

AT: Welcome to the Infinite Women podcast. I'm your host, Allison Tyra, and today I'm joined by Barbara Winslow, professor emerita in women and gender studies at Brooklyn College and founder and director emerita of the Shirley Chisholm Project of Brooklyn Women's Activism to discuss the rise and fall of Roe v. Wade and how the activist tactics used to gain American abortion rights decades ago can hopefully prove effective in protecting them today. So first, if you could give us a bit of context for your experience and what you'd like younger feminists to know.

BW: Well, let me begin by just saying that I became active in the women's liberation movement in the late '60s. At the time I became active, I had actually had an illegal abortion. My parents were, by today's standards, would be considered very left-wing, but by standards of the '50s and '60s, they were liberal and they founded a Planned Parenthood in my town. And so they always were supportive of issues of birth control, a woman's right to abortion. Now, whether or not they were happy when they found out many years later that I had had one is another story. My closest friend from high school had had an abortion. There was a woman at my college who died from trying to terminate a pregnancy. She put a tube in a vacuum cleaner and put it in reverse. And she died that way. Also at my college, for women who needed abortions, there was an underground doctor and none of us ever gave the name of the doctor or called the police. We wanted to protect him. So I think that for women of my generation, because abortion was illegal, we believed it should be available because if you look at the statistics, by the time you're in high school or college, if you were heterosexual, when you became heterosexually active, there always was the risk to abortion. So I was always, shall we say, in favor of this. And even when I was married, I was married before contraception was easily available and before abortion was legal. And I can tell you as a married woman who did not want to have children, I was still in graduate school, you worried every month that you were going to get your period. So that was what life was like for the overwhelming majority of American women.

And then just larger demographic issues, family size in 1956, the average family was, I think about 4 children. By 1965, it was 2.6. And the reason was more and more women were entering the paid labor force and they were entering the paid labor force because the male wage was not sufficient to allow the woman to stay at home. So if a woman was going to get a job, even a white collar job, she needed a college degree. So that meant that you had to postpone pregnancy and raising a family. So those were some of the larger issues that led to the movement to change the abortion laws.

And then finally, the medical establishment was horrified at the number of women who died or were permanently injured from illegal abortions. And so no one on this podcast ever forgets, 80% of the women who died from illegal abortions were black and brown. So it was a class issue, it was a gender issue, and it was a race issue. And it really wasn't until the late '60s that contraception became legal and available. And I remember as a young girl, we all did this. You went to Woolworths and you bought a fake wedding ring. You went into Planned Parenthood to get a diaphragm. You said you were engaged to be married and you were just married and they would give you a diaphragm. The wonderful people at Planned Parenthood knew you were lying. We knew they knew, we all played this game, horrible game, lying game in order to have something which shouldn't have been illegal or difficult to begin with.

So that's the context. I lived in Washington state. I moved there in 1967. I was an undergraduate and then a graduate student. I was involved in one of the first women's liberation groups in the history of the country. And if you want to know more about it, you can read my award-winning book called *Revolutionary Feminists: The Women's Liberation Movement in Seattle*. But abortion was sort of the key issue of the early women's liberation movement. And it really was key to our ability to pursue the kind of life we wanted to lead. And to give you an example, there was a bad joke that in 1965 - we were called girls then - girls went to college to get an MRS degree. By 1970, and I joke about this with my students, we went to college so we wouldn't need an MRS degree, but an advanced degree so that we could have some level of autonomy. You also have the development of the pill. And the pill for both better and for worse, I was on it for a while and got very, very sick as a result of it. But the pill was something that the woman took. They have yet to develop a pill for men and I

wouldn't trust having sex with the man who claimed he was on the pill. But the reason I thought I would argue the pill was important is one, it added to women's responsibility for controlling, it gave her a sense of responsibility for controlling sex. That is, I took the pill. I bought the pills. I got the prescription. Two, once you're on the pill, you can have sex anytime, what have you, with men, heterosexual sex. Now, the reason I say this is important is because while the diaphragm was safer and also something that only the woman controlled, when I was sexually active in the '60s, the problem with the diaphragm is, you had to take it out every six hours and clean it and put fresh jelly in. And sometimes you didn't, you were having sex more than, you'd have sex at noon, you'd have sex at 6:30, you'd have sex at midnight. And I got pregnant with the diaphragm. So there were good and bad things about both. And male condoms, the men hated them and women had to convince men to wear them. And quite often men wouldn't do it.

So the pill provided a way for women to be more sexually free. But as this wonderful feminist writer pointed out, it also took responsibility away from men. No longer could your boyfriend or your husband say, you can't give the excuse of you're worried about getting pregnant. "You're on the pill. So you have to have sex with me." And so the men would say, "well, if you get pregnant, it's your fault because you didn't take the pill." So there were both good and bad things about it. But the '60s were a period where more and more women of all classes and races and ethnicities became heterosexually active at a younger age and heterosexually active without the institution of marriage. And that begins to destabilize things, but that was very important for the women's liberation movement. So once contraception becomes available, then the next issue became abortion because when in the '60s, contraception was either 90% safe, but not very aesthetically pleasing. For example, condoms were about 90% safe, but there were issues with that. Or they were unsafe, but effective as the birth control pill was. The birth control pill was like 98% effective, but it wasn't all that safe. Same thing with the IUD. So there always were these issues in terms of contraception. So that's why I think, was one of the reasons why abortion became one of the key demands of the women's liberation movement.

AT: Well, I always have to point out when we're talking about the pill, because it has very much been held up as this amazing thing for feminism. And I certainly agree when we're talking about bodily autonomy, that is very important. But when we're looking at it through an intersectional lens, much of the push for women's access to contraception came out of eugenics, which was classist, ableist, racist. And the pill itself, however good the intentions and outcomes might've been, the pill was tested in its clinical trials on poor brown women. And it was explicitly targeting those communities, ostensibly because they felt that if *these* women can remember to take the pill every day, then any woman can. It was a very condescending approach. They were targeting vulnerable women and they were not warning them of the risks. So the intersection of reproduction and particularly race as well as class has always been an issue. And from your writing, I know that racism was also presented as a reason that Black women in particular should not support abortion. Abortion was presented as something that is meant to harm the Black community in particular. And so can you tell us a bit about how race was weaponized against the fight for abortion?

BW: Yeah, absolutely. Well, first of all, I'll just add, in terms of what you said about the pill, I think there were two motivations. Yes, absolutely. No question about it. The issue of eugenics was part of it. Margaret Sanger began her life as a reproductive activist. She was a socialist, and she coined the term "birth control" because it corresponded with the idea of workers control. Just as socialists believed in workers control of the means of production, birth control was the right of women to control the means of reproduction. After the First World War, when the socialist movement was destroyed, the only people who would support Sanger were white upper-class women, and her slogan changed from birth control to planned parenthood. And the question is, who does the planning for the parents? And she moves more and more in a rightward direction. Now, in terms of eugenics, and eugenics has always been central in most of the history of the struggle for reproductive health and reproductive justice. But it also has to be brought about that almost everybody in the United States, until they recognize the logical consequence of eugenics, supported eugenics in some form or another. The Puerto

Rican Socialist Party supported eugenics, meaning smaller families means a healthier life. And so the question is, who controls the size of the family? Is it the women and the family itself? So I'm not disagreeing with anything you have said. I just want to amplify it in a historic perspective. And there was a very famous debate between two famous members of the Industrial Workers of the World, Bill Haywood and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and they were speaking at the Passaic textile workers strike. And Bill Haywood is talking about big, big, healthy families. And Elizabeth Gurley Flynn goes, "no, Bill, smaller, healthier families!" So this has been an issue for as long as humanity.

Now, in terms of abortion reform, the first group that begin to really raise it are professionals who are overwhelmingly white. Not completely, because I know in Seattle of the main abortion rights group, there were three people of color on it, one Asian- and two African-American. So I would bet if I studied each state, we would find something somewhat similar. And it began because they were horrified at the fact that abortion was restricted led to women dying, led to women being maimed, not being able to have children. And it was horrific. And a lot of doctors, you were wheeled into a hospital as a result of a botched abortion, and some doctors would not treat you unless you gave the name of the doctor. I'm not saying all doctors were good, but many doctors moved on this to liberalize the laws. But I believe it was really the women's liberation movement was the engine that pushed it forward. And the story I love to tell in New York, to give you an idea of why I believe in creative confrontation, women in New York began campaigning and petitioning to liberalize abortion laws early in the mid-'60s. And there would be long lines of women in their lunch hours. In those days, you had a lunch hour, and you would go out in your lunch hour, because I know, I worked in New York City, and you would sign these petitions to liberalize abortion laws. And finally, Nelson Rockefeller held hearings. And the first set of hearings were all men, and a group of women from New York Radical Women disrupted the hearings. So Rockefeller said, "Okay, I'll put a woman on the hearing" and he put a nun. So the women came back and they started chanting, "if you don't play the game, you can't make the rules." Now, also New York Radical Women had what they thought was the first speak-out on abortion. And they had all these women come and publicly testify that they had had an abortion. And a young journalist who didn't really consider herself a feminist, but who had had an abortion, named Gloria Steinem was at that teach-in. And that changed her worldview, and she became an advocate of women's liberation.

Now in Seattle, the Black Nationalist movement, that is, in the early days, the Black Panther Party, the Muslims and other Black Nationalists revolutionary, even reactionary, opposed birth control and abortion, because they felt it was genocide. Now, at the same time, there were groups of black women, including Fran Beale, and the Third World Women's Alliance, there was the Mount Vernon Women's Club, who basically took on this argument. And so did Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American woman elected to Congress, who was, by the way, the first president of NARAL, the National Abortion Rights Action League. So that there was a debate within the Black community, where, as I said, many Black women did support the right to abortion and contraception and spoke up about it.

In Seattle, our group, I think at best, we just did not know how to reach the African-American community. One of the groups did have a teach-in on high school Blacks and abortion and contraception. The women in the Black Panther Party did not support the referendum that would liberalize abortion laws. The African-American women who had been in the Communist Party did. They were older, and they supported on the grounds of human rights as opposed to women's rights. They were very wary of the women's liberation movement. But one thing changed everything, at least in Seattle, and that is our Women's Liberation Group invited the legendary activist Fannie Lou Hamer. She had been one of the leaders of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. And we invited her up to speak to Seattle about what she had done. So the Peace and Freedom Party and our Women's Liberation Group asked me to speak about our abortion work. And you'll see why I say this, I should have of said to them, "just a minute. I have no right to be speaking with Mrs. Hamer. She should speak for herself," but I was like 20-something. So I spoke first and I spoke about our struggle for abortion. And when it was over, she looked at me and she said, "that was very interesting. I've never thought about it that way before." And then she began to talk about the time when she was arrested for voting, sent to jail, beaten

senseless in jail, she got sent to a hospital. And when she got out of the hospital, she found out she had been sterilized. When she told that story, everybody in the audience gasped. Now, I was a white middle-class woman. I had no notion, no understanding about coercive sterilization. So prevalent in Mississippi, it was referred to as the "Mississippi appendectomy." After the referendum passed, one of the members of our group who was white, but was in an interracial relationship and had a mixed-race child found out she was pregnant. She was studying to be a draftsman at Seattle Central Community College. They didn't have any money and she couldn't afford to have an abortion. She went to the local public hospital, Harborview, and they, the doctor said, "we'll terminate your pregnancy, but you have to agree to be sterilized because you obviously can't control your life." And she was desperate. So she was sterilized. She came back to our group and told the story. And we were as shocked as we were when we heard what Mrs. Hamer said.

So a group of women from our group went to Harborview and we found out that sterilizations were routinely performed, especially on poor working-class, women of color, women on welfare. And just so it's very clear, Seattle then was a city that was 94% white. So if I speak about women on welfare, the overwhelming majority of the women on welfare would be white, not Black, Indigenous or Latinx or AAPI. We began to raise the issue of sterilization, but perhaps not as forcefully. There were two African-American newspapers. We should have raised money and put ads in those. We didn't. The anti-abortionists did. So I think there were ways that we could have and not in our defense, but in our explanation, I think part of it was we didn't know how to do it. We did not know yet how to work in multiracial coalitions. I describe us in our book as at best, we were clueless. And at worst, I don't think any of us were out and out racist saying Black people were A, B, C and D or terrible. And we didn't appreciate the work that latter anti-racist feminists have done about equating the issue of eugenics with underserved, and eugenics, not only in terms of looking at health, but also in terms of other reproductive choices such as adoption and now assisted reproductive technology. So much of it is also based on eugenics. So that is something we have to continue to deal with. Fortunately, the next generation of activists, people like Loretta Ross founded SisterSong. Byllye Avery founded the Black Women's Health Network. Shirley Chisholm and Loretta Ross and Byllye Avery founded a Black women's reproductive health group too. And what is happening now is who's leading the struggle for reproductive justice? Women of color. And I would say to white sisters, "why don't you step back and listen to them and follow their lead?" as opposed to trying to think you know all the answers.

AT: When we're talking about the internet, it's always, it's great. It's also horrible, depending on what you're doing with it. But from what you're saying, it sounds like a lot of the issue in your day was more the empathy gap, which is basically saying, "I don't understand other people's experiences." And in that time, you wouldn't necessarily have been exposed to those stories. So like you were saying, Fannie Lou Hamer coming and telling her story. That's one of the most effective ways to reduce and close the empathy gap, is hearing other people's stories. And so I do think one of the great benefits that we have today is that thanks to the internet, there is so much more access, (BW: Right.) particularly if you make the effort to go and look for it, to hear different people's stories. And so I do think that that makes intersectionality, hopefully much easier because we have all these tools that we can use to close the empathy gap. And so, the fact that even when we're talking to cisgender men and saying, this is a men's issue as well. If I can't afford this child, my male partner probably can't either. And there are all of these factors that impact women, but at least in theory, they should be impacting the man who impregnated that woman in the first place as well. And so you would hope that whether it's men, whether it's white women understanding the perspectives of women of color, whether it's middle-class and upper-class women who are better able to understand working-class women, I would hope that that's gotten better. But what do you think?

BW: Well, I wanted to end my story, I forgot to tell the story. So I told you, I shouldn't have spoken with Mrs. Hamer. And I gave this talk somewhere and a friend of mine raised her hand and said, "Barbara, but if you hadn't been on that panel, if you hadn't spoken about abortion, we never would have heard Mrs. Hamer's story.

We never would have been educated.” And I think that's the point you were trying to make is that we not only have to find ways to let more stories be told. And those of us who have historically been privileged, and I would say isolated - privilege is a form of isolation. We have to be also open to not only hearing the stories. So by the early '70s, the issue of race and reproductive rights became even clearer. There was the famous case of the Relf sisters. And it turned out these two teenage women who are Black have been sterilized. They were illiterate, they didn't know the language and their mother didn't. And the forms to have them sterilized were signed with the signature X.

A wonderful woman, Latina, Puerto Rican descent, Helen Rodríguez Trías, founded a group called the Committee Against Sterilization Abuse, and found out that at Lincoln Hospital in the Bronx, there was massive sterilization of Puerto Ricans going on. Ana María García did a movie called *La Operacion*, where she showed that one out of every three women of reproductive age in Puerto Rico had been coercively sterilized. Later writings by a woman named Iris López has pointed out that, as you said, it's neither good or bad. The Puerto Rican experience was far more complicated, because a lot of the women did want smaller families. And so the idea that after you've had your third kid, you'll get your tubes - and I love the expression “your tubes tied”, they weren't tied, made it sound like it's a birthday present, pretty ribbon. They're cut, snip.

But we also found out as a result of the American Indian uprising, that also one out of every three women of reproductive age on Indian reservations were sterilized. And so many of their children were taken away from them and adopted by white families. So a lot of the groups and I would say it was mainly the left feminist groups. CESA was a left feminist group, the Committee for Abortion Reform and Against Sterilization Abuse was a left feminist group, the Reproductive Rights National Network, a left feminist group. And after the Hyde decision passed, the first woman who died from an illegal abortion, she was from Texas, and she went to Mexico to terminate a pregnancy. Because the Hyde decision, which cut off federal funding for women who needed healthcare, she went and she died. And the Reproductive Rights National Network had a national campaign to show what the Hyde decision did, especially to poor women of color and working-class women. So I would argue, at that point in the mid-'70s, the National Organization for Women, and I thought it was incorrectly, focused solely on the Equal Rights Amendment, and put all of its energy into that. And it left reproductive justice, reproductive rights, reproductive health, for left feminists. And we were not as big, we were not as rich, we weren't national, we were all local groups, and so forth.

AT: And so one of the things that I love about a piece of yours that I read is that there was a subheading, “we weren't ladylike.” And it's got me thinking about how any form of activism I've looked at typically has this division between militancy and accommodation. So you've got, to put it in a suffrage context, you've got the women who were breaking windows versus the women who were saying, if we just behave, then maybe these nice men will give us what we're asking for. And I do think there are advantages to both approaches. I don't think that either full extreme is effective in its own right. But I think that when you interweave different tactics and find sort of a balance between those two, that that tends to be what gets things done. What do you think?

BW: Well, the way you've said it is perfect. But I do believe that the progress that gets made in the United States around human rights has always been made through what I call creative confrontation, whether the abolitionists, and remember, for the suffragists in the United States to speak in the 19th century, to speak publicly, to wear a bloomer costume, to petition, to march was considered absolutely outrageous. And remember, the Civil Rights movement people, you would hear arguments, “they're sitting in, they shouldn't do that, they should be more polite, they should wait,” all that sort of stuff. But what moved the American conscience about Civil Rights, was creative confrontation. And the same thing's true, I talked about ACT UP. ACT UP changed people's attitudes, not only about the AIDS crisis, but about homosexuals, about what is the role of healthcare. And with the women's liberation movement, our first act was to protest a Playboy Bunny. And we made the front page of every newspaper. And as a result, people joined our group. When we showed up at Olympia, Washington, 1500 of us - the majority, by the way, were women of color - for what I call the kind

of lobbying I like to do. We sat in, and we said we weren't going to leave these, and they were all white men, we were not going to leave the state legislators office until they got the bill out of the rules committee or whatever it was. The other form, after that awful murder in the Mother Church in South Carolina, and this African-American woman climbed to the top of the statehouse flag and pulled down the Confederate flag. That's the kind of creative confrontation. No one gets hurt. And in Seattle, there were these billboards. And the anti-abortionists put up these billboards and it was of a hand with a fetus in the hand and the slogan was "let him live, vote no on this referendum." And first of all, somebody pointed out that the fetus was a male because you can see this little teeny tiny teeny teeny peenie. But two women in the women's movement would get up and when they they crossed out the "him" with red paint and wrote "her." That's effective communication. I think disruption of hearings can be very good. They've got to be strategic. You have to know how to do it. You have to be also clever and disciplined. When I was in Cleveland, our reproductive rights group successfully heckled Phyllis Schlafly. We did this great thing called Ladies against Women. And we we were the ones that everybody loved and not her. So I think when we go about confronting people, we have to keep in mind that we do it without demonizing. And especially since the one thing they do about white women is they use humor about us to ridicule us. So we have to find ways to be humorous. I think one of the great things that Billie Jean King did in her tennis match with Bobby Riggs is she used humor to win people over, along with being a brilliant tennis player. So you have to be good at what you do. But I think when we're going to be demonstrating, we also need to figure out exactly what we want to get out of our protest or what have you, so that we move people to say, just what you said, "I have empathy for them. I understand why they're doing it. It makes sense."

AT: Well, I'm wondering how that interplays with the likability problem, like this idea that women often are not allowed to be angry, even when it is perfectly valid for us to rage at whatever the topic is. And incidentally, if anybody wants to read more about that, I highly recommend Soraya Chemaly's *Rage Becomes Her*. Great book. But I do think that anyone who presents themselves as relatable is more effective, right? Anybody who is likable is more likely to be listened to. But I do think that that's often weaponized against any marginalized people. We saw this with the Civil Rights movement. There's a reason that we have Martin Luther King Jr. Day and not Malcolm X Day.

BW: Except now Malcolm X, because he's dead, is on the stamp. So is Paul Robeson. You're good when you're dead, that sort of thing. Martin Luther King was not, he was disliked by the white establishment. But every woman has been told, you should smile more. I'm sure you've been told that by employers or whatever.

AT: I was once hit in the face at work with a paper airplane, because the visiting IT consultant who was fixing my neighbor's computer, I didn't even know this guy's name. But I was at work at my computer, he thought that I was too serious while staring at a spreadsheet. And so he decided that it was appropriate for him to fold a paper projectile that almost hit me in the eye when he threw it at my face, because I looked too serious at work.

BW: And you didn't think it was funny. What's wrong with you?

AT: I did not. I think he very quickly realized that it was stupid. But I don't know that there were any actual repercussions for him. (BW: Right.) And this was in the 2010s.

BW: We have to find creative but serious ways to take up this business that if you have a strong point of view, you're not relatable. If you don't smile, you're not relatable. And I don't know all the answers to that. Somebody once told me to smile and I say, "Do you tell men to smile?" And then they can't answer that. That's some of the things that we can try to do. I think the best way to be relatable is not necessarily smiling and wearing pink.

But it's also to have as best as possible, good arguments, reasoned arguments. But the angry black woman, think of what Ketanji Jackson Brown had to endure from those racist senators, whether it was talking about her hair, her religion, and so forth, and that there was no way she could just say to them, "you guys are racist piece of shit," which is what probably a lot of us were thinking.

AT: Well, and at the same time, they're more than happy to let literal sexual predators like Clarence Thomas and Brett Kavanaugh take lifelong positions on the highest court in the land where they're making decisions like the one we're talking about to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. (BW: And they don't have to smile.) And so one of the things that I find really difficult when trying to talk to a conservative because I am from Indiana, which anybody who's familiar with US political geography knows is not a liberal place, to put it mildly. But I remember when I was younger, I was working at a newspaper in Shelbyville, Indiana. It's a large town, but it's definitely not a city. And this was when the Republicans, led by Mike Pence, were trying to defund Planned Parenthood. And in Indiana, they were able to pass a law that said that Medicare and Medicaid funds could not be used at Planned Parenthood. Now, you mentioned, the Hyde Amendment, which already stipulated that none of those federal funds could go to abortions. (BW: Right.) So this law did nothing to actually impact abortion. They were just trying to drive Planned Parenthood out of business, but they were doing so in a way that was just cutting off access for things like pregnancy tests, STI tests, mammograms, pap smears, important medical needs that have nothing to do with abortion. They were cutting off that access for poor people and old people. That's who is able to access those funds in the first place. And so it's things like this, where I remember talking with a woman who was on, I believe, our county council. And she was a Republican because they were all Republicans. But even she was able to look at that and say, "this is completely stupid. It's harmful. It makes no sense." And someone like that, I'm saying, "okay, this is a reasonable Republican. This is someone who can look at a measure like that and admit that it is completely nonsensical and also very harmful."

But what I see in the media today, and I believe there is data showing, the US has become more polarized with the rise of Trump. (BW: And Fox News.) Oh, yes. And Fox News, God help us all. Like I said, the internet is not great for everything. There has been a lot of extreme right-wing media that has taken root because of that. But I'm just at a point where I genuinely, I don't understand how you can even try to find common ground with these more extreme Republicans, because I do still believe that there are reasonable people who have largely been forced out of power in the Republican party. So for example, there was a letter signed by, I believe a hundred prominent Republicans saying "we support Kamala Harris because Donald Trump isn't fit to be president." And so there are still what I would consider reasonable Republicans out there, but they're not in control. And so I don't see how I can even talk to someone who is in a position of power, especially when we know for a fact that women are dying. Mothers are dying, if you are one of those people who cares more about a mother's life than that of a childless woman. Women are dying. The women that these politicians are supposed to be representing. And they also don't seem to care about science or facts. And I have no idea how to try and even talk to someone who I cannot appeal to on either a logical basis or a moral basis.

BW: Well, first of all, let's deal with that immediate thing. You can't at this point. I do canvassing and to me, anybody who says today that they're a Trump supporter and they only watch Fox news and news to the right, you're not going to win them. They're in a cult. And for me, I think our job is to try to a) convince all the registered Democrats to vote. That's the key thing. We have to convince them. And I just wonder how many independents there really are. Trump has been in everybody's brain for the last 10 years. He's been reinforced by Fox and all the right-wing things. It's a terrifying thought. And I think until about a year ago, the corporate media just didn't take Trump that seriously, or as the head of CBS News said, "yes, Trump is a danger to democracy, but he's making a fortune for our stockholders." That is for them, the idea of making stockholders and themselves richer and richer and richer meant that they wouldn't do serious news reporting about Trump's threat. Even the so-called liberal New York Times, if you read their headlines and some of their articles, you just wonder, they must want to get Trump elected. So it's very, very serious. But when you look at a number of

the states that are Republican-held and led, Ohio, etc., have voted to keep abortion somewhat legal. You just think of all the members of Congress who have been caught bringing their girlfriend to terminate a pregnancy. But it doesn't change their point of view. So I think there's some people you're not going to win over. So I think the best thing we've got to do is to work hard to get people out to vote, to convince especially young people that this time it makes a difference, that you're not voting for the person you're going to be in love with for the rest of your life. You're voting to give us a fighting chance to save the planet, to save our lives and so forth. But I don't see how you can win over somebody who's a Trump supporter who watches Fox News. Because it's not logic, it's not anything, it's just "I believe in Trump and I don't care what the facts are, I don't care what I see right in front of me." It's the facts. And they're aided and abetted by the Supreme Court, by the leading Republicans in Congress who, they know it's all bullshit, but they want to stay in power and listen, I'm sure they all can't stand Trump, but if he's the only one who can keep them in power, they want it because all they want are lower taxes and they want everything deregulated except women's bodies.

AT: With all of that time and energy that we are not wasting on the people that you are never going to convince, it's only going to frustrate you, what do you propose for the people that can be convinced? So you've mentioned those forms of creative confrontation, but if you're just having a one-on-one conversation with someone who is genuinely open to having that conversation.

BW: Ask, if you're open to it, "what do you care about? What are your concerns? Do you have kids? Do you want your kids to go to college? Do you think college should be affordable? Do you believe that there should be parks and libraries and more public transportation?" I mean, these are the things I think, if you live in most places, if people are worried about the cost of housing, all these sorts of things, I think the question of democracy is both abstract and very real. The big thing I think we have to convince people is to get out and vote and get your family to vote, and are you registered? But I also think we have to work on it at a local level as well. We have to do down ballot as well, but I think you have to first always ask, what concerns you and why?

AT: Join us next time on the Infinite Women podcast. And remember, well-behaved women rarely make history.