

Lafayette College and the Denial of Female Sexual Agency

Taylor Corsi

WGS 340

Throughout the 1970s, a multitude of single sex colleges and universities across the United States transitioned to coeducation. After much debate among faculty, alumni, and students, Lafayette College, a small liberal arts institution in Easton, Pennsylvania, admitted its first coeducational class in September of 1970 (Lafayette Coed in 1970). This pioneering Lafayette class of 1974 was a monumental mark of progress towards gender equity in higher education that was mirrored in the coeducational transition of many schools across the country. However, the quality of such an education remained unevaluated for some time.

In the spring of 1989, nineteen years after coeducation, President David Ellis charged a Task Force on the Quality of Coeducation at Lafayette College, upon the recommendation of the All-College Planning Committee. The task force committee consisted of seven members; two faculty, two students, two alumni, and one administrator of the College. After thorough investigation and debate, the task force committee produced the Report of the Task Force on the Quality of Coeducation at Lafayette College in 1991 (Basow 1). During their study of coeducation at Lafayette, the task force committee distributed a Sexual Experiences Survey to students. Of all women respondents, 92.6% reported being in a situation where a peer made suggestive remarks about their appearance, body, or sexual activities, 72.5% reported a peer misinterpreting the level of sexual intimacy they desired, 44.9% reported an instance of verbal pressure by a peer to have sex when they did not want to, 10.1% reported being raped, and 29.0% reported being a victim of actual or attempted sexual assault ("Report of the Task Force" 26-8).

In spite of these grim statistics regarding the sexually volatile climate on Lafayette's campus, the final report put forth by the task force charged by President Ellis painted a picture of coeducation that displayed great optimism. However, three members of the task force- Professor

Susan A. Basow, Dr. Karen Forbes, and Professor Robert Chase- refused to have their names published on the finalized report due to the non-inclusion of their minority dissent to the optimistic portrait of coeducation at Lafayette. Professor Basow, a member of the Lafayette College Department of Psychology, specifically stated her disagreement with the report's overly positive views in her correspondence with the newly appointed President of the College, Robert Rotberg, in May of 1991. Basow firmly asserted that the task force report did not fulfill the purpose of "identifying circumstances within the Lafayette environment that encourage...and inhibit the success of coeducation". She continued to stress her dissatisfaction with the lack of thorough attention paid to the issue of sexual harassment at the institution, citing that half of all female respondents in the aforementioned Sexual Experiences Survey reported avoiding situations because they were concerned they would receive unwanted sexual attention from peers. Professor Basow used this statistic to highlight the College's disturbing sexualized environment and to emphasize that the issues of sexism, sexual harassment, and sexual assault had not properly tempered the optimism of the Report of the Task Force on the Quality of Coeducation at Lafayette College (Basow 1-2).

This disturbing sexualized environment, as illuminated by task force committee members such as Susan Basow, seemed characteristic of a college campus without policy and procedures addressing the issues of sexism, sexual harassment, and sexual assault. However, at the time of coeducation quality evaluation in 1991, Lafayette College had in place a Policy on Sexual Harassment for nearly ten years. Clearly, regardless of an established policy on sexual harassment, Lafayette College had been ineffective in protecting female members of the community from a volatile, sexualized environment. Although Lafayette College could claim a policy on sexual harassment existed from 1982 through the evaluation of coeducation in 1991, it

was a forced, disingenuous legal response of the institution to both national and internal discourse championing female sexual choice and denouncing sexual harassment. This disingenuous legal framework could do little to protect female sexual agency against the volatile, sexualized campus climate as it was undermined by the institution's active denial of the female sexual agency it claimed to protect. The active denial of female sexual agency by Lafayette College from 1982 to 1991, as evidenced by stagnated improvements to an ineffective College harassment policy and the lack of availability of quality women's health and sexual services, led to the dissonance observed in the 1991 debate over the quality of coeducation.

The first sexual harassment policy at Lafayette College was implemented as the cumulative institutional response to several campus incidents, in addition to internal and national-level discourse on sexual harassment and female sexual agency in places of higher education. In December of 1980, the Professional Women of Lafayette, a faculty and staff group, and the Association of Lafayette Women, a student group, joined forces in a letter to President David Ellis to demand that the Lafayette administration take firm action against sexual harassment on campus. These groups defined the term for the President, and even provided evidence for the widespread, severe nature of student-to-student sexual harassment at Lafayette, from wet t-shirt contests to sexual violence that is rarely officially reported. Both the Professional Women of Lafayette and the Association of Lafayette Women called for not only the implementation of a complaints procedure, but also the establishment and enforcement of a clear and strong system of penalties for sexual harassment that is made known to all members of the campus community (Chaudhuri, et al. 1-2).

One such incident that provided evidence for the claims made by the Professional Women of Lafayette and the Association of Lafayette Women occurred in late February 1981.

Delta Upsilon, one of the many resident fraternities at Lafayette, hosted an alcohol-supplied party entitled "Back to the Womb". This party featured the fraternity house party area decorated as a womb, with stairway walls lined with pink tissue paper illuminated by red light bulbs, mattresses shaped to resemble giant tampons, inflated condoms above the bar, a hanging sign that stated "Association of Lafayette Wombs" (a mocking jab at the Association of Lafayette Women), and even fraternity members with hangers around their neck dressed to resemble aborted fetuses. The Professional Women of Lafayette responded swiftly to the incident, writing to *The Lafayette*, the College's student newspaper. The Professional Women of Lafayette proclaimed the popularity of such an event as suggestive of a pervasive sexist climate that causes both powerlessness and fear in women on campus. They continued to state that many students, as a consequence of such a climate, are led to accept the terms of campus social life as dictated by the masculine tradition of Lafayette. Faculty, in addition to those members of the Professional Women of Lafayette, overwhelmingly approved a motion that deplored actions such as those of Delta Upsilon that show a blatant disregard for the dignity and welfare of any member of the community. Faculty demanded the appropriate bodies within the Lafayette administration take rapid and proper action against these violations of human decency ("Alumni Quarterly" 6). Delta Upsilon Fraternity was subsequently charged with demeaning the female members of the Lafayette community and was required by the Student Conduct Committee to pay \$1000 to be used to support lectures or symposiums to foster better communication and respect among students (Rogers 1).

While certainly memorable, the "Back to the Womb" fraternity party was not the only incidence of sexual harassment that elicited intense and negative responses from the Lafayette community. In March 1982, approximately one year after the party hosted by Delta Upsilon,

Tonimarie A. Vizzuso, a student contributor to *The Lafayette*, authored an article entitled "Student Government Concerned About Harassment Issue". Within this article, Vizzuso discussed Student Government's distress at the Lafayette administration's decision to re-admit a student charged with and convicted of sexual harassment. Student Government was quoted as finding the case decision "insensitive to both the women involved and the college community as a whole". Student Government and Vizzuso continued on to call for the creation of an ad hoc committee to research and analyze college policies pertaining to sexual harassment. They emphasized that the College needed to take a stand to protect those on campus affected by these issues (Vizzuso 1). At this time, there was no formal policy on sexual harassment at Lafayette, and the reporting structure consisted of merely a conversation with a specifically identified Dean of the College. This reporting structure yielded zero reports of sexual harassment (Cunningham 1).

Internal negative discourse on the state of sexual harassment at Lafayette was clearly and directly driven by the Professional Women of Lafayette, the Association of Lafayette Women, the faculty of the College, and innumerable students in the community. However, the early 1980s heard a louder and louder national discourse develop surrounding the issue of sexual harassment in both higher education and the workplace. The impact and scope of the sexual harassment problem specifically on college campuses were first recognized during the early 1980s, stimulating an incredible amount of attention to the issue itself and the policies, procedures, and resources of campuses across the country (Riggs et al. 2). In 1980, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* formulated discussions on sexual harassment as a form of illegal discrimination prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and suggested that students should condemn such discrimination as a form of academic malpractice ("30 Pct. Harassed" 5). Additionally, reporting

structures within the workplace and in places of higher education, in addition to ways in which to address the widespread issue of sexual harassment, had come under intense scrutiny by social scientists. In August of 1980, the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, a part of the Department of Education, issued a report that provided a working, generalized definition of academic sexual harassment, which ranged from generalized sexual remarks, advances, and coercion to assault (Cunningham 1). Furthermore, the new focus of employment discrimination law by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission at this time was in the area of sexual harassment. In 1980, the EEOC issued their first guidelines on sexual harassment. The Commission declared that sexual harassment was prohibited sex discrimination under Title VII and provided definitions of two types of sexual harassment: *quid pro quo*, in which employment decisions are conditioned upon the grant of sexual favors, and hostile work environment, in which unwelcome sexual conduct affects the workplace environment ("Enforcement Efforts in the 1980s").

The rise of national discourse promoting sexual harassment policy and procedures in the workplace and places of higher education, in addition to the internal outrage in the wake of events such as the "Back to the Womb" party and the re-admittance of a student convicted of sexual harassment, made it quite difficult for Lafayette to remain silent on the issue. In legal response, the institution formulated the Policy on Sexual Harassment in October of 1982. Under two pages long, the first College policy pertaining to this issue explained sexual harassment without outwardly including sexual assault as apart of its definition. The policy referred to sexual harassment as "reprehensible" in any situation, but chose to specifically highlight its "particularly damaging" effects when it "exploits the educational dependence and trust between students and faculty". There is no outward mention of the possibility of sexual harassment

between students. The policy then later states that if an individual believes himself or herself to be sexually harassed, they may “obtain redress informally or through established formal procedures”, but does not specify in the text of the policy itself what these established procedures are. Before any mention of consequences for violations or disciplinary procedures, the policy states the institution’s respect for confidentiality in both formal and informal complaints of sexual harassment, and proceeds to firm state that this does not “preclude legal or disciplinary action by the College against anyone who might fabricate an accusation maliciously”. At the end of the text, the policy finally outlines that if found guilty, an individual is subject to disciplinary action and that such action will be consistent with the existing College procedures. No specifics of disciplinary action were mentioned, and the “existing College procedures” were not outlined (“Lafayette College Policy on Sexual Harassment”).

While the Lafayette administration responded quickly to the demands and outrage apparent in national and internal discourse on the issue, the 1982 Policy on Sexual Harassment was underdeveloped. Its establishment may have been enough to placate internal and external rumblings, but the shortcomings of the less than two page document were painfully clear. One of the most obvious limitations was its focus on authority figure to student harassment and inattention to student-student harassment. The majority of internal outrage that sparked the College’s legal response was based on student-student cases of harassment, and to not attend to their presence seems to suggest the institution formulated a policy for the sake of policy, rather than to address the concerns of the community. Another clear limitation of the 1982 policy is the lack of outlined procedures for reporting, case management, and consequences for those found guilty. Although the document clearly defined sexual assault, the use and enforcement of the policy seems almost nonexistent without the inclusion of outlined procedures, disciplinary

action, and the like. Even more interesting than the lack of specificity is the fact that the policy states a much more strict and direct "legal or disciplinary" response of the institution to a "malicious" fabricated accusation before mention of disciplinary actions if found in violation of the policy. The physical placement of the statement of institutional response to fabricated accusations before the statement of institutional response to those found guilty of policy violation, in addition to the more direct and firm outlining of the response, suggests that Lafayette believed it more important to discourage unsure reports of sexual harassment than to address consequences for proven violations of the policy itself. This choice most certainly would frighten any female unsure if her experiences were categorized sexual harassment, effectively discouraging reporting for fear of legal or disciplinary action taken against her. While the 1982 Lafayette College Policy on Sexual Harassment covered the legal basics necessary, it very clearly did not portray the institution as particularly concerned with protecting the sexual agency of female members of the community.

Not only did the 1982 Lafayette College Policy on Sexual Harassment portray the institution as unconcerned with protecting the sexual agency of females on campus, but also proved ineffective throughout the following decade, culminating in the statistics grimly reported by the Task Force on the Quality of Coeducation in 1991. The ineffectiveness of the sexual harassment policy did not go unnoticed from 1982 until 1991- continued national attention and college community discussion strongly persisted throughout the decade. On a national scale, the discourse surrounding sexual harassment was growing stronger and stronger, and even federally funded organizations joined the conversation on finding solutions and protecting women and their sexual agency. In 1985, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention participated in the Surgeon General's Workshop on Violence and Public Health to provide national leadership and

continue discussion of the public health implications of violence against women. The CDC provided recommendations for action against sexual and other aspects of violence towards women ("Health Equity- Women's Health"). In 1986, the Supreme Court upheld early case decisions confirming that a woman could sue her employer for sexual harassment under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act with the Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson case. This case was based on the complaints of Mechelle Vinson, a bank employee whose boss had intimidated her into having sex with him up to fifty times ("A Brief History of Sexual Harassment in America"). In 1991, the first National Young Feminist Conference took place. Sponsored by the National Organization For Women, the conference continued conversation about the widespread problem of violence against women including rape, sexual assault, and harassment (Stoddard 8).

Paralleling the national conversation, students and faculty at Lafayette continued voicing their concern with sexual harassment consistently and stridently throughout the decade. Many demanded the College administration take further action following incidents of severe sexual harassment on campus, establishing it as a persistent issue despite the institution's attempt to address it in the 1982 Policy on Sexual Harassment. One such incident occurred one morning in November of 1984. From the flagpole located outside the fraternity house, members of Delta Upsilon displayed a nude female inflatable form with a noose around its neck. This atrocity remained for the entire campus community to see until a Dean of the College demanded it must be removed late in the afternoon. Professor Susan Basow, on behalf of The Professional Women of Lafayette, wrote to Dean Herman C. Kissiah regarding the incident, asking for the fraternity to be charged with sexual harassment and specifically with creating an environment that was "offensive and demeaning to women". Basow continued to discuss that violence against women was a serious and increasing societal problem, and specifically that such violence against women

was a large problem at Lafayette as recent reports of attempted rape and assault had indicated at the time. She asserted that these acts by Delta Upsilon fostered an environment in which violence against women is thinkable, doable, and even humorous. At the conclusion of her letter the Dean, she called for prompt and sever action against the fraternity (Basow 1). Even students continued discussion on the matter throughout the decade, and even in 1986 admitted that if sexual assault occurs, it is very rarely discussed or reported- the subject remained quiet at Lafayette (Shur 2). Only a year later in 1987, students are seen discussing date rape as a major social issue that is not well understood, talked about, or prevented against, particularly at Lafayette (Cahn-Hidalgo 1). By 1990, the institution's inability to protect the sexual agency of female community members, an epidemic that persisted in spite of the 1982 Policy on Sexual Harassment, became so problematic that The Professional Women of Lafayette directly addressed President David Ellis in the student newspaper. They encouraged the college president to make a strong statement to the Lafayette community regarding acquaintance rape. The Professional Women of Lafayette indicated their concern that the issue of acquaintance rape had not received enough public institutional attention at the College, and suggested that this lack of attention reflects the institution's belief that this issue was not serious enough to be addressed in public and conceals the fact that the issue affected the well-being of all members of the Lafayette community (Professional Women of Lafayette 8).

Despite sustained discussion of sexual harassment on a national and college level and several incidents throughout the decade on Lafayette's campus, the institution revisited the Policy on Sexual Harassment only once in the nine years before the Report on the Quality of Coeducation. The policy itself did not even appear in the 1983 Lafayette Faculty Handbook, but was listed by name without further description in Appendix I, Policy Statements in the Student

Handbook. The policy was first featured as a full document in the 1984 Faculty Handbook, approximately two years after its creation. The policy was published in its original form in the Faculty Handbook from 1984 through 1986. It was not until 1987 that the policy was first revised. The 1987 version contained the only edits to the policy from its establishment in 1982 to the evaluation of coeducation in 1991, featuring additions that were in the form of "guidelines" to be used in administering the College's policy. These guidelines included directions for written complaints, the names of appropriate reporting authorities, how charges were handled, how to appeal to the President of the College if an individual felt as if their complaint was not satisfactorily resolved (Faculty Handbook). While the 1987 revisions were more specific as to reporting process and provided an option to appeal decisions made in a reported case of sexual harassment, these additions were entitled as merely "guidelines". The relegation of important procedural detail and appeal information to the "guidelines" category suggests that this portion of the policy is flexible, rather than mandatory and steadfast. Furthermore, this reflects an institutional disregard for an organized, fair, and well-characterized process in handling reports of sexual harassment at Lafayette, suggesting once again that the Policy on Sexual Harassment and its minimal and stagnated revision reflects a disingenuous legal response to national and internal discourse, rather than protection of female sexual agency.

Stagnated improvements to a disingenuous, ineffective sexual harassment policy clearly provide evidence for the active denial of female sexual agency by Lafayette College. This active denial manifested itself as dissonance observed in the 1991 debate over the quality of coeducation.

Similarly, a lack of available, quality women's health and sexual services at Lafayette from 1982 to 1991 further reflects intentional institutional disregard for female sexual agency,

even as prominent discourse encouraged otherwise. Prior to the establishment of the sexual harassment policy, female students at Lafayette expressed their disappointment with the women's health and sexual services at Bailey Health Center, the College's resident medical facility. One anonymous female contributor to *The Lafayette* in December of 1980 wrote:

Women's health services, in the true sense of the term, are, quite frankly, nonexistent. For fear of acknowledging that a "problem" exists, the administration has been extremely reluctant to institute adequate gynecological health facilities and information for women, and to make the campus aware of their existence. Contraception is a dirty word only to be discussed in hushed tones. But, in my opinion, they would probably regard abortion, one result of such negligence, as much dirtier. ("The Weight of a Woman's Word" 5)

Clearly, the state of women's health and sexual services at Lafayette was not well supported by this particular female student. However, her commentary suggests a far more widespread disdain for the actions of the administration regarding these issues. She even goes so far as to say the institution had been incredibly slow to provide female-specific health services, especially as it pertained to overt sexuality, such as the availability of contraception and abortion. In this way, it becomes apparent that Lafayette in 1980 was actively working against the sexual agency of female members of the community.

Results from a Student Affairs questionnaire in 1978 revealed a similar trend; 67% of female respondents felt the College Health Center was lacking in gynecological services, 94% were in favor of a Planned Parenthood program on campus, and 100% felt there should be special gynecological services on campus ("Results of Student Affairs Questionnaire"). Much

like discourse within the college community that highlighted the issue of sexual harassment on campus and demanded the establishment of proper policy to address it, students expressed their discontent and desire for change in women's health and sexual services. As recorded in the Health and Security Report of 1982, sponsored by the Health and Security Subcommittee of Student Government, 27% of female respondents of a Women's Health Questionnaire had sought women's health care in general, but only 5% had ever sought gynecological care from Bailey Health Center. Similarly, 31% of female respondents reported ever seeking birth control information and supplies. Only 4% had done so at the Health Center, while 20% of all women reported knowledge that the current doctor could prescribe it. In addition, 75% of women said they wanted to see other forms of birth control prescribed at Lafayette, including Intrauterine Devices, diaphragms, and condoms. At this time, Bailey Health Center could prescribe the contraceptive pill, but did not supply it. Demand for alternative forms of birth control was so high that 73% of women reported being willing to pay if made available. Out of all female respondents, 73% saw a need for pregnancy testing services at Lafayette. Out of all those who had used Easton Planned Parenthood, 76% were satisfied with their services as compared to the 21% who found Bailey Health Center women's health services adequate. An additional 69% of women found a need for a Planned Parenthood Counselor with hours at the Health Center, and 78% saw a need for a gynecologist's care at the College. In response to an open-ended question regarding how to fulfill the health needs of women at Lafayette, high frequency requests included hiring a gynecologist and increased advertisement of birth control, gynecological care, and family planning. Additionally, "student would not use present Health Center staff for women's health services" was a highly frequent write-in response to the questionnaire ("Health and Security Report"). While the institution answered the call for policy against sexual

harassment in 1982, the above dissatisfaction with women's health and sexual services was answered instead by organizations comprised of fellow students. The Student Services Committee of the Lafayette Student Government responded with advertised information on contraception and family planning in the student newspaper, providing students with knowledge of women's health services and education offered by Planned Parenthood of Northampton County, ranging from contraceptive options to pelvic exams. When advertising family planning, contraception, education, and women's health services, the Student Services Committee did not mention the Bailey Health Center once (Student Services Committee). This curious fact indicates that Student Government, those individuals that serve as liaisons between the institution and its student population, did not believe the administration would answer the call for change in female health and sexual services like they had for sexual harassment on campus.

This bizarre misalignment of institutional action was consistent throughout the decade. Amid a growing 1980s AIDS epidemic that demanded the promotion of contraception, the Center of Disease Control and Prevention focused research on premarital sexual activity, family planning, and contraceptive use, the National Organization For Women called for better contraceptive use and research, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* made public statistics on the gynecological and contraceptive services offered by academic institutions across the country, and Lafayette students demanded that sexual health become a public issue ("Shock for Ratings" 1). Almost as if the institution could not hear these national and college-level conversations on women's and sexual health services, Lafayette and the Bailey Health Center remained blissfully removed from the practice of female sexuality. Pamphlets distributed by the Health Center throughout the 1980s outlined services pertaining to birth control and gynecological services. Even as late as 1988, the Health Center detached themselves from a responsibility to provide

female members of the community health and sexual services, suggesting they receive “counseling” for their interest in birth control and other contraceptives and referring them to the local Planned Parenthood or “specialists in the community” for gynecological services. Although pamphlets distributed by the Health Center in 1989 eventually mentioned their ability to counsel regarding, prescribe, and distribute birth control and other means of contraception, reproductive and other women’s health services were still referred to Planned Parenthood and various private clinics such as Women’s Medical Offices. The most the Health Center could boast by way of education on these topics was a student-found and administered group known as the Student Educators on Reproductive and Contraceptive Health (SERCH). Interestingly, Bailey Health Center relegated information regarding this group to the “Counseling Services” section of their brochures. This organizational choice by Bailey Health Center indicated not only that the institution removed themselves from the responsibility of providing sexual health services that would allow women on campus to fully and sensibly experience their sexual agency, but also that they regarded the desire of female students to take control of that agency as a mental pathology requiring not physical, but counseling services. By 1990 to 1991, offerings of pelvic exams, pap smears, birth control consultation, treatment of sexually transmitted diseases, and pregnancy tests appeared in Bailey Health Center informational brochures. SERCH, the peer education group, appeared once again in the Counseling Services” portion of brochures, but under the new name of Students Educating on Responsible College Health. The more progressive women’s health and sexual service offerings by Bailey Health Center in 1990 to 1991 were countered by the institution’s more subtle conservative demonstrations, such the SERCH name change that removed any mention of reproductive and contraceptive health. Other conservative demonstrations of the institution that countered any progressive change to women’s

and sexual health service offerings include an article on sexual health by Dr. Alan Johnson, the Health Center's physician starting in 1989, in *The Lafayette*. In the article, "Sex, the Bailey Health Center, and you", Dr. Johnson spent a majority of his time encouraging students to think about saying yes to sex and advising that "sex is a special gift to give to someone you care deeply about". Dr. Johnson emphasized the "medical and emotional problems" that can develop when sex is casual and with multiple partners, even mentioning how unwanted pregnancy is emotionally exhausting for all involved so "perhaps the 'old fashion' way of waiting until the truly right person comes along is still the best" (Johnson). Dr. Alan Johnson, a medical representative given authority by Lafayette College, provided a voice, at long last, to the institution's active denial and discouragement of sexual agency and the right to proper women's health and sexual services that would allow an individual to fully claim it. Although Dr. Johnson provided the public voice for Lafayette's disregard for female sexual agency, in a letter to Dean Herman Kissiah he voiced his professional concerns on the health services he was hired to provide. Johnson describes Lafayette to be "at a deficit" compared to similar institutions, as it was the only college not to have hired a healthcare professional with the sole responsibility of gynecology by 1990. He emphasizes that the Health Center cannot keep up with the demand for pelvic exams, and that women are reluctant to see a male physician for such services. Johnson also mentions that there were four pregnancies in the beginning of the 1990 academic year, but that there were probably more he was unaware of. He closes with a strong belief that physicians hired by Lafayette College need more time to educate students on sexual health and need to provide the community with more availability for examinations, as the wait is usually several hours ("Letter to Dean Herman Kissiah"). This concern over the quality and availability of women's health and sexual services displayed privately by Dr. Johnson stands in stark contrast to

his public denouncement of female sexual agency. Dr. Johnson's public denial of female sexual agency, therefore, represents not his personal views, but instead the institutional values he was hired to personify in a public forum.

At first thought, this suggests Lafayette's paradoxical view of female sexuality, an inconsistency between willingness to protect agency through policy and being unwilling to allow women to claim this agency through proper health and sexual services. It would be assumed that if the establishment of the Policy on Sexual Harassment truly reflected an institutional interest and dedication to protecting female sexual agency, this interest and dedication would be focused on other issues that prevent full and successful claims of this agency, such as a lack of quality women's health and sexual services. However, this was clearly not the case for Lafayette College from 1982 through 1991. The ineffectiveness of the first policy on sexual harassment, and the subsequent lack of revision throughout a decade in which revision was clearly in order, elucidate this paradox. The establishment of a policy on sexual harassment was not out of institutional interest and dedication to the protection of female sexual agency, but rather a lackluster and insincere legal response to national and internal discourse that demanded change. The ineffectiveness of Lafayette's 1982 Policy on Sexual Harassment was never corrected by the institution, despite events on campus that displayed its ineptitude, suggesting that what the institution valued throughout the decade was silencing dissent rather than preserving female sexual agency. This institutional attitude was very clearly mirrored throughout the decade in its resistance to providing proper women's health and sexual services, despite national discourse to the contrary and the discontent displayed clearly by both students and staff at the College. Although Lafayette could minimize overt devaluing of female sexual agency through the establishment of the 1982 Policy on Sexual Harassment and offerings of some female-specific

health and sexual services, an active denial of such agency was quite apparent in the stagnated improvements to ineffective harassment policy and the lack of quality women's health and sexual services from 1982 to 1991. Elucidating the institutional denial of female sexual agency through such mechanisms makes clear the dissonance observed in the fierce and troublesome 1991 debate over the quality of coeducation at Lafayette College.

Works Cited

- “A Brief History of Sexual Harassment in America Before Anita Hill.” *Time*. 11 Apr. 2016. Web. 28 Apr. 2017.
- Alumni Quarterly. *The Wrong Theme*. 1981. Print. Unprocessed Records of Susan Basow, Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- Basow, Susan A. Letter to Robert Rotberg, President. 29 May 1991. Print. Unprocessed Records of Susan Basow, Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- Basow, Susan A. Letter to Herman C. Kissiah, Dean of Students. (8 Dec. 1984). Sexual Assault, Rape, and Harassment Policies. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- Cahn-Hidalgo, Diego G. “Date Rape Concern.” *The Lafayette*. 18 Sep. 1987. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.
- Chaudhuri, Una, et al. Letter to President David W. Ellis. (12 Dec. 1980). Sexual Assault, Rape, and Harassment Policies. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- Cunningham, Craig A. “Sexual Harassment Receives Greater Attention At Lafayette and In Nation.” *The Lafayette*. 27 Mar. 1981. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.
- “Enforcement Efforts in the 1980s.” *EEOC*. Web. 28 Apr. 2017.
- Faculty Handbook*. Lafayette College, 1982-1991.
- “Health and Security Report- Health and Security Subcommittee, Student Government.” (Jan.

- 1982). Health Services at Lafayette. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- "Health Equity- Women's Health." *CDC*. Web. 28 Apr. 2017.
- Johnson, Alan. "Sex, the Bailey Health Center, and you." *The Lafayette*. 15 Sept. 1989. Web. 28 Apr. 2017.
- Johnson, Alan. Letter to Dean Herman Kissiah. (3 Dec. 1990). Health Services at Lafayette. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- "Lafayette Coed in 1970." *Lafayette Coed in 1970*. Web. 28 Apr. 2017.
- "Lafayette College Policy on Sexual Harassment." (16 Oct. 1982). Sexual Assault, Rape, and Harassment Policies. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- Professional Women of Lafayette. "President Ellis." *The Lafayette*. 30 Mar. 1990. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.
- "The Weight of a Woman's Word." *The Lafayette*. 5 Dec. 1980. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.
- "Results of Student Affairs Questionnaire re. the Bailey Health Center." (May 1978). Health Services at Lafayette. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.
- Rogers, Joseph. "DU Required To Contribute \$1000 By Conduct Committee." *The Lafayette*. 27 Mar. 1981. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.
- Riggs, Robert O., et al. *Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: From Conflict to Community*. The George Washington University, 1993.
- Shur, Laura. "Shock for Ratings." *The Lafayette*. 29 Feb. 1987. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.

Shur, Laura. "The Weight of a Woman's Word." *The Lafayette*. 21 Nov. 1986. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.

Stoddard, Heather. "Reevaluating Some Misconceptions." *The Lafayette*. 8 Feb. 1991. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.

Student Services Committee. "FYI: Contraception and Family Planning." *The Lafayette*. 24 Sep. 1982. Digital. 28 Apr. 2017.

Task Force on the Quality of Coeducation. *Report of the Task Force on the Quality of Coeducation*. 6 May 1991. Print. Unprocessed Records of Susan Basow, Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.

Vizzuso, Tonimarie A. "Student Government Concerned About Harassment Issue." *The Lafayette*. 5 Mar. 1982. Digital. 38 Apr. 2017.

"30 Pct. Harassed." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. (15 Dec. 1980). Sexual Assault, Rape, and Harassment Policies. Reference Files. Special Collections and College Archives, David Bishop Skillman Library, Lafayette College.