papers, Barnard College Archives, New York City.
24. "Column To Announce Radcliffe Engagements Inaugurated by NEWS," *Radcliffe News*, Feb. 28, 1947, 3.
25. *Radcliffe Student Handbook, 1950-51*, 100.
26. *Radcliffe Yearbook, 1953*, 65.
27. Stephen O. Saxe, "Radcliffe Survives Years of Sneers," *Harvard Crimson*, June 20, 1951, 3.
28. Mark H. Alcott, "The Challenges and Rewards of Galloping Feminism," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* (5 March 1960), "Gender at the Gates" Display files, HUA.
29. *Radcliffe Yearbook, 1952*, 7.
30. *Radcliffe Yearbook, 1954*, 23.
31. Janet Ross and Hope Mourousas, "Radcliffe," *Radcliffe News*, Oct. 5, 1957, 2.
32. *Radcliffe Yearbook, 1954*, 18.
33. Nancy Lynch, "Radcliffe College," *Mademoiselle* (Oct. 1951), 6, "History (1950-59)" file, RCA.
34. Wini Breines discusses the sociological perspective of the "double bind": "boys and girls were formally treated as equals in the midst of a tendency toward increased differentiation of their future roles." Winifred Breines, *Young, White and Miserable* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), 34-36.
35. "Miss Lonelyheart," *Percussion* [Radcliffe student publication] (Feb. 6, 1959), 3.
36. "'Cliffedweller Dwelling at Kirkland House Shatters Precedent with Dean's Approval," *Harvard Crimson*, Sept. 29, 1950, 1.

37. "Eight Honored by Radcliffe," *Boston Herald*, Dec. 4, 1954, 3.
38. Shari Rudavsky, "Struggling with the Dilemmas of Inequality and Feminism," *Harvard Crimson*, June 3, 1985, 11.
39. Alcott, "Challenges and Rewards."
40. Photo feature, *Harvard Crimson*, Jan. 17, 1958, 3.
41. Philip M. Cronin to Patsy Arens, Nov. 6, 1952, *Radcliffe News* Records, RCA.
42. The "lower deck" quote appears in an apparent draft of the letter. Arens ended up being less saucy, but still firm: "I am sure now that we both understand that neither ship needs a lifeboat." Patricia Arens to Philip Cronin, Nov. 8, 1952, *Radcliffe News* Records.
43. Sally Boyle to Stephanie Walser, Aug. 25, 1957, Radio Radcliffe Records, RCA.
44. Radio Radcliffe Comment Book, March 30, year unspecified, Radio Radcliffe Records.
45. "Happy Birthday Alma Mater," *Percussion* (Feb. 20, 1959), 1.
46. Vyola Papps, "Comstock Urges Girls to Assume Leadership," *Percussion* (Nov. 14, 1958), 1. Comstock's full response appears in her personal papers. See Ada Louise Comstock to *Radcliffe News*, undated correspondence, Ada Louise Comstock Papers (81-M287), RCA.
47. "Radcliffe Helps on Harvard Yearbook," *Percussion* (April 10, 1959), 4.
48. Ross and Mourousas, "Fadcliffe."
49. Vyola Papps, "Have We Reached the End of This Road?" *Radcliffe Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (Nov. 1958): 15.
50. "Percussion Elects New Editors," *Percussion*, Feb. 6, 1959, 1.