

Voices of Feminism Oral History Project
Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College
Northampton, MA

SARA K. GOULD

Interviewed by

KELLY ANDERSON

November 16, 2006
Northampton, Massachusetts

This interview was made possible
with generous support from the Ford Foundation.

© Sophia Smith Collection 2006

Narrator

Sara Gould (b. 1951) was raised in Grand Haven, Michigan. She graduated from Grand Valley State University in 1973 and earned a Master's degree in City and Regional Planning from Harvard University in 1977. Gould's work in economic development ultimately brought her to the Ms. Foundation for Women in 1986, where she spearheaded the Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development, a pioneering grant-making initiative that has provided more than \$10 million in support of organizations creating jobs for low-income women. Gould's legacy at Ms. also includes the Institute for Women's Economic Empowerment, which has provided thousands of grassroots leaders with the skills and resources to help women achieve greater economic independence. She is currently the President and CEO of the Foundation. Gould currently serves on the boards of the Center for Community Change; the Proteus Fund; Women's Funding Network; Women & Philanthropy; and The Challenge Machinery Company, a 137 year-old family business. She currently resides in Brooklyn, New York, with husband Rick Surpin and their son Jacob.

Interviewer

Kelly Anderson (b.1969) is an educator, historian, and community activist. She has an M.A. in women's history from Sarah Lawrence College and is a Ph.D. candidate in U.S. history at the CUNY Graduate Center.

Abstract

In this oral history Gould describes her childhood in Michigan, growing up and into a family business, and her mother's struggles with depression and addiction. She describes finding both the women's movement and her passion for economic development work in Cambridge in the 1970s and her journey to the Ms. Foundation for Women, where she has spent more than twenty years of her career. This interview focuses on Gould's tenure at Ms., the shifts in grantmaking strategy over the past twenty years, and the world of women and philanthropy in general.

Restrictions

None

Format

Interview recorded on miniDV using Sony Digital Camcorder DSR-PDX10. Three 60-minute tapes.

Transcript

Transcribed by Lisa Sears. Audited by Cara Sharpes and edited by Sheila Flaherty Jones. Transcript has been reviewed and approved by Sara Gould.

Bibliography and Footnote Citation Forms

Video Recording

Bibliography: Gould, Sara. Interview by Kelly Anderson. Video recording, November 16, 2006. Voices of Feminism Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection. **Footnote:** Sara Gould, interview by Kelly Anderson, video recording, November 16, 2006, Voices of Feminism Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection, tape 2.

Transcript

Bibliography: Gould, Sara. Interview by Kelly Anderson. Transcript of video recording, November 16, 2006. Voices of Feminism Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection. **Footnote:** Sara Gould, interview by Kelly Anderson, transcript of video recording, November 16, 2006, Voices of Feminism Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection, pp. 23–24.

Voices of Feminism Oral History Project
Sophia Smith Collection
Smith College
Northampton, MA

Transcript of interview conducted November 16, 2006, with:

SARA K. GOULD

by: KELLY ANDERSON

ANDERSON: Yes. Can you just do this to your mike? Yes, OK, great. All right.

GOULD: So how does this go? What's the –

ANDERSON: Well, I'll tell you.

GOULD: All right, good.

ANDERSON: These tapes are about an hour long.

GOULD: OK.

ANDERSON: And so I'm kind of thinking of this in three different chunks of maybe an hour each, and we'll break in between.

GOULD: All right, perfect.

ANDERSON: Get whatever you need and take a break. I think that we'll start with Ms. [Foundation for Women], since that's the reason that you're here today.

GOULD: OK. Right, right.

ANDERSON: And because the records are coming here, and it's really in your capacity as president of Ms. that you're here. So I think we'll start here, and then maybe for the second hour, talk more about the women and philanthropy movement in general. The women's funding movement. And then in the third hour, maybe we'll do some more personal reflections. And take it from there.

GOULD: Great, all right.

ANDERSON: Let's just start with Ms. and how you landed at the Ms. Foundation 20 plus years ago.

GOULD: Well, I was working in the field of women's economic development, and before that, in the field of economic development, because there wasn't really a field of women's economic development yet. And I was one of a

few number of people in Massachusetts, both in Boston and in Western Mass, who were beginning to organize. Women who were working in community economic development, and were beginning to talk to each other and to say, Well, what about women? You know, that hasn't been the topic of anything that we studied about, and we're working with these community development corporations around the state, and it doesn't — You know, women are not being really focused on or mentioned as a constituency or as leaders, you know. Many of the executive directors were women, but that wasn't noted either. So there were many things that some of us saw that weren't being noted, in general.

I was going to go back to graduate school to become a therapist, actually, and I decided to take a job — I heard about a job, again, through this network of women that I'd been talking to in Massachusetts. I heard about a job with the Women's Action Alliance in New York, and I went to the interview, and I ended up getting the job. Long story short. So that's how I moved to New York. And the Women's Action Alliance was — Also, Gloria [Steinem] was one of the founders of that, and she was on the board at that time. This was 1983. And the office for the Alliance was in the same building as the office for the Ms. Foundation, at 41st and Lexington Avenue in Manhattan. So I went down to the Ms. Foundation. I hadn't really known about it before. But it was like three or four people. Julia Scott was then the executive director, and I kind of, you know, nosed around. And Judith Sutphen was at that time called the field director. She was the one who was most often out across the United States meeting activists at that time. And I became really curious about what they were doing.

So then later in — When Marie Wilson came to the foundation in 1985, one of the things that Marie wanted to do at Ms. was to start a women's economic development program. Because she was coming from Iowa, where she had been working with the Iowa Banker's Association, and with Iowa educational institutions thinking a lot about women and the economy. And particularly women in small business, women as farmers, and other kinds of small business people. So she called me up one day. Literally, I was sitting at my job. I was then working for the Corporation for Enterprise Development in New York City on their Women in Microenterprise Program, and I was at my desk and the telephone rang. And this woman said to me, "Hi, I'm Marie Wilson, and I'm the new executive director of the Ms. Foundation. And I want to start a women's economic development program, and people have been telling me I should talk to you." And I was, you know, 34, 35 at the time. And so I remember thinking, I can't believe this. Because I had been thinking Ms. is where I need to do my work because I want to be connected to activists all across the country, and the Ms. Foundation is. So she said, "Will you come over and talk to me?" And I said yes in a heartbeat. And I went over and met with Marie within the next several days and, you know, discovered this human dynamo. And she was going into her very first board meeting, and wanted to talk at that board

meeting about this program that she wanted to start in women's economic development. So she invited me and a man named Bob [Robert] Friedman, who was a donor to Ms. at the time. Still is. And who happened to be the CEO of the organization I worked for then, the Corporation for Enterprise Development.

So Bob and I went to the board. I remember saying to Marie, "Are you sure you want to do this on your first meeting?" And she goes — You know, this was Marie. "Yes, you know, that's how we're going to do it." So we went to the board and encountered a range of opinion there because what we were talking about was women going into small business, women going into self-employment, microenterprise, low-income women, and there were some women on the Ms. Board who felt that this was, you know, small-scale capitalism, and why would you encourage women to go down that path? And there were other women on the Ms. Board who felt like this was a great thing.

ANDERSON: How did you convince the skeptics that this was a good idea?

5.15

GOULD: I would say we didn't convince them. It was just that Marie was a forge-ahead kind of woman, and so she forged ahead. After that board meeting, it can't have been very long before I decided to — Marie made me an offer and I decided to go to Ms. So in April — April first, actually, of 1986, I started half-time at Ms. And sort of the story and the joke is that my desk — We were still on Lexington Avenue then, in a very small space. And I was the second person Marie hired. The first person she hired is a woman who's still at Ms. named Carol Yesalonis as her assistant. Carol's still at the foundation. And then me. And it was in a very small space. Carol was probably the fourth, and I was the fifth employee. And my desk was by the copy machine in the backroom where all the supplies were, and everything like that. And then I still was working half-time for CFED, so I finished up that assignment, and by January of '87, I was full-time at the Ms. Foundation.

ANDERSON: And how did you create this program from scratch for Ms.?

GOULD: Well — Yes, it was very — It was —

ANDERSON: What models did you have?

GOULD: Yes. Well, that's a great question. Well, the foundation, first of all, was not doing very much funding in economic development. It wasn't doing very much funding at all, really. It was very small scale then. I think the entire budget of the foundation was probably half-a-million dollars, at this point. Somewhere between half a million and a million, and closer to the half-a-million end. And all of its grantmaking was from a general pot of money. And the foundation was not widely known among activists across the country at that time. The field director — that position was called field director, even then — would go out and make two- and three-week visits out to regions of the country, and hold

meetings where women's organization people would come, and women activists would come hear more about the foundation, and so that the foundation could learn more what was happening in that region. So that was what was going on. There was a technical assistance project, and there was reproductive-rights grantmaking that I think may have been specifically — You know, had its sort of own boat, or whatever. And so we didn't have a lot of money. I mean, I came to Ms. with my salary, which was, at that point, \$34,000, and really not much else. And in fact, I don't think we had the money for my salary for the whole year.

ANDERSON: How much grantmaking would have been out of that half-a-million dollar budget, do you think?

GOULD: I think at the time maybe \$150,000 or \$200,000. Maybe more, but I think maybe about that amount. So I decided to get a lay of the land, so to speak, which in Ms.' case meant, you know, a lay of the whole US. So I did zero in on beginning to visit those grantees that we were supporting. Whether it was in economic development or not, because even at that point, the words “women” and “economic development” weren't said in the same sentence. They were kind of considered an oxymoron. And if you were talking about economic development, you were talking about the purview of white men, right? And if you were talking about women, you were talking about the social service system as a way to meet their economic needs. You were talking about welfare. And so I just went out.

8.00

I remember visiting the Morenci Miners Women's Auxiliary in Morenci, Arizona. Within the first month of work — These were a group of women. It's a mining community, and a group of women whose husbands, primarily, worked in the mines. And they were — Literally, these women were the Auxiliary. And they were feminists, I guess, and they were trying to start an ice cream shop in Morenci, Arizona. So I went to kind of just, you know, get a lay of the land and see if I could be of help. And I was of, I think, of help in the sense that I was able to help them think about, Is this a feasible idea or not? Starting, you know — How many ice cream cones do you have to sell a day? What would your — You know, how would you staff this? Where are you going to get the capital that you need for it, and how much do you need? So I think I helped them think about those questions.

ANDERSON: And I can see where it's going to be a conflict. In terms of really convincing people that this is part of the women's movement.

GOULD: Absolutely.

ANDERSON: I mean, like you said. Are they feminists or not? I mean, how does this fit into your mission?

GOULD: Right, right. And why had they approached the Ms. Foundation for support?

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: And why had Ms. granted them the money?

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: You know, the philosophy of Ms. at that time, and really now, is, you know, if women — Feminist is what women define it to be. The mission of the Ms. Foundation is to assist women to govern their own lives, and influence the world around them. So within those parameters, what's feminist is what's happening on the ground.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: And the foundation has always taken — You know, looked at the ground and taken its cues from what's happening on the ground. So I visited other projects, some of which I knew about before. Many of which were funded by Ms., and some weren't yet. Then I began to put together regional meetings in different regions of the country, because it was very much the situation where women and economic development didn't go in the same sentence. So, you know, it was mid- toward late-'80s now, and there was a lot of economic development happening in these communities. But the women were marginalized. The women's organizations were marginalized. Women weren't thought of as a constituency, and women's organizations weren't thought of as knowing anything about this.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: So I started regional meetings that were Paulo Ferrarian in style. Meaning posing questions to elicit and draw out from the women what they knew already, and in that way to show them or help them to see that they were doing economic development. Without, you know — So questions like, What do you think economic development is? So our first regional meeting was in Albuquerque, New Mexico. And that was probably in '86, in the fall of '86, and possibly '87. And we — a group of us from the staff went down. We brought together, I would say, in Albuquerque about 75, 80 women from the region. From New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado. And they were from women's employment and training programs, battered women's shelters. Other kinds of women's organizations. And so in small groups — The regional meetings basically had a format where in small groups, with a facilitator, women would work on questions like, What do you think economic development is? How do you define it? How is development different from growth? What's happening in your region that you think is economic development? Who's benefiting from this activity, and who isn't benefiting from it, and what do you think about that? And then we also had some workshops where different models of economic development that I knew were happening in different parts of

11.00

the country. Those models were introduced. So something about microenterprise, something about job readiness and training. You know, women — Reentry women coming back into the labor force. The sectoral work, kind of looking at various sectors of the economy wasn't really yet happening. So that — I don't think we did that. And then we would always have a keynote speaker who was either — If there was in this region a woman who was already doing this, you know, from the standpoint or point of view that we wanted other women to see, then she would — We would showcase her. If there wasn't, we would bring someone in.

In Albuquerque, the keynote speaker was a woman named Maria Varela, with Ganados del Valle in Los Ojos, New Mexico, which was north of Albuquerque, and even north of Santa Fe and Taos. But Maria was known to the Ms. Foundation, and actually later served on the board of the foundation. And she spoke about, you know, what they were doing. I mean, Shepherders of the Valley. And they were, essentially, a community development corporation organized around the raising of sheep, and then the shearing of sheep, and the weaving of wool, and the products. Producing sweaters, wraps, all kinds of things. So the regional meetings, we did about 11 or 12 of them in a three-year period. And that's a lot of what I spent my time doing. My feeling was I should be reaching as many women as possible and helping them to see that what they were engaged in — You know, I was coming with my Harvard degree in economic development, *et cetera*. So people would say, What is it? and I would say, "You know what it is. You're doing it already. You know, I think you're the model." I did a lot of public speaking in those years. Again, because nobody else thought they were the expert yet. But within three or four years — I think this was a great strategy, because within three or four years I wasn't doing the public speaking anymore. The women in communities were becoming more recognized, and were finding their voice, and they were the people called on to do the public speaking. So that was another interesting kind of dynamic.

ANDERSON: In those first few years, was it hard to bridge that class gap, or a race gap, or — Even coming to a foundation, I mean, there must have been some trepidation on their part about —

14.45

GOULD: Not really.

ANDERSON: No, OK.

GOULD: I don't think there was that so much. There was — Because everybody was really eager to come together. You know, in any region that we came to, we had no trouble putting together a great group. You know, was it — How racially diverse was it? I'd have to think awhile back to remember. Probably not nearly as racially diverse as the work that the foundation has done in recent years. In, you know, these gatherings. But some diversity. You know, not all white. And the class stuff was

interesting, too, because the — What our experience was that the women on the ground had no questions at all about this strategy of microenterprise because — And the reason was they knew the women who were doing it.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: It wasn't a strategy somebody from the outside was trying to make up and push on these women. It was a strategy that the women themselves were using. Because if they had a wage job, they weren't making enough money in that wage job to support themselves and their families. And if they lived in a rural area, then the likelihood of them having a wage job was even less, because there were just fewer jobs available, and men were getting those jobs. And so in a rural area, oftentimes if — They had to pick up self-employment activity in order to be making money of any kind. So we really felt that this was happening. And from our vantage point at a national level, we could see so many different places.

ANDERSON: Right, right. So it's not like an organic strategy. Talking about poor or working class women.

GOULD: Yes, yes, yes.

ANDERSON: Um-hmm. And then — Talk more about, then, how you had to sell that kind of a grantmaking strategy and program to Ms.

16.40

GOULD: Yes. Yes. So then what we did was — You know, we were — There were board meetings, of course, regular board meetings. We were talking — I remember one board meeting in particular. I think it was my first board meeting on staff, and Gloria was still on the board then. And I remember talking at the board about the program. And I would often — When I would talk publicly, I would say, "Well, you know, economic development has two goals. Our work has two goals. Women creating their own jobs, and also women moving into existing jobs. And better kinds of existing jobs with good wages, benefits, career ladders, et cetera." And I remember really clearly Gloria saying to me, "You know, anything that has just two things to it, I'm really suspicious about it." But, I mean, she was referring also to gender, of course, and, you know, this was in 1986 or '87. And I remember thinking, Oh, my God. Also, we got into this thing about the words because I called the program the Economic Development Program, and Gloria felt very strongly it should be the Economic Empowerment Program. And so we got into a discussion back and forth about, you know, how do you work with language? Do you reclaim this language of economic development? Because, yes, I understand better than most people do that the way it's commonly understood is not what it really means, and it's certainly not how women are approaching it. But I really felt strongly that we needed to reclaim that word. Development is a very

positive word that, to me, is completely talking about the redistribution of resources, and not — It's different from economic growth.

ANDERSON: Yes. And 20 years later, you can see that you were right.

GOULD: Yes. Yes, yes, yes.

ANDERSON: Because that's a term so commonly used now.

GOULD: Absolutely.

ANDERSON: And the word empowerment, I think, has come to be really, you know, often overused.

GOULD: Right. But it was just great, also, to be — I mean, I tell that story also because it was — I had thought — Just pause. (pause in recording)

ANDERSON: Let's try to remember what sentence you were in the middle of. Oh, empowerment versus development.

GOULD: Yes. And then I said I was telling the story because, you know, it was great to be at a place where this kind of discussion and dialogue could happen. And it was such a vibrant time in the world of economic development, and in the world of women's organizing, and in the world of women's philanthropy, and, really, philanthropy in general. You know, the late '80s, early '90s were a time when there was more money circulating. And into the late '90s when the stock market really began to boom. But even now — or even at that time, the feeling was really that there was a lot of money. Although not at the Ms. Foundation. So — (laughter)

19.00

ANDERSON: Well, how did you raise the money for this initiative?

GOULD: Well, Marie and I went out to some corporations and some foundations. Marie was, I would say, the belle of the ball in the philanthropic community when she arrived in 1985. And so she was making a lot of inroads, and we also — At the Council on Foundations, which has an annual meeting. We would go to that. And you can't really fundraise at it, but you can work it really well to meet people and to make contacts that you can later follow up on. And we would hold — You know, we would invite people to lunch and dinner, and *et cetera*. But then it was not too much later that we began to work on the idea of the women's — The Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development because we realized that — By this time we knew all this activity that was happening across the country, and we were a foundation, after all. We should be funding this activity because it was all operating on a shoestring.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD:

So we said to ourselves, How are we going to make that happen? And we knew a woman named Paulette Meyer, who was a consultant in California, and a small donor to the foundation. And she was, actually, at that point working at Levi Strauss Foundation, which was one of our funders. So we started to talk to Paulette about, What's a strategy to interest more philanthropic money to come to this? And she said, "Well, you know, you could do the usual. You could hold donor briefings, or we could write something up and pass it out. Or, you know, we could develop something where people came to the table at Ms., pooled money at a common table, and worked together to do the grantmaking so it becomes a learning opportunity, and money gets out into the field. So we thought that was a tremendous idea, and took that idea, and began to develop it, and it became the Collaborative Fund for Women's Economic Development.

So Marie and I went out to raise money for that, and to design it. And the way we designed it, working with Paulette, and with others — Caren Grown is a woman who participated in that a great deal with us. We said, OK, this Collaborative Fund is a pooled fund, and we want it to reach some scale. The whole point of this is to pool enough money to make a difference. So we established that it would have a minimum gift of \$50,000 a year. This was in, you know, in 1990. Fifty thousand a year for three years. You had to make a multiyear gift. And then we went out to get four anchor donors who would be giving at least a half a million. So we thought if we had four at half a million, we'd have two million. Then we could get to three million by filling in with that.

And we went to the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller, MacArthur, and Pew. And we brought Ford on rather quickly. I think they ended up doing \$300,000. Pew we never got anywhere with. I could tell you stories about that. Rockefeller we never got anywhere with. And MacArthur, we finally did, although it took quite awhile to get to that point. And a nice little aside here, kind of a small world story. Kavita Ramdas, who's now the president of the Global Fund for Women, was our program officer at MacArthur at that time, and she was instrumental in actually getting MacArthur to come to the table.

When the first grants were made — And the Collaborative Fund also — The idea was we would do learning together, and develop a request for proposals. Well, first of all, develop guidelines that would guide our decisions. And then a request for proposals, and then get all the proposals from around the country, which gave us this incredible scan of what was going on everywhere. And then narrow it down. Go on site visits, so that we would take the donors on site visits so that they would be able to see more about what was happening. And then we would actually make grant decisions for a three-year period because we could make three-year grants. This was the first time the Ms. Foundation had ever made a multiyear grant. And the grant size was \$50,000. That was, by far, the largest grant that the Ms. Foundation had ever made.

ANDERSON: Can you back up and say a little bit more about the decision-making process in there?

GOULD: Yes.

ANDERSON: Who got to decide about the grants?

GOULD: Well, it was very much by consensus, so it was facilitated. I was, in the beginning, the facilitator of the process.

ANDERSON: So you'd have one person from Ford, one from MacArthur, and they had —

GOULD: That's right. Each institution —

ANDERSON: And then some major donors?

GOULD: Yes. Well, in the first round, there were actually no major donors.

ANDERSON: OK.

GOULD: It was all institutional. Either private foundation or corporate. They would send a representative. The Ms. Foundation had, really, kind of three roles. One was, we were the developer of the whole thing, and we had our own money in the pot, and we staffed it. So Marie sat at the table to represent our money that was in the pot, and I was staffing it. You know, we would literally sit around a table like this. Before grantmaking decisions were made, we probably met for full day meetings about four days.

ANDERSON: Wow.

GOULD: Over a several month period, because during this time we would be gathering — We did the RFP in two different stages. First of all, a letter of inquiry where applicants needed to send back a three-page letter of inquiry. We received in that first time we went out, 300 letters of inquiry. And we knew we could make — And we had advertised we could make 15 grants. So our job at the staff level — and we had decided this with everyone around the table — was to take these guidelines, and to cull it down to a group of, let's say, 30 — We ended up with 33 — that we wanted to show to the full table. These are the organizations that best meet the criteria. So that was quite a process that took some time, to go through all those letters, and to figure that out.

Then the whole group came together again, and we went through those 33 organizations, and we mapped them out on a map of the US so that we could see where they were geographically. One of the criteria people had decided was they wanted geographic distribution across the country in urban areas and rural areas, and they wanted constituency diversity in terms of race and ethnicity. They wanted strategy diversity in terms of the different strategies that were being undertaken by the

organizations. The main strategy of the fund was microenterprise, and then a second strategy was community-based business development. So we came back together, we looked at these 33 groups. And again, this was all about education. Our education learning from the people around the table, but also their education. Because we wanted the impact not only to be this money that we were granting out together, but the impact to be when they went back to their home institutions, to the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, the Nord Family Foundation, the Levi Strauss Foundation, they would bring this knowledge. They would then be carrying the banner of women's economic development back to their own organizations. That did happen to some extent, but that was — You know, we can talk more about that.

So then, the outcome of that day where we looked at the 33 was — We said, Well, we can't site visit 33, but we can site visit, let's say, 20 or 22. By the end of that day, as a group, using a consensus-based decision model — Consensus doesn't mean everybody has to agree, but it does have to mean that people on any given issue have to say, Well, I don't agree, but I'm not going to hold it up. You know, it's either a thumbs-neutral, or a thumbs-up position.

ANDERSON: And was that a decision-making style that those other representatives were used to, or was this something that they needed to learn from this?

27.00

GOULD: I think they needed to learn it, because it truly was — We were trying to get the best from everyone around the table. And it really was a consensus. If someone said, "It's not OK with me to eliminate that group," well, we would keep talking about that group. Now, in a productive way.

You know, I would say, "Well, what else is it that you are curious about? Or what is it that you really believe about this organization that possibly we don't yet understand?" And then that process really, almost always, would lead to either that person saying, "OK, I do get it now," or other people around the table saying, You know what? You convinced us. They should be in the pile — You know, they should stay in the group.

ANDERSON: Yes, yes. I just think it's interesting because you're saying they take back the issue, but they also take back the process of grantmaking, which is an important contribution that Ms. has made in terms of its collaborative work.

GOULD: Yes, yes, yes. That's exactly right. And in 1991, and '90, actually, when they started to meet together, this group of organizations, they — You know, collaborative funds now, you find them on every street corner, and find them in a variety of colors and whatnot. But at that time, you didn't. And we really did pioneer this methodology of collaborative grantmaking. So by the end of that day, we would have narrowed it

down to — In that case, we narrowed it down to 22 organizations. And then we set up a site visit schedule where the donor partners around the table would go on one or more site visits, and the staff would cover the whole country. So that — You know, when you're site visiting 22 organizations, you're — It took us two or three months to accomplish that.

So we did that, and that was fascinating. And then at the end of it, we had planned ahead. There would be another meeting. Everybody came back together, and then we used that meeting for people to talk about what they had learned. And the Ms. staff would sit back, and we would go organization by organization. And other donors who had been there would say, Well, this is what we found. And, you know, the bottom line was you had to say, "I would still recommend this group," or "I learned something there that would take them out because they aren't really a great fit with the criteria, or what they described on paper isn't really what's happening, or whatever."

So that was always such a fantastic learning opportunity for everybody. And by the way, we had nearly 100 percent participation in these kinds of meetings, and people would stay all day. And everyone would remark on this, you know, how people didn't leave the table. We didn't have cell phones then, and that sort of thing. We didn't even have e-mail. So in that sense, it was a different time. But people were really engaged in what was happening. So by the end of that day, we would have made the final grantmaking decisions. And made them by consensus, and then we would pop a bottle of Champagne, several bottles of Champagne, and celebrate what we had done. And then, you know, really reflect on it.

Then the process moved into a learning component, we called it, where we began to learn from the donors given this group of organizations, what are we most interested in learning about. And then when we began to meet with the grantee organizations, asking them the same question. What are you most interested in learning about? And then we would craft — We would decide on a final set of, let's say, three or four learning questions that would guide learning for a period of three years. In the beginning, and even now, people are really interested in this question of scale. How can these organizations scale up, right? And in the United States, very hard to do. People were really interested in the question of women's incomes. Is this a strategy that makes a positive contribution to women's incomes? If so, what women? In what way? You know, how much does it contribute? And so over the years, in this particular area, this particular field, our learning questions have focused a lot on those questions. And then they've broadened out with the advent of the Internet. Some questions about, How can the Internet be fully used by self-employed people, and small entrepreneurs to sell their products? We've looked at questions like in what — We've looked at particular sectors of small business development, like childcare. We've looked a lot at childcare. Both home-based childcare and center-

based childcare, to figure out, is this an activity that it would be good to say to low-income women, This is a business opportunity to go into.

ANDERSON: And did you always have in mind that the institute would follow from this grantmaking strategy?

31.55

GOULD: No. The institute kind of started parallel. The institute started, actually, before the Collaborative Fund. The institute came — was an outgrowth of the regional meetings. So we were doing these regional meetings around the country, and then there was also — At Tufts University, there was something called the Management and Community Development Institute that a man named Richard Schramm, who was then at Tufts, pioneered. And Richard and I were friends. Over about a three-year period, I taught a class at the Tufts institute in the summer on women's economic development [with different co-teachers.] Well, the third year that we did that class, it was the best enrolled class at their institute. So Richard came to me and said, "You know what? You should start your own institute, and we could help you do that. You could do that in the beginning under the auspices of our institute."

So in 1988 was the first institute on Women's Economic Development. And it was held under the auspices of Tufts. It was held on Thompson Island in Boston Harbor. And it brought together about 88 women from around the country. Literally, who went to an island for a weekend, you know, a long weekend, and had classes and workshops. Wilma Mankiller was there. She was the keynote speaker, talking about women on the reservation, you know, which was — This began a hallmark of the institute. That when you go there, you learn — We always try to present something that the majority of women there really don't have an inkling about. You know, they just don't have the window in. At that time it was, What is it really like to be on a Native American reservation, and be a woman doing organizing, *et cetera*. The next year when we were up in New Hampshire, we looked at the question of refugee and immigrant — You know, this was 1989.

ANDERSON: You could do both of those again, and still teach people a lot.

GOULD: Exactly, exactly. And actually, when we were together up in New Hampshire, that was the year of Tiananmen Square. That was happening in China when this group, which had gotten larger now. We were 88 the first year, but by the second year in New Hampshire, we were probably in the high 180s.

ANDERSON: The grantees — are grantees required to come? What's the connection?

GOULD: No. And actually the institute didn't really — the majority of people there were not grantees. They were staff women of organizations all over the country that were not grantees. So this was a way — And with the institute, with that first institute, I left there with this clear feeling that we had used our resources in absolutely the best way possible.

Because we had reached 88 women who would now go out and reach more women. So it wasn't really so much — Of course, we welcomed our grantees, and we wanted them to be there, but this was our means to keep reaching beyond our grantee group, because we are a relatively small foundation, and we can't reach that many grantee organizations.

Yes. So that's how the institute got started, and it happened every year for maybe about five years. Then we went to an 18-month schedule. It was the Institute on Women's Economic Development, and then it became, after several years, the Institute on Women's Economic Empowerment.

ANDERSON: Why the shift?

GOULD: There were new staff at Ms., younger women. And also we wanted to attract even more women who were organizing around economic justice, more specifically than economic development. So they were organizing low-wage women workers in particular sectors. Probably you're getting up now to the beginning of the Living Wage Campaign and minimum wage work. So we wanted to reach out even more to that group, and so we changed the name of the institute so that it didn't say just development. And then this last June, we changed the institute again, and now it's called the Institute for Women's Empowerment, not economic empowerment. In June, it was a gathering of the Ms. Foundation's grantee group across issue area.

ANDERSON: OK.

GOULD: Because the foundation is moving now in the direction of coming out of being so deeply siloed in issue areas, and being funded so pervasively by restricted money. We're moving into trying to change the way the foundation is funded, more unrestricted money, more movement-building grantmaking that, of course, can use an issue. It can use a region of the country, it can use a constituency of women. But it isn't bound to use only issues by the source of the funds.

So we brought about 220 women at this Institute from — So it was the foundation's entire grantee group, and then including some organizations that our grantees had identified, that they work with closely in their regions, they're allies with. They could benefit from being at this institute together. So we included a number of those organizations as well.

ANDERSON: Can you describe the process that you went through as an organization to get to that different kind of funding priorities movement building versus issue orientated and –

37.10

GOULD: This has been the trajectory of the foundation.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: So throughout the '90s, you know, beginning when Marie came, and then the history I've told you in this one area of economic development, we grew. The foundation grew from a half a million to, you know, currently a nine million dollar budget. And at its peak, a ten million dollar budget. The foundation grew from having no endowment in 1986 to, this moment, having a \$26 million endowment.

How did that happen? It happened a lot through this work in "fields." I call it fields, even in the '90s, because I think that's how, in philanthropy, it was understood. You know, and philanthropy is very issue oriented, and very issue bound. So we developed responses to this. In reproductive rights and health, the Women and AIDS Fund started up in '96. The Ending Violence Against Women Program, the Collaborative Fund for Healthy Girls, Healthy Women, which started in about '96. The Economic Development Collaborative, which kept going. Some economic justice work. And we were raising the money to keep these — You know, to grow these areas. And so the foundation was growing. Also, in '93, which we won't go into now, was the advent of Take Our Daughters to Work Day. That's a whole other thing in the way that the foundation grew.

ANDERSON: Yes, we'll talk about that. Yes.

GOULD: This is how we were growing. But by the year 2000, and then after 9/11. First of all, the year 2000, 2001, the money in philanthropy is beginning to dry up because the dot.com boom is over. And, you know, money literally had been pouring out of those foundations. They couldn't get rid of their money fast enough. And then, all of a sudden, you were in quite a different climate when the dot.com boom was over, and the stock market boom was over.

ANDERSON: And that really impacted Ms. as much as the other —

GOULD: Oh, definitely. Definitely. Because those sources of money were no longer so flush. And then with 9/11, of course, for everybody the whole world changed. And that's the way it was — You know, now I think we're moving maybe into a time when we can be a little more reflective about that, and realize that the whole world has not changed. That that was a moment in time, and an event, but it doesn't have to determine everything that happens since. And that's another subject. But anyway, it became more clear to Marie and to myself — Marie was still at the foundation. I mean, a couple of things. One was that we needed to be developing new streams, and that the foundation's endowment had to grow. So it was at that point that we set a goal of increasing the foundation's endowment, which was \$15 million, then, to a \$50 million endowment.

ANDERSON: Wow.

GOULD: And we set a goal of \$35 million. And that was one strategy. And then another was, you know, looking for the ways in which the foundation could really be relevant to what was happening in the world. You know, not only did you have 9/11, but you had the coming together of 9/11 and the Bush administration. And so the sort of deep-knowledge-in-fields theme, which had been in the '90s, to me didn't make any sense anymore. I mean, yes, some foundations are still — And some people are building deep knowledge. We can keep thinking about that, but that can't be the headline for us. We're the Ms. Foundation for Women, and the world is going to hell in a hand-basket. So the headline for us has to be, What is our role in this era, and how are we going to respond to that? And it was a challenge. Our biggest challenge was, Where is the money going to come from that is flexible, that can actually be used proactively, and responsively, quickly, as we said, in real time, to get out to organizing efforts, whatever needed to be supported. We don't have that source of funds at the Ms. Foundation. So we have been, you know, we have set out to develop that source of funds.

ANDERSON: And what do those funds look like? Where do you go for those funds?

41.30

GOULD: Yes. They look like general support grants. Now, I think, in this day and age, they look like larger support from individual donors. So we have made a lot of progress in that regard. We now have — I would say we're close to 15 donors who are giving the foundation \$50,000 or more. In some cases, 50, some 75, some 100 in general support each year, and making multiyear commitments.

But, you know, that number has to grow from 15 to 1,500, or at least 150. So that's one way, is to find people who, on an annual basis, are willing to give large or unrestricted dollars. Another way is to grow the endowment because our endowment — We're very lucky in that — And we were strategic, also, Marie was, in building this endowment in an unrestricted manner. So we didn't go to people and say, Oh, you endow our economic development work, and you endow our violence against women's work, and you — We didn't do that. We said, We want to build an endowment. So the \$26 million we have, it has no restrictions on it. And whatever it is throwing off has no restrictions on it. So the bigger we can get that — If we can grow that endowment to 100 or 200 million dollars, that's throwing off a lot of money that can be used in any way that the people at the Ms. Foundation see fit to use it. So that's another way. And then yet another is to work with our key foundation supporters. And, of course, this has been a mantra in philanthropy for a long time, about making general support grants and not project. And some people understand it now, and are making grants in that way. But many institutions, of course, still are not.

ANDERSON: Who are your key foundation supporters now?

GOULD: The Ford Foundation, the Marguerite Casey Foundation, and then from that point, I'd be going into individual funds. And saying, well, in economic development, it's these foundations. In women and AIDS, it's these foundations, and individuals. In violence, it's actually just two individuals who provide. One woman who is anonymous put nearly seven million dollars in donor [advised] funds at the Ms. Foundation in the area of ending violence against women. And with a particular focus, some of the money on childhood sexual abuse. Because she was the victim of childhood sexual abuse herself. And so you'd have to look within each issue area to say, "Oh, these are the foundations."

ANDERSON: Right. And do they then get a role in the decision-making or is this –

GOULD: Not in all cases. Although we have done a lot of that. And that is both a great thing because of the education piece. And of course, it's an extremely cumbersome thing. It's no way to do rapid-response grantmaking. And so we knew — and this is our big motivation in moving in these new directions — we knew that we can't any longer spend the time to go out and convince 20 different people and institutions that something is a great idea and get the money in the door before we fund it.

ANDERSON: Right, right. What was your trajectory there in terms of going from this Economic Development Program, and then into the executive director, now president and CEO. How was –

44.30

GOULD: Well, for ten years, I led the Economic Development Program. That was '86-'96. And then in '96, there was a sort of a sea change that happened at the foundation. Idelisse Malavé, who's now the head of the Tides Foundation — Idelisse was our deputy director under Marie from '90 to '96. And it was in '96 that she decided to move to California to become the head of the Tides Foundation. So Marie was there. I was there, leading the economic development work. And that's when I was promoted to become vice president for program, all of the programmatic work.

ANDERSON: Sounds like a new job descript — I mean, a new title.

GOULD: It was a new title and a new position description. So it was no longer just focused on economic development. You know, from '96 to — I don't know when, maybe '99 — I was that. And at some point, I became the executive vice president. And, you know, a lot of this looks like a chief operating — I mean, it begins to look like a chief operating officer. These were also the years when Marie had started up the White House Project, which was, in the beginning, affiliated with the Ms. Foundation. That affiliation really didn't stick, and that's a whole — you know, that's a whole other discussion. So Marie was spending a lot of her time on the White House Project.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: And so I became executive vice president. I believe probably in 2002 or so, became the executive director. She was still there as president. And then when she resigned her presidency in 2004, the board turned to me to become the president and CEO.

ANDERSON: But it's also a shift in terms of decision making there, right? For you — I mean, that's a new —

GOULD: That was a very new role for me.

ANDERSON: And they created a new position, right? Because she wasn't president and CEO before, right? She was just —

GOULD: Yes, she was. She was.

ANDERSON: Oh, she was?

GOULD: She was, yes.

ANDERSON: OK, OK.

GOULD: Yes, yes. When she came on, she was executive director. By about probably '94, and then Idelisse came on as deputy director. But probably around the '94 era, they changed their titles. Marie became the president, and Idelisse became the vice president. So at that point, there was just one vice president. But the foundation was much smaller.

ANDERSON: Got it. Could you describe the culture at Ms.?

47.00

GOULD: Yes. Now the culture at Ms?

ANDERSON: Yes, yes. And how it's changed going from five to 30 employees, and —

GOULD: Yes. It's changed — of course, that —

ANDERSON: I mean, you're a much bigger organization and much more polished in all sorts of ways you've grown. So —

GOULD: So I think that a part of the culture has been to project ourselves as a permanent institution because we believe, and our supporters believe, that there should be a permanent women's foundation in the United States. And so part of the culture is to project that in our office space, in how we conduct ourselves, in the kinds of meetings we take part in and hold, *et cetera*. Another part of the culture is very feminist. And it's an organization into which — If you come as a new employee — my experience, anyway, watching a lot of new employees come to the foundation — they think that they are in the women's movement. Meaning they think the foundation *is* the women's movement, when I

actually think the foundation — Of course, it's a part of the women's movement.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: It's supporting the women's movement. It isn't the movement. And so a part of our culture is always going back and forth between how much are we to be the best employer that ever existed in the world — the best feminist employer that ever existed — and how much are we focused on what we're doing on the outside. And, of course, the Ms. Foundation funds dissent. It funds resistance. It funds making trouble. So all those things live inside the foundation as well.

ANDERSON: I can imagine. (laughter)

GOULD: Authority is extraordinarily suspect inside the foundation.

ANDERSON: Even yours. (laughter)

GOULD: Oh, particularly mine. I've been there a long time. But definitely even mine. The overall, you know, authority is suspect. That's a part of the culture. I would say another part of the culture — It's pretty much developed over the years as a sink-or-swim place.

ANDERSON: What do you mean by that?

GOULD: Well, you come in as a new employee. And of course we'll give you a lot of help, but it's also pretty incumbent on you to find your own way. To learn the ropes, to figure out what's going on. Because — I think this is largely because the foundation, almost every day, moves at the speed of light. And we have never — Certainly, it was never Marie's style of leadership to find a plateau and be comfortable living on a plateau. And I don't think it's really the mission of the organization to be comfortable living on a plateau. So the foundation doesn't operate that way. Therefore, when you enter, you know, you're kind of moving along, and you've got to grab hold to some toeholds, and then pull yourself up, and then figure out, you know, what your role is and get into the swing — get into the stream yourself. So that's definitely a part of the culture.

There are a lot of race and class dynamics inside the Ms. Foundation culture. Because the foundation at the CEO level has been led — Well, from the very beginning, I think — You know, I think Brenda Brimmer is the first executive director. Shelly Korman, who's now our corporate attorney, and has been for many years, was an executive director. Both white women. Maybe by the third executive director, who is Joyce Yu, you had a woman of color at the head. You know, at the head of two or three people. Then Julia Scott succeeded Joyce, and she is an African American woman. But again, the foundation was very small. Five employees or something. Marie comes, and Marie has a 20-year tenure, and really was a — came with a vision.

Marie had a — very visionary person, and she had a vision for what the foundation should become. And she worked that vision for many years. And she was the head of the foundation at the — a white woman at the head of the foundation for many years. And then you have the history of the foundation coming from Gloria [Steinem], Letty [Cottin Pogrebin], Marlo [Thomas], and Pat [Patricia Carbine]. All white women. And then you have all the truth and the stereotypes about the women's movement in the early '70s.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: Was it a white women's movement? In what ways wasn't it? Certainly the press characterized it, and showed it as a white women's movement. But in what ways did that not portray everything that was happening, and what were the other things that were happening? And then who succeeds Marie? Me, another white woman. So that's been a part of the race dynamic. And kind of a feeling inside of the Ms. Foundation of how — It's hard to describe this. How can we feel great about our origins and our brand and what — and the privilege that that brand brings us? Because, you know, Ms. is a highly recognized brand. Gloria is a great person who connects to many, many people. And, of course, Gloria's a troublemaker, and she's, you know, a very pretty troublemaker. And so there is great privilege. You know, you look at the foundation with \$26 million in the bank, and a \$9 million annual budget, and then you look at women of color organizations. We think of ourselves now as a multiracial organization, but there are also women of color organizations. Women of color led, and staffed, and on the board. The access they've had to resources is far, far less than the access we've had to resources. So those are some of the dynamics, and things that we struggle with every day at the foundation.

ANDERSON: So what steps has Ms. taken to address in those things? Do you have — Like some do 50 percent of the board has to be women of color, or staff makeup, or —

52.50

GOULD: Yes. We've had over the years, of course, a strong affirmative action policy in hiring. The board has gone through phases. And to my knowledge, there has never been an edict that said the board has to be at least 50 percent women of color. There have been times when who — First of all, who's on the board has changed dramatically. For most of my time at the foundation, and I think from its history, after the founding mothers began to bring in others, activists were on the board of the foundation. And so it was extremely racially and ethically diverse at that time. A majority women of color. Then in the late '80s — Well, the late '90s and early in the 2000s, we — There are not activists, per se, on the board. Of course, every board member of the Ms. Foundation is an activist. But by that I mean she's not running her own organization back home. Our experience was that the foundation was not benefiting enough from the people on its board, and needed to have people on its

board who could open a different kind of door for the foundation, and had access to a different kind of resources. So the board now is — Out of 13 members, I believe six, five or six are people of color. And it's very much a criteria as we look — We're going up to 17, and some people's terms are ending. So, you know, it's always — The look you take at any moment in time is just that moment in time.

ANDERSON: Right, right.

GOULD: And so we are moving to be 50 percent, at least 50 percent. At the staff level, we pursue an affirmative hiring process for every position, and of course, it's very much on everyone's mind, What does the makeup of the staff look like?

ANDERSON: Yes. Do you have conflict about that in meetings or — I mean, how does that sort of erupt in terms of —

GOULD: We certainly have at different times. We're doing a hire right now. I'm hiring a chief operating officer, which I'm extremely excited about. And we used a search firm to do this hire. And the search person, you know, spoke to well over 100 people. And then I put together a group inside the foundation of seven people from different clusters and levels to do the initial interviews with the first crop that Ted brought us, which was eight people. And I was not in on those initial interviews because I wanted people — There was a lot of resistance inside the foundation to the concept of a chief operating officer. And I didn't want to bring somebody and sell them, you know, to everybody else. I wanted it to come to me. And I thought through this process, we could build a greater understanding of what value I see this position can give to the foundation. But let's see if other people can begin to sense it.

ANDERSON: Is that working?

GOULD: And it worked. Oh, it worked so well. The initial interviews — Ted brought forward eight people. Of the eight, two were people of color. One of them dropped out of the process because he took a job. Before he ever did this initial interview, he took a different job. So it left seven candidates and one person of color. The committee interviewed all those seven and brought forward three. They're bringing forward three to me. One of them is the person of color. But even today, I was on the phone driving up here with Ted, and with my human resources person saying — Because I had talked about it with the committee to say, "We need to have a goal in the next couple of weeks to gin up more qualified people of color candidates for this position." Because this hasn't put us in the best place in terms of how we've done, you know, this hiring process. And so we need to have a two-week deadline here, and gin up. And we set a new date, December first, for the committee to come together again to see new candidates. So our assumption is on December first, we're going to have some additional women of color candidates to interview.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: Yes, great.

ANDERSON: I'm going to pause it right there.

GOULD: OK.

END TAPE 1

ANDERSON: Let's see. Since we were talking about sort of conflicts over race and class, and it's obviously — it's something that has plagued every feminist organization over the last hundred and some years. So it's really worth talking about, I think, a little bit more. How Ms. as an organization, has educated itself around race, class, and sexuality. I mean, from the beginning, of course, you always defined yourself as an inclusive organization. Have funded women of color in the '80s when nobody was, funded lesbian battery, funded lesbian moth — I mean, it's always been sprinkled throughout the funding strategy, and yet I'm sure you've all had to do a lot of work on all those things, too, despite your best intentions of being inclusive or diverse.

GOULD: Right, right.

ANDERSON: So how have you struggled with that and what are your strategies for educating yourself?

GOULD: Right, right. I would say we've struggled with it in many ways. It's true that the resources of the foundation, the financial resources of the foundation have always been, since the very beginning, focused on — The language was different at the time, you know, but it's focused on communities of women of color, communities — When I came to the foundation, rural women. The way we talked about it was, you know, people in communities, women in communities with less access to resources, the least access to resources. Poor women, women of color, rural women and other kind of marginalized women. And that is where the foundation's resources have gone. I think the way we've always educated ourselves is by learning from the people who we are able to support. That certainly is one large, large way. And by staff. You know, as the foundation grew — When Idelisse, for instance, became the deputy director — a Puerto Rican woman, who grew up working class — That was quite different. You know, that brought into a 15-person organization in a leadership position someone who didn't have exactly the profile of Marie. So there have been many women over these years in leadership positions at the foundation, even if not at the top, who are women of color. And that's been another way that we've educated ourselves. And we have this incredible advantage because we are in touch with, talking to, funding, learning from the best of the best. You know, the places where the movements are really moving. That's where you'll find the Ms. Foundation funding. And so they're incredible points at which to learn. There is so much to learn there. The board, I think, is behind in terms of learning really about race and class. The board understands the foundation's work, and of course, we talk about this all the time. One of these tensions is between — As you build a board that has greater access to resources, a board that can open different kinds of doors, you are moving away from people, typically, whose life experience, or their current life experience, is teaching them very much

about race and class. On the other hand, we don't bring anyone onto the board, of course, who isn't proficient, and who hasn't done a lot of thinking about race and class and who isn't willing to do more thinking about race and class. And then sexual orientation. You know, I would say that the Ms. Foundation has funded probably less, and looked at that intersection less deliberately over the last many years than I would have wanted the institution to do.

4.20

ANDERSON: Why is that, do you think?

GOULD: I think it has a lot to do, frankly, with the issue areas. You know, again, being so deeply restricted. So of course, within Ending Violence Against Women, we're supporting lesbian initiatives. In economic development, you know, have we looked very much at the issue of sexual orientation? Not a heck of a lot, really. And so, you know, in different ways, this has been — But we haven't been able to take or we haven't — The money has not really facilitated or supported us taking a more holistic view of sexual orientation. And now, you know, I think we're right on the cusp of learning a tremendous amount about gender. I was just in the last two weeks at the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, at their donor retreat.

ANDERSON: Very nice.

GOULD: Eighty women, not all donors, together in Dallas. And I was there, and learned a tremendous amount about the work that Astraea is supporting. And both there, and in our own work, the new realities about transgendered people. And transgender issues, and just the life and experience of transgendered people. Which, really, the Ms. Foundation is I think taking — is on the cusp of — and taking baby steps. Not deliberately taking small steps, but I would say, you know, we just haven't really leapt forward in our understanding of the transgendered community and the issues that it faces.

ANDERSON: But it's part of your vision as you do more movement building, funding, to include these communities more.

GOULD: Yes, yes, yes. Yes. So, you know, those are some of the ways that we educate ourselves and have — And then bringing younger women — And, you know, the staff of the foundation is very diverse racially and ethnically. If you look at levels, of course, I'm a white woman at the executive team level. You can take a look there. You can look at the program officers, you can look at the support staff. We are a majority women of color organization. And lots and lots of young women, which is very much a part of the culture of the foundation and plays out in positive and, in my opinion, not so positive ways. And, you know, on the main, it's extremely positive. You come into contact with women — young women — and it gives you hope that there are young women who actually see the world in much the same way you saw it, even

though you're coming from such different generations. And then I particularly have experienced it as difficult. I'm 55, and when I was growing up and getting my feet wet, you know, in my first work experiences, *et cetera*, I remember operating from kind of a place of learning. Wanting to learn, wanting to soak up what other people know. And also kind of a pay-your-dues position. And my experience is that's just not out there. Nobody — It's not that they don't want to pay their dues. That isn't a relevant concept to them. And that's, probably, a really good thing. And I very much believe, and I've learned this by being at the Ms. Foundation, that young women are not just getting ready to lead, young women are leading. And, you know, so —

ANDERSON: Ready or not.

GOULD: Right. Ready or not, here they come.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: And, you know, when I was a young woman, I just didn't think of myself that way.

ANDERSON: Uh-huh. That's interesting.

GOULD: I can't imagine, you know the young women who come onto our staff, or in the grantee organizations that we support — I cannot imagine doing the work that they're doing at the age that they are.

ANDERSON: Um-hmm. But that's such a measure of our success. That they come in with such entitlement.

GOULD: That's right, that's right. It is.

ANDERSON: Right?

GOULD: It is. It is.

ANDERSON: They believe themselves powerful.

GOULD: It is, absolutely. Yes, yes, yes.

ANDERSON: But I can see that it would also be challenging as a leader.

GOULD: It is. It is, it is. And part of the organizational culture because, of course, they come with wonderful ideas. And many of these ideas, they don't want to think that they're not the first person who had this idea, right. But they're not the first person who had this idea. And so then you're also, I think, as you lead and mentor and supervise, I think you're always working this area where you don't want to say, "We tried that five years ago, it's just that you weren't here. And this was what we learned." You know, you don't want to say that all the time. And, of

course, some of what they're saying, we haven't tried. So that's where it's easier to move. But some of what comes forward, I often find myself, as an older leader thinking — My immediate thought is, you know, it's a great idea. We did that. And are you interested in hearing what happened, you know, and what were the pros and cons, and what worked well and what didn't work well, *et cetera*. So that's part of the culture, too, is how to navigate those waters.

ANDERSON: Yes. What about mentoring other, younger women's foundations, like Third Wave, or — I mean — What is your relationship with some of those smaller and younger foundations like?

9.10

GOULD: Yes. You know, I'll be very, very honest. The some, like Third Wave Foundation — There was a time when it was thought it might be birthed under the Ms. Foundation wing. And decided not to. So that did, you know, and Third Wave was birthed again when I wasn't in my current position at the foundation. Many — ten years ago. They're about to celebrate their tenth anniversary. And so for a few years, there was this sort of weird turf stuff. And then you get, you know — There's competition for donors. I think we all operate on a landscape on which both our collaborating organizations and our competitive organizations — It's the same organizations. It's just a fact of life. You're going to compete with the same people you collaborate with, and you darn well better collaborate with the same people you're competing with or you're going to be left behind. So that, I think, colored the dynamics between the Ms. Foundation and Third Wave Foundation for some time.

Lately there has been a project, a piece of work, that Ms., the Third Wave Foundation, the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, and the Ford Foundation, and the Center for the Advancement of Women, which is — Faye Wattleton is currently the leader of it in New York. The five of [us] worked together on something that we called the New Women's Movement with support from Ford over the last two-and-a-half years to bring together the leaders of national women's organizations for — We spent 11 days together at different times over a two-and-a-half year period talking about what are the possibilities to galvanize, again, women's movements, bring more women into movements, work on the separations of — You know, move forward very deliberately cognizant of race, class, age, and sexual orientation. So that working together has brought me quite close in contact with Monique Mehta, who's the current executive at the Third Wave Foundation, and with Katherine Acey, the current executive at Astraea. So right now, I feel quite in sync with both of those organizations, and as if we're really helping each other, and have each other's backs. But I wouldn't say overall that that's been a theme.

ANDERSON: Yes. Yes. That's interesting. And what did that conversation over 11 days yield?

GOULD: Oh, a ton.

ANDERSON: Can you say what some of the most exciting ideas you developed?

GOULD: Yes. Well, it yielded a lot of conversation between older women and younger women. Well, we met together for two single-day meetings at the Ford Foundation, and then we held three three-day-long retreats. When we first began to meet together at the day-long meetings at Ford, we didn't have enough younger women around the table. And, in fact, Third Wave was not in the initial group that was pulled together by Ford. Ford pulled together Astraea, Ms., Ford, and the Center for the Advancement of Women. It was my staff at Ms. — when I went back and debriefed with my staff about the fact that I was in these meetings, they said to me, Well, where's the Third Wave Foundation? And I said, "Oh, that's a good question." So then I e-mailed my colleagues and said, "Well, my staff just asked me where's the Third Wave Foundation," and everybody agreed they should be there. And so then we invited — Kalpana was the executive director then, and she actually was — before she had led Third Wave, she worked with the Ms. Foundation. So I knew Kalpana, and I reached out to Kalpana and said, "Would you like to be part of this? We'd like to have you be part of it."

But there was always tension there because I think even now if you interviewed some of those young women, they would not feel that they were really welcomed at the table or that, you know — But I think people would feel that there was a breakthrough as the process went on. And particularly at the second retreat, we showed the movie *The Sisters of '77*, about the Houston Convention. So you had people in this group who had been at the Houston Convention. You had young women who didn't even know it took place, and were stunned to find out that the United States government had funded a convention of women to come together from every state. It was like, What? You have to be kidding. And so a great conversation. Boy, that was an icebreaker. A great conversation ensued. Because you also have the younger women who saw Ellie Smeal, who was sitting in the room, on tape, and Anne Ladky from Chicago Women Employed, who had been at the Houston meeting and was on the tape. And all of a sudden, it was like, Oh, you have been in this a long time. You have taken part in — And it opened up — that night, not even during the day meetings. But afterwards, people drinking wine, having — And we stayed an extra two-and-a-half hours. And that's when we had the most open, honest conversation about, OK, as an older woman, you know what? You think I should move over. I don't feel ready to move over yet. And as a younger woman, you know, you look at me and think I'm preparing to lead. I've got news for you. I'm leading now. So it was like there was really a lot of good conversation. So that, I think, was a great outcome of it.

Another was just new connections between the women in the room, because we didn't bring together the usual suspects. We invited everybody. Every national women's organization that we could locate. The usual suspects in Washington, the usual suspects outside of Washington, and then a lot of organizations that most people —

including some even that I hadn't heard of that — And, you know, organizations with budgets from \$100,000 a year to \$10 million a year, and beyond. We wanted the executive directors or presidents. It was a majority women of color group, the 60, by far. Majority women of color.

ANDERSON: Well, that tells you where the women's movement's gone. And that was great. So that was a big breakthrough.

GOULD: And so there were breakthroughs and discussions around race. We had a conversation in that room about the Hyde Amendment. And Charon Asetoyer, who I know you're connected to, said in that room, "I feel like white women sold women of color down the river over the Hyde Amendment." Well, you also had in that room Judy Lichtman, who headed — she doesn't still head, but she's still very connected to the National Women's Law Center — and you had Faye Wattleton, who led Planned Parenthood at that time. And you had Ellie Smeal, who was leading NOW at that time. So you had a pretty good discussion in that room about —

15.35

But, of course, typical with women, or really any sort of conflict avoidance — Charon said that at the beginning of the afternoon. And it wasn't until people were about ready to go home that Judy Lichtman said, "You know, I really want to talk about that, because that's not the way I see it. I don't feel like I sold anybody down the river." And people stayed and we kept talking about it. I don't think Charon was very satisfied with the conversation at all, but it was a good beginning conversation. And what it really pointed out was when you compromise — Let's take an organization like the Ms. Foundation or like the National Partnership for Women and Families, you know, a Washington-based organization doing a lot of work on the Hill. When you decide to compromise, who loses? Who isn't in the room when you decide to compromise? And it is the lowest-income women, women of color. So that provided an opportunity for new kind of, just, ah-ha moments about that. And I think it's fair to say, and others would say, that some of those organizations, their executives were thinking differently at the end of this process than they had been thinking before, and they were understanding how women of color, whether they're leading or not, other organizations look at them and say, You don't represent us, because you know what? When you get to the toughest decisions, you make compromises that, if we were sitting at the table, we wouldn't make. Plain and simple. We wouldn't make the same compromises. And it was like, Oh, OK.

And there was another moment. I didn't get to go to the first retreat because it was at the time my father was passing away, but there was a moment at that retreat which was pretty incredible. We broke down into tables by race and ethnicity, and the assignment at each table was to say, What does winning look like for your community? So there was a table of white women, and when everybody reported out — When it came to the white women reporting out, they reported out, apparently, Winning

to them was if black people won, and if — They reported out in terms of everybody else. They didn't say anything about eradicating racism, they didn't say eradicating white supremacy. You know, they didn't name things in our own community. And I probably would have done the same thing had I been at the table. So I am not pointing any fingers.

ANDERSON: Right, right.

GOULD: But that was a moment where, Oh, you know. Then women of color pointed it out and said, Wait a minute. You're framing all of your victories in terms of our communities. The assignment was what does winning look like for white people? For progressive white feminists, what does winning look like in your own community? So that occasioned a whole pre-meeting at the next retreat where white women came together to talk about white privilege, with a facilitator who has done a lot of work on white privilege. And I did take part in that. So I would say this process did yield several moments and situations where there was much more honesty than had been possible before. And I know it is yielding some new behavior and new connections. You know, because you take 11 days to come together in these different configurations. You're running into people a lot at the dinner table and the breakfast table, and in the bathrooms, and in the hallways, and it's fostering some new friendships, and some new relationships, and I think that that was a big outgrowth of it.

ANDERSON: Do you think for a lot of the white women at that table that talked about white privilege, that was the first time?

GOULD: No, I don't because these were pretty sophisticated white women. But it was very much of an eye opener. They did cop to the fact that that's what they did at their table, that they didn't look at their own community. And so it was kind of like, Ooh. But it definitely wasn't the first time that, for many of us, that we talked about white privilege. But it maybe was the first time in a while. It isn't as if that's an ongoing conversation among white feminists — you know, in my opinion — outside of the university. Maybe inside academic circles it's more of an ongoing conversation.

ANDERSON: Did it shift your funding strategy, or collectively with the women's philanthropy that was there? Did it shift anything?

20.35

GOULD: It shifted, I think, the practice of several of the large inside-the-beltway white women's organizations. Although some of them weren't — You know, the reproductive rights organizations weren't at the table, like NARAL [National Abortion Rights Action League], Planned Parenthood. They never came to this table, although they were invited. In terms of our funding strategy, it didn't shift it. Well, let me tell you one other big outcome of this was a kind of consensus agreement, a loose consensus agreement on a frame of social justice feminism.

ANDERSON: That's significant.

GOULD: Yes. As opposed to victim feminism, or power feminism or whatever. Social justice feminism.

ANDERSON: And how did that get defined? Do you remember?

GOULD: Yes. It got defined as feminism that is focused on those most marginalized. So in an economic frame, let's say, it's the difference between focusing your efforts on breaking through the glass ceiling, and focusing your efforts on a living wage campaign that is going to bring women up from the bottom. At the third retreat, we actually tried to delve more deeply into topic areas to answer this exact question. If you look at women, at ending violence against women with this frame of social justice feminism, what's the outcome, and how is it different from if you didn't do that. If you look at women and HIV, if you look at economics. How is it different if you take this slice on it. So I think that that was a great outcome. And you had, even again, the bigger national women's organizations saying, Oh, oh. All right. I get it. Then we also talked about — And I was the one who introduced this into the conversation, not only feminism, not only social justice feminism, but feminist social justice. Because in my world, and in my everyday struggles, the biggest one is that I work a lot with wonderful social justice activists who use deep race and class analysis, and they have no idea about gender. It never enters their thought or consciousness. I mean, you just — After all these years, we still haven't broken through.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: So I said, "Yes, social justice feminism, and feminist social justice, because unless we're working on both of those fronts, we can celebrate feminist social — There's social justice feminism until we die, but we're going to be marginalized over here because there's a lot of great social justice work going on that does not have a gender lens in any way." So that was a big outcome. So what was the — There was something — The reason I wanted to say that —

ANDERSON: Just in terms of funding strategy with your shift towards movement based funding and —

GOULD: Right. So a part of that funding strategy is also greater connections, and we talked about this in the two-and-a-half years spent together. That women — You know, it's not 1972, it's not 1989, it's not even 1999 anymore. That women can't be separate, and we want to organize women to join movements. And certainly, yes, we want a vibrant women's movement, but not necessarily standing completely alone and autonomous. We want it connected. You know, we want to be able to go. If the immigrant rights movement is moving, well, there's plenty of great social justice feminism to work, and plenty of women to draw into

— If that's what's going to draw women into social justice movements, great.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: And then from the feminist social justice lens, the immigrant rights movement is never thought about in that lens, but in fact the leaders — Many of the leaders are women, and many of the people you would want to enlist in it are women. So if you don't bring a gender lens, you're not going to be able to do that. So that, you know, that has figured prominently in our funding strategy. And we now have an opportunity — Barbara Phillips [Sullivan], who was the women's rights program officer at Ford, who got the money in her portfolio to support these meetings, she also — And this is a long story, and I don't think we have time to go into it. But she went to the Ford Foundation to get reserve money, which is the big money that, you know, gets thrown off the endowment, and gets kept for special kinds of projects. So long story short, Barbara was successful in getting about \$51 million in reserve money out of Ford to various women's organizations and efforts.

ANDERSON: Wow.

GOULD: And three million of that is coming to the Ms. Foundation to do strategic grantmaking in the frame of social justice feminism.

ANDERSON: That's exciting.

GOULD: Which of course is — That's all the grant — That's our frame. I mean, we were not one of the groups sitting in the room going, Ah-ha. You know, like we get that. But that's very, very exciting. So that's what we're working on right now at the foundation, is what is that strategic grantmaking going to look at, how do you leverage the money, how are we going to work with partners, how are we going to share power? And then there was another stream that came out of this. Because Barbara had worked to release this money, it immediately created this opportunity to do some grantmaking, strategic grantmaking. There still is the larger question of where these conversations go, towards building kind of the highest vision of a social justice feminist movement, and — That is connected in many, many ways. It's not at all clear in the community right now how to take that conversation forward. What role can the Ms. Foundation play, because we are a funder and it's my belief that funders, you know, can't determine the direction of the movement. And yet, the huge — not even elephant in the room because it was like everybody knows it — is capacity. The other — Where is the capacity inside the women's movement for the leadership to take that conversation forward? It doesn't exist. Because other organizations are operating on a shoestring. They're already doing too much. They can't free people up to take it on. So you end up looking at the better-

resourced organizations to take it on, and then you are, again, looking at the white women's community.

ANDERSON: Right. Right, right. Did you go to or learn anything from that Incite conference that happened a couple of years.

27.20

GOULD: I didn't. One of our program officers, Pat Eng, went, but –

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: Yes, yes. She –

ANDERSON: What kind of conversation has that sparked with you?

GOULD: It sparked a lot. And actually, Beth Richie had taken part in these new women's movement conversations for Incite. And at the Ms. Foundation, Pat was bringing this already. Pat Eng was with us for about five years, and she was the founder of the New York Asian Women's Center, and just a very great thinker and woman of color activist in ending violence against women. So Pat had brought us this perspective already. But over the last few years, we have looked more at community accountability strategies for ending violence. We've produced a great paper that Pat —that came out of conversations that Pat had with others on the limits of the criminal justice system. We're supporting — I mean, that entire portfolio is really focused on these community accountability strategies. We're also supporting a few men's organizations because we feel that it is men's violence being perpetrated against women, and if men are not enlisted in the effort, I mean — You know, this is sort of part of this community accountability. If men are not calling each other to account for this continuing violence against women, how far can we get? How much of this can we really turn around? So we have supported men's organizations through our own portfolios, as well.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: But big questions about the criminal justice system. And in fact, I went to an AWID (Association for Women's Rights in Development) meeting a couple of years ago — two, three years ago. And Pat Eng couldn't come as well, so she asked me to be on a panel talking about our approach. And it was an eye-opener for me. I was approached by at least three United States feminists after that who came up to me and basically said, How dare you stop funding — You know, How dare you not be funding shelters? How dare you not — And these were all white US feminists. And I said, "You know, we just — I'm trying to tell you. This is where we think it's at. And I don't — You know, if we had a lot of money to do everything, would we? But with the money we have, this is where we're going to focus our resources." But it was a huge learning moment for me. I had no idea. Because another thing I didn't

speak very much about was the Violence Against Women Act, and they were shocked. How could I have gotten up in front of this international audience, and not spoken about the progress that was made through the Violence Against Women Act? And I said, you know, "I completely agree that huge progress has been made through the Ending Violence Against Women Act, and I would not want to belittle that in any way, and I did mention it." And they said, Yes, but you should — You know, there was so much more to talk about about that. And I said, "I'm sure you're right, and had you been on the panel, that's what you would have been talking about. But our experience has led us in some of these other directions."

ANDERSON:

We could talk a little bit about two programs at Ms., and let's do it quickly because I want to move into the larger world of women in philanthropy. The decision to add boys to Take Our Daughters to Work Day. Obviously, which was, you know, not very popular. And so I'd like to hear what it was like from your end, and also your work with Women and AIDS. So let's talk about those, and then we'll move on.

30.35

GOULD:

OK, great. So in terms of Take Our Daughters to Work Day, which — As we were nearing the tenth anniversary of Take Our Daughters to Work Day, what we had learned — And you know, I'm telling you this from my perspective. What we had learned, basically — because we did Roper polling after each day — and the history of the day was it was to be a pilot program in New York City, and immediately took off all over the country. Huge, huge homerun. The goals of Take Our Daughters to Work were making girls visible, valued, and heard. And whatever happened in workplaces on that day, those goals were reached. Could be a career day, could be any kind of sort of things that were happening in that day. But what we knew, because we were doing Roper polling on the extent of participation, and what kinds of programs were being held, *et cetera, et cetera*. By the fourth or fifth year, we knew that — At that point, a significant number, and a growing number, of workplaces were not holding Take Our Daughters to Work Day. They were holding Take Your Children to Work Day. And why were they doing that? Because, mainly, it's the people — The program happens in so many workplaces across the country because the employees love it, and the human resources people love it, which is a great thing. It's a day that employees can actually take more of their full self to work, right?

ANDERSON:

Right.

GOULD:

And have that validated by their co-workers, and validate their co-workers, more of their full selves. A growing number of employees didn't have daughters. And so, you know, even though the program was Take Our Daughters, meaning the nation's daughters, to Work — You don't have to take your own daughter. You can take someone else's daughter, you can take the girl next door, you can adopt a whole classroom and bring them, right. That message also never got through to

the general public. I have never met anyone who has correctly told me the name of the program. Everyone says Take Your Daughter to Work. Take Your Daughter, period, to Work. So we knew that that is what, in fact — You know, we also have had merchandise available all these years thinking we might have a little bit of a cash cow here. No. Because corporations and workplaces that run the program, they want to put their own brand on it, and they don't call it Take Our Daughters to Work. They want to put on it Take Your Children to Work. They want that on a t-shirt. They don't want a t-shirt that says Take Our Daughters to Work. So by the fourth, fifth year, we could already see that this was happening. By the sixth, seventh, and eighth year, the majority of people were participating not in Take Our Daughters to Work Day, but in Take Your Children or Your Child to Work Day. So —

ANDERSON: They co-opt any great idea, don't they?

GOULD: Really, really. Just give it to the general public. They took off with it. (laughter) Oh, man. So then, simultaneously, we were talking with people at the Families and Work Institute, and — I can't think of her name right now, I'm having a senior moment, but she's a very famous woman who heads that up. [Ellen Galinsky] I can see her face. Anyway, we were talking with her, and with others at the Families and Work Institute. There's a book that they publish called *Ask the Children*. And in that, they have a lot of research that they've done by asking children. So they uncovered, or revealed, through this research some things that we found very helpful around boys. That boys, almost as often as girls, when you ask them if they're going to take time off when they have a child, they say yes. If you ask them about their vision for what the world looks like when they grow up, it looks — it doesn't look like the traditional, you know, 27-year-old or 35-year-old man who has entered — you know, who is, like, living out to the full bounds of masculinity. There's a wider range of viewpoints, and some very hopeful viewpoints.

So Marie really felt very strongly that we needed — We had lost our edge in the program, and that this research — Just the way Take Our Daughters was predicated and founded on the research of Carol Gilligan and others who saw this need to make girls visible, valued, and heard. She felt we were seeing research that we could try to capitalize on, and bring boys in. So the messages that we used were not that we were adding boys and stirring. You know, people would say, Oh, you added boys. And our message was, No, we didn't add boys. We developed a new program.

ANDERSON: Got it.

GOULD: The new program is called Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day. It's about work-family balance. It's about young people envisioning workplaces, and people who are working now, to envision a different future, for full participation in your work life, your family life, and your community life. So what happened with this program? It's also not

called Take Our Children — It's called Take Our Daughters and Sons. And by the way, there was a debate on the Ms. Foundation Board because originally Marie came forward wanting to call it Take Our Children to Work Day, and the board said no. And then we came to the place of saying, No, if we start this new program, it's got to be called Take Our Daughters and Sons. And that, I think, was the right decision. But what has happened to the program, it's not called Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day, it's called Take Your Children to Work Day. And it's a career day. So if you went onto our Web site, daughtersandsonstowork.org, you would find a panoply of fantastic activities to do at your workplace on that day, and they would all be oriented to the theme of full participation in work, family, and community. And getting intergenerational dialogue going between the adults, and the young people, *et cetera, et cetera*. Not a career day. But we know because we visit workplaces and we Roper poll, we know that what's happening is a career day. So the goals of the program, you know, I think it's fair to say, are not being met.

ANDERSON: Yes. Do you think that you'll drop it at some point? Does that –

GOULD: I think it's a possibility.

ANDERSON: And what about the work that you're doing for — around AIDS?

GOULD: Yes, so the Women and AIDS Fund.

37.00

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: The foundation was approached by a woman who we actually, when I came to the foundation in '86 — her name is Irene Banning. Irene was at Radcliffe. She was a friend of Marie's daughter, who was also at Radcliffe. And she came to intern at the foundation. So we were connected to Irene from very early on. Irene became HIV positive sometime in the '90s, and she is a woman of wealth. She's originally from Germany. Her original family lives in Germany.

In '96, Irene came to Marie and said that she was interested in starting the Women and AIDS Fund at the Ms. Foundation. And we, of course, said yes. So it started with — I believe she made about a \$60,000 or \$70,000 annual commitment to the Fund. What did we do? We started to put together an advisory committee of women who were HIV positive or had AIDS, a majority of women, Irene, herself, included. And we began to fund the first — and this was 1996. But we found a few organizations and local communities that were women with HIV and AIDS who came together mainly for support, social support, so that they could either get the nerve up to be tested if someone had, you know, a suspicion that they were HIV positive, or to disclose their status, and have the support that they needed when they disclosed their status to their families.

So we began to fund with \$10,000 grants an increasing number of those organizations. And we have raised other money for the Women and AIDS Fund, and we are still the only funding institution that has a specified program on women with HIV and AIDS in the United States. This has grown, the fund. It still isn't huge, but we, over these years, have been able to support — I believe at this point it's nearly 20, and we make a three-year commitment. So an organization gets three years of \$10,000 a year, and is brought together once a year. We always bring the grantees together for networking, for skill building, *et cetera*.

And you know, those are some of the greatest gatherings I have ever been to. I mean, these women are so courageous. Because they are — you know, they are women with HIV and AIDS. They are women who've lost their partners, they've lost their children. You know, they are sicker or not so sick. There are definitely women who have come to these convenings, and two years later, they have died. So it's just really incredible work.

But now we have funded nearly 20 organizations in this way. So a year ago, we decided, and they decided, that they wanted to go to Washington, D.C., because they had never met the national AIDS activists. And we knew from talking to the national AIDS activists that they really didn't have any idea that there was this nascent movement. Right? And the organizations had developed with our support, and with each other's support. They had moved from being strictly support organizations to beginning to do advocacy, particularly with the Ryan White Councils in their communities, to get awareness that women have a different experience of HIV and AIDS, and to bring particular money for that purpose. So we took them to Washington, D.C., and they were there for about three days. And these, you know, many of these women had never left their hometowns. And there they were in Washington meeting the national AIDS activists. And then, that was great, very fruitful.

And then they spent a day together, just the women, putting together a policy agenda which is called the Ten Point Call to Action. And they then spent the next day going to Capitol Hill, and lobbying for this Ten Point Call to Action. And the first platform of it, the biggest plank is around — It was the reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE [Comprehensive AIDS Resource Emergency] Act, that, in the reauthorization, women and HIV would be named and funded, *et cetera*. So that was just, you know, transformational and phenomenal. And then we also partnered with a Broadway play that was written by two women who were in school together at the New School in the drama program. And they are writing — of course, I've seen the play. It's two characters. One woman in South Central, L.A., and one woman in an African country — I forget which country it is now — who are both HIV positive and haven't disclosed their status yet, and they're — One is in her thirties, I think, and one is a teenager in her late teens, and both have discovered they're pregnant. And so they are wrestling with this question of whether to disclose or not. So we partnered with that

play Off Broadway, and had in the lobby the Ten Point Call to Action, and also had some talkbacks at the end of a few performances. Gloria went to a couple and facilitated. I went to a couple and facilitated with the audience about HIV and AIDS.

So that's — You know, we're very excited about that work at the foundation.

ANDERSON: It must be one of the things you're most proud of, too.

GOULD: Yes, it is.

ANDERSON: It was under your leadership there.

GOULD: It absolutely is. Yes, yes.

ANDERSON: Let's talk about Ms. in the context of the larger women's funding movement, and what your role is as one of the first, you know, obviously one of the first with Astraea and the Women's Foundation in San Francisco. One of the first funders of women, and now to have grown to this size and to have women's funds all over the country. I mean, it's really a remarkable movement that's happened in the last 20 some years.

42.15

GOULD: It is. It's phenomenal.

ANDERSON: Now, where does Ms. fit in that larger landscape of the women's funding movement?

GOULD: Now, that's a great question. So we were — I think except for the Business and Professional Women's Foundation, which may predate the Ms. Foundation, although with a very different purpose — we were the first women's fund. We're about 34 years old, and we like to say we were, at that point, you know, a new animal in philanthropy. You know, such a thing had not been seen before.

Just a slight diversion into the history of Ms. Of course, it was the intent of the founders that the profits of *Ms.* magazine would fund the foundation. But one small problem; the magazine never made any profits. So the first money that came into the Ms. Foundation was actually proceeds of *Free to Be You and Me*. And then we began to seek money from other foundations. And the first foundation money that came in was from the John Hay Whitney Foundation under a category called Powerlessness. So we were, as you say, among the first, and Astraea not long after, The Women's Foundation in San Francisco. And then we were, of course, instrumental with others in starting the Women's Funding Network. And this predates — I'm trying to think if it predates me. Pretty much at the same time that I arrive at Ms., but I wasn't really involved in it. Marie was.

ANDERSON: Wasn't it mid-'80s?

GOULD: Yes, it's mid-'80s. Yes, yes. And Marie was really, you know, the person at that table with Katherine Acey, with Carol Molnar out in Minnesota who became the first executive of it, with other women around the country, with Tracy Gary and — again, senior moments on the — Roma Guy meeting together to birth the Network, the original Network. So we are on the landscape. Where are we? We're the national public multi-issue women's foundation. So we're distinguished from a local women's fund. We're distinguished from a statewide women's fund like The Women's Foundation of California. We're distinguished from the Global Fund. Our purview is the United States, and it's the entire United States.

I think our niche, and our particular competency, and our particular brilliance, is that we can fund anywhere in the US, and we can link the levels of local to regional to tribal to national, and even to global. Not by funding, but in all the ways that we know that what's happening in this country links globally. And in fact, is inextricably linked. I mean, I think you can make a very cogent argument that one of the best things you could do for women around the world is change the US government. And we, the Ms. Foundation, can be a way that you can help, you know, in this country, to bring about a better policy. So that's where we are on the landscape. We are a great collaborator with — We're a member of the Women's Funding Network, which has now been revived under the leadership of Chris Grumm. And really has been revived. Do you know about — Well, about six or seven years ago, Helen Hunt and —

ANDERSON: Sister Fund.

GOULD: Yes. And a few others decided that — I mean, the network was almost moribund. It just didn't have traction anymore. So they decided to try to revive it. And it has really taken off. So they moved to San Francisco, hired Chris Grumm, who came from the Chicago Foundation for Women, who is a very visionary woman, and Helen put money behind it and organized other donors to put money behind it. And the Kellogg Foundation has given the Women's Funding Network tremendous support, like to the tune of more than ten million dollars over the last five years. [We're a member of the Women's Funding Network that was birthed all of those years ago. About seven years ago the Network hired a new executive director—Chris Grumm. Chris came in with the backing of Helen Hunt, who felt a strong motivation to have the Network grow and play a stronger role in the women's funding movement. The Network had, until this time, been located in Minnesota. It had achieved many goals during its initial years under the leadership of Carol Molnar. When Chris was hired, the Network's offices moved to San Francisco.]

ANDERSON: Yes. It seems a very well-resourced, strong organization.

GOULD: Right. Yes, yes. I sit on the board of the Women's Funding Network. You know, this is where I think you'd want to go into a little bit of a

conversation about the cooperator. Well, what's the word we're using now? Coopetition. Collaboration and competition.

ANDERSON: Yes. OK.

GOULD: That's what I think the landscape looks like. I think we — Funds, whether we're at the local, the regional, the national, the global level, or WFN, which is the funds. We are really wrestling with issues about donors we share in common, about growth strategies. You know, how much should the Ms. Foundation be pursuing its own growth in, you know, without thinking about everything around it?

ANDERSON: That's interesting.

GOULD: It really is quite fascinating. And then also within that landscape, you have funds that originated in many different ways. But you might be able to characterize the ways funds initiate in two ways. Although as Gloria says, "If there's two of anything, I don't trust it." But — here I go again. But, you know, you have funds that were founded by wealthy women and came top down. And a good example of that is the New York Women's Foundation. And you have funds that came from grassroots activists, The Women's Foundation in San Francisco. Beautiful example of that. And you see this reflected in their culture, you know, to this day. The Ms. Foundation is a bit of a hybrid. Definitely top down. With some wealth, and some — and a lot of prominence and celebrity. So much more from a top-down model than a bottom-up model. It was a top down where Gloria and the other women who founded it worshipped the grassroots.

ANDERSON: True.

GOULD: Which when you have a top-down model that's donors, that doesn't necessarily happen. You know, you have some women's funds in the community that don't fund reproductive health, or reproductive rights, or abortion rights, because the board can't agree on it.

ANDERSON: Right, right.

GOULD: And I think that's pretty phenomenal [that that should exist in a women's fund]. So, you know, I think the landscape of women's funds is quite dynamic right now. The smaller funds are growing. It's really, though, not entirely clear to me how much are we marginalizing ourselves. I am also on the board of Women & Philanthropy, the affinity group. And that affinity group is going out of business.

ANDERSON: Oh, really?

GOULD: We're joining up with the Council on Foundations. Because we've suffered from poor leadership, I think, for quite a long time. And the board really has not paid enough attention to that. And I think that often

happens to organizations. And then, I think that the sector of philanthropy has proven to be so resistant to, again, feminist social justice.

ANDERSON: Would you also say that there has been some resistance to just funding women? I mean, how would you say –

50.00

GOULD: Yes.

ANDERSON: How — OK.

GOULD: Yes.

ANDERSON: So the percentage is still hovering around one percent or –

GOULD: Well, it's hovering around seven.

ANDERSON: Oh, OK. seven percent, and you feel like it's too hard to make more of an impact? You're not going to be able to make more of an impact?

GOULD: Well, we don't entirely know how. And it reflects itself in this affinity group, whereas in the '70s and '80s, this affinity group had people giving money to it. [Are] other philanthropy institutions giving money to it [now]? A much, much, much harder sell. Two foundations, Ford and Kellogg, give major general support grants to Women & Philanthropy. Nobody else. Nobody else. So the profession of philanthropy, it has been feminized. There's no question. You know, Women & Philanthropy started out in the '70s with a two-pronged mission: to bring women into philanthropy, and to change that dollar figure.

ANDERSON: So you did A and not B?

GOULD: We did A and not B. And A we didn't even do [completely], and these things are linked, I think. We did it at the program officer level. Seventy percent or more of program officers throughout philanthropy are women. We did it to some extent at the CEO level. The statistic is 53 percent, I think, of CEOs. But that takes no account of the size of foundation. And in the boardroom, no. That has not been done in the boardroom. Boards are still predominantly men. And that is really where the policy and the funding decisions get made. And if the boards aren't making actual funding decisions, they're making them by setting policy about what can be funded, and what approaches will be taken, and what is their analysis, and they're not bringing in analysis around women. And again, many of them are bringing a strong analysis around race and class, but not gender, race, and class. [And many are not bringing any race or class analysis.]

ANDERSON: How do you make that decision in terms of both of these professional, larger philanthropic network organizations about Women's Funding Network, obviously doing so well, so strong, such good energy. And

then — does that mean that some of that's been taken from the Women & Philanthropy? Do you know?

GOULD: No, I don't think it does. They're really different constituencies.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: You know, the network is really a network of the funds. Now it's trying to project its work out into greater philanthropy, but it hasn't had the mission of organizing greater philanthropy. That's happening at the fund [level]— like we're trying to organize greater philanthropy and a local fund is trying to bring in its philanthropy in its local area. But the network as a whole is not trying to organize greater philanthropy except to get a message out. But what's its message? Give to your women's fund. So, again, the message is kind of like, marginalize it over here. You know, then you'll be able to — Of course, this isn't the message. But I think some institutions do this. They may give to their women's fund, and then — but it doesn't impact their core institution and the biggest dollars they have.

53.00

ANDERSON: So do you feel like that's a big loss for Women & Philanthropy?

GOULD: I do. I do, on the one hand, and on the other hand, it was inevitable because it wasn't sustainable. It's been a very difficult decision for the board, and I do think it's a good strategy for us to go to the Council. Now, the Council — I mean, you know, you can say this is sleeping with the enemy. And in some ways, I would agree with you. And I would say it's also getting closer to the money that you want. Not from the Council, but from the Council's members. It's getting closer to the visibility you want to have among the Council's members. It means that the Council would be the body that gives away the LEAD award — the Leadership for Equity and Diversity — in its award ceremony, so there'll be a bigger audience. It means that if you've got the right person in the Council doing the work, the programmatic work — We're going to continue to do programmatic work and to raise grants to do the programmatic work. You know, we've got to have an organizer who really wants to meet every single member of the Council on Foundations, and start the organizing work all over again. And it is sort of like starting it all over again. But I also take the lesson — which I think we all need to sit with and think about a lot — Why is philanthropy — why are all of these sectors — I mean, we know why. To me, it's sexism, it's misogyny, it's what we — It's patriarchy. But it's playing out in 2006 in many of the same ways it was playing out in 1974. It doesn't mean we're all going to go burn our bras, but I'll tell you, we're up against the same resistance to the really simple message. There's a new book out, I don't know if you've read it, by Molly Mead and Mary Ellen Capek called *Effective Philanthropy*.

ANDERSON: No.

GOULD: And their premise — Because in the larger philanthropic world — the non-gendered philanthropic world — the mantra now is effective philanthropy. Let's do effective philanthropy. So Molly and Mary Ellen wrote a book called *Effective Philanthropy*, and their thesis is you cannot do effective philanthropy without a gender lens. That's just a fact. You know, you can dispute it all you want, but you can't do effective philanthropy.

ANDERSON: Do they mean in terms of working with donors and raising funds?

GOULD: No, they mean grantmaking.

ANDERSON: Or they just mean in terms of grantmaking?

GOULD: Grantmaking cannot be as effective as it would be if you were bringing a gender lens, and what's the big deal anyway? You know, like, what's the problem? So those issues are really fascinating to me. And another thing I think about a lot is this concept of universality.

ANDERSON: Say more.

GOULD: Well, you know, a grant maker is thought to be doing, you know — That people say, Oh, in universal funding, a lot of women get reached. But the point is, if you think of it as only universal funding, the dominant lens is male, it's white, it's heterosexual, it's older. It's not universal. You only think it is. You've only been led to believe. You know, we've — Society has dubbed that universal. But it's not universal. So from my point of view, the Ms. Foundation is universal just as much as any small family foundation that's doing universal funding, because we care about every single issue in our society today. We are no longer about, Let's find the women's issues. We don't believe that there are women's issues. There are some issues that impact women more than they — and differently than they do men. But the Ms. Foundation, we say our highest goal is building a true democracy of equity and inclusion in the United States. That's how we say our highest goal. It doesn't have the word women in it. And we know that you can't have a strong democracy without the full participation of women and girls. Alone, it's not enough. It's not sufficient, but it is absolutely necessary.

ANDERSON: I'm going to stop right there, OK.

GOULD: Yes.

END TAPE 2

ANDERSON: OK, what was I just saying that I wanted to start with? A little bit about women as donors and philanthropists. And what are some of the challenges and how women surprised you as donors and philanthropists. How do you work with some of the acculturation issues around women being powerful, having money, taking leadership in terms of financial decisions, and — I mean, you've obviously raised a lot of money from women donors. Some of it has been from foundations, and I'm sure some male allies, but you've also gotten women to give over a lot of money which is a very new thing for women to do.

GOULD: Yes, it is. It is.

ANDERSON: So let's talk about that piece of your work.

GOULD: OK, great. Well, the Ms. Foundation has raised a lot of money from women donors. I would say that we began to do that, you know, really in earnest not so long ago. The foundation's history was that the money was coming from foundations and corporations. I would say until — Well, really, it still is, primarily. The majority of our funding is still coming from there, and that's one of the things in my presidency that I am working to see changed. That we move to a place where the foundation is funded differently. It's funded through unrestricted money that comes probably primarily from individuals, and still from foundations. But unrestricted.

But anyway, the first large grant to the Ms. Foundation from an individual was made by Alida Rockefeller Messenger in about '86. And it was around — she was on the search committee that searched for the new executive when Marie was hired, and she was very excited about Marie coming, and pledged a million dollars into an endowment to start the endowment if Marie would take the job. So, of course, Marie did take the job, and that's how the endowment really, you know, got kicked off. And that — in 1986, a million-dollar gift was huge. By anybody, let alone by a woman. And I would say it was in the late '90s when we had our first major gifts officer. Until then, we were bringing women into the collaborative. Later, as time went on, into the Economic Development Collaborative, and certainly into the Girls Work. Because women were very interested in the mothers and daughters, *et cetera*. But we were not seeking general support from women nearly to the extent that we needed to. And we had many women in our orbit that we were not really working with fully as donors. So —

ANDERSON: But most of the other women's funds, that's exactly what they were doing, right?

GOULD: Yes.

ANDERSON: So it's interesting. Is it because you didn't need to because you had that other support, or –

GOULD: I think it is because we didn't need to.

ANDERSON: Yes, yes.

GOULD: Yes, I think that's right. Yes, I think that's exactly right. We were on the national stage, we were pretty, you know — Ms. is this — I think even more so than, let's say, a women's foundation, the New York Women's Foundation. Ms. just has a cache in the philanthropic community. It always has. It's always been much larger because of Gloria. And all the legacy around it, around the word Ms. You know, we are [thought to be] much bigger than we really are. And everybody — people notice you immediately. So, yes, I think it was because we didn't need to.

But then we began to build our capacity in the area of raising money from individuals in the late '90s, and certainly in this new century. We now raise a fair amount of money from individuals. We have worked with women donors in circles, and brought them into the collaborative funds, which I think is a natural way to work with women donors. Not all women donors, of course. You know, some women don't like to work collaboratively and would much rather just talk one-on-one about making a gift. Some women don't want to participate after they've made the gift. Some women really love that hands-on participation. But I would say that successfully we have brought women into our circles, and then we've been working with them to see the whole institution. Well, what is really the institutional mission of Ms., and how are we going forward as a whole group? And we have now a range of donors, and we've been more successful at getting larger gifts.

Maybe it would be good to talk for a minute about our recent endowment campaign. Where we set out to raise \$35 million. And in gifts from individuals of a million dollars and above. And we raised nine gifts of that size. We raised nine gifts from women, and one from a couple is among that nine that were either a million dollars or larger, and they weren't paid out over ten years. They were like outright gifts, and maybe paid out over two or three years.

ANDERSON: That must have really exceeded your expectations.

GOULD: Well, it did, and it didn't.

ANDERSON: Really?

GOULD: Well, the timing of it was quite — I think is what happened. We started it at the very end of the dot.com and the stock market boom. Again, there was money everywhere, *et cetera, et cetera*. Then, right after that, we had 9/11, and the stock market goes down, and everybody's more cautious. So we wanted to reach a goal of 35 million; we haven't gotten there. We have gotten to 25 million. Nine donors giving these larger

gifts. Some are a million dollars, but one is two million, and one is 2.5. And then the Ford Foundation made two five-million-dollar gifts. Well, one into this endowment campaign, and then we got a planned gift from an individual who also made a million-dollar cash gift, but she made a planned gift of \$10 million. Now, that was great. Yes. I mean, it just says volumes about what she feels about the institution, our capacity, our ability to take a gift like \$10 million, *et cetera*. So that, we are going to be building on. We're working on now a real planned giving campaign that really takes advantage of this brand of Ms., and the alumnae, if you will, of the women's movement who feel and know that this word Ms. changed our lives. And the second wave of feminism changed our lives.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: So I'm excited about that.

ANDERSON: Yes, that's wonderful.

GOULD: Of course, I would want to acknowledge the work of the Women Donors Network, of Tracy Gary. We're able to take advantage of groundwork laid 20 — you know, beginning 20 years ago by Tracy, who was an inheritor and decided to give all her money away. Or the vast majority of it, and has spent now 20 or 30 years even, proselytizing among other women donors, and making spaces for them, like the Women Donors Network, which at the beginning was just really a space where women could come together. And in some cases, kvetch about their wealth, kvetch about how difficult it is have this wealth, to generally have no control over it because of your advisors, and your brothers, and your father, and everybody else. And, you know, I mean, there are burdens that come with that as well.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: Now I think we're operating in an era where there are many, many more very savvy women donors. Women who have taken control of their wealth, women who know what they want to fund, women who know how they want to be involved, and there's a lot on the landscape for them to give money to. So that's, you know —

ANDERSON: There's the competition question. It takes you back to the turf and competition question.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: Our deep belief and our mantra is that women — First of all, the donor decides. I think in this day and age, most of the women I meet, they're interested in all these levels. If they live in New York City, they probably want to give to the New York Women's Foundation. But that's

not going to bring them to a national table. Being part of the Ms. Foundation will bring them to a national table. We're not going to take them to a global table. They're going to give to the Global Fund for Women to reach a global table. So our mantra is give at all these levels. And, in fact, we do share — the Global Fund, the Ms. Foundation, and local women's funds — we share a lot of donors. We share a lot of big donors. Donors who have given each of our institutions a million dollars or more, and may be on the board of one of our institutions now, but if you took a look five years from now, she might be on the board of a different one of our institutions. So it's a pretty sophisticated landscape out there, and I think you have to be fairly aggressive.

It's been difficult in the — if you're interested in this — difficult in the domestic scene, lately, I feel, until — Well, it's not as if the midterm [2006] elections are going to turn the situation around. But for the last several years, we've also been competing for donors with party politics because an increasing number of donors became so, so frustrated with the fact that — And just felt that they wanted to devote their resources to getting different people elected. Even if they didn't get a tax deduction for putting their resources to work in this way. It really didn't matter to them. And so I know we were competing for their money with party politics.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: And, you know, what could you say?

ANDERSON: Or even the White House Project and some of your own projects.

GOULD: Right. But what can you say? I can think that's important, too. And what I really believe about women donors is that we haven't — At the same time that we're in this very sophisticated universe, we haven't begun to scratch the surface. One of the advantages we have at the Ms. Foundation is we can fundraise anywhere in this country. And I sat down to lunch with a woman who is a fairly sophisticated donor the other day, but I wasn't even coming to make an ask because we were just beginning the conversation. By the end of the lunch, she had committed \$100,000. At the Family Foundation's conference, we sit down — just happened to sit at the same lunch table. My VP of development at the time happens to sit at the same lunch table with a woman from Boston. By the end of the lunch, this woman is saying, "Yes, I would join your President's Circle," which is \$50,000 a year for a three-year commitment. You know, so if we had —

ANDERSON: When you're not even looking for it, there it is.

GOULD: We're not even — right. And so if we had the capacity and the strategy — Because I think there are women all over this country who are looking for something to be involved in that has meaning to them.

ANDERSON: Right. And that gets to my next question. Do you think philanthropy has a different definition for men and women? Do you shape –

GOULD: Yes, I do. I do.

ANDERSON: Because it seems like that's such a big part of raising money from women is the connection, the process, the relationship. Funding circles are so popular because of that. But I'm interested just in how you would define — What is philanthropy in 2006, particularly for women?

GOULD: Well, that's a very big question.

ANDERSON: I know.

GOULD: Because I think philanthropy is changing a lot. You know, you have the relevance of the Council on Foundations even, you know, diminishing, frankly. The relevance of affinity groups that are either constituency-based or issue-based is increasing. I don't know if you read the philanthropy section of the *New York Times* this week. They regularly publish a philanthropy section, and it's all about the billionaires like Pierre Omidyar and Jeff Skoll, not women, who — that's not who they profile — who are combining philanthropic ventures with for-profit ventures that have social goals. And in this sort of — I think there's increasingly a panoply of ways that if you have wealth and resources, you can put those to work to create more common good in the world. There is one of our donors, actually, in the Midwest who recently — who's quite a wealthy woman. She made an investment of two-and-a-half million in our endowment, and she's recently reorganized her philanthropy, and doesn't have a board any longer. She's reorganized it so that she can just take her resources and she can give them c3 if she wants, c4 if she wants. She can invest them. You know, so when I read this piece in the *Times*, it reminded me of her. You know, that's essentially what she has done. She's organized herself in the most flexible way possible, and she's very involved in her philanthropy. She's not a control — You know, you'll meet women and men who are much more into control of what really — You know, they want to follow the resources. And sometimes they don't want to let go of the resources. They want to learn from the foundation, but then they want to make their own commitments. So I think that's changed on the landscape.

ANDERSON: Yes, yes. You mentioned it off tape, the article that came out a couple years ago and the conference that Incite put on about “The Revolution Will Not Be Funded.” I'm wondering what kind of conversations that sparked at Ms., and if you see yourselves as one of the pieces that's being critiqued there, or if you see the work that you do as outside of –

GOULD: Oh, I think we're definitely part of what's being critiqued there. I don't think we're what's being critiqued there in the main. But it did spark some conversation, and again, at the gathering we've had with the 60

women over this period of time, it's sparked a lot of conversation about the professionalization for all of us. I mean, you know, I make a hefty salary running the Ms. Foundation for Women. You know, how do you think about that? How do you feel about that? And it's a business, this thing, the Ms. Foundation for Women.

ANDERSON: Right. And nonprofits, as well.

GOULD: And nonprofits in general. So I think you have to keep yourself on the edge. I think you have to keep asking yourself really hard questions about how you are making a difference, and stop doing the things that are not making a difference, and stop doing the things that are uncomfortable. I agree that the revolution won't be funded, but I don't think there's going to be a revolution. So I think that we should still be capturing other philanthropic — I think at the point that — If all of us were to start to say, Well, you know, we're going to do this in our spare time, or, you know — And I love the way Beth Richie describes Incite and how, you know, the mothership and the different committees. And, you know, I think that's great.

I don't think that's the model — I don't think alone that stands. Because I don't think that the rest of philanthropy or nonprofit practice is going to turn that way. And so we'll be — If we were — Let's say, women's nonprofits were to move so far in that direction. I think we'd be losing a lot that we could have access to. I do think we should be changing decision-making structures. We should be asking ourselves very hard questions, we should be looking for new ideas. And we should be, you know, turning the tables, so to speak. We should be changing.

ANDERSON: And it seems like for nonprofits and grantees, that they do need to continue to rely on donors or increase their reliance on donors instead of corporate or government philanthropy. So do you think that there's a role for Ms. or the Women's Funding Network to play in sort of building that capacity so that more social change work is possible instead of more service delivery?

15.55

GOULD: I don't know if there's a role for us to play. Though, it — Certainly among our grantees there's a role for us to play in building that capacity. I'm not sure beyond that if that's really something that we should take on. And you know, there's great work. I don't know if you know a woman named Frances Kunreuther. She's at Demos right now, which is a think tank in New York. And she's the head of something called the Building Movement Project, which is particularly looking at social service organizations that see themselves as social service organizations, and how do social service organizations move farther to the left and become change organizations. I think that's great work, you know — that needs to happen more. It's great that Frances is doing that. I think the reality is that it will be very hard for smaller-scale nonprofits

accepting grassroots fundraising. But major donor fundraising, I think that's a tall order.

ANDERSON: Right. And you would probably characterize your grantees as social change projects versus social service or delivery projects, anyway.

GOULD: Yes. Yes, yes, yes.

ANDERSON: So let's talk a little bit about the women's movement in general. You know, you went from economic development that wasn't necessarily gender specific into a women's action alliance. And what was the inspiration for your wanting to work with women? I mean, is some of this about the movement in college? Is some of this about family memories, and shaping, and experiences?

17.40

GOULD: Yes, yes. I grew up in a family with six children. I have three older brothers, and I have two younger sisters. And I grew up in the Midwest. I was born in 1951, and I grew up in a small town of 12,000 people on Lake Michigan in southwestern Michigan. And I grew up in a family business. My mother's great-grandfather had founded a business in Chicago in 1870 called The Challenge Machinery Company, which manufactures heavy-duty, large industrial paper-cutter and paper-drilling machines.

ANDERSON: And still does?

GOULD: And still does. And it's passed down since 1870, father to son, father to son in my mother's family. So when I was born, what I was born into — In my mother's generation, in her — When she was a young woman, it was World War II. It was the time of World War II. She had a brother, an older brother, and he was killed in the war. So in her generation, it could no longer be passed down father to son because there was no heir living any longer. My mother married my dad, and my dad was invited to join the business. And he did, and he worked his way up to be president until — I mean, there's a whole other history there. But anyway, when I was growing up my grandfather was still president of the business. My father was coming up in the ranks. My grandmother — but my mother's mother, very matriarchal, extremely matriarchal. And so it was really clear to me from a young age that — the gender stuff. The men were controlling this company, but it was in my mom's family.

ANDERSON: You saw that as a kid?

GOULD: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. And I saw all the ways it impacted — You know, we're really in a family-business universe. I grew up completely in a family-business universe, where they were very intertwined. And my brothers could work in the company in the summer. I could not. When I wanted a summer job, finally, that would make some more money, I worked in a different factory in Grant Haven. I was not allowed to work

in my own company. And I got that. My brother Jim, my oldest brother, who had the same name as the Jim who was killed in World War II — This, I think, was a great burden for him. From the time he was born, it was destined that he would become the president of The Challenge Machinery Company. I saw that. I saw what a burden that was for him, and then I saw my second brother Robb, exactly a year younger, who grew up knowing that the presidency was Jim's. So I saw Robb try to develop other interests. He became a veterinarian, and he worked as a veterinarian for not a really long time, because he really didn't want to be a veterinarian. He wanted to be a salesman like his dad. So he ended up being a salesman in other companies, and landed later at Challenge. And then my youngest brother, John, who became a Presbyterian minister. Very shy boy. Really lovely boy. It appeared to me that people thought he had more potential to contribute to the company than I did, let alone my next sister or the sister after me. It was so clear that it was a gender thing. The only reason I could not be considered for what was the prize in my family — it was clear to me that it was because I was a girl. Now, I was deeply loved and encouraged to be educated and all those things. But this thing that was the most important thing to the family, The Challenge Machinery Company, I could not play a role in. And I could see my mother had not been able to play a role either. So, that's where I — I didn't call it feminism at that point, but I developed a keen eye for seeing something that didn't look right at all. It looked —

ANDERSON: Did you voice it to them at the time or —

GOULD: I did not. I don't think I did voice it until I married when I was 20 for the first time, and I married for the specific reason, really, I understand now, of getting out. That was the only way I really could figure to get out of my nuclear family at that point. And my family was very happy about my marriage, *et cetera*, but I only stayed married for three years. During that time, we left west Michigan and we moved to New York, to Syracuse, New York, so that my husband could go to law school. I went to work as a secretary. And first of all, I went out to find a job. Well, the first job interview that I got sent on, because I went to a placement company or something, they sent me to a hardware store to be the clerk in a hardware store. And you know, that was a moment when I said, "You know what? This is not what I see for my life." So I said, "No, not that job." I ended up being the secretary in the student union at Syracuse University in 1973. And I ran into a whole slew of people I had no idea existed. Hippies, you know — Everybody's sleeping together, dope. You know, the whole thing was like, Whoa. So that opened my eyes in different ways.

And by '75, I went to Cambridge. I had ended the marriage. I had decided to go back to graduate school. I got accepted to the Harvard Design School in city and regional planning, and I moved to Cambridge in 1975. Well, alone, right, with a boyfriend back in Syracuse. But, you know, it was like, OK. And then I began to meet women. And in

22.05

Syracuse, as well, of course. I would have called myself a feminist then. But when I got to Cambridge, then I really began to call myself a feminist. And I participated in the women's collective in Cambridge, and you know, different — Did a little, you know, questioning and searching about my sexuality. Decided that I was, you know, that I was heterosexual in the main, although really I think I'm bisexual. And so I learned so much more about myself, and that's where I really began to define myself as a feminist. At the same — And then I knew —

And, you know, sort of [the] other strand that was happening was my mother's struggles. My mother was an alcoholic when I was young, but she was able to sober up, and she was sober for 16 years before she died. Then she struggled with manic depression, and I was very connected to my mother, so this was the other thing that was happening at that same time. When I started graduate school, my mother was institutionalized. That's what happened that fall. I went to graduate school, my mother went into a psychiatric institution. And so I was very involved. And she lived for about six or seven years after that. She went on lithium very successfully, and had a good run on lithium until, for some reason, she stopped taking her meds. She went into a manic phase and then depression, and 11 months later she killed herself. So I was very involved with my mother, and seeing that. So that was another piece that was really combining with this feminist perspective.

And just this deep, you know, understanding about this woman's experience, and what a woman's experience was really like and how it was different from men's. I saw my father, who I adored, and I mean, I adored both my parents, and had close relationships with both of them. My father remarried within 18 months. My mother, never, although, you know, she would have loved to. So it was also that personal experience that was helping me to see. So then I trained in community economic development.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: And went back to Syracuse for a year and worked in the state — in the city office. Then I came back to Massachusetts and I worked for CEDAC [Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation]. I worked, first of all, in the state employment and training apparatus, and then I went to CEDAC. And increasingly I was saying to myself, I'm not satisfied with this. And I was missing working with women. And so I decided I was going to go back to school and become a therapist or really heighten my skills around working with organizations. And —

ANDERSON: And the therapist part was in response to your mom's struggles, do you think?

GOULD: I think it was partly in response to my real deep interest in that. I had become very interested in my mother, in the psychology of everything.

But it was also in response — There was a program at Harvard at the time called the Counseling and Consulting Psychology Program. And if you went through that program, you could actually do organizational development work. So I was also really interested in organizational development work.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: But then the Alliance job came up that I heard about through networks, as I said. And I got that job. So I moved to New York. I applied to Harvard to go back to that program. I moved to New York thinking, I'll do this job for six months, that's all the funding they have anyway. And all of a sudden, when it was focused on women, and I was meeting all these women activists, and women's organizations, and I actually met my husband within a month. And he said, "Go back to school? You've got the job that's a dream of a lifetime. What are you —" And we've always had this sort of different value on formal education.

ANDERSON: Oh, yes?

GOULD: Yes. I mean, I love formal education. Just being here at Smith is like a thrill. And going to Harvard was — And I went to a public institution in Michigan that I graduated from, Grand Valley State University. So, anyway, I like formal education. But I was persuaded that I did have the job of a lifetime.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: And that I would learn things in this kind of work that I would never learn any other way. And also, it just — The desire to go train myself to do something else completely evaporated when I was working with women's organizations. And so, recently, I think one of my sisters said to me, "But Sara, you've never been affiliated — you know, since you grew up — you haven't been affiliated with a religious institution." And I said, "You know, actually, feminism is my religion." And I mean that.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: Because it's extremely values based. It's how I find meaning in the world. It's very anchoring and grounding. It's community. It's all about community, and community building, and broadening communities. And to me it is a belief system that's ethical and principled, and is about people and humanity, and how people live their lives.

ANDERSON: Um-hmm. So many people of your generation say that the women's movement really saved their lives.

GOULD: Yes.

ANDERSON: Do you feel similarly?

GOULD: Oh, I do. I absolutely do. I mean, you know, to the point where, when I was 20, I married, and were it not for the women's movement, I would not have found my way out of that marriage. Were there not other options that I could already see. Myself going to graduate school, living and working on my own. The fact that I could already see those options, I think made an enormous difference.

ANDERSON: What does your family make of you over the last 30 years, that you became so successful and independent?

29.00

GOULD: Yes, I think they're very proud. I think for a lot of it they haven't been able to understand. You know, I think all of us in nonprofits and women's work have this constant, well, you know, your parents don't really understand what you do. They think it's probably great, but — No, I think they've been very, very happy and proud about it.

ANDERSON: Yes. Do they wish that they'd let you be president of Challenge Machinery? I bet.

GOULD: Well, so this is another great story. I got involved — I was asked to come on the board of The Challenge Machinery Company in 1987. And there's, again, a whole history here. The leadership of The Challenge Machinery Company changed from an outside manager who had come in when my father was fired by my grandmother —

ANDERSON: Because of the divorce?

GOULD: Yes. And really because of his remarriage. But she fired him after 30 years, and there was an outside manager who came in. My oldest brother was still there working his way up. And in '87 we finally went to my grandmother — and she was in her early 90s at the time — and [we were] able to say, You know, Grandma, these people don't have our best interests at heart, and you're still the majority stockholder, and what we want you to do is tell them to get the hell out of here. And she did, and they did. So we reformed the board, and I went on the board at that time.

ANDERSON: Are your sisters on the board, too?

GOULD: No. There's so much — because we grew up in this family business system, and there are six of us, some of us have — actually, almost, almost to a kid, except for me — ended up rejecting, and just not being able to take part because it was too painful. So I'm one of the only siblings who still has her stock — you know, actually the stock in the company, *et cetera*. Most of the others have sold. I mean, our father was fired. I mean, just our whole — so many things happened in the system that were very, very difficult.

But I was invited on the board, and I have been on the board ever since. The company hit really hard times with the recession in the early '90s. And also, there's another story because my oldest brother Jim, who frankly had leadership issues in good times, was clearly not the leader to take the company through this [very difficult] period. My aunt was still alive at this point, my Aunt Sally, my mother's only sister. And she and I and Jim were doing family business work with a consultant. But it became clearer and clearer to me that Jim needed to — that the company, in order to survive, needed to have different leadership. You know, it was a real soul-searching time around, What is the definition of family in this company? It's not just my family. There are, you know, 150 families in this community who are impacted, and who have worked in this company since 1900, generation by generation. And we can't make this decision simply because Jim is our family member.

So I led the very, very difficult process of moving him out of the company. And therefore, they made me the chair. And it's a good thing that we did do that, because we thought that we would be able to turn the company around again. I mean, the company's performance — You know, I didn't just wake up one day and say, "Oh, Jim has to go." It's like sign after sign that he was not going to be able to lead the company.

So we thought we could turn it around within a couple of years. It took us 13 years because of the external environment, the decline of manufacturing, our particular industry of paper, cutting paper. And think of how technology has impacted that. Agglomeration in the industries, *et cetera, et cetera*. But from '93 to '99 I was the chair of the board, and really was instrumental in — And then my father would turn to me, Kelly, and say, "I'm so glad you're in the company." And I would say, "Yes, Dad, and isn't it ironic that I might never have been able to be in this company because I'm a girl?" And he would say, "You're right. You're right. We made a mistake. That was a mistake." And that doesn't even take account of my younger sister, Criss, who is a marketing and communications genius, working for some other stupid company in Silicon Valley.

ANDERSON: Right. Right, right.

GOULD: Making them rich. And hitting the glass ceiling. So yes, there has been a turnaround in the family. To say, you know, there's a lot of — And then my next — My younger sister, the one between Criss and me, is a lesbian and a musician and a Buddhist, now. So there is just tremendous — We all went to her wedding in Toronto this summer.

ANDERSON: Nice.

GOULD: It was fantastic and, you know, it was another moment where — I mean, my three older brothers were kind of — They were there, but it was just clear that it was the women in the family, and it's what I saw when I was young. That it was the women in the family in a funny way by virtue of

the fact that in some ways they hadn't had these other concerns. You know, they didn't have to be focused on it, but it was so clear what their abilities were, and that they were real decision makers.

ANDERSON: Um-hmm, um-hmm. Well, it sounds like, despite the pain of the Challenge Machinery, that it's something very dear to your heart, and you put a lot of –

GOULD: Oh, I love it. A lot of blood, sweat, and tears.

ANDERSON: Into turning it around, and caring for your brother.

GOULD: Yes, yes. I have a son who's 14, my only child, Jacob, who's named a J name to carry on the James tradition, but not James.

ANDERSON: Is that his destiny?

GOULD: No. He doesn't even get it. He's been there a few times because I wanted to take him there. And he owns some stock because, you know — The stock, by the way, that I still own, is worthless right now. It became worthless, and now we're building it up again.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: But it put me through college. It put all of us through college. But anyway, there was a small family foundation that my grandparents founded for my Uncle Jim who was killed in the war called the James Lee Foundation. And its only asset was Challenge stock. So, again, as the company — We actually liquidated the foundation in the last couple of years, and so the original stock that my grandparents had put in there, 150 shares, was there. And you know what it cost? It cost two dollars a share. So I bought that stock for my son.

ANDERSON: So that might be the extent of his connection with it as an adult?

GOULD: Yes. You know, I talked to him a lot about it. And we don't go to Michigan together that often. Although I love the town I grew up in, Grant Haven, and I love going there, and I feel very, in a visceral way, connected to the place. And so I go there at least once a year. But Jacob — My father lived until two years ago, so Jacob was able to get to know his grandfather very well.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: And, you know, I mean, my father really never overcame completely what happened to him when he was fired at age 55, the age I am now. Although he was a very resilient person, and he went on to live a very full life from 55 until 82, when he died. And so Jacob knew him — But my father, he was The Challenge Machinery Company from his toes up

to his head. I mean, he just loved that company, and he talked about it constantly. So Jacob, you know, really kind of got a feel.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: And Jacob knows why — Jacob never met his Uncle Jim until my dad died two years ago because Jim and I had never really reconciled. But we were both there, and we had actually reconciled a few days earlier — begun a reconciliation a few days earlier — because we were with my father before he died. And so, you know, it's emotional. But it was at my father's funeral where I introduced my son to my brother. It was pretty amazing. And you can see all of that with the lens of family dynamics, and all of that, and you can, of course, read it as a feminist.

GOULD: You absolutely can.

ANDERSON: And say that's one of the costs of devaluing girls.

GOULD: That's exactly right. And putting this burden on Jim who clearly — And, you know, so look at his life.

ANDERSON: Exactly.

GOULD: How his life was shaped. What control did he have over his own life?

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: Because of this gender expectation that was on him.

ANDERSON: Absolutely. So you probably can't stay at Ms. forever.

38.15

GOULD: I certainly hope not.

ANDERSON: So what is your dream for beyond Ms.? What else do you want to do?

GOULD: What else do I want to do?

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: I want to not be working full-time. I want to, in many ways, go back to what I did when I was at CEDAC. I have great skills at working with other organizations, helping them to get projects done, helping them to understand a particular problem or insight, you know, needing an insight. So I don't see myself working for another institution again. I've done that — By the time I leave Ms., I will have done that for a long, long time. So that's what I see. I see myself not working full-time, and taking on projects where I can continue to work with others, but definitely not going into another organization. The only thing I could see that I would want to do in that vein would be to run a small family

foundation. I would love to run an endowed foundation where you didn't have to raise any money.

ANDERSON: Is that the toughest part of your job?

GOULD: Yes. Yes. And I would say right now, the toughest part of the job is really taking the institution forward on its next steps, and being the president of an organization that is widely regarded as having achieved a tremendous amount, and was brilliantly led for 20 years by Marie, and knowing how much the landscape has changed. And so both the challenge — you know, the hardest part but also the part that speaks to me the most — is taking the foundation, you know, down the path toward where it's going. And I have a vision for that, and I feel really excited about that, and, you know, the steps and ingredients, and things that are necessary to make that happen, are coming together and falling into place.

ANDERSON: Right, right, right. And then maybe you can think about the next chapter for you once you do that.

GOULD: Absolutely. Absolutely. Because, you know, I already have over 20-years tenure in this organization. So I see myself there. I don't think I can bring this about in less than four or five years. But I don't see myself there beyond that. And who knows what will happen.

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: You know, perhaps we'll, like, really go down this road very fast or, you know, I don't rule out something else happening in the interim either. But what seems great to me right now is that I'm holding a vision for where the foundation is going, that we're moving in that direction, that I'm still feeling a lot of support to go in that direction. And then we'll see what happens.

41.05

ANDERSON: So how have you been able to do family-, work-, community-balance? You must have one of the busiest, most taxing jobs for women out there.

GOULD: I do.

ANDERSON: So how are you able to –

GOULD: And it's a national job.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: Right, yes.

ANDERSON: So how have you been able to do that?

GOULD: You know, through making tradeoffs. Luckily for me, when my son was young — And I was 41 when I had Jacob. I was not even yet the vice president for program. He was born in '92. So when he was born, I was leading the economic development work, and it was far enough along in the work that I had some staff I actually was working with. So in the beginning — And because I was working in a feminist institution. Although at that moment, I don't think we had a maternity leave policy. But we do now. And you know, we developed that. But anyway, I was able to — I took the first four months off. I didn't go to work for four months. Then I went back 80-percent time for the first year, and was able to craft a pretty good work-balance situation. It's been in these later years where I've stepped up the ladder. It's the reason that I said to The Challenge Machinery Company, "I'll remain on the board but I can't be the chair any longer because I'm moving into this role at the Ms. Foundation."

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: I can't come to the meetings. I'm going to have to be at the Challenge meetings by phone because I can't add four more trips a year into my calendar. I've got all this other travel now. Now it's much harder and Jacob is — He's just started high school, he's in ninth grade. So you know, honestly, I try to do it, in a sense, a day at a time, and by looking ahead. I look at my calendar. I've got a wonderful compatriot, assistant, Caroline — we really work on schedules together.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: I try to make use of other people in the foundation, and to think where I really need to be, and where other people can be put forward and gain some visibility. I do travel, you know, 35, 40 percent of the time.

ANDERSON: Wow.

GOULD: And that's a lot, and they tend, you know, typically not to be overnight trips. They tend to be trips that keep me away four or five nights. I have a husband who is largely based in New York City, almost completely. Who, even when I'm home, is the cook.

ANDERSON: Yes, so you got lucky.

GOULD: I got really lucky in that.

ANDERSON: You chose a co-parent, somebody who could really participate with you.

GOULD: And I think — Had I had a second child I wouldn't be doing this. I couldn't. I —

ANDERSON: Do you feel like that was a tradeoff? Did you think about that?

GOULD: No, I tried to have a second child. But I had already been in early menopause. That's why I didn't have Jacob until I was 41. I got really lucky, and somehow, the goddess changed all the dynamics, and all of a sudden I was pregnant. I didn't get pregnant before, and I haven't gotten pregnant since. But my priority was to have a second child, although even then I wasn't thinking, You know, if I have the second child, I won't be able to be president. But I didn't ever have the second child, so I worked out this balance stuff. Clearly I feel the tradeoffs. But one thing that's really good about me, when I'm not working, I am not working. And I am not driven to work all the time. I love going home at six thirty or six o'clock and being with my family.

ANDERSON: Yes.

GOULD: Or, you know, taking a walk around the block or — Which is not to say I never work in the evenings. But I try to keep my work in the evenings to evenings that I'm not home.

ANDERSON: Right. And what a wonderful example for everybody else who works there. Because in nonprofit culture we are expected to do so much.

GOULD: That's right. Yes.

ANDERSON: So modeling that's important.

GOULD: Yes, yes. I don't think most people at Ms. would say I'm a workaholic. I really think that people would say, No, Sara has good boundaries.

ANDERSON: That's great.

GOULD: Whereas Marie, when she worked this job — And remember, Marie is a completely different person than I am. She would be out four nights out of five having dinner with a donor, or doing X, Y, and Z. Often traveling on weekends. If you look at her schedule now — I mean, I knew when I took this job, and I said it to the board. "I'm not going to do this job like Marie did it." And they said, That's fine. I said, "This job is not going to become my life."

ANDERSON: Right.

GOULD: It couldn't. You know, it's not even like I could make that choice because I'd immediately be unhappy.

ANDERSON: Right. And you're a parent. I mean, some of this is just the practicality.

GOULD: Right. Marie was the parent of five children. Marie is, you know, in a beautiful way a driven individual. And it's just who she is. She could no more control that than I could start to work, you know, in a more highly driven way. I like to have fun, I love friends, I like getting together, I

like reading, I like just hanging out. And so those things are very much still a part of my life.

ANDERSON: And give you the sustenance to be able to give so much to Ms.

GOULD: Right. So then we also wanted to talk about what's happening out there in –

46.00

ANDERSON: Yes, let's talk — We have about ten minutes left.

GOULD: Great.

ANDERSON: So let's turn towards visions and what's out there that is really new and exciting, in the movement in general. If you've got reflections on that because of all the grantees you see, but also in terms of women in funding and –

GOULD: Yes, yes.

ANDERSON: That'd be great.

GOULD: So in terms of women in funding, what I think is exciting is that women are giving larger gifts. And Helen and Swanee Hunt with the Women's Funding Network have started — We're trying to start up this project around women and men giving million-dollar and million-dollar-plus gifts to funds, and, you know, trying to create almost a movement around that. High-level giving. So I think that that's really exciting. I think that the midterm elections are really exciting.

ANDERSON: They give you hope, don't they?

GOULD: They do. They absolutely do. And the hope that they give me is that people got out and voted for candidates. Now, I don't think all those candidates are very good, you know, are really great, not all of them. I read the article in the *New Yorker* about Allen and Webb, and I read it — I was sick the day after the election, and I read it that day. And honestly, I thought to myself, I don't think I would have voted for either of these people. But anyway, I digress. So I think young women's organizing is really exciting, and I think cross-issue organizing — I think organizing that is not deeply issue based is exciting. You know, somewhere where you see movement happening is in immigrant rights. I think that's extremely exciting, and –

ANDERSON: Is it hard to get Ms. behind that? Your board or your staff?

GOULD: Not at all. We are right there.

ANDERSON: They see the interconnectedness of all of this –

GOULD: Yes, yes. And, you know, a really interesting phenomenon, actually, for us has been because we have funded organizations that don't strictly define themselves as women's organizations. Like in the economic realm we have funded a lot of organizations that are organizing low-income women, you know, who do garment work, who do small electronics work in sectors where there are large numbers of low-income women. We've done a lot of funding of work like that.

ANDERSON: So it's not as big a stretch for you.

GOULD: It's not. And what's really exciting is when those women begin to identify as feminists, and those women begin to see — You know, they may have felt a visceral gender analysis or understanding of themselves as a woman in these occupations, in these communities. But getting funding from Ms. that has an explicit gender lens, it really helps them to see it more clearly. And you have this incredible experience of people calling themselves feminists.

I have to tell you this anecdote. We have the Women of Vision Awards, the Gloria Steinem Women of Vision Awards, in the spring. And a few years ago, we instituted a Young Woman of Vision Award. So this year it was given to a woman over at the Center for Young Women's Development in San Francisco which works with low-income women of color on the street in San Francisco. Largely are runaways, and you know, it could be because of sexual orientation, or drug use, or just abuse in their homes, or whatever. But, you know, they've been kicked out of their home for one reason or another, or they've left for one reason or another. They're on the street, and this organization pays these young women to reach out to others like themselves, *et cetera*. We love this organization.

So we honored one of the women, the young woman, an 18-year-old young woman from this organization. At the last minute, she couldn't come to the Gloria awards because she was living in a foster home, and she witnessed a murder, and she was picked up by the authorities for her own protection, and she couldn't come to New York. So the executive director of the organization, you know, who's 23 years old, she came, and then she brought the development director, who's 21 years old. They're both women of color. They're absolutely impressive. So we're sitting at Abby Disney's house having our pre-event dinner the night before, as we always do, and Gloria's there, of course. And at this dinner, it's tradition — feminist tradition — to go around, and everyone to say something. So it comes around to the end, and there's a young — The two women from the Center for Young Women's Development — And first of all, it's the young development director, who's an African American woman. So she looks over at Gloria, and honest to God, this was just so natural. This just like popped out of her mouth. She looks over at Gloria and she says, "You know, I didn't know who you were, and so I Googled you, and I started to read about some of the things that you've done, and what you believe in, and the change that you've made

happen in the world. And I turned to Marlene and I said, 'Marlene, I'm a feminist.'" It was like an unbelievable moment.

And then, the woman who'd spoken before her was a woman from Australia, and she was talking about Margaret Mead. She had said at the end of her remarks, she had said, you know, that quote from Margaret Mead about never doubt that a small number of people can make something change. You know, indeed, that's all that ever has. So this young woman, then, after saying this to Gloria, that she Googled her, and she realized that she's a feminist, she turns to this woman and she said, "I love Margaret Mead." You know, here's this young African American woman from the streets in San Francisco. "I love Margaret Mead. I'm studying to be an anthropologist." And we just about fell off our chairs.

ANDERSON: But you — who are you?

GOULD: Right.

ANDERSON: That is so great.

GOULD: So that just like — That gives me hope. You know, and I think that's the future. Where we can make the connections outside of the boundaries that the so-called Women's Movement has operated inside of all these years. And I think that the Ms. Foundation is really great at doing that. We have done that. You know, we've been on the wave that's been breaking through and making those connections. So that gives me a lot of hope. I'm also on the board of an organization in Washington, D.C., called the Center for Community Change, which is a very old organization, but has a new leader, a young man named Deepak Bhargava, who I have watched, you know, moving that organization, getting rid of certain programs, becoming much more clear what the vision and the focus is around organizing, making connections in different communities. That's given me a lot of hope. You know — So I see a lot of young leadership that I think is really visionary, and does have a different way of looking at things.

52.52

ANDERSON: What are you the most proud of to date?

GOULD: You know, I think I'm just most proud of the foundation. And I'm proud of having worked for an organization that makes such a difference in everybody's life, not just women's lives. I mean, I think feminism has made everybody's life so much better. And so I'm most proud of making the decision at many different points to stay and to really commit, you know, nearly my entire career. Really, my entire career to this institution and to women's work, you know, and even to feminism. Because if you're in an organization called Ms., that's what people think you are.

ANDERSON: Absolutely.

GOULD: That's what you're labeled. You're labeled a feminist, and you're not really going to be able to escape that. So I'm very proud of that. I'm very proud of the economic development work. And you know, the thing that's been — And even more than proud, I just, I feel so privileged to have had, you know, this particular work ex — You know, to know Gloria. To know those women on the streets in San Francisco. To have, you know, an eye into so many communities, and to get paid for doing this kind of work. It has just really been this incredible privilege, which I think brings with it a huge dollop of responsibility. But I'm really proud to have worked all those years with Marie and to have been a part of growing an institution from \$500,000 to \$10 million, to have \$26 million in the bank. You know, to have gained the skills that I needed along the way, to learn how to make asks, to better assist our grantees, to figure out what direction, should the foundation do this or that. You know, so that — I am definitely proud of the foundation having brought together all of this.

ANDERSON: Absolutely. I think we're out of time.

GOULD: All right.

ANDERSON: Thank you, Sara.

GOULD: Thank you, Kelly.

END OF INTERVIEW

Transcribed by Lisa Sears, December 2006. Audited by Cara Sharpes and Edited by Sheila Flaherty Jones, January 2006.