Cracking the Glass Ceiling—Keeping It Broken

Kristen Renwick Monroe, *University of California, Irvine*

"Ginger Rogers didn't do anything Fred Astaire didn't do. She just did it backwards and in high heels."[1]

In January 2001, the APSA Nominating Committee designated Theda Skocpol as president-elect of APSA, making Skocpol only the third women ever to hold this office. In April of the same year, the APSA Council passed a nonbinding resolution encouraging future APSA Nominating Committees to avoid choosing presidents-elect of the same gender for more than two years in a row. In February 2002, the APSA Nominating Committee shattered tradition by selecting Susanne Rudolph as president-elect, thus promising the first instance of two women—given a normal course of events—consecutively assuming the APSA presidency. These actions hold tremendous value, both symbolic and substantive, in widening the cracks in the glass ceiling for female professional political scientists. In this article, I describe how many people, together, worked to break the glass ceiling. I then propose a program designed to increase gender equality within APSA as a professional association.[2]

APSA: Bastion of Male Privilege?

APSA was a bastion of male privilege well into the 1960s. In 1969, agitation from the ranks and the receptive APSA presidency of David Easton combined to propel APSA to do more to bring women into the power structure of the Association.[3] At some level, the progress has been remarkable. The Women's Caucus for Political Science (WCPS) was founded in 1969 and women and minorities now routinely serve on the APSA Council, committees, and as section heads.

Actual statistical data documenting this general impression, however, are neither as accessible nor as complete as I had believed, making it difficult to arrive at a reliable, objective assessment of the situation for women. The APSA staff performed yeoman service in digging into files to provide data on women's official participation in APSA's power structure since 1950, although the data series I eventually pieced together is incomplete and may not be fully accurate. Overall, these data reveal a slow rate of inclusion, with the list of "firsts" for women beginning with Gwendolen Carter, the first woman elected to the APSA Council (1955) and the first vice president (1964). Gladys Kammerer was the first female secretary (1957) and Betty Nesvold the first woman treasurer (1975). Between 1950 and 2001, 30 out of 153 vice presidents have been women, six of these serving in the last five years. Eleven secretaries out of 51 have been women, five elected during the last five years. And seven out of the 25 treasurers have been women. Of the 400 Council members elected since 1950, 76 have been women.[4]

There has been some progress, then, and the progress has accelerated in recent years. Nonetheless, the post of president rarely left male hands. Until 2001, only two women—Judith Shklar and Elinor Ostrom—had served as president in the Association's nearly hundred-year existence.[5] And the WCPS had to mount an extraordinary and controversial effort to secure the nomination of the third. Why?

One reason may be the process by which the president is chosen.[6] Despite its commitment to democratic governance, the APSA presidential election is rarely contested, with the annual business meeting more *pro forma* than an open election. Indeed, within APSA's political culture, even the threat of contesting the official nominee would be interpreted as a rather graceless faux pas. Effectively, the president-elect is chosen using a closed system that many find more appropriate for a Byzantine autocracy than a democratic country's premier professional society dedicated to the study of politics.[7]

The Nominating Committee consists of six members, each chosen for a two-year term. The president-elect presents the three names of his nominees to the Council at the September meeting. If the Council approves these three names, they will be added to the names of the three members who are serving the second year of their two-year term, and who were chosen by the sitting president. Although the president-elect's choices for the Nominating Committee are presented to the Council for approval, at least during my term on Council (1997–99), the choice was not even discussed, let alone debated or challenged. There is no election, then, for what is an all-powerful Nominating Committee of six people who choose future officers. And these six people are chosen in secret by two officers who were themselves selected in the same process and, in the case of the president-elect, by three of the same people. Not surprisingly, this process favors the status quo, even though anyone within the Association has the right to submit names to the Nominating Committee for its consideration.[8]

Failing to Crack the Glass Ceiling

In 1999–2000, the Women's Caucus decided to make a concerted effort to crack APSA's glass ceiling. We put forward Susanne Rudolph, a woman of extraordinary credentials from the generation of women who deserve special honor because they came up the hard way.[9] A member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a chaired professor and former chair of one of the nation's top departments, past president of the major professional association in her specialized field, and recipient of many prestigious

***Kristen Monroe** is professor of political science and philosophy at the University of California, Irvine, where she serves as associate director of the Program in Political Psychology and as head of the Informal Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Morality. Vice president of APSA and president of the Organized Section on Political Psychology, Monroe's most recent book is on moral choice during the Holocaust. She can be reached at krmonroe@uci.edu.*

grants (e.g., Guggenheim, Rockefeller, and three Fulbrights), she has published more than nine books and numerous articles in the major professional and scholarly journals and received one of the Women's Caucus's Mentor of Distinction Awards. Rudolph had been active in APSA, won its Best Paper Award for an APSA conference paper, and served as one of its first female vice presidents and on many of its committees. Our nominee thus possessed impeccable professional and scholarly credentials and had well-honed administrative skills.

Her field, university, and geographic region had not been over-sampled in recent years, so these points also should have worked in her favor. In addition to all of this, APSA's Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession enthusiastically joined the WCPS nomination, and members of APSA's Nominating Committee told me later that our nominee received far more letters of support than did any other candidate. Yet she was passed over in favor of a man who, although also superbly qualified, was much younger and whose nomination could easily have been deferred another year.

I must make it abundantly clear that I am not questioning the qualifications or the worthiness of the person chosen as president-elect in 2000. Indeed, I find it divisive to cast the debate in terms of who was the "best" choice. Doing so also distracts us from a deeper and more important issue: Why are female candidates subject to harsher scrutiny?

The evidence supporting this claim is subtle but striking. Furthermore, it suggests the extent to which understated inequalities stem from the unconscious attitudes of both men and women. It is not only men who participate in creating and enforcing what I call the Ginger Rogers syndrome, the psychological acceptance and internalization of differential standards for men and women, and I am certainly not lodging a blanket indictment of male colleagues. Instead, the syndrome spreads and is nurtured across gender. Indeed, it is ironic that women may be more effective at enforcing the syndrome than men, and may frequently step forward to do so.

As the situation for women improves, it is now necessary for women, especially those in leadership positions, to recognize that expecting women to do more to prove their worth is no longer a healthy response to a chilly climate; such an attitude is now outdated and counterproductive. It is sometimes difficult to make these psychological shifts, and I have watched many feminists, for whom I have deep respect and affection, as they slowly extricate themselves from the implicit assumption that women need to do more to be accepted. I intend no criticism here; indeed, I had to go through some of the same process myself.

As the situation for women improves, it is now necessary for women, especially those in leadership positions, to recognize that expecting women to do more to prove their worth is no longer a healthy response to a chilly climate.

I believe this particular part of the Ginger Rogers syndrome worked against the WCPS candidate in 2000; for example, one of the objections against her candidacy concerned the spotty record of her department in hiring women. But the man ultimately chosen came from a department whose record was arguably no better in this regard. While feminists might reasonably ask what another woman has done for the cause, holding a woman—but not a man—accountable for departmental colleagues is how the Ginger Rogers syndrome keeps women down. If a man does not have to answer for his peers' behavior, why should the woman?

The subtle differential standard was not unique to the nominating process in 2000. Confidential conversations with past members of the WCPS and with former members of past APSA Nominating Committees revealed similar differential standards at work whenever women have been suggested for APSA president. It is the subtle application of shifting but differential standards that gives the Ginger Rogers syndrome its power. A woman who expresses her views forcefully is too pushy; a man is dynamic. A woman is too strident; a man is forceful. A woman from an institution that is not prestigious has that held against her. Yet a man who succeeds in producing first-rate work while teaching more students, with less resources and fewer helpful colleagues would be given extra points, and might be selected precisely because he would provide an important symbolic bond with the many APSA members who are not at prestigious research universities. A woman who is devoted to her family has her professional commitment questioned; a man is praised for his humanity and family values. A man is a quiet, dedicated, dispassionate scholar; a woman with the same personality is criticized because her reserved, professional demeanor lacks warmth, or because she is not nurturing enough. I have carefully avoided using names in order to depersonalize the discussion, but I could provide examples for each of these differential standards, all of which have been leveled at one time or another against well-known female scholars the WCPS has suggested as president. The standards shift, and shift in a way that privileges men.

Forget blame; let's fix a situation no one really wants to continue.

Working to Crack the Glass Ceiling in 2001

After our unhappy experience in 2000, the president of the WCPS and I talked with the continuing members of the APSA Nominating Committee to see what we could do to make sure a woman was chosen at the next opportunity (2001). One of our main concerns was to avoid the psychology of demonization or confrontation, since we believed there was goodwill on all parts. We found this assumption justified, for all the APSA Nominating Committee members seemed receptive to our concerns. They suggested we provide a broader selection of women scholars from which they might choose next year. We recognized that such a strategy has advantages—e.g., it increases the degrees of freedom, as one Nominating Committee member put it—but also carries the risk of not uniting behind one person. In the spring and summer of 2000, Georgia Duerst-Lahti and Martha Ackelsburg, as the current and future

WCPS presidents, joined the WCPS Nominating Committee in compiling an initial list of potential candidates to be presented to the WCPS at its September meeting. This list comprised top scholars with proven commitment to ending discrimination and differential treatment of women. Each had extensive APSA service and superb intellectual credentials. In assembling these names, we were struck by just how much talent is out there. We omitted several obvious choices because they felt it was not the right time for them; others were not yet 50 years old, a kind of minimum age for APSA presidents, we were told by the members of the APSA Nominating Committee. A few women who might have had the scholarly credentials were not included on our list because we felt they had not worked to increase opportunities for other women, a requirement that was critical for the WCPS.

We presented this final list to the WCPS at its September 2000 meeting. The list included a superb group of diverse scholars: Jean Bethke Elshtain, Doris Graber, Mary Ellen Guy, Jennifer Hochschild, Susanne Rudolph, and Theda Skocpol.[10] We asked the WCPS to pass two resolutions. The first authorized the WCPS Nominating Committee to present these names with the full endorsement of the entire WCPS, thus demonstrating that support for these candidates was both united and broadly based. The second resolution authorized the WCPS president, president-elect, past-president, and chair of the Nominating Committee to nominate an alternative candidate for president-elect at the APSA business meeting if one of our nominees were *not* chosen as the official candidate. According to APSA by-laws, a second nomination, if supported by sufficient APSA members at the business meeting, necessitates a contested election, with a mail ballot required of all APSA members. No one wanted to have to follow this route, which would be expensive and polarizing, but it was an option we were prepared to consider if necessary.

During the fall, the WCPS asked each of our six nominees to send us her vita, along with a brief description of her major scholarly contributions and her APSA service. We also asked each nominee to ask someone in her field to organize a small letter-writing campaign, to make sure each nominee had at least five letters highlighting her various contributions. I wrote a detailed memo to the APSA Nominating Committee describing the specifics of each nominee.

By this time, and despite the prior request to provide a list of candidates, some members of the APSA Nominating Committee had asked me to rank-order the candidates; I did not do so, although I did write a short memo about the respective advantages of each nominee. (For example, we argued that Graber's selection would send a powerful symbolic message that the APSA presidency was not restricted to elite institutions, something that we thought was of particular value, given the extensive numbers of APSA members at nonresearch institutions.) We sent this material, along with the WCPS nominations for other Council offices, to APSA in early January.

My sense is that the 2000–2001 cycle was a particularly active year in terms of APSA nominations, with many groups who usually are outside the decision-making process working hard to have influence. The *Perestroika* movement was especially vocal and raised myriad issues that needed to be addressed but which, I gather, also engendered a defensive response because of the confrontational tone in some of the *Perestroika* communiqués. I suspect this hurt one of our nominees—Susanne Rudolph—who was endorsed by over two hundred *Perestroika* members. I thought that such an endorsement would ensure Rudolph's election, naively assuming that the APSA Nominating Committee would bow to such an overwhelming demonstration of grass roots support. My sense now is that this support may have proved a mixed blessing for Rudolph, with some members of the APSA Nominating Committee interpreting it not as democracy at work but rather as excessive pressure—but I have no solid evidence of this, and my conclusion is based only on conjecture. Once I submitted the WCPS material, I felt my job was done, and I have scrupulously avoided asking about how the deliberations were conducted or what transpired behind the scenes.

After I submitted the WCPS's formal nominations, I emailed all the women on our list to thank them for their willingness to help the cause and to ask each of them to contact me if she heard from the APSA Nominating Committee. Only then did I realize that my joy at the election of any one of these superb nominees would be tinged with sadness that the others were not chosen, an odd psychological phenomenon that I would guess might affect the members of the APSA Nominating Committee as well.

Shortly after the APSA Nominating Committee concluded its deliberations, I received an email from Theda Skocpol, telling me she had been nominated president-elect. Theda sent a gracious note to the other women on our list and to the WCPS, and Martha Ackelsburg informed the entire WCPS in the next WCPS newsletter. Rodney Hero, Chair of the 2001 APSA Nominating Committee, also called to tell me of the outcome, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him and the other APSA Nominating Committee members on their excellent choice in Theda Skocpol and to thank them for their continuing willingness to remain open and receptive to the WCPS's ideas and suggestions.

Why were we successful this year and not in prior years? I would like to think that by working together, civilly but with determination and focus, and with the APSA hierarchy, we all helped make it happen. To ensure that this is a permanent shattering of the glass ceiling, however, and not just one more tiny crack, the WCPS asked the APSA Council to institute a structural change necessary to make sure women more routinely become serious contenders for the APSA presidency.

Council Resolution

We asked the APSA Council to pass a nonbinding resolution strongly encouraging the APSA Nominating Committee to avoid designating presidents-elect of the same gender for more than two years in a row. While this resolution is not mandatory, the WCPS felt it nonetheless would send a powerful signal that the APSA Council encourages gender equity. We chose this route, instead of contested elections, because we recognize that the existing process of nominating APSA officers, for all its flaws, is one way in which underrepresented groups may gain access they might not otherwise receive if they were dependent solely upon winning electoral contests. Thus, we felt it made sense for the APSA Council to arm the Nominating Committee with a mandate to do even more to factor gender into their decision-making calculus.

There was some concern during Council discussions that the resolution advocated a kind of quota system, and this was not the WCPS's intent. A more apt metaphor is the college admissions process, in which the relative qualifications of all candidates are recognized but in which it is also acknowledged that in any given year there are many who are eminently qualified to be admitted to the class. Once we conceptualize APSA presidents as a class and narrow our pool of nominees to the many who are qualified for admission, it becomes

counterproductive and perhaps even damaging to cast the debate in terms of "the best" or "better than." Doing so leads to unnecessary divisiveness.

It is well accepted that after we narrow the field to those scholars eligible by virtue of superior scholarship, then the particular combination of qualifications desired in a president-elect will vary from year to year. The APSA Nominating Committee thus routinely shifts its emphasis to reflect different methodological orientations, substantive area of concentration, and other diverse constituency considerations, such as ethnicity and university affiliation. Such factors are widely accepted as valid reasons for deviating from the single-best criterion. (We would not choose for five years in a row political scientists teaching constitutional law at Yale, for example, even if these five were, by some measure, the five "best" political scientists in the world.) My sense is that many of the slate-making requirements (gender, race, field, geographical, and institutional diversity) are now conveyed informally. It might serve a useful purpose to have the Council go on record as favoring these and other qualities in nominees.

WCPS members spoke with APSA officers and Council members before the April 2001 Council meeting, asking them to make a more determined institutionalized effort to enter gender into the equation by which presidents-elect are chosen. We noted that the Western Political Science Association does this with no difficulty, just as it has instituted a nonbinding and informal process in which the presidency rotates each year between someone from California and someone from the other states. We were fortunate that one of the recommendations of the Strategic Planning Report, presented at the April 2001 Council meetings, contained a provision similar to this recommendation.

Despite reservations expressed by a few Council members, the resolution passed and should encourage the future selection of female APSA presidents-elect in a far less politicized context than the one that existed in 2001.

Shattering the Ceiling?

Given the above, the mood at the 2001 APSA meeting was one of celebration for WCPS members. Any contentious issues concerning APSA offices were focused on general concerns with the selection process, not the outcome in terms of gender. (The process of selecting APSA officers is currently under review; the committee in charge, however, had not submitted its report at the time this article went to press.) On the whole, my sense is that WCPS members ended by feeling ambivalent about the selection process. Members felt the existing system carried the potential for replicating existing power structures, but they feared that a move to competitive elections would jeopardize the access to APSA power of women and other minorities.

A mentoring program could combat the subtle psychological phenomena that work against full gender equality within political science as a profession.

Fall 2001 found little political activity in terms of APSA elections. Since I no longer chaired the WCPS Nominating Committee, my information is second-hand, but my sense is that the WCPS believed it unlikely that it would be successful with a second female president so it was content to rest on its laurels. Ironically, the events of September 11 provided an unexpected rekindling of interest in Rudolph, as APSA—along with the rest of the United States—realized the importance of having at its helm someone who had spent her entire professional life trying to understand the problems of communication when East meets West. In a further irony, the interest in Rudolph emanated not from Perestroikans or the WCPS but from within the APSA power structure. Private conversations with several members of the 2002 APSA Nominating Committee—a committee distinguished by particularly strong women—suggested a Rudolph nomination might be well received. Rudolph herself expressed reluctance to be nominated again and the WCPS felt bound to respect her wishes. In order to keep her candidacy alive, the decision was made to have a private member submit her name to the Nominating Committee. The argument was made that the moment was right for this particular presidency and that "two in a row" would shatter the glass ceiling and be a bold step forward. Timing is all, and in February 2002, the woman who had twice been denied the presidency, despite more nominations than anyone else in APSA history, was selected on the strength of only one letter.

Does "two-in-a-row" prove that the glass ceiling is broken? Is it a large crack, or is the ceiling truly gone? Only time will tell. Certainly this particular nominating committee deserves congratulations, as do all involved in this excellent move toward greater equality within APSA. I hope APSA will continue the momentum in this direction and will institute additional institutional or structural changes that could help further open its power structure to women, and to other minorities. I conclude by suggesting one such proposal, in outline form.

Mentor Program

A mentoring program could combat the subtle psychological phenomena that work against full gender equality within political science as a profession. To attack the underlying psychological factors that may act as choke points early in a woman's career, choke points that prevent women from achieving their full professional and intellectual potential and which cheat APSA of their full contribution, I encourage APSA to consider institutionalizing a mentor program. Doing so would help increase the pool of available talent by attacking the Ginger Rogers syndrome in its early stages.

There are many choke points in career growth and advancement, but only some occur in the form of outright discrimination prohibited by law. For example, many women become discouraged by the complexities of balancing family life with careers, and drop out or curtail their professional activities early in their professional lives. Role models help tremendously—hence the need for more female APSA officers—but so do explicit encouragement and personal advice. The kind of mentor program I propose would provide guidance on scholarship and career development, and thus help with the prerequisites for APSA executive positions. But mentoring should not be viewed only as a tool to widen the road to APSA offices. Suggestions on how others have "done it" also will be invaluable in helping people conceptualize their way out of situations that initially seem to be irreconcilable conflicts. It is important to remember that not all of us will be Elinor Ostroms,

Susanne Rudolphs, Judith Shklars, or Theda Skocpols. Simply providing an understanding of how people carve out a meaningful personal and productive professional life would be a valuable service.

Though smaller mentor programs already exist,[11] a national mentor program could draw on the tremendous untapped talent of senior scholars who have succeeded in the profession and who would be willing to provide advice, entrée, and encouragement to others. Such a program would encourage women to take the risks necessary to grow, professionally and intellectually, and to open doors they never knew existed.

Mentoring is a complex phenomenon and there will be many issues to resolve as a mentor program is instituted. Certainly, we need intellectual mentoring, in which ideas are discussed and nurtured and in which an older generation shows newcomers what a scholar is and does. We also need institutionalized mentoring as socialization within the profession and mentoring for executive positions within APSA as an association. Such mentoring should stress early professional socialization in a more self-conscious manner designed to make it more likely that women get the preparation many—although certainly not all—men have typically received. In doing so, we must remember how subtle and mindlessly any network functions—be it of the "old boy" or the "ageless woman" variety—not in any conspiratorial or malicious fashion but through a thoughtless process in which men "naturally" speak with other men about how to write an article, where to submit grants, or how to muster resources so as to put their best foot forward.[12]

To initiate a mentor program, APSA could establish a committee, consisting of the current associational officers who hold honorific titles (vice presidents and secretaries) to work out the details and to decide which aspects of mentoring APSA may reasonably hope to influence. It is premature, and would be presumptuous of me to offer any one solution to this complex problem. But to encourage such discussion, I offer three opening suggestions.

1. Each Council member could be responsible for involving five senior scholars in the mentor program each year. Past APSA presidents could form part of this group, as could former APSA officers and Council members and volunteers. Senior women should be active participants, but should not be the only mentors, for many reasons, e.g., there are too few of them, they are already overloaded with professional activities, etc. Nor do we want to establish a pattern of only men mentoring women (somewhat patronizing) or of only women mentoring women (too exclusionary). Much of the matching of mentors should be dictated by specialization and substantive knowledge. This is fine tuning; a committee can address such issues once a mentoring program is put into place.

2. The Association could provide staff necessary to organize the communication and set up the initial contacts. External funding, such as that provided through the NSF Advance Programs, might be applied for by APSA in the initial stages. But the costs of this program are not excessive, and could be covered by APSA money and by asking each young scholar to contribute a small fee (say $5) and each of the senior participants to contribute a larger fee (say $25–$50). A reception should be held each year to honor the participants, much as the International Society for Political Psychology holds young scholars' reception at its annual meetings.

3. The Council could designate at least one Council member each year to be in charge of the mentor program. This person should have a high profile—perhaps a past president or vice president. This person would establish ties to the WCPS and, eventually, to the other groups that deal with the problems of minorities, since mentoring could profitably be expanded to include not only women but also other minorities.[13]

Ironically, a mentor program also would provide a valuable service to senior scholars. Many seniors often feel passed by at the Annual Meetings. Mentoring would be a valuable way to draw on their store of knowledge and remind them that they still have an important function to play in the association, even if their days of active scholarship are in the past. Mentoring may counteract some of the isolation that may occur as a result of fame, as well as age. And, of course, we all know that teachers often learn as much as the students do from the teaching experience. So it is with mentoring.

From Glass Ceiling to Glass Bridge

Why should APSA do all this? To ensure equity, to create goodwill, to avoid wasting valuable talent, and because a vast body of scholarly work tells us how important others are in creating both our own sense of self and our subsequent behavior.[14] As a scholar concerned with identity's tremendous power to shape our acts, I am continually struck by the importance of internalized psychological forces that influence our behavior. To illustrate the importance of others in combating the Ginger Rogers syndrome, let me conclude by noting a variant on a famous set of cognitive psychology experiments. The particular experiment that intrigued me is a variant on a set of well-known experiments dealing with visual perception. This modification deals with visual cliffs and suggests that people will attempt to overcome seemingly insurmountable obstacles if given the necessary encouragement of those they trust.

Traditional experimental work on perception has long determined that infants—baby lambs as well as human babies—can visually recognize drops into space, referred to as visual cliffs. There seems to be an inborn protective mechanism that allows infants to perceive and hence avoid the dangers of these visual cliffs. These experiments usually are interpreted as evidence of the hardwiring or biological underpinnings of certain behaviors.

I was told of one variation of these experiments, however, in which babies were placed on one countertop and the babies' mothers stood beside a second countertop. Although the two countertops were connected by a piece of clear but firm plexiglass, the visual appearance was of a cliff. Since the infants lacked the knowledge and the cognitive ability to distinguish between the plexiglass and a cliff, the covering that to the adults was easily and reliably traversed appeared to the infants as a visual cliff, a dangerous drop forming an insurmountable barrier between the infant and the mother. To reach the mother, then, the baby had to crawl across what looked like empty space. Remarkably, some babies were willing to do so, but only if the mother showed encouragement by her facial gestures. Babies whose mothers smiled at them, babies who were encouraged by those they loved and trusted, would crawl out over the visual cliff. Minus such encouragement, if the mother remained passive or showed fear, babies would not risk venturing the danger. They stayed where they were.

The political science community could help shatter the glass ceiling if we would establish institutionalized mechanisms to encourage women—and other minorities—to find ways to traverse professional hurdles that can feel as threatening as crossing a visual cliff. Doing so would help turn the glass ceiling into a glass bridge, and would enrich everyone in the profession.

Notes

1. I have found this phrase attributed to various people, from Ronald Reagan to Ann Richards.

2. In this analysis, I do not address questions of salary, initial discrimination in hiring and promoting women within universities and colleges, choke points in career paths, or the situation for women outside the Association itself, although all of these factors are related. I focus on two closely related phenomena, which I find critical to attaining gender equality in political science as a profession: institutional reforms to ensure equal access to women and the underlying psychological factors that inhibit women in their move toward full equality.

3. I ignore the situation for minorities because of space constraints.

4. Council statistics are current as of 2000 and were provided by Theresa Gubicza of the APSA Staff. I am grateful to Sue Davis, Rob Hauck, and Sean Twombly for sending me earlier pieces of raw data, and to Rob Hauck and Catherine Rudder for their helpful comments. Rebecca Segrest compiled the statistical information. David Easton provided research assistance necessary to fill in some of the missing data points in the data set supplied me by APSA. I have not updated these statistics to factor in the most recent set of nominations. Martha Ackelsberg, Judith Baer, Gayle Binion, and Georgia Duerst-Lahti generously provided comments on early drafts of this article, as did Laura Scalia.

5. The first woman president was Judith Shklar, chosen in 1989. Elinor Ostrom was elected in 1996. Skocpol's term as president begins in September 2002, and Rudolph's in 2003.

6. The same selection system supplies the other officers and Council members. The problem is that the norms of presidential selection tend toward the "best," while the selection of Council members and other officers is more self-consciously representative of the Association membership as a whole.

7. APSA's electoral system is currently under examination and proposals for reform may have been made public by the time this article goes to press.

8. Terminology becomes confusing here since the person who is president-elect when his (I choose the pronoun deliberately) choices for the Nominating Committee are given to the Council for approval becomes president at the business meeting the next day. So by the time the Nominating Committee actually meets, the people who have selected them are the president and the past-president.

9. Our nominee resembled many other female scholars of her generation who did not seek attention or controversy because of their gender yet found themselves being trail-blazers, the first to challenge a male taboo or infiltrate a male establishment. It requires a particular courage and dignity for a gentle scholar to be put on the frontline of a political movement, and I am grateful to her, and to all the women of her generation, for their inspirational efforts.

10. A seventh of our original nominees, Arlene Saxonhouse, later asked to be dropped from the list for personal reasons.

11. I have participated in the Mentor Program sponsored by the Women's Caucus of the MPSA for several years and it is highly successful, although small.

12. When I began my career, the NSF officer came to speak with the young scholars about grant opportunities. I later learned that some of the best advice happened to be dispensed in the men's bathroom. There was no malice aforethought, but I certainly wasn't privy to this conversation.

13. Special attention might be paid to women—of color, lesbian, Latino, Asian, etc.—who may be subject to more than one form of discrimination. Mentoring also should be sure to include some provision for those who choose to work in nonacademic settings.

14. I draw on clinical work in psychoanalysis, developmental psychology, and experimental cognitive science that focuses on the prelanguage perceptual memory and the importance of affect in recognition memory and a creation of the core self and others. This is a vast literature and is perhaps best summarized in Stern 1985. Although Stern alludes to the experiment I describe below, I have been unable to locate the precise article reproducing the particular experiment I refer to in the text. (I hope this particular finding is more than an expression of optimism on the part of the psychoanalytic community!) I believe the experiment may have been conducted by Eleanor J. Gibson, and am grateful to Dr. Robert Keller for drawing it to my attention. See also Pick 1979 and Gibson 1969.

References

Gibson, Eleanor J. 1969. *Principles of Perceptual Learning and Development.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Pick, Ann D., ed. *Perception and Its Development: A Tribute to Eleanor J. Gibson.* 1979. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Stern, Daniel N. 1985. *The Interpersonal World of the Infant: A View from Psychoanalysis and Development Psychology.* New York: Basic Books.