



2019 NCSBN Leadership and Public Policy Conference - Identification, Mobilization, and Political Activism Video Transcript

©2019 National Council of State Boards of Nursing, Inc.

Event

2019 NCSBN Leadership and Public Policy Conference

More info: <https://www.ncsbn.org/13621.htm>

Presenter

Scott H. Ainsworth, PhD, Professor of Political Science, University of Georgia

- [Scott] Well, good morning. And thank you for inviting me and letting me have this opportunity to share some thoughts with you. And I want to also thank you for the work that you do.

I know very little about the National Council but I'm learning more and more about it and I do recognize that intersection of efforts where you're doing some regulatory work and you're doing some promotion work.

And so this is some advocacy. So this is a really interesting area to be in. Okay. So it's a fairly straightforward title, fairly drab title in some ways, and it also gives you an idea as to the outline for this talk. So I want to spend a little bit of time talking about identification, a little bit of time talking about mobilization, and then discussing how identification and mobilization affect political activism, political activity.

And I want to tie this in before the conclusion of the talk, I want to tie this into the National Council. Okay. So that's the setting for today. So, when I think about identification, when I want to discuss identification, I'm thinking about identification for a social scientist.

So what do we mean by identification in the social sciences? Well, it's pretty much how we define ourselves, how we view ourselves, how we present ourselves to others, okay? But it's also partly how other people see us. We cannot always affect, we cannot always control how others see us. And so I'm a professor, I'm introduced as a professor, you might see me as a professor.

If I'm fumbling with the AV equipment, you might see me as a certain kind of a professor, right? And so I can't fully control that. So it's sometimes how other people define us. And so when we think about, "Who drives identification?" some of it is us and some of it is those people around us helping to drive identification.

A couple of things to keep in mind about identification. It's not necessarily 24/7. Think about some of the ways in which you identify as a parent, as a man, as a woman, as a person of a certain race or ethnicity. Some of those identifications are immutable and are 24/7.

Some are not. So, sometimes we identify in a certain way, and then we choose to not identify in that way. Sometimes we identify, say, as an environmentalist, but that doesn't mean that we're identifying as an environmentalist 24/7 and that it's immutable.

And so identification is not always immutable. My wife, I think, would be the environmentalist 24/7. Okay. Identification is also multifaceted. Very very few of us would ever, it's hard to imagine any of us ever being identified by one factor, by one feature.

And the term that is sometimes used is "intersectionality." This is a term that was first used, first introduced to the social sciences by individuals who were studying the effects of being, or the sense that some of the...yeah, I'll say the effects of being African-American and female.

And so there's the intersectionality, okay? So it's not just being female, it's not just being African-American, it's being an African-American female. And that puts individuals in a slightly different situation. But all of us have multiple attributes.

All of us identify in multiple ways. So let's flesh this out a little bit. I do teach political science. I have to talk a little bit about elections. Go back almost 25 years, we have the election in 1996 presidential election.

As you no doubt recall, President Clinton defeated Bob Dole. But more importantly, a catchphrase was born. And this is a catchphrase that I don't usually use but I thought I might be able to use it today. It's a catchphrase that helps us understand identification, and that is "Soccer Moms."

So, if you followed the 1996 election, there were some individuals who suggested that soccer moms came out in support for Bill Clinton and that they were a driving force in that election. So, what do we have up? I used to have this on an animation.

So, this was the first slide, so we'll go counterclockwise. So what do we mean by a soccer mom? Well, it might mean that you play soccer with children. That would be this image. You are a soccer mom. You're playing soccer with, ostensibly, your own children. It might mean you're a chauffeur, right?

I'm not sure the mom is even in the front seat there, but somebody is driving that minivan. So, you might be a soccer mom but really, you're just a chauffeur. And probably a chauffeur for some of your children and other children as well. Or you might somehow separate yourself from from children, from chauffeuring, You might separate yourself from the soccer ball there.

I don't know if anyone's ever used this sort of mosquito netting. We have a lot of mosquitoes here in Georgia, so if it works, please let me know. But what we mean by a soccer mom can be very different. And how individuals view soccer moms... The car dealer views the soccer mom as a great potential purchaser of an SUV or minivan, right?

I'm not sure who sells these but they're finding a market for it. They're finding a market. Okay. A couple of things to keep in mind. Any number of women might consider themselves soccer moms but not necessarily 24/7. I think I've heard my own wife say, "I don't want to be a mom for the next few hours," which was a way of saying, "I need to separate just for a bit," okay?

So it's not necessarily 24/7, it's not immutable. Children grow up, they move away. Once a soccer mom, you're not necessarily always a soccer mom. And you're not solely a soccer mom. You're also a chauffeur, right? And so one could have created a catchphrase about women and chauffeuring children to after-school events.

But for some reason, no, it was "Soccer mom," not "Chauffeur mom." okay? So that identification, it's partly self-identification, and it's partly identification by others, right? Other people kind of defining who you are and what you're all about. So, next what I want to do is show you some photos that are a little more oriented to political activism.

And a couple of things I want to highlight. One is that once you leave the soccer field, you might not be recognized as a soccer mom. You might still be recognized as a mom, you might still be recognized as female, but you won't necessarily be recognized as a soccer mom.

And so our identifications are changeable throughout the day, okay? And sometimes, we even try to hide identifications and we try to hide identifications when identification is costly. And I can think of two examples here.

One, a current example. This is a photo from the protests in Hong Kong. And this is even before they turned violent, or as violent as they have turned. So individuals are trying to hide their faces. There are lots and lots of cameras being used in Hong Kong and their fear is that they will be identified, that they will be identified and that will be problematic, okay?

They will be at risk. And so, right away, we're seeing, "Oh, there can be costs to identification, there can be costs to mobilisation." And individuals take actions, they carry the umbrellas because most of the cameras are street-level cameras.

They're pointing down, okay? And they wear the masks and the goggles to obscure their face. So they want to avoid facial recognition. Of course, the group in the United States, and probably elsewhere as well, that has oftentimes thought of as being interested in hiding identification at various times would be groups or homosexuals.

So you hide your identification, you hide that attribute of yourself. A couple of other slides. This is from the suffrage era. Of course, it's 100 years since women got the right to vote. Here, we have a group of women who do not identify as suffragists. Here, we have a group of women who do, okay?

So you have the identification, and now, we're also in a position to see some mobilization. And indeed, we can be a little more...right? Here they are charming. And aggressive. And you can go back and forth.

Charming. Aggressive. Charming. Aggressive. When you mobilize, you are making demands upon others, right? You're mobilizing to effect some sort of change. And at some level, there is then a claim against others.

That's the standard line that's been used in the social sciences since the 1950s. Okay, so here's another photo. This is in Memphis.

So this is just off of Beale Street in Memphis, Tennessee. This is just a few days before the assassination of Martin Luther King. These are armored vehicles, these are rifles with bayonets affixed. So a couple of things here about identification and mobilization.

The costs for identification are different for these individuals. Look at this guy, this third gentleman here. His identification is different than the identification for this individual or this individual.

So the first two gentlemen in line have different identification costs than the third individual in that line. They also have different mobilization costs. Think about it this way.

The third individual can go to the grocery store, make some purchases, and not bear costs of having gone to this march. And it could've been costly going to this march. We know that civil rights protests were not always peaceful, right? These are armored vehicles.

These are bayonets. I don't see the German Shepherds in this photo but that was pretty standard. So this individual can go to the grocery store and not have any of the identification that these first two individuals have. And so, another way of thinking about this is that there are some identification costs that are borne by us, by individuals in society, because of the way other people treat us.

There's just no denying that. And so, identification, as a civil-rights activist, is going to be a different sort of cost for these individuals and these individuals. What about the marginal cost of mobilization?

The marginal cost of mobilization is a little bit different for those individuals as well. The marginal cost of mobilization is going to be greatest in this instance for this third individual. These individuals, I will argue, already bore the cost.

The marginal cost of going to this protest was not much greater than the marginal cost, the expenses, the burdens of being an African-American male in Memphis, Tennessee where just your presence is questioned, questioned to such an extent that you carry a sign that says, "I am a man."

So we have different identification costs. We have different mobilization costs. So we have some identifications that can be hidden, some that can't necessarily be hidden. You can't necessarily go home and pretend, "Ah, it's all over," you know, "I did that thing and now I'm done."

The mobilization requires that one identifies, and so, you have to think about that marginal cost, that marginal cost to mobilization. And that marginal cost varies by individual, okay? So some individuals have a greater marginal cost for mobilization.

Some have to identify and mobilize. So the third individual had to identify and mobilize, okay? Some individuals have identification defined for them, right? It's already defined for them and it is, in a sense, making the marginal cost of mobilization, therefore, a little bit lower.

So, all of this ties into political activism. You have to be sensitive to the cost that people bear when they engage in political activity. And the one thing that I want to drive home today, in this first part of the talk, is that there are identification costs, there are mobilization costs, and those are different for people involved in the same political activism, involved in the same political mobilization.

And this is the case, not just in that march in Memphis, just off of Beale Street. In the early 1900's, a committee of 12 was a group of individuals who were concerned about the plights of African-Americans and it included folks such as Booker T.

Washington and W.E.B. DuBois. It also included a large number, a majority actually, of white citizens who were concerned about this transitional period. The committee of 12 though, even that committee of 12...which then broke off, we had Washington breaking off into one field, he was more interested in economic progress, and DuBois who was more interested in political representation.

That split creates a split between the Committee of Twelve and the Niagara Movement, which was DuBois' movement. The Niagara Movement then begins to merge with a nascent, an emerging organization called the NAACP. But in the Committee of Twelve and in the NAACP there were partners.

It was not just DuBois. it was not just Booker T. Washington. And the group most closely tied to Booker T. Washington would be the be the Urban League today. Okay. So what about political activism?

How do we understand political activism? Well, there's substantial costs to identification. There are, or there can be. So what that means is that identification is not guaranteed. No one is guaranteed to identify, to come out and identify with one political movement or another.

And so we need to keep that in mind. There can be substantial costs to mobilization. Even if I identify, I might not choose to mobilize. So mobilization is not guaranteed. And this is among your supporters.

This is among the people with whom you see eye-to-eye. They still might not identify. They still might not mobilize. So, suppose we wanted to pursue some policies related to advanced-practice nurses. I get the impression that that might be something of interest to folks in this audience.

Or other issues related to the National Council. What we'd want to do then is we'd want to think about how people identify. So do the APNs, do the advanced- practice nurses, do they identify as health advocates?

Nurse advocates? Patient advocates? I could say the same about individuals here in this audience, right? Are you public healthcare professionals? Are you regulators? Well, you're all. Maybe not all but some of you do, some...

I see some nods, "Yeah, I'm a bit of a regulator." A Healthcare professional, a health professional, healthcare coordinator, there are any number of ways in which you could or one could identify, either as a member of the National Council or as an advanced-practice nurse. And so, the thing to keep in mind is, to the extent that you have control over that identification, you want to craft that identification to work for you.

How should we view our multifaceted jobs, our very complex jobs? How should we view that, okay? How do we want to identify? Is that identification immutable? So, many of you are nurses. If you're a nurse, are you a nurse 24/7?

Is it immutable? Is it 24/7? Is it without any alteration across the day or over the years? So, what is required for successful political activism? So there are all sorts of studies related to, in the social sciences, related to collective action problems.

And some of these studies are very empirically-oriented, some of these studies involve very interesting models of strategic interaction, mathematical models of strategic interactions. But the main thing to keep in mind with any collective action problem is that individuals are in a position to enjoy the benefits, to reap the rewards of successful collective action, even if they don't engage.

Even if they don't engage. And so, that allows individuals, to use the standard phrase, "To freeride." "Yes, I'm interested in this. I want to be supportive. But there's a lot going on in my life, and so, I'm staying home," okay?

"I'm not going to engage." And it's easy to find other people who are choosing not to engage, but we ourselves choose not to engage. We can't engage in all efforts all the time. This is why understanding identification is so important. We cannot engage with all of the activities that we might want to.

We do not have enough time in the day. It's also important for successful political activism to be thinking about partners, partners for working within your coalition. And these can be some very natural partners.

These can be some rather interesting unanticipated partners, right? These are the folks who you wouldn't necessarily anticipate. And so, I want to talk about some ways in which you can secure some natural partners and maybe some unanticipated partners. And to do that, I want to talk about lobby chains.

So what do we mean by a lobby chain? What we mean by a lobby chain is that we imagine an organization, say, the National Council, but we imagine an organization that is interested in affecting some sort of change. They want to create some sort of change and they think about all aspects of their organization, from the very top of the organization through every level of the organization.

And they reach out, they spread out as far as they can in all directions. So the lobby chain concept comes, most directly, from economics and it's sometimes referred to as a rent chain. And the example there would be the corporate structure. Corporations.

Corporations work within their organization to help people learn how to identify. They work within their organization to help people mobilize for political activism in one area or another. How do they do that?

They do that through their communications with the employees. They do that through communications with supply chains, their subcontractors. They do that through communications with stockholders. I saw this firsthand. I worked at a Fortune-500 company for a brief period of time, in Saint Louis, Missouri.

It's a standard practice. It's how they operate on a regular day-to-day basis. This is how you should think about things. These are the political issues we're concerned about today. So it shows up in the stockholder reports. It shows up in communications with contractors and subcontractors, keeping in mind that this corporation is building stuff and they're buying and selling things to build stuff.

And it shows up in communications with the employees, right? We all heard that Mark Zuckerberg said he does not like Elizabeth Warren, and he was talking to Facebook employees. He's communicating that to his employees. He's saying, "In my view, this is an existential threat for your employment."

So what is he doing? He's trying to have the individuals in that audience think of themselves as Facebook employees, first and foremost, and to mobilize as Facebook employees. And it's not just evil Mark Zuckerberg, right? This is standard practice. The difference is the live mic, okay?

The difference is some people in the audience didn't approve of his, I don't know, political interest in having Elizabeth Warren defeated. Other examples of lobby chains, banks and savings and loans. Banks and savings and loans were known to put slips in the quarterly statements, the monthly statements.

Now, with online banking, of course, we all get emails all the time. So banks are constantly doing this. The American Medical Association did this in the 1960s. So the American Medical Association wasn't very supportive of Medicaid/Medicare. So, massive changes to their way of providing healthcare.

Massive changes to their day-to-day, year-to-year lives. And they were not supportive. And who did they contact? Well, they contacted their membership, various physicians. Who else did they contact?

Who did they really target within that membership? Well, imagine that. a bunch of members of the house, and a bunch of senators have physicians. And those are physicians who have access. Those are physicians who can reach out to senators and reach out to key senators, and reach out to key house members.

And so, that's a lobby chain. That's part of that lobby chain. So lobby chains are very interesting entities. So lobby chains for the National Council. You're working with state and local governments, I imagine, right? That's part of a lobby chain.

States are constantly, the state of Georgia is constantly tweaking my healthcare. I'm still not quite sure what is covered and what isn't. It's a constant struggle. Hospital associations. Insurance companies. Patients.

Let's not forget the patients. So, all of these individuals, all these associations, individuals, entities, they could be interesting partners. They're part, potentially, of a lobby chain, right? It's not quite as clear of a lobby chain as, say, the corporate structure, but that's part of a lobby chain.

Another thing for successful political activism, geography. Let's think about the AMA example. So the American Medical Association contacts the physicians of these elected officials and gets them to engage in some lobbying efforts.

That means that they're able to reach every congressional district. They're able to reach every state. Geography has an interesting political foundation. So, when we make weapon systems, I say "We" when various companies make weapon systems.

They often use contractors and subcontractors from key congressional districts and from key states. So, you will never see a weapon system, a large expensive weapon system, made in one district, made in one state. It's not just made in Seattle because Boeing will subcontract, spread the wealth around.

And that means that more legislators are interested in supporting it. Geography has been very important for some of the most powerful associations lobbying in the nation's capital. So, geography is very important for realtors. What is one of the advantages of the realtors' associations? Realtors are everywhere.

They're in every community. They're in every community. And they're, generally, reasonably successful small-business people. So they're very widely- dispersed geographically. That's an advantage for the realtors. For many many years, through the '70s and '80s, the realtor pack was considered the most powerful lobbying entity in Washington, DC, okay?

What was one of the things that they were constantly, constantly, constantly, you know, trying to promote and trying to protect? They were trying to protect, among other things, they were trying to protect the mortgage interest deduction on your taxes, okay? What was the argument against mortgage interest deduction? It got out of hand.

Second homes were included. Boats were included if you could live onboard or live onboard for a certain period of time. It was a tax benefit for people wealthy enough to own homes, or two, or a boat. So it was a tax benefit for the wealthy.

It was not a tax benefit for everybody. The realtors, however, said, "Oh, this is how you get a foothold into society. If you don't own a home, you're nothing," right? Unless, of course, you were living in Las Vegas in 2006, '7, '8, '9, '10 when you owned a home and still had nothing.

So geography is really important, okay? It favors some sorts of businesses. It does not favor other sorts of businesses. Let's think about some settings, or some political activism where maybe geography doesn't help.

Agriculture comes to mind. We grow some peanuts here in the state of Georgia, but there aren't many other places that grow a lot of peanuts. And so, you don't have the geographic distribution that would be favorable for successful political activism. We can also think about message effectiveness.

And so, message effectiveness is very important for successful political activism. And so, what are some attributes for successful messages? A personal touch. So, being able to reach out to an audience in a very personal way. Urgency.

Something is at hand, right? So, there's something urgent or some immediacy. This is something that needs to be addressed right away. And then also the possibility of loss. There's some evidence to suggest that we are easier to mobilize when we fear a loss.

And it's harder to mobilize individuals for a potential gain. So, if you're protecting against a loss, then it's easier to mobilize people. If you're promising some sort of benefit, some sort of gain, then it's generally been harder to mobilize people.

It also requires successful lobbying. So, what do we mean by "Successful lobbying?" What do we need for that? Well, this is actually the area of political science that I would spend the most of my research effort on, and in a sense, the least amount of this talk.

But successful lobbying, you need to understand the institutional context and the personal context. And so both of those come into play. But you cannot simply glad-hand your way through political activism. There are real Institutional constraints that the friendliest of regulators, the friendliest of bureaucrats, the friendliest of elected officials have.

And so glad-handing doesn't do it. That doesn't mean that you should not engage in some everyday pleasantries, right? Lobbyists engage in everyday pleasantries for the same reason that we do.

We kind of like being pleasant rather than being ugly all the time, right? That doesn't do us any good. And so, there's nothing special when a lobbyist says, "Oh, it's all about personal relations," right? That's what makes my business a business. You could ask any business person, "What makes your business so successful?"

and that person would say, "it's all about relations. It's all about relations." You could ask a family member, "What makes your family so successful?" "Well, it's the relations. We talk to one another," right? We sit down and we discuss things. And so there's nothing as important as that personal touch is, as important as that personal connection is.

There's nothing that makes it more important for lobbying and less important for anywhere else in our lives. And so we need to think about institutional contexts pretty carefully. In terms of legislative contacts, a couple of things to keep in mind. One is that legislative efforts are going to be much more public and they're usually going to engage in more sweeping activities, more broad activities, okay?

So, do you want to engage in a public activity or do you want to be under the radar? Do you want to take on a big sweeping change or do you want a more minor change? The other thing to keep in mind, or a couple of other things, I should say, to keep in mind about a legislative institutional context is that you have a committee system.

And that committee system is going to affect the flow of legislation. It's going to affect your progress. You also have, in many states, and at the federal, an authorization cycle. So there's a certain cycle, a certain cycle to certain policy areas. So that there's an authorization cycle for the federal government, Every six to seven years, there's a major transportation policy.

Every year, there's a major Defense Authorization Act. And so every year, defense is back at it. Every six or seven years, transportation or education are back at it. That means that if you're out of sync with that authorization cycle, maybe you should wait.

Maybe you should hold back, okay? All of those things, of course, interact with the personal context. Sometimes you just have a stinker on a committee, right? Sometimes you want to wait until the next election. It doesn't make sense to bang your head against the wall. Sometimes you want to wait for the right authorization cycle.

What about the regulatory matters which you are more involved in? Well, they tend to be a little more detail-oriented. They tend to be a little more private rather than public. With the regulatory efforts, political activism in that regulatory area, though, you also need to understand when regulators, when state bureaucrats, have authorizing legislation that would allow them to change rules along the way.

I'll give you a couple of examples from the federal level. Present Trump has changed various rules, okay? His administration has changed various rules. He and his administration, they're in a position to do that because there is authorizing legislation that allows one agency or another to do things like control border access, do things like regulate clean water, or clean air.

And the legislation, the authorizing legislation. is rather sweeping. It's up to the regulatory agency to fill in the fine print, okay? And so that becomes something that you need to be sensitive to. Are the efforts for political activism that you're interested in, for any particular state, are there statutes available that allow bureaucrats that allow regulators to make the change that you're seeking?

And that might very well vary from state to state. I used to use, in my undergraduate class, an example that failed miserably when it came to changes in regulations. But I'll try it again.

It failed miserably because it dealt with snowmobiles. And I just refused to accept the fact that I was teaching in Georgia, even though I had most of my experience in Pennsylvania, New York, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, so, you know, all the snowy places. So there was a time when snowmobiles were regulated in national parks.

And they were regulated by the Department of Interior. And they were regulated because of their impact on wildlife and because of their impact on air quality, in particular air quality when individuals would come through on certain snowmobile paths. And so certain areas became more polluted.

President Clinton said, "Yep, we're going to regulate that. We have the statutory authority." President Bush follows, "No, snowmobiles are great and it's important to have access for, you know, a wide range of activities in national parks."

They're pointing to the same legislation. Both of those rules, both of those regulations pointed to the same legislation. So it was the same legislation that was used to prevent snowmobiles from having regular access as the legislation that allowed regulators to say, "No, as many snowmobiles as you want and any type of snowmobile."

Okay. So, in conclusion, a couple of things to keep in mind. There's nothing automatic about identification. There's nothing automatic about mobilization. They can be costly, and that means that there's nothing automatic about successful political activism.

And you need to keep in mind that political activism, you're going to be making claims upon others, maybe large claims, maybe important claims, maybe small claims, but you're going to be making claims upon others, one way or another. And there are going to be costs that you bear, and that your supporters bear, for the identification and mobilization.

So it's not necessarily the case that you will be successful. Having said that, I think the National Council enjoys some political advantages that, you know, I'd be quite happy about, I would be thrilled to have these sorts of political advantages. So the political advantages that I see the National Council having would include things such as, potentially, a great lobby chain, right?

I don't know as much about the National Council, I don't know who your partners are but it seems as though there is potential for a great lobby chain. It seems as though we could talk about immediacy, urgency. It seems to me that you could talk about the possibility of loss.

Healthcare is something that is sensitive to everybody. Everyone is sensitive to it. You have incredible geographic coverage, incredible geographic coverage, which is a huge huge advantage.

Now, I should maybe have talked a little bit about it at the state level. But even at the state level, you have nurses operating in every region of a state. So you have great geographic coverage at the state level. What do you need?

You need what any organization needs. You need to think about that identity. What is the identity? What is the identity that we want to communicate to others? That's the only identity that you can control. How other people view you, you can't necessarily control. But you can control how you want to present yourself as an organization.

And that can lead to, I think, considerable success. So, that's what I prepared for you today. I'm happy to take any questions you have. I also recognize it's just before lunch. Questions, comments.

- [Female 1] I'll ask a question. So, this doesn't have anything to do with nursing but just kind of I think interesting from your talk. A couple of years ago, this was pre-2016, pre-Women's March, etc., I was having a conversation with an older generation, a baby-boomer generation woman about the term feminist.

And I said that, you know, I embrace that identification, that, you know, I do see myself as a feminist. And she had argued that embracing that identification is also embracing decades of kind of... I don't want to say, "A bad reputation," but you're embracing a whole lot of history with that identification and that we would be better off now dropping the term feminist and instead picking up a new term to start fresh a new.

And my immediate reaction was, "I'm not going to let them tell me how to identify myself," that means they're controlling how I can identify myself. But, you know, and then, it looks like we kept feminist.

But I did think it was very interesting because I wasn't thinking of the decades-long impact here, since I'm a little on the younger side, and how that identification could have negatively impacted, you know, any changes that I wanted to see, etc.

- So, I mean that is an ongoing struggle, right? The sense that words have a history. They have a meaning that was established over years and years of use. And then, we come along, and we start to use some of those same words.

We use some of that same language. And, you know, to what extent should we, you know, bear the cost of that or not, I'm not sure I can answer that. But I will say that, yes, the ways in which we identify and the words that we use to identify, they do have historic grounding. And so, for the feminists, I'm not the best person to answer questions about feminism, but there were three waves of feminism and they stressed different attributes or different challenges of being a female in society today.

And so, they had different nuances. And I think now there's some argument that we're in the fourth wave of feminism. And so it can mean different things. But, you know, do you want to have to read Betty Friedan and everybody else?

- Well, I have but for different political science courses. But no, you're exactly right. My thought of a feminist was, you know, equal pay for women, you know, childcare, etc. Whereas, you know, the little bit older generation says, "Well, you know, you don't want people looking at you like a bra burner or that you hate men."

And that didn't even dawn on me. I'm like, "Why would they think that I hate men?" So just that kind of identification, how it can change generationally or through generations.

- Yes. And some of that, again, ties in with this notion that I was saying before, that how you choose to identify or how you're seen is partly affected by your own choices. But then how other people view that, and that we have less control over. Yes.

- [Sandy] Hi. Sandy from Ohio. Kind of piggybacking on what she just said, one of the things that I know I've stressed with my students in the past is finding out how somebody identifies with their label that they use for identification. In the political realm, what is the best way to handle finding out how somebody identifies with their term?

Because I think if you had a clarification about using the term feminist and found out how a group is using it, you might avoid a problem. But I'm not really sure, in the political arena, how do you go about that?

- So, I think this is really important, especially when we talk about political activism because what you probably don't want to do is stress ideology, right? You probably don't want to try to create a large successful coalition and a series of great partnerships by emphasizing nothing but ideology or partisanship.

And so you want to think about, you know, what sort of policies you're interested in and what the effect of those policies are, what the impact of those policies are. What are the entities that you're trying to

affect? Who are the individuals whose lives you're trying to improve, right? And that becomes very important.

And this is a dicey area for everybody but I imagine it would be a dicey issue in the health field because insurance companies like to see costs go down. And healthcare providers are in that mix, right? You're providing healthcare.

And so when is a policy focused on patients? When is a policy focused on insurance companies? That's something that you have to kind of work to define and define it in as favorable a way as possible.

I think it is possible, for instance, that, you know, you do create policies where all of the interested parties are able to gain. And those are the sorts of policies that are most important to implement. I'm not sure if I fully addressed your question but...

- [Sharon] Thanks for this. It's really good thinking because I've always wondered why don't nurses get together and do more, you know... We're the most trusted profession but, when I think about it, you know, we can be the porn star, or we can be the angel, and we can be everything in-between in the culture, because I don't think we've really identified what a nurse is in a good way.

So there's a lot of media that kind of nurse Jackie, and these images. And so, I'm just wondering maybe that's part of the problem we have such a trouble with collective action is because we are not sure who we are?

- I think that could be. And I mean don't be too hard on yourselves, right? I think you used the expression porn star?

- Well, the [inaudible] and costumes coming out, yeah.

- Wow. That had not dawned on me. So that's, you know, again, this horrible example of other people defining you, right? That's exactly what's taking place there. So don't be too hard on yourself though because keep in mind that everybody faces collective-action problems, right?

Everybody faces collective action problems. So, when we see successful political activity, sure, we see organizations and people who were able to surmount the collective action problem. But the collective action problem isn't something that just mysteriously goes away, okay? And I wanted to end on a positive note where you do have real advantages.

And how we see healthcare providers... You know, the last time I saw a physician, last many times I've seen a physician, no lab coat, right? So, it's very different. No tie, no lab coat. The little hats are gone. thankfully, probably.

But that changes then that relationship and that identification. - [Female 2] So I know we had a last question already up there, but just... So the anthropology of nursing is a very interesting field to look at. And to...Sharon, is it Sharon?

- Yes. Sharon's comment, the sexualization of nursing. It's not as flagrant in the United States anymore but in Latin American countries it's still very flagrant. And as a side note, I'm originally from Connecticut but I'm in Vermont now, but originally from Connecticut, and there is a craft-beer company that developed a beer that's called "Naughty Nurse."

And I refuse and I have written to the company about, you know, that type of image for nursing, and here, in the 21st century, what are we doing? You know, so, anyway. Thank you.

- I have never had a "Naughty Nurse" beer. Again, I've never heard of that. Yeah. I think there's an address to share. Thank you all.