

AT: Welcome to the Infinite Women podcast. I'm your host, Allison Tyra, and today I'm joined by Dana Rubin, author of *Speaking While Female: 75 Extraordinary Speeches by American Women*, to discuss the secret history of women's speech. So first, can you explain to us what you mean by that phrase?

DR: Not many people know about it. Not only is it secret and hidden, but it's really been invisible. Through most of our historical studies, our curriculum, our bookshelves, our speech collections, even our popular discourse, our media, we don't acknowledge, we don't recognize that women have been speaking throughout history. So I consider it a kind of a secret.

AT: And this also creates a self-fulfilling prophecy for future generations, which your Speaking While Female speech bank website is helping to try to offset that.

DR: Absolutely. Now, just to be clear, I started this project by collecting women's speeches. I just started collecting them the way somebody else might collect rocks or stamps or fine art or silver. I collect women's speeches. They don't have any monetary value, but all together, in total, in sum, they are very valuable because they make a valuable argument. I collect them. I find them. I dig them out of old archives, old anthologies. I go to institutions, repositories. I look at out-of-print books. I find speeches by women. I write to institutions and request permission. And I put them on this website, the Speaking While Female speech bank. And altogether, cumulatively, they create an argument. The argument is that, indeed, women have been speaking in history. That it wasn't just men whose voices we recognize. It wasn't just men who said the most powerful, the most amusing, the most insightful things. Women, too, were engaged in that activity throughout time.

AT: But there is that catch-22 of if no one wrote about this at the time, whether that's a newspaper account or personal document or anything like that, if no one wrote about it at the time, there's nothing for you to find today.

DR: Well, absolutely, Allison. Absolutely. There are thousands, thousands of speeches, thousands of public words by women that we will never have access to because nobody recorded them. I mean, just think about it this way. Here's how I usually frame it. If a woman said something in public, whether it was a sermon, whether it was a speech or testimony, a lecture, and nobody thought it merited covering, suppose a newspaper editor at the time, the editor didn't send a reporter there to cover it. If the reporter wasn't there to cover it, or even if the reporter was there and didn't write down what the woman said, then her words did not appear in the paper the next day. If they didn't appear, then nobody really even knew she spoke. No one could quote her. Her words could not be anthologized in collections. And the result is that all of us today don't even know that she spoke. So there is a whole silent generations, generations of silent women made silent by the oversight and negligence of the gatekeepers of history, the recorders of history.

AT: And even on a personal level, if a woman has an entire, a complete version of the speech

she gave written out and it says, "I delivered this speech on this day at this time, at this place, here is exactly what I said." If no one saved that, if her papers were not considered important enough by her family to bother to save them, again, we see that just erasure of history.

DR: Exactly. Exactly. And that's why I always say in my speeches, usually at the end of the speeches, because I always want to give somebody, my audiences something positive to do, right? You always want to send people away with a positive action. I say, "look in your attics, look in your basements, look at your grandmothers, your great-grandmothers, diaries, look through their papers. There are gems there." I found a speech not long ago in the journals of Matilda Joslyn Gage, the great suffragist from upstate New York. They were published in a special publication that reproduced her diaries. And in her diary, she had a copy of a speech that she gave that no one even knew that she had given. So these are precious. These are precious parts of our heritage. And they have been overlooked and ignored for so long. And it really made me angry. I always think it made me angry. And then I got busy. First I got angry. Then I got busy. I also say in the book, I tell the story about an old house in Chatham, Ontario, in Canada, that was torn down. I think it was about 20 years ago. It was a decrepit, old, dilapidated house. And in the ruins, in the rubble, they found a cache of documents that belonged to Mary Anne Shadd Cary. She was a black woman who escaped. She fled to Canada with the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850. The law basically said that not just in the south, but in the north where slavery was not legal, any enslaved person who escaped from the south could be arrested. In fact, it put the onus, the burden on people in the north to arrest that person and forcibly remove them to the south. So she, like many, many tens of thousands of black people, went to Canada. And so her documents were in that pile of rubble. She was the first black publisher in North America, she published a newspaper. And in those documents, there was a speech, a sermon that she gave. So how precious is that? There is no price on that.

AT: Well, it's interesting that you mentioned Matilda Joslyn Gage, specifically in this context, because there's a phenomenon, if you will, I don't think it's that phenomenal, called the Matilda Effect, which is this innate bias against acknowledging women in science. And so you see it in women just being overlooked, or there's a literal photo of women programming the ENIAC computer, for example, and you've got people who say, "oh, those must have been models that they brought in to display the hardware." It was like, "no, those were the women programming the computer." But it was actually named for Matilda Jocelyn Gage.

DR: I've written about that. There was a wonderful woman. I think her name was Margaret Rossiter. She's a professor, and she is the first one to identify that phenomenon. And I wrote to her and I got permission from her to use that speech in which she identified that phenomenon in my archive. So and also there was a wonderful piece about it in Smithsonian Magazine a while back. Matilda Joslyn Gage is my hero. She really deserves an enormous amount of credit for advancing the suffrage cause, but not only the suffrage cause, but the cause of forgotten women in history. She was just an utterly brilliant woman. And she's very little known today. I live in the southern Hudson Valley, not far from New York City, north of New York City, but one of my goals for this summer is to go up near Rochester and visit Matilda Joslyn Gage's house

because there's a museum there that I really dearly want to visit.

AT: She's also an interesting example in this context because Matilda Joslyn Gage actually had credit stolen from her by two of America's most prominent women's suffragists. So the women fighting for women's rights kind of tried to erase her. So after she had an ideological split with Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, they removed her name as an author from the history of women's suffrage, which she co-wrote, she edited and extensively researched. And the work also largely left out parts of the movement that didn't perfectly align with their views. So it barely mentioned major figures like Alice Paul and Lucy Stone. So it is very frustrating and I think illustrative that women who fight for women are not above silencing and dismissing women as well.

DR: It's true. Her name was removed as an editor, although I think I want to say that she's in one of the volumes, she's listed as editor. And I don't believe she's absent altogether, it's just that her role was vastly reduced. But another very interesting thing about Matilda Joslyn Gage is that historians believe she was an example of the Land of Oz, where women were powerful, women were empowered and were powerful, because her son-in-law was Frank Baum who wrote the series. She inspired him. When her daughter wanted to marry him, he didn't have any money, he was an impoverished writer. And I think that situation went on for quite a long time. He didn't have any money, but Matilda Joslyn Gage supported her son-in-law and inspired him. I think he, if not specifically in words, I think in spirit, paid homage to her with that series, the Wizard of Oz series.

AT: So when we're talking about the impact that this has on girls and women today, an interesting 2013 study found that students in Switzerland were delivering persuasive political speeches in a virtual reality space. And the back wall that they could see featured either a picture of Hillary Clinton, Angela Merkel, Bill Clinton, or no image. And when they were presented with a female role model, the female speakers were more likely to speak longer, rate their performance more highly, be rated more highly by others. So they are more confident, they are more effective when they can literally see other women who have done this well. And so by erasing women's speaking, we are making it harder for current and future generations to speak as well.

DR: It is one of just a number of studies that have shown that role models do matter. The one I usually refer to was a one in women in doing tech work in computer science. They were measured with images of men on the walls, and then they were measured with images of women on the walls. So they did demonstrably better when they had women role models. Women throughout history have unfortunately been intimidated, they've been discouraged, they haven't been able to look up to women, they blame themselves, they lack confidence. I don't want to paint reality with too big broad of a brushstroke. All people can lack confidence, and that includes men and women. And not every woman is fearful of speaking up or not convinced she can perform difficult tasks or complicated math or computer science. It's very hard to generalize, but in general, with the broadest possible overview, I think it's clear that more women than most

men do suffer from these things. More women than most men are intimidated, have difficulty speaking up, feel inclined to blame themselves or apologize. So that's what we're still dealing with. That is the sad residue of centuries of absence from the historical record and omission. So that's what we're up against.

AT: And as someone who is also a speech coach, incidentally, I feel like you would agree that confidence is very important when it comes to being effective. And so if you feel like you are not good enough, that can become this reinforcing cycle where you are not as good a speaker as you could be because you don't think you're a good speaker. And again, that's self-fulfilling prophecy, but on a personal level.

DR: No, absolutely. It's to me, in the world that I operate in, I see examples of it over and over. Just last week, I was giving a talk to some female attorneys. And the woman who introduced me is a litigator. She does litigation for a living. She goes into a courtroom. She speaks before the judge. She speaks before a panel, a jury. And she admitted to me how nervous she was, just to introduce me at the event. My heart really went out to her. And of course, I encouraged her every way that I could and let her know that she was fine. And she was fine. Her introduction of me was great. It was just fine, but she herself felt like a nervous wreck. And I just felt so bad that we're still dealing with this leftover, hangover, sense of inferiority.

AT: And I see it with these interviews as well, because I could be talking to someone where, say it's an academic who has spent years studying this person and their context, or someone who has literally written and published a whole book about this exact topic that we are talking about. But they still get nervous about the idea of speaking about it. And it's one of the reasons that I do these in advance. I record them and I edit them because I don't want that pressure to impact the conversation. I don't want them to be stressed. And it's a bummer that intelligent women feel like we shouldn't be speaking about things that we know about.

DR: It's true. It's exactly true what you say. And it makes me really sad and frustrated, but it also energizes me or inspires me to get out and speak even more about this. I don't know if you or your listeners are aware of the OpEd Project, but it is a non-profit that helps underrepresented voices use their voices, use their knowledge and their expertise and to put it into the world, mostly in the form of op-eds, but also in the form of articles and speeches. It's called the OpEdProject.org. And it was through the OpEd Project that I really first learned about the extent to which women in particular have trouble with expertise, calling themselves experts. And they do an exercise in their workshop. And they go around the room and every person has to introduce themselves and in very abbreviated form, in a very distilled form, say, what is their expertise? And there are women who, as you say, have written not just a book, but multiple books. They have PhDs. And they have a hard time saying, "I am an expert." "Hello, my name is Donna Rubin. I'm an expert in (blank)." It's just hard for them to acknowledge their expertise. And if you can't acknowledge it to yourself or to a group of sympathetic supporters, imagine how hard it is to put your voice into the world, the larger world, where you know you're going to invite argument, disagreement, pushback, because that's the nature of public discourse. We need that

argumentation. We need the best minds to argue and debate in order to get to the best solutions. So it's imperative. It's critical that we all put our voices in the world. But if we can't even accept and acknowledge our own expertise, it's going to be difficult.

AT: There's a fascinating and, I mean, for me, at least quite disheartening book called *The Authority Gap* that analyzes the fact and the circumstances around how women are perceived as having less authority than men are, whether this is a leadership role, whether it is areas in which, as we've discussed, they are an expert, if not **the** expert. And one of the things that the author talks about is a triple bind, where women are, by default, assumed to be less authoritative. And one of the best ways in theory to offset that is to list your qualifications to prove that, "yes, I know what I'm talking about because I have a PhD, because I've written a whole book about this, because I've researched this for 20 years." And the problem there is that if you're a woman, doing that makes you less likable, because you are more likely to be seen as arrogant. And women who are less likable are in turn less likely to get the job, land the client, be elected. And so like I said, it is very disheartening to read this because it does feel like a no-win situation.

DR: Well, I agree with everything that you say, except I don't think it's a no-win situation. I just think it's one more challenge that we have to overcome. And everything you say I agree with, but it is getting better. I have seen it get better just in the time that I've been leading workshops and practicing and speaking, I see younger women coming up the pipeline who are more emboldened to speak who do understand they're worth better. So I think that a lot of it is generational. I think there's been a huge cultural shift. And you and I are part of it. You and I, it's incumbent on us to keep pushing. But you are correct. There is a narrow, acceptable band of conduct, a narrow range of behavior that women have to operate within. But just look at American politics, just as an example. Look at Hillary Clinton. I don't want to say anything about her politics because some people love her. Some people hate her. She's very divisive. But I think it is indisputable that during her presidential campaign, she was the victim, the recipient of all kinds of terribly sexist calumny, bias and criticism for her voice. Just because of her voice. She was strident. She was shrill. She was argumentative. She was too loud. I mean, it was so biased and gender biased particularly. But here we have in the American political landscape, other women coming up who aren't receiving that. And also there was so much focus on that bias that Hillary was the victim of that now, if anybody behaves that way, they get called out pretty quickly. So not that they didn't get called out then as well. But I see American culture shifting. I see world culture shifting. Not fast enough. But I think that there are changes and it is more acceptable now for women to speak in whatever tone of voice comes naturally to them. In whatever range, vocal range comes naturally to them. Not that I don't encourage women to speak stronger, to speak more powerfully, to use all the rhetorical tricks at our disposal and strategies, our disposal to sound more authoritative. All that's very important. But I think we are relaxing our standards and giving women more bandwidth or more latitude to be who they are.

AT: It is fascinating when you look at, I think Christine Blasey Ford and Brett Kavanaugh are the starkest comparison. When you see a calm woman talking about her own sexual assault and

then you've got a man who is saying "I should be allowed to be on the highest court in the land for decades to come," who is throwing a tantrum in the Senate and just that juxtaposition of how I think most, if not all, women looked at Christine Blasey Ford and they knew she's not allowed to get emotional because they'll call her hysterical. And in fact, I think there was some Fox News commentator who called Kamala Harris "hysterical." And I love Stephen Colbert. His response was, "Kamala Harris: hysterical or a woman doing her job?" because the context was that she was questioning someone in a Senate hearing. You know, there was no hint that she was emotionally out of control. But I think every woman knows on some level, whether they admit it or not, that you are more likely to be accused of not being in control of yourself and therefore not being someone who deserves to be listened to.

DR: Well, I couldn't agree with you more, which is why I lead workshops in public speaking, in thought leadership, in speaking strong and storytelling because I want women to be better speakers, because it is harder for us. It is just harder for women. But also it's harder for other underrepresented voices too. It's not just women. It's harder for gay men to get the kind of legitimacy and respect they deserve. It's hard, I'm sure for many black speakers. But again, not all. Not all. So I think we are, what we are dealing with as a society, our society's in transition. And I want you and me and all of our listeners to be part of the positive force that's moving to change these things so that in our children's lifetime and our grandchildren's lifetime, they operate in a different environment.

AT: And I'm glad that you brought up intersectionality because as much as we know that women as a whole have experienced this, there is definitely a difference between a financially secure, able-bodied cis-het white woman and someone who does not have those privileges. And previously on the podcast, I talked about Sojourner Truth and "Ain't I a Woman" because this is one of my pet peeves.

DR: So Sojourner Truth, as your listeners might know, was truly a magnificent orator. She was an uneducated black woman who became one of the most powerful voices during the Civil War years. She traveled around. She literally, many years, was an itinerant minister and speaker. And she found herself at a woman's conference in Akron, Ohio in 1851. And she stepped up and gave an impromptu speech which has become known as Ain't I a Woman, her Ain't I a Woman speech. And about a week or 12 days, I think later, a friend of hers, a black publisher, published a version of her speech in his newspaper, but it was virtually forgotten. It wasn't for another, I want to say, 10 or 12 years, that Frances Dana Barker Gage helped Sojourner Truth by publishing her memoir. And I want to emphasize the word "helped." I don't believe she wanted to do anything that hurt Sojourner Truth. But in that memoir, she presented her own version of that speech and she "translated" it, if that's the right word, into a kind of southern black vernacular. So she made Sojourner Truth sound as if she was coming straight out of black enslavement. She had the intonations and the words of a southern black woman. When, in fact, Sojourner Truth came from upstate New York. She spoke a form of low Dutch. So she would have had a completely different accent. So for many, many years, Frances Gage's version prevailed and everybody thought that that was the accepted version. It became almost an

endeared, a beloved form of prose. It was reproduced in speech books. It was delivered in anthologies. It was delivered at speech competitions. Soldiers embraced it. So it became a part of American literary history, if you will. And it was only quite recently that a scholar wrote about the situation and pointed out what really should have been obvious all along, if we had really done our homework, which was that that was a corrupt rendition or a corrupt version of the speech. In my anthology, I put both side by side so that readers could read both of them. But I encourage your listeners to go to a website called The Sojourner Truth Project. And on that website, you can see both of them side by side, just like in my book. But even more, you can click on versions of the speech read by women that came from environments where they would have had a different accent. There's a woman there, I think, from the Dutch Antilles and women from Jamaica. So you can get a truer sense or alternate senses of how Sojourner Truth would have more authentically spoken. And it's delightful to click on them and listen to them.

AT: And in various contexts, you've given several different examples of particular speeches and particular women who are just fabulous, shall we say? So is there anyone that you would like to particularly highlight in this conversation?

DR: Yeah, I would love to talk about one of the earliest speeches in the collection, which was by a Cherokee woman named Nanyehi. She's so interesting to me partly because we know so little about her really. We have a sketchy outline of her biography, but she was just one of what historians assume were many hundreds, if not thousands, of indigenous women who spoke in their clans or their tribes. There were many, many Native American tribes that were matrilineal in which power descended through the mother, in which women held positions of authority and power. And Nanyehi was among them. She spoke on behalf of her clan, her tribe, the Cherokee. And in 1781, she was present at a negotiation between her community and some representatives of the US government. This would have taken place along a river in what's now Eastern Tennessee. And she spoke the words. And the only reason we have those words is because the US government emissary wrote them down, wrote them down in an English translated form. And that scrap of paper, I've seen it, you can see a picture of it on the website of the Library of Congress. It is in the papers of Nathaniel Green. He was an American military leader and scout. And you can see those words and the piece of paper is ripped and torn and hard to read. And we only have a fragment of it. But we have her words in which she says, it's a plea for peace. "May our sons be your sons. May our children be your children. We are one with you." And it's so powerful and so sad to hear her say these words and to realize the extent to which all her other words have been lost and all the others like her. Now most indigenous tribes didn't have a written language. They only had an oral culture. So their words had been lost to us. But whenever people ask me, who was the first American woman speaker, I always say "she's some unknown indigenous woman whose words we no longer have."

AT: It's interesting when we're talking about translations and obviously in the context of Native American women, it just makes me wonder how impactful women like Sacagawea were in the sense that you have someone who is translating. And I think most translators, shall we say, tweak as they go whether for cultural reasons or because things don't convert exactly between

one language and another. And I feel like there were quite a few translators in history who have been women. And it just makes me wonder how much of that has gone unrecognized. And interestingly, there's a new version of the Odyssey. And it's the first English translation by a woman. And there are very clear differences in terms of particularly how women are spoken about in her translation because she has interpreted things through that specific lens. And so it's just interesting when we're talking about speakers that translation. And I mean, you used translation when we were talking about Gage's version of Sojourner Truth's speech. And obviously that was a very impactful translation.

DR: That's fascinating. I would love to read more about that translation of The Odyssey. I did read about the book when it came out, but I didn't read any analyses that said that the translator's voice because she was a woman might have affected the nature of the translation. That's really fascinating. But I don't know, people ask me all the time are women different from men? Are women's speeches different from men's? I always maintain rather stubbornly that they're not. So what do I mean by that? Are women different from men? Yes. Women are embodied differently. Women have different bodies. Women have different hormones. We have different roles in society. We have different outlooks. Women and men are different. But I don't think in any straightforward way, you can say that women's speeches and their rhetoric, their spoken words are different from men's. Women speak with the same amount or lack of passion as men. Women use data and evidence-based argument just as much or as little as men. Women speak with authority as little or as much as their male counterparts. What is different is their experiences or what we like to call today their lived experiences, because throughout the course of history, women and men have played really different roles in society. Women were not on the whole, they were not politicians. They were not military leaders. They were not legislators. They were not legal experts. They were not negotiators. In the main, in the whole, there were some exceptions. But overwhelmingly, women's role was relegated to the home and hearth, so to speak, which means that most of the speeches that I have recorded, that I have been my archive, in my book, in which women speak, they were talking about, for most of history, they were talking about concerns or issues that were more domesticated, that had to do with family, that had to do with welfare, especially into the Victorian era. Women spoke a lot about education, health, sanitation, prison reform, all those issues, and men spoke more about legislative issues, political issues. But of course, as we enter the modern era, that's all changed. I don't find anything stylistically different enough between women and men to say categorically that women and men speak differently.

AT: And one of the interesting women that you've brought up is Isadora Duncan in your other works. And that's fascinating to me because she was a dancer, a choreographer, and so I don't necessarily think of her as a speaker. It's that sort of juxtaposition of the verbal and the physical.

DR: Isadora Duncan is really a remarkable woman. Many consider her to be the mother of modern dance. She was arguing that women need to get out of their tutus, their ballet, their corsets, their stays, and off their pointe shoes at the turn of the century, even before that. And she was an American. She came from San Francisco, but she lived most of her creative life



overseas. She was in Germany. She was in France. She spent a lot of time in Russia, but she was also quite remarkably a public speaker. I even have a book here, a collection of Isadora Duncan's speeches. She gave speeches. She spoke to the media. She loved the spoken word, and she was clearly unafraid to put her views out into the world. So the speech that I included in my anthology was given in Berlin in 1903. It was called *The Dance of the Future*. And she delivered it at the Berlin Press Club, Press Association. And she talks about, she'd been studying a lot of German philosophy, like she was studying Nietzsche, and Schopenhauer, and all these existential philosophers. And she talks at length about the spiritual development of women, of women in dance, and the role of women in dance as an expression of the spiritual winds of change that were defining modernity and moving through the times. And her speech is considered a manifesto of modern dance. It was published in Germany, translated into English, and you can find it easily. It's in the public domain, you can find it online. So it's quite remarkable to me that Isadora Duncan was obviously the embodiment of physical artistic expression, but also equally comfortable using the spoken word.

AT: And Amelia Earhart is another one where obviously we've heard of her, but we don't necessarily think of her as a public speaker, even though obviously she was doing a lot of that to garner support so that she could do the flights that she did.

DR: Amelia Earhart is a completely different personality from Isadora Duncan. I admire Amelia Earhart tremendously. She was undoubtedly courageous and she accomplished a lot. However, it's important to know that she was by no means the best aviator, female aviator of her time. They used to call them aviatrix. She was one of many, and she was chosen for this special role, and given the special role of making this historic flight across the Atlantic, because of her skill, yes, but also because of her physical appearance, she looked a lot like Lindbergh. If you look at the pictures, you can see she looked like the female version of Lindbergh, especially when her hair was cut a certain way, and he was already a world celebrity, Lindy. So she was chosen to be the female version of him, so to speak, and her husband, George Putnam, came from this family of publishers, GP Putnam and Son, so he became her agent. So when she flew across the Atlantic, he was responsible for her media. He published her memoirs. I think there were several different books that Putnam published and pushed her to give speeches. She never liked giving speeches. She always said that she was uncomfortable speaking. She did it. So I give her full credit for doing it, but you will not find many copies of her speeches. There's certainly no volume collection of Amelia Earhart speeches, so there's no comparison between Amelia Earhart and Isadore Duncan in terms of their public speaking.

AT: So then do you include her in your works, not just because she is a very recognizable name, obviously, but the context of why she's a recognizable name, and why she was doing these speeches, and why other women who, as you said, were accomplishing more and didn't necessarily have the PR machine behind them.

DR: I celebrate her like I celebrate all these speakers. I don't want to diminish her contributions. She did make important contributions, but she's not the same category of Isadora Duncan

because Isadora Duncan was really self-made in the sense that it came from within her. I think Amelia Earhart was more pushed into the role, drawn into the role, and pushed into the role, and she never really liked public speaking. It wasn't her thing. So I don't want to discredit her at all. I want to celebrate her, and in my speech archive, I have several speeches by her. She just doesn't have my the same amount of admiration that I give to Isadora Duncan and then the other same women.

In fact, in my archive, I have other aviatrixes who gave speeches, Ruth Nichols, and there were quite a few of them who flew around the world, and everywhere they went, they would get off and make a little speech and encourage other women to get in the air and explore science and technology. There are a lot of women who did that. If you want to find a lot of their speeches, you really need to come through the newspaper archives. There are resources like [newspapers.org](http://newspapers.org), [newspaperarchives.com](http://newspaperarchives.com). You just have to put in the legwork and look at them, and you'll find not a lot, but some of their speeches, and I dig them out whenever I can, because I want us to know about them and celebrate them.

AT: In our modern age, where seemingly everyone has a video recorder on their phone and access to uploading content to the internet, what's your perspective on how modern technology can amplify women, silence women, or both?

DR: Well, I think it's clear that it does both, but overwhelmingly, I would tilt the scales towards amplifying women, because women are amplifying themselves. Young women are grabbing their cell phones and speaking out, they're speaking out on Instagram, they're speaking out on TikTok, they're speaking out on other platforms. I hear them all the time. Is it all good? No. Is any technology having a positive impact on our culture? Obviously not, but I think when it comes to young women and encouraging a woman to use their voices, it's been a big plus, a big plus, and I'm really heartened by seeing all the young women who speak out, unafraid, unabashed to share their knowledge, their identities, their persona with the world. That gives me hope.

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