

'Different' women politicians

By GEORGIE ANNE GEYER

Los Angeles Times

Washington.

Sixty-four years ago, on the eve of President Woodrow Wilson's inauguration, women marched here in the greatest suffragette parade of all time. They were led by a woman riding a virgin-pure white horse.

Friday that parade will be repeated by 70 women's groups. Once again they will be led by a woman on a pure white horse.

Of course, there are relatively few fears that it will be quite so "exciting" this time around. No one really thinks that, because of some residual conflict between the sexes, the male onlookers will behave as they did in 1913. At that time, as the police turned their backs, thousands of men charged into the women, slapped them, kicked them and burned them with cigar butts.

What is in question today is where that old white horse is headed.

The symbol of the old, historic National Woman's Party, which is leading this annual anniversary celebration of women's suffrage, remains the woman on the white horse and the slogan, "Forward Into Light." Yet, where *are* women in political life today?

The statistics don't tell much. Between 1969 and 1977, women more than doubled their numbers in the state legislatures, from 305 to 685. But there are 7,500 state legislators.

In the House of Representatives, there were 19 women members last year; there are 18 this year. No senators. Women as top political leaders throughout the world, while certainly noticeable, have not acquitted themselves with any overwhelming historic consequence. Yet, if one looks at women like Indira Gandhi in India and Madame Bandaranaike in Sri Lanka, one has to consider that they were less women leaders than they were merely consorts of

the powerful men of their families.

When you go deeper than the figures — deeper than the political scabs — it gets more interesting. The Center for the Study of Women in Politics at Rutgers University, for instance, finds that women politicians, after first rejecting the idea outright, later came unanimously to the conclusion that they were "different."

Audrey Sheppard, of the political consulting firm of Rothstein and Buckley, is doing the first real study of how women candidates run their campaigns and how, in general, they act.

She is finding unexpected things. In Connecticut, for instance, voters hesitated to vote for a woman senator because they already had a woman governor. Sexual double-dipping?

Sheppard says that almost everybody seems to think that all that is different in women's campaigns "is that women candidates don't have the money. We are not accepting the conventional wisdom."

Sociologist Jessie Bernard, who has researched feminist causes for decades, feels that, while it took a long time for women's votes to surface (for a long time most women didn't even bother to vote), now they vote "on the right side" . . . that they vote on the "redemptionist" issues . . . that they cling fast to the white horse and "Forward Into Light."

What she means by this, of course, is that they vote the liberal vote — "against hunger, for people, against war."

And, indeed, polls show this, as well as the interesting fact that today more young women vote than do young men.

There is also a highly important new development that cannot be overestimated: For the first time since woman's suffrage, the "redemptionist," white-horse element of suffrage is not the only element represented among political women.

Today, the conservative strain — the right-to-lifers and the anti-ERA faction — is also politically active. And if women's suffrage is to be total, then this, in itself, is a major breakthrough of the kind that did not come at all in the early days.

The new stages for political women are: 1.) precisely this representation of all parts of the political spectrum, instead of only the "redemptionist" one; 2.) the beginnings of the difficult translation of the redemptionist strain into strategic reality.

That may mean that the white horse gets a little gray, but maybe there's nothing wrong with that.

THE MINNEAPOLIS

STAR

LARGEST DAILY NEWSPAPER IN THE UPPER MIDWEST

Thursday, August 25, 1977
VOLUME XCIX, NO. 233

DONALD F. WRIGHT,
Executive Editor

STEPHEN ALNES,
Editorial Editor

HAROLD CHUCKER, Associate Editor

Women politicians

More visible,
but more vulnerable

By Dale Mezzacappa

Staff Writer

Greta Kiernan stood before a local political group and listed her qualifications for public office: two years as an assistant to the N.J. Senate president; two years on the Assembly staff; three years as lobbyist for the League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Kiernan, who is seeking an Assembly seat from northeast Bergen, expounded on one of her areas of expertise — education — and asked if there were any questions.

A man raised his hand. "Why don't you wear a wedding ring?"

She sagged. It's the sort of question women candidates for office must learn to expect.

While women now are more visible on the political scene than ever before, they still are far from achieving equality with men in the halls of power.

• Although more women are running for office, they frequently are sacrificial lambs in districts where their opponents are entrenched incumbents.

"We found it very difficult to find women who could be credible candidates in districts they had a reasonable chance of winning," said Gina Glantz of Ridgewood.

Earlier this year she worked on a (short-lived) project designed to get more women to run for Congress. "The thought they could run for Congress was foreign to most women, even those who are politically involved," she said.

The project started with \$25,000 from a liberal backer who See POLITICS, Page A-7

Thousands of sign-waving women demanded equality six years ago at this Central Park rally.



Politics: Only a few women need apply

FROM PAGE A-1

wanted to model it after the "Committee for an Effective Congress," which provides money and technical expertise to progressive candidates of both parties. "It became clear we would need \$200,000 to make it go, and we didn't have access to that kind of money," said Ms. Glantz.

• Tokenism still applies for women candidates. Political leaders who want to balance their tickets usually seek a woman nominee — but only one. "The toughest part of breaking into politics is getting nominated," said Democratic Freeholder Joan Lesemann. "Only a few select women need apply. Once they've got their balanced ticket, forget it."

• Women candidates do not have access to the "old boy" network, which usually provides men with the money they need to run for office. "Men call up their law partners or business associates to raise funds," said Audrey Sheppard, a Washington political consultant. "Few women can draw on those kinds of resources, so they never get started."

• Candidates are expected to pay their political dues before moving on to higher office. But because of family obligations, women usually don't start seeking office until late. They spend their entire careers paying their dues at the lower levels of government.

Mostly local gains

"Most of the gains women have made are in local office, and while they've got to start somewhere, it's really disheartening," said Ms. Glantz. "Women are years if not decades away from building the kind of political bases and getting the experience they need."

Mrs. Kiernan, a 43-year-old mother of six, is an aide to Senate President Matthew Feldman and a member of Assemblyman Albert Burstein's staff, where she acquired her knowledge of educational issues. If elected, she will be the first woman Democrat from Bergen County ever sent to the legislature.

The Harrington Park hopeful thinks that a big stumbling block to women's progress is women. "Women have let some of their own inhibitions get in the way," she said. "Some are afraid that being assertive means being aggressive and un ladylike."

Republican Freeholder Joan Steinacker, previously a Ramsey councilwoman, said that in some situations men set up the stumbling blocks.

Passion called hysteria

"I found that, on the local level at least, women run into difficulties," she said. "If a woman gets up in a council meeting and argues a point, she's viewed as a hysterical woman. But if a man argues passionately for something, he's considered a statesman. Some women just don't want to put up with that, so they don't get involved in politics."

Whichever sex is more to blame, the statistics show that the acceptance of women in politics has been slower than many people expected in an age of feminism.

In the past 10 years, the number of women holding office in Bergen County has tripled. Even so, fewer than 50 of the county's 470 municipal officials are women. Three women serve on the nine-member board of freeholders, and a woman is Democratic county chairman.

In Passaic County, the numbers are smaller: Only 8 of 110 elected municipal officials are women, one woman serves on the seven-member board of freeholders, and a woman is Democratic county chairman.

None of the 15 members of the legislature from Bergen is a woman, and of the 30 candidates running this year, Mrs. Kiernan is the only woman. Statewide, only 15 of 240 legislative candidates are women.

Nationwide, 8 per cent of the members of state legislatures are women; 18 of the 435 members of Congress are women — two fewer than in 1960.

There are no women senators — there were two in 1960. Ella Grasso of Connecticut and Dixie Lee Ray of Washington are the only two women governors.

Report shows imbalance

Last year the Center for the American Woman and Politics at Rutgers University released a lengthy report called "Profile of Women Holding Office." After compiling reams of statistics and exploring attitudes across the nation, the study reached a pointed conclusion:

"Women are not well integrated with the political life of the nation. The number of women active in the polity is small. The few women who do hold office are found most frequently in positions with little potential for affecting broad segments of the population. This imbalance in the social participation of women should be corrected."

Ms. Sheppard, whose Washington consulting firm is conducting an in-depth survey of women running for office, cited a prevalent reaction among voters last year to Connecticut Senate candidate Gloria Schaeffer.

"The voters said, 'Why should we vote for a woman for senator when we already have a woman governor [Mrs. Grasso]?' Ms. Sheppard noted. "Until we break that kind of psychological barrier in people's minds, women will not make great gains in public life."

Backlash feared

Many feminists fear a conservative backlash will hurt women candidates the way it seems to be hurting acceptance of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA).

"It's evident when I go around promoting the ERA," said Anne Campbell of Red Bank, president of the Democratic State Chairmen's Association. "There's an unfortunate paradox: If women seem to be acting too militant, they create a backlash. But on the other hand, if they don't fight for their rights, they won't get anywhere."

More moderate women, like GOP Freeholder Steinacker, use the backlash sentiment as justification for soft-pedaling women's rights.

Mrs. Steinacker is not an advocate of the ERA. When male leaders planned to exclude women from the Bergen GOP golf outing this month, she didn't think it was worth making a fuss.

Some of the older women political pioneers also tend to criticize today's feminist movement.

In 1965, when Republican Marion West Higgins of Hillsdale was elected assembly speaker, she became the first woman ever to preside over a state legislative body. Now a real estate broker retired from politics, Mrs. Higgins opposes the ERA and professes a desire to be "treated as a woman."

But she also betrays an ambivalence typical of many female public officials. She tells this story about being treated as a woman with a tinge of anger:

"One day, I was sworn in as acting governor, and of course that was the first time for a woman. I held a press conference. Do you know what they asked? 'Mrs. Higgins, what are you going to do with the drapes?' The drapes! My God, I hadn't even looked

at the drapes. Is that all they thought a woman could think of?"

That was 12 years ago. Attitudes have changed somewhat since then, but even men who score high marks with women's groups have occasional lapses.

Gov. Byrne, who has appointed four women to his cabinet, made a statement the other night that startled feminists.

Addressing a crowd of Democrats

during a campaign dinner, Byrne began introducing members of his cabinet.

"I have a little girl who has built senior citizens' housing all over this state, and I'm very proud of her," he said. The "little girl" was Commissioner of Community Affairs Patricia Sheehan.

One woman party member in the audience stared at Byrne in amazement. "As long as we're 'little girls,' we'll never make much progress," she said.

SHOP 10 A.M. 'TIL 9:30 P.M.

STERN'S

■ A UNIT OF ALLIED STORES



Women candidates stress jobs over feminist issues

By SUSAN FOGG

(Newhouse News Service)

WASHINGTON — Women running for major political office may be feminists, but their campaigns generally stress the traditional pocketbook issues rather than women's liberation.

Middle-aged, middle-class, politically moderate, educated, professional — the women who ran as major party candidates for statewide or federal office in 1976 did not differ all that much from men seeking such positions.

THE CLEAREST differences were their indifferent campaign organizing, the large numbers of women in key campaign positions, and their support for feminist issues, according to a poll of 55 — or about half — of the women who ran for major office in 1976.

The poll was conducted by the political consulting firm of Rothstein-Buckley, which researched the issue for the Center for the Study of Congress to lend some insight into the candidates who ran in a year that saw women lose one seat in the House and fail to dent the all-male Senate.

Many women apparently ran their campaigns out of their hats, serving as their own managers, press secretaries, speechwriters, field organizers and volunteer coordinators.

ONLY HALF had paid campaign managers, and only a third of those managers were full-time workers. Almost half of the managers were women, an indication such campaigns serve as training grounds for other women entering politics, according to Audrey Sheppard who wrote the report on the poll.

Only half the women candidates had press secretaries, and even fewer assigned anyone to do research on opponents' voting records and issues, identifying known supporters and getting them to the polls, or coordinating efforts of volunteers.

Only a third of the women won their campaigns. A fifth were incumbents. Two-thirds were challenging other incumbents, an indication that women were taking on the toughest kinds of races rather than seeking out positions

that were open.

Two-thirds of the women had run for public office before. Nearly half had lost every previous try.

In general their political experience was limited. Less than half had served in an appointed public office, attended a statewide or national convention as delegates, or served in a major party office.

THIS LACK of experience and involvement in party affairs (two-thirds were Democrats, one-third Republicans) may help explain why most received little more than pro forma support from the parties.

Two-thirds received a party endorsement. But less than half got party money, and less than a third received help from party workers.

The same was true of big labor, which endorsed half the women but coughed up money for a third and workers for a fifth.

On women's issues, 88 percent supported the Equal Rights Amendment; 70 percent endorsed the women's movement in general, federally-funded day care and women's right to abortion.

But these issues did not play a big role in their campaigns; the major themes for the women were jobs (63 percent.)

Twenty percent of the women called themselves liberals, while 51 percent saw themselves as moderates and 13 percent conservatives.

THE POLL showed 96 percent of the women were 36 or older and 60 percent were over 46. In education, 64 percent had worked on or received a graduate degree.

Only 14 percent were housewives, students or clerical workers; the rest were professionals: office holders, lawyers, doctors, managers and the like.

The poll showed that 62 percent of the women were currently married and that 82 percent had grown children. Their average income was \$20,000 a year.

Keep your tapes in tiptop shape

NEW YORK — Although can stretch it after long

Male supremacy alive in Congress

By DAVID S. BRODER

MILWAUKEE — There was great irony in the juxtaposition of two news reports last week.

In Maryland, both parties endorsed Mrs. Beverly Byron as their choice to succeed her husband, Rep. Goodloe E. Byron, D-Md., a member of the House of Representatives who had died of a heart attack a few days earlier.

Here in Milwaukee, Republican State Rep. Susan Engeleiter announced that she was giving up her request for a recount of a September primary for a U.S. House seat which she lost by 580 votes out of 71,000, after a 16-month, \$90,000 campaign effort.

The message to women candidates from the two stories is that the most accessible route to Congress is still through the pain of widowhood. In an era when corporate suites and other decision centers are increasingly open to women, Congress remains a bastion of male supremacy.

There are two female senators out of 100 — both of whom got there by the route of widowhood. Both are leaving this year — one retiring and one defeated in a primary — and neither will have a

female replacement. Women candidates have won Senate nominations in Kansas and Tennessee, but both are in uphill fights.

There are 18 women members in the 435-member House. Three are retiring, and all three will have male replacements. Three others have very serious challenges from male opponents in November.

WITH ABOUT six real chances in the whole country for women challengers to win House seats, most of them uphill fights, odds are that the number of women in the new Congress will be lower than in this one.

While women are making significant gains in state legislatures and lower offices, their scarcity in high elective office is both conspicuous and worrisome.

Women candidates suffer a number of disadvantages. Polls show that about 10 percent of the voters say they will not vote for a woman "under any circumstances," and many women politicians suspect that unacknowledged prejudice against their sex is much higher.

Women have a hard time raising funds, because they are not part of the "old boys' network" of business-connected

givers. A survey by Audrey Sheppard and Jill Buckley of 55 women candidates for major offices in 1976 found only half of them had campaign managers and even fewer had the funds for polling and other professional campaign services.

Alice Reed, former chairman of the Wisconsin Republican Party, surveyed women candidates in this state and found they had many other problems.

Small women felt their lack of physical stature worked against them. Shy women felt inhibited about campaigning in taverns and other "male" hangouts. Rural women complained about fears and depression on long, night auto trips.

Many women, Reed said, commented that they really needed "a wife" to help them keep prepped for their public appearances — and care for the home and family while they were out campaigning.

BUT THE ENGELEITER race shows that even without those problems, the road to Congress can be difficult for a woman. At 26, pretty, personable and outgoing, she was a veteran of four years in the legislature, having won her first election while she was still in college.

With no children at home and a politically savvy and supportive husband, she put on an energetic door-to-door campaign and built a strong precinct organization. She gained the support of teachers, doctors and other interest groups. She raised

\$90,000 — including a \$5,000 gift from the Women's Campaign Fund, a bipartisan organization that helps finance female candidates.

Still, she came up a few hundred votes short against her primary opponent, State Sen. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., who is nine years older, more politically conservative, and part of a well-known family that contributed \$30,000 to his race.

He is now favored for the open House seat in a normally Republican district — as she would have been if she had won the primary. Engeleiter personally is unembittered by the results and undeterred in her political ambition. Now planning to finish her last year of law school, she says, "I'm certainly not finished at 26."

But she is unhappy about one thing. Even though Sensenbrenner beat her by only a handful of votes at the pre-primary GOP district endorsing convention, state and national Republican party organizations gave him \$10,000 to help defeat her in the primary.

THE GROSS IMBALANCE in the making of Congress will not change until both parties start helping women candidates get nominated in races that are winnable — instead of putting obstacles in their way or forcing them to wait until they are widows.

Severns adviser handles 'media end'

In need of someone to put the "media end" of her Congressional campaign together, Penny Severns was placed in touch with Audrey Sheppard through informal networks of Washington.

"I came to her attention because she had met with a number of people in Washington and my name came up to her," said Ms. Sheppard.

Last month she arranged a fund-raising cocktail party in Washington for Ms. Severns and currently is arranging to produce some brochures and radio ads and "that sort of thing." How much more she will do is likely to depend on campaign contributions.

A political science and journalism major in college, Ms. Sheppard found herself "chomping at the bit" to get into politics.

In 1972, she went to work in the presidential

campaign of George McGovern, caught on with Rothstein and Buckley, a Washington consulting firm linked to the Democratic Party, and then struck out on her own after the 1976 elections.

"It's worked very well," she said. "I tend to specialize in races for Congress, but I've also worked in state and local campaigns. Right now, I'm doing different things for about a half-dozen candidates."

Though she doesn't discriminate, she does seem to have a "specialty" in women candidates. "I certainly have far more women clients than the average consultant," she said.

Of Ms. Severns, Ms. Sheppard says: "She's a terrific candidate. Physically, she's an attractive person. She's highly articulate. I think she's idealistic but also realistic."

Her opponent, incumbent Edward Madigan, hasn't used a hired consultant in recent years in two campaigns against weak Democratic opponents.

Why does a candidate need a consultant? With a need for scheduling radio and television time, putting together brochures, obtaining polls, keeping campaign records straight and staying within often obscure campaign regulations, outside help is almost mandatory to run a credible campaign.

"A campaign is like a small business," Ms. Sheppard said. "If you and I were to open a drug store, there would probably be a lot of things we wouldn't know anything about. I help supplement the skills and knowledge of someone else."

Women Climbing Political Ladder

By Lynne Olson
©1980, Baltimore Sun

CEDAR FALLS, Iowa

THE AIR-CONDITIONED chill of the bar is welcome after the 95-degree heat outside, and Lynn Cutler pauses to savor the coolness before moving to the back to greet four men drinking beer and playing cards.

"Hi, I'm Lynn Cutler, and I'm running for Congress," says the 41-year-old Democratic county supervisor as she passes out her campaign brochures. The men seem unperturbed by the interruption, and one, in fact, says, "We sure appreciate you coming in and taking the time to talk to us."

About 200 miles to the east, in Rockford, Ill., Lynn Martin, another candidate for Congress, is giving her campaign pitch to a group of residents at an apartment house for the elderly.

The talk is filled with gentle one-liners about her parents, who live in the apartment house, and some talk about the need for a balanced budget and a halt to the creation of new government programs. After the short address, the 40-year-old Republican state senator, her father, and her 11-year-old daughter, Carrie, serve orange juice to the audience.

AS WOMEN NOMINEES for Congress this year, Lynn Cutler and Lynn Martin are members of a tiny club of candidates, seeking to enter an even more exclusive one. Only 17 women are members of Congress, three fewer than the record of 20 set in 1962.

The record could be broken this year, but the number of women members probably still will be fewer than 25 — less than 4 percent of the total membership of Congress.

"At the rate we're going, it will be over 400 years before we get 50 percent women in Congress," Patricia Bailey, a member of the Federal Trade Commission recently complained.

So far this year, 19 women non-incumbents have won House primaries, and 13 others are facing House and Senate primaries this month. Of that number, only eight or nine are thought to have a chance of victory in November.

All the incumbent congresswomen are seeking reelection, with the exception of Rep. Elizabeth Holtzman of New York, who won the Democratic nomination for the Senate on Tuesday.

THE NUMBERS have not changed much over the last decades, but there has been a significant change in the kind of woman running for Congress, political experts say. That difference, they predict, will have a profound effect on the future of women in national politics.

"Women politicians have really come of age this year. They're a whole new breed," says Audrey Sheppard, a Washington political consultant. "The average woman congressional candidate in previous elections was a civic activist who was not well-plugged-into party affairs. Many of the women running this year served in local and state offices. They have records and connections. They've proven themselves."

Echoing that view is Ranny Cooper, director of the Women's Campaign Fund, which raises

money and provides other help for women candidates, who says: "Women are far more serious, credible candidates now. They started early, and are running good, professional campaigns."

ONE EXAMPLE cited by experts is Lynn Cutler, a member of the Black Hawk County Board of Supervisors since 1974, who announced her candidacy for Iowa's 3rd District seat in November, and who has been campaigning nonstop ever since.

She has spent 12 hours and more a day on the hustings in her district's 18 counties, passing out leaflets at parades and on the Main streets of small towns, speaking at Rotary Club luncheons, and tramping through hog and cow barns to shake hands with farmers at county fairs.

Even before she began campaigning, she was well known in her district, having served as chairwoman of the County Board from 1975 to 1977. She is also president of the county's economic development committee.

In Illinois, Lynn Martin has been running for her congressional seat for more than a year. According to recent polls, more than 95 percent of the voters in her district — an extremely high percentage — recognize her name.

She started her political career eight years ago, when she was elected to the Winnebago County Board. After four years on the board, she was elected state representative from Rockford in 1976, and state senator in 1978.

Other women House candidates with considerable experience are:

— Jeannette Reibman, a 67-year-old state senator in Pennsylvania, who is the Democratic nominee facing Don Ritter, a first-term Republican. She has been in the state Legislature for 26 years.

— Marie Muhler, the Republican minority whip of the New Jersey State Assembly, running against Jim Howard, a Democratic incumbent.

The better political track records of women congressional candidates reflect the fact, that while they have had a hard time gaining access to Congress, women are making much more rapid gains in state legislatures and local offices — the traditional breeding grounds for Congress.

IN THE LAST 10 YEARS, the number of women state legislators has more than doubled — to 770 (10.3 percent) in 1979 from 305 (4.1 percent) in 1969.

"Women are working their way up the ladder. We're seeing small, steady gains," says Rosalie Whelan, director of the National Women's Education Fund. "When you've been outsiders, like women have, you have to work your way into the process. There's no magic way of getting the power all at once."

As a result of their increased credibility, women congressional candidates are now getting more serious attention from party leaders.

In the past, many party officials cast women in the role of "sacrificial lambs," encouraging them to run only against unbeatable opponents.

There are still a few sacrificial lambs around this year. But more than half the women candidates, several of whom defeated male opponents in hard primary fights, are running for competitive seats, where the incumbent is not running or is considered vulnerable.

They're not called home to cook, but women struggle yet in politics

By Jane L. Seegal
Newhouse News Service

WASHINGTON — Attitudes have changed since 1958, when Coya Knutson's husband, Andy, issued a statement asking his wife, a Democratic congresswoman from Minnesota, to return home and make the breakfast again.

The voters apparently believed Knutson's place was at home. She was the only Democratic congressional incumbent to lose that year.

In the years since Coya Knutson returned to the kitchen, the type of woman candidate, her approach to campaigning and the voters' attitudes toward her have changed. And those who believe that there should be more women in political office are pleased with the changes.

But the numbers of women in high-level elective office are still small. Although 51.3 percent of the electorate are women, only 20 seats of the 535 in the US House and Senate are held by women — 4 percent. A decade ago, there were 11.

Women have been elected to 12 percent, or 897, of the 7482 state legislature seats across the nation, according to the National Women's Political Caucus. There are no women governors.

And of the nation's 829 cities with populations of more than 30,000, 71 are run by women mayors — less than 9 percent.

Perhaps most important, women who try to enter the fray still have more difficulty raising campaign funds than men do.

The cost of campaigning is high for everyone. Democrats who won congressional seats in contested races in 1980 spent about \$285,000, while Republicans spent about \$375,000, according to the National Republican Congressional Committee.

For those challenging incumbents, fund raising is a problem for men and women.

Those who lost 1980 congressional races — most of them challengers — spent an average of \$300,000, according to the National Republican Congressional Committee.

But when the calculations are made for women only, the average spending comes out quite differently: The average woman challenger spent just over \$100,000 — one-third of the average for everyone.

Women are not spending more because they are not raising more. They are not raising more because women are "outside" the fund-raising networks, said Mary Gojack, a former Democratic Nevada state senator who lost to US Sen. Paul Laxalt in 1980.

Women less often have a former "classmate who is a partner in a law firm or chairman of the local United Way campaign," said Ann F. Lewis, political director for the Democratic National Committee.

The woman candidate seeking funds has changed markedly in just a few years.

Five years ago, she was most often a



Coya Knutson leaves a Minnesota courtroom in 1962 with her attorney after she was granted a divorce from her husband, Andy.

AP PHOTO

middle-aged, well-educated and prosperous professional, a former PTA or zoning board leader, or the relative of a famous politician, experts say.

Like male challengers, the woman candidate most often let her friends and relatives run an amateur operation from the kitchen table. Polling, a campaign plan, a budget and paid political consultants were uncommon, according to Audrey Sheppard, a political consultant who surveyed woman candidates after the 1976 elections.

Today, Sheppard said the woman challenger is more likely to be a young, professional politician making use of polling and other expertise.

Planning begins early. Ranny Cooper, executive director of the Women's Campaign Fund, cites as an example a female page in Congress who "came in to ask

what she should take in college if she wants to be in Congress."

There is still reluctance to accept women as candidates and office holders. Many voters question whether a woman can handle the rigors of elective office and whether she should be home taking care of her children.

"A couple of people would say, 'Mary is so young and pretty. She'll never survive,'" said Mary Landrieu, 25, elected two years ago to the Louisiana House of Representatives.

Women candidates, unlike their male opponents, are regularly asked first about their stands on abortion and the equal rights amendment, even though they campaign mainly on jobs, inflation or other issues, Cooper and others say.

But there also are compensations to being a woman candidate.

"Since Watergate, women candidates have been perceived as more likely to be honest, open to their constituents, less likely to be part of the establishment, (and) sharing the immediate concerns of their constituents," Lewis said.

"They know the cost of day-to-day existence," she said having usually managed a household.

"We feel women have been better legislators," said Cooper. "They've been forced to. On the Hill, they're not on junkets, not in scandals. The incumbents are re-elected easily, even though 1980 was not necessarily a good time to be an incumbent."

Gojack, who last ran for office in 1974 when she won a Nevada Senate seat, said she noticed a "wonderful" difference in attitudes, at least among women constituents. Once self-conscious about seeing a woman candidate, the women she encountered this time were clearly supportive, she said.

She used polling, a political consultant and other expertise in 1980 for the first time. With \$275,000, one-fifth the incumbent's campaign chest, she won 38 percent of the vote.

It's not known whether women tend to vote more often for women candidates, the experts say, but women politicians more often are associated with the issues of special concern to women — displaced-homemakers' assistance, flexible work hours, pension discrimination.

"I don't think male legislators would say they don't support those issues," said Cooper. "It's just not a priority for them."

The Women's Campaign Fund, which supports "progressive" women candidates, contributed a total of \$115,000 during the 1980 campaign. But more important, that organization and other groups offer expertise and introductions to other funding sources.

The active support of a national party can mean a windfall.

In the past few years, the Republican Party has been recruiting grassroots women candidates — and the effort has paid off.

At the state legislature level, in the 1978 election, of 63 women who won, 60 were Republicans.

Although the state and national party can give no more than \$31,700 in the general election, party support can attract money from other sources, according to Linda DiVall, director of survey research for the National Republican Congressional Committee.

"We have been out there actively recruiting women because we believe there should be more," said Nancy Sinnott, the Republican Congressional Committee executive director.

"Thanks to the work of the '70s, we're just at the point where the pool [of women candidates] is there," she said. "We've got a good crop coming up this year."

DEMOCRATS EXPECT HARD SENATE FIGHT

Say They Must Win Six Seats
— Get Lift in Mississippi

By **MARTIN TOLCHIN**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22 — After a disheartening summer and fall, Senate Democratic strategists finally received a lift when they recently persuaded former Gov. William Winter of Mississippi to declare his candidacy for the Senate seat held by Thad Cochran, a Republican completing his first term. But the Democrats still acknowledge they face an uphill fight to regain control of the Senate.

"This is the big break we've been waiting for," Audrey Sheppard, assistant executive director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, said of the Winter candidacy. "It's the best thing that's happened to us in a long time."

The Winter candidacy could prove one of the Democrats' few breaks in a season of gloom. They suffered a severe blow last summer with the death of Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington. Last fall the election of his Republican successor, Daniel J. Evans, gave the Republicans a majority of 55 to 45. Many Democrats who previously considered control of the Senate well within their reach began to regard the required effort as Olympian.

Democratic and Republican strate-

Continued on Page B11, Column 1

Democrats Admit Facing Uphill Fight for Senate

Continued From Page A1

gists offer remarkably similar assessments of the prospects of the Senate's changing hands.

"We'll win three to seven seats," said Senator Lloyd Bentsen of Texas, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. That assessment hedges whether his party will regain control of the Senate, which it lost in the 1980 elections.

Richard G. Lugar of Indiana, Mr. Bentsen's Republican counterpart, said, "We'll end up with at least 53 seats, maybe more." In other words, Senator Lugar predicts Republicans will retain control of the chamber, but with reduced forces.

However, almost no one in Washington forecast in 1980 that the Republicans would capture control of the Senate.

Few things seem to have gone the Democrats' way. At the outset, they were depressed by their inability to persuade governors to run against Republican senators. The Democrats have a large crop of popular governors, whom they consider ideal Senate candidates because they have already run and won statewide and often have their own statewide political organizations.

Nevertheless, after varying amounts of effort, they failed to persuade Richard D. Lamm of Colorado, Toney Anaya of New Mexico, John Carlin of Kansas, John V. Evans of Idaho, Bill Sheffield of Alaska, Ed Herschler of Wyoming, Charles S. Robb of Virginia and, most recently, Joseph E. Brennan of Maine. These Governors met counter-pressure from their state organizations, which wanted them to remain in the Statehouse to dispense the patronage needed by local politicians.

Democrats were successful, however, in helping persuade James B. Hunt Jr. of North Carolina and John D.

Rockefeller 4th of West Virginia to make Senate races, although Mr. Rockefeller is running for a seat held by a Democrat, Jennings Randolph, who is retiring. On the other hand, one race unexpectedly opened with the recent announcement that Senator Paul E. Tsongas, a Massachusetts Democrat, planned to retire. Republicans believe that they have a strong contender in Elliot L. Richardson, who has agreed to make the race at the behest of President Reagan.

Even more depressing, from the point of view of the Democrats' efforts to regain the Senate, is the economic turnaround and the President's strong standing in the polls. There is much talk on Capitol Hill of the President's ability to dodge political bullets on the deficit, Lebanon and relations with the Soviet Union.

In addition, the Senate Republicans, who have made an art of fund-raising, are expected to outspend their Democratic opponents significantly. "We've raised enough money to go everyone the maximum," Senator Lugar said. He referred to the law setting a maximum for contributions by national party organizations, based on a state's voting-age population. It ranges from \$40,400 for the eight smallest states where seats are being contested this year to \$447,753 for Texas, the largest state with a contest in 1984.

The Winter Campaign

Small wonder, therefore, that Democratic strategists seized upon former Governor Winter's candidacy as welcome relief. Mr. Winter had been telling friends he could not envision life in Washington and weekends of traveling back and forth to Mississippi.

Then he changed his mind.

"It's a big shot in the arm," J. Brian Atwood, executive director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, said of the Winter candidacy. "It gives us five states where we

have a clear shot."

The four other states are Tennessee, where the retirement of Howard H. Baker Jr., the majority leader, has left an opening that many believe will be filled by a Democratic Representative, Albert Gore Jr.; North Carolina, where Governor Hunt is waging a strong campaign against Senator Jesse Helms; Texas, where Democrats believe they have a better-than-even chance at winning the seat being vacated by Senator John Tower, and Iowa, where Senator Roger W. Jepsen is being challenged by Representative Tom Harkin. Democrats also believe they have a good chance to unseat Charles H. Percy in Illinois and Gordon J. Humphrey in New Hampshire.

Mitch Daniels, executive director of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, said he expected control of the Senate to be narrowly decided. "It's still a very tense situation, as far as keeping our majority," he said. "The odds are better than even."

Republicans say they believe their best prospects for defeating incumbent Democrats are in Michigan, where Senator Carl Levin may face a former astronaut, Jack Lousma, or former Representative Jim Dunn; Massachusetts, with Mr. Richardson seeking the Tsongas seat; Arkansas, where Senator David Pryor is challenged by Representative Ed Bethune, and Kentucky, where Senator Walter D. Huddleston may be challenged in the Democratic primary by John Y. Brown, a former Governor, and the winner will face Jefferson County Executive Mitch McConnell, a Republican.

If they can persuade Arch Moore, a former Governor, to run for the Senate in West Virginia, Republicans believe they have a good chance to defeat Governor Rockefeller for the seat held by Mr. Randolph. But local Republicans want Mr. Moore to run again for Governor.



Democrats expect to regain power in the Senate in 1986

By JAMES WORSHAM
Chicago Tribune

WASHINGTON — Even before the Reagan landslide, before the exit polls and the voting and before the concession speech, the Democrats were smelling victory.

Not for this year, but in 1986.

That is when Democrats are confident they can regain control of the U.S. Senate. They are hoping that voters will go Democratic after six years of Reagan administration policies, which some observers say might sour with the public by then, in an election in which President Reagan himself will not be on the ballot.

The Democrats will be focusing on the 22 Republican Senate seats that will be up for re-election that year, along with 12 Democratic ones. Sixteen of the 22 are known as the "Reagan babies" — senators who came to Washington on the coattails of the Reagan victory of 1980.

They are mostly conservatives, some the "ultra" variety, and most are little known outside of their own states and Washington. In fact, many were given little chance to win in 1980 because they were taking on powerful Democratic incumbents.

"They're accidental senators," said Audrey Sheppard, campaign services director of the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee. Sheppard noted that Reagan's 1980 coattails allowed the Republicans to take control of the Senate for the first time since 1953.

The GOP is aware of its task. "We look at the large class as a tough one to defend," said Ceci Cole, a representative of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. But Cole noted that Senate races are not decided completely on national issues, but also on local issues.

Democrats shaved the Republicans' lead in the Senate from 55-45 to 53-47 this year, requiring them to take back only four more seats to win control of the Senate again, so long as Democrats don't lose any of the 12 Democratic seats that will be decided in 1986.

Who are the Reagan babies?

Idaho's Steven Symms unseated Frank Church, then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in 1980. Charles Grassley of Iowa turned out John Culver after one term. Robert Kasten ousted Wisconsin's Gaylord Nelson after three terms. Indiana's Dan Quayle retired three-term Birch Bayh. And South Dakotans finally tired of their former presidential candidate, George McGovern, and opted for James Abdnor. John East knocked off the liberal Robert Morgan in North Carolina.

New York's liberal Jacob Javits

lost to the conservative Alfonse D'Amato, and scandal-plagued Herman Talmadge of Georgia fell to Mack Mattingly. Slade Gorton unseated powerful veteran Warren Magnuson in Washington state.

The other freshmen Republicans due to face voters in 1986: Frank Murkowski of Alaska, Jeremiah Denton of Alabama, Paula Hawkins of Florida, Warren Rudman of New Hampshire, Mark Andrews of North Dakota, Don Nickles of Oklahoma and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

The Democrats have only two freshmen who must run again in 1986: Alan Dixon of Illinois and Christopher Dodd of Connecticut.

Fourteen of the GOP's 16 Reagan babies won with majorities of 54 percent or less, leaving them vulnerable, as party professionals put it, in the 1986 midterm elections.

Cole said it is too early to tell which GOP senators will be most vulnerable. Even those who won with only 50 or 51 percent of the vote in 1980 could be almost unbeatable in 1986 if they have done a good job providing services to their constituents and increased their popularity at home.

Some of those who were considered in danger this year and who won in close races in 1978 were alerted early and ended up winning by big margins, Cole said. They include John Warner of Virginia, Rudy Boschwitz of Minnesota and Thad Cochran of Mississippi.

But Cole agreed that 1986 will be a difficult year for GOP incumbents. "There's no question this is going to be tougher" than 1984, she said.

The campaign fund for the Republican Senate contests stated the 1984 campaign \$3 million in debt, but fundraising allowed it to spend \$25 million and still end up with a \$6 million surplus two years before the 1986 voting. The Democratic unit, on the other hand, spent \$4.5 million but could have spent \$8 million if it had enough money this year.

Looking to 1986, the most notable Senate challenger may be Geraldine Ferraro, the Democratic vice presidential nominee this year who gave up her safe House seat in Queens to become Walter Mon-

dale's running mate. Incumbent D'Amato narrowly won in 1980 over Democrat Elizabeth Holtzman and incumbent Javits after he beat Javits in the Republican primary.

Political scientists like to look at history to help them make predictions.

The party in the White House suffers some congressional losses after six years, figures show. In 1958, the Republicans lost 13 seats in the Senate after six years of Dwight Eisenhower. The Democrats lost three seats in 1966 after six years of John Kennedy, and the GOP lost three in 1974 after six years of Richard Nixon.

But electioneering has changed. Cole said that the 1980 election ended the practice whereby an incumbent could campaign little and not answer any charges against him.

So far, there will be two open seats in 1986 as a result of the announced retirements of Sens. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., and Thomas Eagleton, D-Mo.

Other Republicans whose terms are up in 1986 are Sens. Robert Dole of Kansas, Jake Garn of Utah, Paul Laxalt of Nevada, Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland and Bob Packwood of Oregon.

Other Senate Democrats whose terms expire in 1986 include four senators who sought their party's presidential nomination this year: Gary Hart of Colorado, Alan Cranston of California, John Glenn of Ohio and Ernest Hollings of South Carolina. Also slated to face the voters are Dale Bumpers of Arkansas, Wendell Ford of Kentucky, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, Patrick Leahy of Vermont and Russell Long of Louisiana.