Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15 (1991), 635–649. Printed in the United States of America.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN PSYCHOLOGY

1969–1991

Leonore Tiefer
Montefiore Medical Center

The Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) was founded in 1969 by American Psychological Association (APA) members who were frustrated with sexism in psychology, in the APA, and at the 1969 APA convention itself. The activism of the 1960s, together with the new women's liberation movement, gave the founders tools and justification for a new organization. This article, the first published AWP history, describes the founding circumstances, early skirmishes concerning structure and operations, evolution of major activities (such as the annual conference, importance of lesbians, growing attention to multiculturalism), and ongoing tensions between centralization and "feminist process."

The Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) was founded in 1969. As of February 1991, the membership directory lists 1,663 members in 47 states and 9 foreign countries. AWP has 27 regional groups, an annual conference that in March 1991 attracted over 900 attenders, many projects, and a substantial treasury. AWP's success is remarkable, especially given the demise of many other feminist organizations of the same period (Echols, 1989). This is the first published history of the organization.

BACKGROUND

Several different kinds of events in the 1960s combined to make women in psychology dissatisfied with their status, alert to psychology's role in foster-

Address reprint requests to: Dr. Leonore Tiefer, Department of Urology, Montefiore Medical Center, 111 E. 210th St., Bronx, NY 10467.

Published by Cambridge University Press 0361-6843/91 $5.00 + .00

ing the stereotyping and oppression of women, aware of a growing women's liberation movement, and willing to form an organization to advocate for women within psychology. Media and government were identifying social injustices against women, and women gained experience within the civil rights and anti–Vietnam War movements. These developments have been reviewed thoroughly (e.g., Freeman, 1973). In the late 1960s, consciousness-raising (c-r) and action groups formed in urban centers and on college campuses, and women (in psychology as elsewhere) gradually learned about the new "women's liberation movement."

Women's Activism in the Pre-AWP American Psychological Association

Few psychologists knew the misogynist history of APA or recalled previous efforts that women had made to organize (O'Connell & Russo, 1983, 1988). The National Council of Women Psychologists (NCWP) had focused its efforts on opportunities for women psychologists during World War II, but with limited success (Capshew & Laszlo, 1986; Walsh, 1985). During the 1960s, APA was affected by the militancy of civil rights, black power, and anti–Vietnam War activists, culminating in the relocation of the 1969 convention from Chicago to Washington, DC, following the events of 1968 (McKeachie, 1969). Injustice and activism were terms of the day.

THE FOUNDING OF AWP

At the 1969 APA convention in Washington, DC, events escalated into the founding of the Association for Women Psychologists[1] by "approximately thirty-five founding mothers and fathers" (*AWP Newsletter*, 1970, p. 3).[2] Regular symposia became angry discussions focused on sexist practices at the convention, discrimination in both academic and professional psychology, and examination of the role of psychological theory in women's oppression. One result was immediate action. A booth was set up near the Job Placement Center for information and advice on sexism in interviewing and hiring.

Another result was the preparation of several petitions[3] to the APA. One would have required psychology departments seeking accreditation to have "anti-female discrimination" policies. This petition was denied by the APA on the grounds that it dealt with a political issue irrelevant to the assessment of professional excellence! A second petition, passed by the APA Council, urged APA to work for abortion, arguing that "termination of unwanted pregnancies is clearly a mental health and child welfare issue and a legitimate concern of APA" (McKeachie, 1970, p. 37). A third AWP

petition asked APA to examine itself for "latent and overt sexist practices" and

> demanded . . . child care . . . be provided at future Conventions, APA conventions not be scheduled . . . during the first week of elementary school, that Convention registration forms . . . read "spouse" rather than "wife/dependent," . . . and that during [job] interviews female applicants should not be asked about marital arrangements, status of husband's career . . . etc., unless the same questions are asked of every male applicant. (McKeachie, 1969, p. 31)

Finally, women demanded that an open meeting be scheduled at the 1970 convention to discuss the report of an APA study group on sexism in APA. No study group was appointed, but the 1970 convention did plan an open "town hall" session "for presentation of problems and issues by Association members to each other and to the Board of Directors" (American Psychological Association, 1970, p. 35). The annual APA Town Meeting became a major focus for AWP energies in years to come, a stormy opportunity for the public airing of women's grievances with the APA and the profession of psychology. Meanwhile, back at APA in 1969, informal discussions hit the boiling point and AWP was founded. Three temporary officers were announced: JoAnn Gardner, spokeswoman; Richard Roistacher, corresponding secretary; and Eleanor Kaplan, newsletter editor.

THE FIRST YEAR

From September 1969 to February 1970, the new organization had only its temporary officers. Then, 26 women and 1 man met in Chicago to write bylaws, set dues, and organize subcommittees. First, the organization's purpose was defined:

> AWP is a non-profit scientific and educational organization of psychologists and others concerned with sex roles in our changing society from an educational, professional and research viewpoint. AWP is dedicated to maximizing the effectiveness of, and professional opportunities for, women psychologists; and to exploring the contributions which psychology can, does and should make to the definition, investigation, and modification of current sex role stereotypes. (Association for Women Psychologists, 1970a, p. 1)

The bylaws continued:

> To implement its statement of purpose, AWP is committed to taking action:
> a) against the roles which psychology and other behavioral sciences have had in perpetuating the unscientific and unquestioned assumptions about the nature of women and men;

b) to stimulate necessary experimentation and implementation of alternative sex-role models;

c) to investigate and review psychological research on sex differences in order to establish facts and explode myths;

d) to educate and sensitize the psychology profession and the public to the psychological, social, political, and economic problems of women;

e) to insure equality of opportunity for women and men within the profession of psychology. (Association for Women Psychologists, 1970a, p. 1)

Anyone agreeing with these purposes was eligible for membership, voting, and elected office. Officers (president, vice-president, and treasurer-recorder) would serve 2-year terms. Six standing committees were established (professional affairs, social issues and programs, public relations, finance, etc). AWP's steering committee would be composed of the three officers plus the standing committee chairs. The frequency of committee and membership meetings, the fiscal year, and election procedures were all defined. The whole design looks perfectly hierarchical and conventional.

The women's liberation movement was attentive to organizational process, and the February press release indicated that AWP would "be open about discussing and resolving internal dissension, and [would] reject the model of competitiveness and elitism that characterizes society . . . as well as many social change movements" (Association for Women Psychologists, 1970b, p. 2). However, the Chicago bylaws themselves described no new kind of organization.

The need to plan for the September APA convention as well as to advertise AWP brought members to the April 1970 Eastern Psychological Association convention. The Chicago bylaws were discussed and many significant revisions were proposed. APA hotel space in Miami was reserved for an AWP headquarters. In the summer 1970 newsletter, AWP President Gardner announced that she was bringing both her electric typewriter and mimeograph machine to APA to prepare announcements and the all-important town hall resolutions. Members were encouraged to bring women's liberation literature, papers, and syllabi to sell and swap.

THE 1970 APA CONVENTION IN MIAMI AND ITS AFTERMATH

AWP hit the ground running in Miami. A long background handout described the new feminist awareness of "gross economic inequities," "political oppression" embodied in legislation, and how "psychological oppression" taught women to be "servile and submissive" (Association for Women Psychologists, 1970c, p. 1). It detailed sexism within APA and academic psychology and called for further research. AWP prepared 32 resolutions and 18 motions to present to APA. More than 20 years later, most are still forward-looking:

> BE IT RESOLVED that APA endorse the principle that part-time appointments count toward tenure and promotion. . . .
> BE IT RESOLVED that APA support and encourage the establishment of child care centers at all campuses . . . and firms employing psychologists. . . .
> BE IT RESOLVED that APA urge that vocational guidance emphasize that all career possibilities are open . . . regardless of sex. (Association for Women Psychologists, 1970d, pp. 2–4)

Motions asked APA for $40,000 and office space to support AWP activities, and $50,000 for research on the psychology of women. The *New York Times* reported that "at a stormy Town Hall meeting, [AWP] demanded $1-million in 'reparations' from the APA," charging "that modern psychotherapy has perpetuated male supremacy and contributed to mental illness among women" (Reinhold, 1970, p. 28). Phyllis Chesler said "the reparations would be used to release women from mental hospitals and psychotherapy," but the demand "was not taken entirely seriously by the 2,000 or so APA members gathered in the main ballroom of the [Miami] hotel" (Reinhold, 1970, p. 28).

In Miami, the initial structure of the organization was overhauled. The name of the organization was changed to the Association for Women in Psychology. Years later, Kathy Grady (1978/79) wrote: "The use of . . . 'for' rather than 'of' reflected the decision that the membership would not be restricted to women. . . . Women 'in' psychology was chosen rather than 'women psychologists' because the organization was to work for the betterment of all women in psychology, including students and consumers" (p. 1).

Other Miami revisions created a slightly broader governing structure, and the changes were ratified at a midwinter Chapel Hill, NC, meeting. The mailing sent to the membership after this meeting included a 2-page "media policy." It advised against being "baited" by reporters (i.e., being asked about bra burning) and suggested members to be interviewed "in pairs or in larger groups" to "avoid elitism and the creation of 'stars' by forces outside our organization" (Association for Women in Psychology, n.d.). It emphasized that part of the AWP mission would be to promote "the value of collective action and cooperation," to communicate "that being professionals does not make us better than other women," and to be "woman-identified" (Association for Women in Psychology, n.d.).

A FEMINIST ORGANIZATION IS BORN

Reviewing AWP's first year reminds us that changing academic psychology was at the center of the organization's founding (Rowland, 1985). "At the 1969 APA convention, *all* of the women who participated in the women's caucus reported experiencing sex discrimination at least once during

their professional careers" (Fidell, 1970, p. 1094; italics added). "All" is a lot, but is probably no exaggeration. In the context of the rhetoric and rising expectations of the 1960s, women in psychology recognized their restriction, relative deprivation, and even exclusion, and easily became activists (Perry & Pugh, 1978). Over the next decade, scores of studies documenting continuing sexism in psychology maintained the anger (Unger, 1982).

THE EARLY YEARS: 1971–1975

Struggles Over Organizational Structure

AWP's early years were full of dramatic struggles to develop and define "feminist process." If we do not operate by "old boy's rules," how shall we operate? A radical step came when the December 1972 (NYC) midwinter business meeting decided to abandon traditional structures. The Chicago (1970) structure had seemed too centralized, but the Miami/Chapel Hill (1970) layered structure was too cumbersome. The third (NYC, 1972) structural design was severely decentralized, eliminating officers and dividing responsibilities among an expanded number (18) of committees; for example, public relations, conventions, feminist therapy, feminist research, and a speakers' bureau. There had been too much unilateral action by the officers, and the media persisted in asking the president to speak for the organization. Years later, Kathy Grady (1977) wrote, "[A]t the time of the 1972 decision to do away with the traditional organizational offices such as President, some members walked out" (p. 1). Here are some excerpts from the new (third) set of bylaws:

> Decisions made at the national meetings will be recorded and published in the next Newsletter for ratification. . . . Since there is no central authority, no president and no officers, the purposes of AWP shall be implemented by Committees specializing in particular tasks. . . . Every member of AWP may join as many Committees as interest and time permit. Once a committee is formed, it will make its own internal rules, plan its own action. (*AWP Newsletter*, 1973a, pp. 3–4)

In her recent analysis of feminist organizations, Martin (1990) claimed that "the most frequently discussed structural issue in the feminist organizations literature is . . . participatory-democratic versus hierarchical authority and control" (p. 195). All power issues were highly charged and produced endless struggle and self-examination, as discussed in Jo Freeman's (1972–73) much-reprinted essay, "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." Tensions persisted between efficiency and democracy, between cumbersome processes of information-sharing and the need to respond

quickly to changing events, and between the desire for maximal inclusion and the recognition of unequal talents and interests.

In retrospect, it is a remarkable testament to the times that AWP continued to function and accomplish its goals for many years with such a loose structure, relying on self-initiative and personal commitment. The fear of elitism continued so strongly that feminist psychology prizes, awards, and keynote speakers at conventions were avoided for years. With the exception of the 1978 meeting, there was no convention keynote address until 1985.

The Annual Conferences

Beginning with the first bylaws meeting in February 1970, AWP established the tradition of an annual midwinter get-together. From 1970 through 1973, these meetings focused on organizational maintenance and national and regional APA planning. By 1973, however, AWPers were looking for more opportunities to share ideas in feminist psychological research and theory. 1973 was also the year when APA approved a formal Psychology of Women Division (Division 35) (Mednick, 1978). Lengthy discussion had vetoed the suggestion that AWP should fold up its tents now that there was an APA women's division, since it seemed that an independent voice could be used to provide radical pressure on APA and to deal with feminist subjects that would probably never interest APA.

The first AWP conference on research and theory was held in October 1973 in Fort Wayne, IN. Coordinated by Cathryn Adamsky, it included lengthy business meetings as well as workshops on sexism, sexuality, women's anger, teaching women psychology, androgyny, concerns of feminist therapists, funding of feminist research, assertion training, and so forth. The emphasis was on the brand new feminist research—how to do it, research instruments, where to publish it, how to network, and similar topics.

The second conference occurred in January 1975 in Carbondale, IL, with workshops on feminist therapy technique, ethics, and supervision, as well as feminist research and teaching psychology of women. One hundred sixty participants registered, with the conference planning done chiefly by graduate students at Southern Illinois University (Laura Brown, Nechama Liss-Levinson, Sandy Webster, Kathy Grady, and Michele Cusatis), some of whom had attended the Fort Wayne conference. By the third midwinter conference in Knoxville, TN, on January 1976 (attendance was about 350; the coordinator was Sharon Lord, a choice made partly because Lord had brought so many students to the Carbondale meeting), a conference design was apparent: lengthy business meetings, concurrent workshops and panels on practical and theoretical issues in psychology of women, and lots of socializing.

The conference began to include elements of the growing "women's culture" when the fourth conference, in 1977 (St. Louis; attendance about 700) included a concert of women's music by Margie Adam. In 1978 (Pittsburgh; attendance about 1,000), a dance was added. Over the years, notables from the women's music movement (e.g., Cassie Culver and the Belle Starr Band, Holly Near, Sweet Honey in the Rock, and Meg Christian) performed at AWP concerts and dances. The sight of hundreds of women dancing together was startling to many conference attenders, not to mention hotel employees. Exhibit rooms of women's books, crafts, and message buttons also became conference hallmarks. Once AWP decided that "stars" were not anathema, feminists outside psychology such as Flo Kennedy, Billye Avery, Patricia Schroeder, and Molly Yard were invited.

Although many presentations could just as easily been given at APA (and some doubtless were), others were too personal, too outside acceptable methodologies, not psychological, or too political. Unger (1982) noted: "At one of the recent AWP midwinter conferences, three of the invited addresses were given by women who were encountering difficulty in obtaining tenure at prestigious institutions. . . . All these women ultimately received negative decisions" (p. 9). The sense of feminist sanctuary, of celebration for feminist psychology despite continuing marginalization in "the real world," continues to define the AWP conference for many.

Lesbians in AWP

Much of AWP's conference and organizational work has come from the significant lesbian membership. After an initial phase in the women's movement when the label of "lesbian" was used as a smear, and many feminists reflexively and thoughtlessly denied the label, some superficial harmony occurred over the construction "that lesbianism was not simply a bedroom issue . . . [but rather that] lesbianism was primarily a political choice" (Echols, 1989, p. 216). In 1973, during a then-typical "marathon" (9:30 A.M.–10:30 P.M.) AWP business meeting chaired by Barbara Wallston at APA in Montreal, an additional purpose was proposed for the AWP bylaws: "Helping women create individual sexual identities through which they may freely and responsibly express themselves (provided such expression does not oppress other individuals)" (*AWP Newsletter*, 1973b, p. 1). It was approved at the meeting and by a subsequent mail vote with little debate or controversy. In 1975, a long position paper on women's sexuality appeared in the *AWP Newsletter*: "[W]e know that choice of sexual expression may change as the woman and her circumstances change . . . celibate . . . lesbian . . . heterosexual . . . bisexual. . . . [t]here are no individual solutions. . . . All women must be free to create their own sexual choice based on their own bodies and experiences" (Childs, Sachnoff, & Stocker, 1975, pp. 1, 4, 5).

This compromise recognized the oppressive social constructions of sexuality (which must be opposed as a group), and the acceptability of diverse individual paths (which must be accepted by the group). In avoiding the political language popular at the time (e.g., were lesbians the most woman-identified feminists?), AWP's statement avoided creating a politically correct sexuality that would have fragmented and polarized the group.

The fall 1975 newsletter announced the formation of a lesbian caucus in AWP as a joint effort of AWP and AGP (the Association of Gay Psychologists). Its first discussion focused on decreasing sexism in AGP and on lesbian issues in psychotherapy. The caucus waxed and waned over the years. By 1984, "the productive collaboration of lesbian and straight women" was being cited as "one of the strengths of AWP as an organization" (Horst, 1984). An annual prize for outstanding lesbian publications was started in 1989. Every survey of AWP membership indicates approximately equal numbers of lesbian and heterosexual women, and the steering group ratio is also intentionally kept equal.

Feminist Therapy

Feminist therapy had been important since the very founding of AWP, when sexist psychotherapy and psychotherapists were among the original targets for change. A recurring agenda item became the creation of a nationwide feminist therapist roster for referral, self-referral, networking, and therapy research. First mentioned in 1972, persons self-defined as "feminist therapists" were asked to provide "a sentence or two to identify yourself within the broad range of feminist viewpoints" for a national list (*AWP Newsletter*, 1972, p. 6). In 1974, the feminist therapy committee asked for bibliographies and references for a clinicians' guide. "Feminist Therapy: A Beginning Statement" appeared in the newsletter in 1975, emphasizing the importance of a therapy process that eliminated the therapist/client hierarchy and recommending that therapy content include a discussion about women's social position and oppression (Sachnoff, 1975a). "Toward a Definition of Feminist Therapy" appeared later that year, asking feminist therapists to answer 29 questions (e.g., "Should feminist therapy only be done in groups?" "Do you treat men?" "How would you describe a healthy female?" "Do you ever refuse clients?" "What is a successful treatment?") (Sachnoff, 1975b). However, criteria for inclusion on the roster continued to be elusive. Finally, in the 1980s, the Feminist Therapy Institute became the organization devoted to feminist therapy issues (e.g., ethics, credentialing, training, and supervision), and AWP ended its efforts at making lists. Many would say, however, that the AWP annual midwinter conferences continue to be dominated by feminist therapy issues of content, theory, and practice.

CONTINUING CHALLENGES: 1976–1991

Organizational Struggles

Every issue of the *AWP Newsletter* in the 1970s contains complaints about organizational structure and function: few members attending business meetings; decisions needed between business meetings, but the loose-knit committee structure cannot act; less than 5% of the membership votes in newsletter; members drop out of a particular committee and their task is forgotten or overlooked; and so forth. At the August 1979 APA business meeting, a decision was made to have a Working Conference on Problems of Growth in AWP in New York City on the following Thanksgiving weekend. All members were invited. A lengthy report appeared in the June/July 1980 *AWP Newsletter*:

> The goal of the meeting was to identify problems associated with AWP's growth. . . . AWP is a feminist, nonhierarchic organization, and relies on active member participation, rather than on a set of "officers" to maintain the organization and get work done. . . . [However,] because we come to AWP with training and experience working in hierarchic organizations, . . . we have learned to expect direction and supervision . . . and we become impatient with the apparent cumbersomeness of . . . [AWP's] process of open discussion, active decision-making and taking initiative. . . . AWP needs a decision-making structure to deal with organizational matters between meetings and beyond the scope of standing committees. . . . A seven-person structure [is proposed]. (Marlowe, Jenkins, Grady & Bob, 1980)

Thus, the Implementation Collective, or "Imps," was born. Ten years after its founding, AWP returned to the familiarity of an ongoing central structure with a fixed number of people in specific roles. The Implementation Collective has now (1991) grown to 11 members who volunteer (still no elections) for 3-year terms. Their expenses are reimbursed. As a result of such an intense working arrangement, Imps become friends, initiate and develop projects together, and see themselves as responsible for "running" the organization. Most Imps joined AWP after 1979 and support AWP's increasing ("efficient") centralization. Not for many years has AWP had "marathon" general business meetings where issues were hashed out line by line by a large and heterogeneous gathering. The Imps have developed policy guidelines to make their decision-making consistent and accountable, including fiscal guidelines, liaison guidelines, guidelines for people interested in setting up regional AWP branches, and so forth. Thus, over the last decade, AWP has clearly moved toward "institutionalization" (Turner & Killian, 1957). However, since there is no paid staff or head-

quarters, and since Imps and others performing key roles are volunteers located all over the country, the business of the organization still has an amateur "feel."

The traditional AWP attention to feminist process is still apparent: Imp decisions are almost always made by consensus, any member can add to the agenda, there is a conscious effort to respect and affirm each woman's individual life circumstances, nonjudgmental attitudes and open communication are reinforced, inexperienced AWP members are recruited to learn leadership skills, and so on. (Hawxhurst & Morrow, 1984). Loraine Obler (1989), then Implementation Collective coordinator, recently described again the persistent tensions over power, inclusion, and efficiency that arise from the feminist dedication to process.

International Activities

Denyse Barbet volunteered in 1976 to serve as AWP's representative to the United Nations, and AWP became an official Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) with observer status. Over the years, Barbet, Diane Borchelt, and Diane Simpson attended U.N. briefings and regularly wrote for the newsletter. One result is that AWP has repeatedly petitioned the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.N. "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women."

As plans were being completed for the final event of the U.N. Decade for Women (1975–1985), a gigantic women's conference to be held in Nairobi, Kenya, AWP was invited to provide resource persons on women's mental health issues for a preconference meeting. Susan Gore obtained a foundation grant (AWP's first and only), and a working conference was held in New York City to brainstorm ideas for a resource document. A California group completed the draft, and six members of AWP presented "An International Feminist Mental Health Agenda for the Year 2000" in Nairobi in July 1985.[4] This document represents AWP's only contribution to feminist efforts to develop policy statements on women's psychological problems (Russo, 1985; Russo & Denmark, 1984; Walker, 1984). Few AWP members have demonstrated interest in AWP's international potential, and there was even newsletter criticism about the "Nairobi caper" (Marlowe, 1985).

Movement Issues: ERA, Abortion, and Diagnostic Nomenclature

Over the years, AWP has signed amicus briefs on abortion cases and participated in pro-choice activities. AWP supported the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) after it was sent by Congress to the states for ratification and participated in the National Organization for Women (NOW)

march in Washington, DC, in support of the extension of the ratification deadline. In 1980, AWP helped the newly formed National Coalition of Psychologists for the ERA, which was coordinated by Nancy Felipe Russo, to work for the APA convention boycott of unratified states.

The major political activity undertaken by AWP since APA's town hall meetings in the 1970s probably was the mid–1980s protest of several new diagnostic categories in the American Psychiatric Association's (ApA's) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM). Under the leadership of Lenore Walker, a coalition of feminist groups wrote numerous letters and picketed the ApA's 1986 convention. Following "months of vigorous opposition by feminist groups," the disputed diagnostic categories were added to the DSM, but only in the appendix (Boffey, 1986, p. A14). However, it was not easy for AWP to take action. The Implementation Collective worried that it lacked authority from the membership, and indecision limited options.

Antiracism and Multiculturalism

AWP, in its newsletter, conferences, and projects, has paid sporadic attention to the fact that it is overwhelmingly a white women's organization. Conference themes have often sounded multicultural, such as in 1986: "Global issues, local solutions," but lacked organizational follow-through. At the 1981 Boston conference, AWP and its convention planners were accused of various "isms," and an eighth purpose was added to the bylaws: "Working to eliminate any practices and prejudices which divide women from one another, such as racism, heterosexism, agism, classism, or conflicts arising from differing religious orientations" (*AWP Newsletter*, 1982, March/April, p. 1).

No committee or other institutional structure was created, however, and throughout the 1980s, letters to the newsletter continued to complain about various aspects of AWP's institutional racism. Finally, at the Newport, RI, conference in 1989, a breakfast meeting for Women of Color was scheduled, and the group that met developed an initial agenda to deal with underrepresentation within AWP.[5] Items included a permanent women of color caucus and position on the Imps, an antiracist policy within AWP, an ethnic/racial issues prize, and active recruitment of women of color within regional chapters. Ruth Hall volunteered to coordinate the new caucus. Within a year, AWP approved the additional Imp position and the Imps added antiracism to their job descriptions. AWP may be able to make use of the experiences of other feminist professional/academic organizations such as the National Women's Studies Association in working toward antiracism and multiculturalism (Leidner, 1991).

CONCLUSION

In memoriam articles are beginning to appear in the *AWP Newsletter*, although they more often commemorate feminist psychologists cut down in their prime than AWPers who have died at a ripe old age. Nevertheless, the membership is aging and thoughts are turning to creating an agenda that will attract younger women. AWP lost its activist edge when it won its early professional struggles, and it never created a structure to find and fight new battles. Nonetheless, it continues as a vibrant organization making important contributions to its members' lives and to psychology through its annual conference and regional chapters. Moreover, it continues to be an example of feminist process at work. As always in a historical sketch, one ends by wondering what the future holds.

NOTES

1. This original name was changed in 1970 to the Association for Women in Psychology.
2. This rendering of events is taken from the summer 1970 *AWP Newsletter*, written largely by the first president, Dr. Jo-Ann Evans Gardner. Gardner was a part-time academically employed experimental psychologist who wrote a moving essay describing bitter experiences with employment discrimination encountered after receiving her PhD in 1964 (Gardner, 1971).
3. The summer 1970 *AWP Newsletter* discusses three petitions. The minutes of the APA Council of Representatives identifies four. The issues are not precisely the same (i.e., the council minutes do not have the newsletter's three plus one additional one). All issues mentioned in either place are included in this article.
4. It was given again at the 24th International Congress of Psychology in Sydney, Australia, in 1988. Copies of this 24-page document are still available from Suzanna Rose, Department of Psychology, University of Missouri, St. Louis, MO 63121, for a contribution of $5.
5. A Jewish Women's Caucus also came together at Newport, and it has successfully lobbied for program time during the subsequent two conferences. A Sabbath celebration, which had been ruled out of bounds in 1981, emerged, uncontested, in the 1991 conference program.

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (1970). 78th annual convention program.

Association for Women in Psychology. (n.d.). On media policy. Unpublished ms.

Association for Women Psychologists. (1970a). Bylaws.

Association for Women Psychologists. (1970b, February 6–8). Press release: National organizing conference of the Association for Women Psychologists. Unpublished ms.

Association for Women Psychologists. (1970c, September). Psychology and the new woman: Statement of the Association for Women Psychologists to the American Psychological Association. Unpublished ms.

Association for Women Psychologists. (1970d, September). Resolutions and motions regarding the status of women presented to the American Psychological Association by the Association for Women Psychologists. Unpublished ms.

AWP Newsletter. (1970, summer). Pittsburgh, PA.

AWP Newsletter. (1972, November/December). New York, NY.

AWP Newsletter. (1973a, March/April). San Francisco, CA.

AWP Newsletter. (1973b, September/October). San Francisco, CA.

AWP Newsletter. (1982, March/April). Los Angeles, CA.

Boffey, P. M. (1986, July 2). Panel accepts 3 disputed psychiatric categories. *New York Times*, p. A14.

Capshew, J. H., & Laszlo, A. C. (1986). "We would not take no for an answer": Women psychologists and gender politics during World War II. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*, 157–180.

Childs, E. K., Sachnoff, E. A., & Stocker, E. A., in interaction with a Committee of the Whole. (1975, March/April). Women's sexuality: A feminist view. *AWP Newsletter*, p. 1, 4–5.

Echols, A. (1989). *Daring to be bad: Radical feminism in America: 1967–1975*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fidell, L. S. (1970). Empirical verification of sex discrimination in hiring practices in psychology. *American Psychologist, 25*, 1094–1098.

Freeman, J. (1972–73). The tyranny of structurelessness. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 17*, 151–164.

Freeman, J. (1973). The origins of the women's liberation movement. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*, 792–811.

Gardner, J. E. (1971). Autobiographical notes relevant to sex discrimination in academic psychology. Unpublished manuscript.

Grady, K. (1977, June/July). An editorial. *AWP Newsletter*, p. 1.

Grady, K. (1978, Dec.–1979, Jan.) Kathleen Grady writes AWP history. *AWP Newsletter*, pp. 1, 8.

Hawxhurst, D., & Morrow, S. (1984). *Living our visions: Building feminist community*. Tempe, AZ: Fourth World.

Horst, L. (1984, December). Implementation Collective planning meeting: summary. *AWP Newsletter*, p. 3.

Leidner, R. (1991). Stretching the boundaries of liberalism: Democratic innovation in a feminist organization. *Signs, 16*, 263–289.

McKeachie, W. J. (1969). Proceedings of the APA, Inc., for the year 1968: Minutes of the annual meeting of the Council of Representatives. *American Psychologist, 24*, 19–41.

McKeachie, W. J. (1970). Proceedings of the APA, Inc., for the year 1969: Minutes of the annual meeting of the Council of Representatives. *American Psychologist, 25*, 13–37.

Marlowe, L. (1985, July). [Letter to the editor]. *AWP Newsletter*, p. 2.

Marlowe, L., Jenkins, S., Grady, K., & Bob, S. (1980, June/July). New York Report. *AWP Newsletter*, pp. 2–4.

Martin, P. Y. (1990). Rethinking feminist organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*, 182–206.

Mednick, M. (1978). Now we are four: What should we be when we grow up? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3*, 123–138.

Obler, L. (1989, Fall). Tensions in feminist process. *AWP Newsletter*, pp. 1, 4.

O'Connell, A. N., & Russo, N. F. (1983). *Models of achievement: Reflections of eminent women in psychology* (Vol. 1). New York: Columbia University Press.

O'Connell, A. N., & Russo, N. F. (1988). *Models of achievement: Reflections of eminent women in psychology* (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Perry, J. B., & Pugh, M. D. (1978). *Collective behavior: Response to social stress*. St. Paul: West.

Reinhold, R. (1970, September 6). Women criticize psychology unit. *New York Times*, p. 28.

Rowland, R. (1985). Women who do and women who do not join the women's movement. *Women's Studies International Forum, 8*, 249–254.

Russo, N. F. (Ed.). (1985). *A women's mental health agenda*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Russo, N. F., & Denmark, F. L. (1984). Women, psychology, and public policy: Selected issues. *American Psychologist, 39*, 1161–1165.

Sachnoff, E. (1975a, March/April). Feminist therapy: A beginning statement. *AWP Newsletter*, p. 2.

Sachnoff, E. (1975b, Fall). Toward a definition of feminist therapy. *AWP Newsletter*, pp. 4–5.

Turner, R. H., & Killian, L. M. (1957). *Collective behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Unger, R. K. (1982). Advocacy vs. scholarship revisited: Issues in the psychology of women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 7*, 5–17.

Walker, L. E. (Ed.). (1984). *Women and mental health policy*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Walsh, M. R. (1985). Academic professional women organizing for change: The struggle in psychology. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 17–28.