2019

Women in the Early Years of the American Economic Association: A Membership beyond the Professoriate Per Se

Ann Mari May

Robert W. Dimand

Women in the Early Years of the American Economic Association: A Membership beyond the Professoriate Per Se

Ann Mari May[1] & Robert W. Dimand[2]

1 Department of Economics, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, NE 68588-0489, USA
2 Department of Economics, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St. Catharines, Ontario L2S 3A1, Canada

Correspondence — Ann Mari May, email: amay1@unl.edu and Robert W. Dimand, email: rdimand@brocku.ca

The records in the archives of the American Economic Association (AEA) located in the David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University, offer us a unique window into the role of gender in the struggle of economists to gain status and authority and allow us to better understand the role of gender in the professionalization of economics. While not replete with information about female economists in the early years of the AEA, the records offer important clues as to the challenges facing women academics, shed light on the formation of the profession, and reveal the influence of the financial frailty of the AEA in the decades prior to the 1930s.

In this essay we examine the decisions and policies of the AEA in its early history from 1885 through the 1920s and the impact of these actions on women's participation and membership in the organization,

Published in *History of Political Economy* 51:4 (2019)
DOI 10.1215/00182702-7685185

especially during the three membership drives that took place during this period— membership drives concentrated in 1900–1902, 1909–13, and 1922–26 (Coats 1993: 241, 256). In its earliest years, we conclude that in abandoning the idea of "branch associations," the AEA lost many potential women members. Our analysis shows that the first membership drive, which targeted academics and businessmen, had a detrimental impact on the pro portion of women members. The second membership drive even more clearly targeted recruitment on businessmen, lawyers, and bankers. We argue that despite the priority placed on expanding membership, the AEA actively recruited a particular constituency outside of academe while ignoring women active in social causes and home economics—women who may have represented a more natural constituency for the organization. Finally, the third membership drive of the 1920s, while not exactly leaving behind its preoccupation with recruitment of businessmen, lawyers, and bankers, expanded recruitment in an effort to bring graduate students and young instructors into the association. It is perhaps not surprising then, that the representation of women as members in the AEA expanded somewhat during the 1920s.

This research allows us to better understand the liminality of women economists' professional lives in the early years of the AEA. Our analysis reveals not only the financial frailty of the organization, but the ways in which gender played an important role in the drive toward professionalization within the discipline of economics. The records of the AEA cast a revealing light on power and influence in what was emerging as a distinct academic discipline of economics and on the differing treatment of men and women in the academic life of the time.

Women's Membership in the American Economic Association

The history of the AEA is a history of the rise of professional expertise in a discipline that would play a central role in the organization of society in the century to come. As Thomas Haskell (1977, 19) has pointed out, the professionalization of the social sciences has involved "a three-part process by which a community of inquirers is established, distinguishes itself from other groups and from society at large, and enhances communication among its members, organizing and disciplining them, and heightening their credibility in the eyes of the public."

Although overall histories examining the rise of economics as a discipline have paid scant attention to the role of gender in the rise of professional authority, there is a growing body of literature that examines early women economists and their contributions, challenges, and conflicts with the discipline (Libby 1984, 1987, 1990, 1998; Pujol 1992; Hammond 1993; M. A. Dimand, R. Dimand, and Forget 1995; Folbre 1998, 2009; R. Dimand 1999a, b, 2011; Madden 2002; May 2006, 2008; May and R. Dimand 2009; Forget 2011; R. Dimand, Black, and Forget 2011; R. Dimand and Black 2012; and Madden, Seiz, and Pujol 2004). Materials in the records of the AEA, along with this literature, help to further expand our understanding of the role of gender in the professionalization of economics in the early years of the association.

While women were a small minority in the US economics profession prior to the 1930s, they were by no means totally absent from the profession. Primarily working at women's colleges such as Wellesley, Vassar, Bryn Mawr, Smith, Mount Holyoke, or Barnard, as dean of women in coeducational institutions, or in social work, women faculty were largely absent from elite institutions and state universities, with the exception of Minnie Throop England at the University of Nebraska and Jessica Peixotto at the University of California, Berkeley. From the 1920s onwards, some women taught economics at women's colleges with elite institutional affiliations, such as Elizabeth Boody (later Elizabeth Boody Schumpeter) at Radcliffe (affiliated with Harvard) and Elizabeth Faulkner Baker as department head at Barnard (affiliated with Columbia), while Anne Bezanson (later the first female president of the Economic History Association) received tenure in industrial relations at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton business school, the first tenured woman in any field at Penn.

Women were, from the beginning, active participants in researching and publishing in the newly emerging professions of the social sciences and even appeared in some leadership roles within the AEA. The lead article in the inaugural issue of the *American Economic Review* (*AER)* was by Katharine Coman ([1911a] 2011), professor of history and economics at Welles ley College since 1883, and the only woman among the organizers of the AEA in 1885.[1] Moreover, the early series, Publications of the AEA, included some substantial monographs by women like Emily Greene Balch (1893), Hannah Robie Sewall (1901), and Katharine Coman (1903), and a few early conference papers by women such as Coman (1891), Marietta Kies (1891), and Crystal Eastman (1909).

Edith Abbott of Chicago was one of five AEA vice presidents in 1918 (there were only two each year from 1920), followed by the economic historian Susan Kingsbury of Bryn Mawr in 1919, Jessica Peixotto of Berkeley in 1928, and Mabel Newcomer of Vassar in 1947. After Newcomer,[2] there were no women among AEA vice presidents until the 1970s.[3] Additionally, only three women—Abbott (1918), Kingsbury (1919), and Peixotto (1928)—served on the executive committee during the period from 1886 to 1930.[4] Throughout the early years of the association and until the 1970s, what most women in economics typically lacked were institutional affiliations that would bring status and access to leadership roles within the newly emerging profession of economics.

While popular arguments against women's intellectual capacity and fitness for academic pursuits had subsided by the turn of the century, more subtle notions of academic identity continued to shape women's careers well into the twentieth century (May 2008: 44–47). Moreover, women, who had worked to gain admittance into institutions of higher learning, were increasingly segmented into disciplines thought to be appropriate for women and women in the social sciences occupied a

1. Coman also published in the second issue of the *AER* (see Coman 1911b).

2. The Vassar College website (http://vcenclopedia.vassar.edu/faculty) reports that "a plan to make her [Newcomer] president [of the AEA], ended when she went on mission to Germany" (in 1950 Newcomer served on a Technical Assistance Mission on German Refugees). Charles Kindleberger (1991: 65) recalled that "when I served one year on the nominations committee of the American Economic Association (AEA), the chairman of the Committee mentioned in opening the meeting that the Association had never elected as president a woman, a Southerner or a Canadian" and so Harold Innis of the University of Toronto became president elect in 1952, although he died before assuming the presidency.

3. AEA vice presidents in the 1970s include Barbara Bergmann of the University of Maryland in 1976, Anne Krueger of Stanford in 1977, and Irma Adelman, who moved from the University of Maryland to the University of California at Berkeley in 1979.

4. Other women serving on the executive committee after this time include Mabel Newcomer of Vassar College in 1939 and 1940; Eveline M. Burns of Columbia University in 1945, 1946, and 1947; Mabel Timlin of the University of Saskatchewan in 1958–60; and *Journal of Political Economy* editor Mary Jean Bowman of Chicago in 1969–71.

particularly ambiguous location. It is little wonder then, that women economists—particularly those whose work traversed the borders of several disciplines—found their professional lives complicated and their ability to gain acceptance limited. A survey of the participation of women as members in the early years of the AEA is revealing. As we can see in table 1, the proportion of women among AEA members in the first four decades of the association peaked in 1888, with 46 women among 430 individual members (10.7 percent— there were also 25 institutional memberships). The proportion of women declined to 2.4 percent in 1903 (21 women among 868 individual members) *after* the AEA's first membership drive (1900–1902). This first membership drive increased the number of men belonging to the AEA from 560 in 1900 to 847 in 1903 but did not increase the number of women. There were 21 women members in 1903—the same number of women as in 1900. In absolute numbers, the 50 women belonging to the AEA in 1889 (out of 568 individual members) was not exceeded until 1910 when 61 women were 4.6 percent of 1339 individual members. This latter level was achieved in the course of the AEA's second membership drive, which increased the membership from 948 men and 33 women in 1909 (3.4 percent female) to 2070 men and 78 women in 1914 (3.6 percent female). Overall, from 1890 to 1909, the number of women belonging to the AEA never exceeded 33, with a low of 19 in 1897. The proportion of women among individual members of the AEA slipped back to 2.9 percent in 1919, thereafter growing slowly but steadily in the 1920s, exceeding 4 percent in 1924 and 5 percent in 1928.

Table 1 shows, in part, the outcome of the activities and priorities of the AEA on the gender distribution of its members and, as we shall see, the role that financial pressures and the desire for financial stability and professional status played in shaping these actions and priorities.

Gender, the Demise of the Branch Association, and the First Membership Drive

In the spring of 1897, following a four-month lecture tour, Charlotte Perkins Gilman spent a week on a ranch in Eureka, Kansas. The past several years had brought her to Oakland, California, where she

Table 1 Membership in the American Economic Association: 1886–1928

Membership Drive	Year	Total	Institutional	Individual	Men	Women	Clergy	Percent Women	Percent Clergy	Percent Institutional
	1886	182	0	182	175	7	21	3.8	11.5	0
	1888	455	25	430	384	46	32	10.7	7.4	5.5
	1889	609	41	568	518	50	41	8.8	7.2	6.7
	1890	634	61	573	540	33	44	5.8	7.7	9.6
	1894	781	77	704	672	32	40	4.5	5.7	9.9
	1895	642	77	565	545	20	30	3.5	5.3	12.0
	1896	675	86	589	568	21	26	3.6	4.4	12.7
	1897	678	94	584	565	19	26	3.3	4.5	13.9
	1898	675	99	576	554	22	26	3.8	4.5	14.7
	1899	693	117	576	555	21	26	3.6	4.5	16.9
1st	1900	706	125	581	560	21	25	3.6	4.3	17.7
1st	1901	801	133	668	648	20	25	3.0	3.7	16.6
1st	1902	968	131	837	813	24	3	2.9	0.4	13.5
	1903	1003	135	868	847	21	3	2.4	0.4	13.5
	1904	975	138	837	810	27	1	3.2	0.1	14.2
	1905	1009	137	872	847	25	n/a	2.9	n/a	13.6
	1906	1006	139	867	841	26	n/a	3.0	n/a	13.8
	1907	1000	146	854	828	26	n/a	3.0	n/a	14.6
	1908	1005	153	852	825	27	n/a	3.2	n/a	15.2
2nd	1909	1134	153	981	948	33	n/a	3.4	n/a	13.5
2nd	1910	1509	170	1339	1278	61	n/a	4.6	n/a	11.3
2nd	1911	2115	198	1917	1841	76	n/a	4.0	n/a	9.4
2nd	1913	2563	251	2312	2227	85	n/a	3.7	n/a	9.8
	1914	2449	301	2148	2070	78	n/a	3.6	n/a	12.3
	1916	2392	346	2046	1973	73	n/a	3.6	n/a	14.5
	1919	2667	478	2189	2125	64	n/a	2.9	n/a	17.9
3rd	1922	2951	611	2340	2257	83	n/a	3.5	n/a	20.7
3rd	1924	3350	728	2622	2511	111	n/a	4.2	n/a	21.7
3rd	1926	3349	744	2605	2480	125	n/a	4.8	n/a	22.2
	1928	3469	803	2666	2518	148	n/a	5.6	n/a	23.1

Data derived from numerous individual membership lists found in the American Economic Association Records, Publications of the American Economic Association, *Handbook of the American Economic Association* in supplements to *Economic Studies, Bulletin of the American Economic Association*, and the *American Economic Review*. The sex of the member is determined by first name and when in question by searches of historical documents such as newspapers and by census records. Clergy are included in the men column and separated out when available for further detail. The column labeled "Percent Women" shows the percentage of total individual memberships that are women.

began what would be a lifelong association with women's clubs—clubs that she would later call "one of the most important sociological phenomena of the century" (Ceplair 1991: 44).

It was through her role as secretary of the Oakland Economic Club that "Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Stetson" joined the AEA in 1892–93, maintaining a membership until 1895–96 where the handwritten membership rolls located in Box 1 of the records of the AEA simply indicate her status as "resigned." Less than a year after resigning her membership in the AEA, Gilman wrote in her diary from Kansas that she had discovered "a new branch in my theory on above subject—the biggest piece & saw it. Now I can write the book" (Ceplair 1991: 44). The book she wrote was published in 1898 and titled simply *Women and Economics*. Although *Women and Economics* is thought by many (Sinclair 1965) to be one of the most original works on economic thought, as a nonacademic, it was in a way written from the margins of the discipline (Gilman 1898; M. A. Dimand 1995b).[5] Gilman's interest in the club movement and subsequent membership in the AEA were perhaps facilitated by the existence of branch associations within the AEA in the early years. However, the early demise of the branch associations in the AEA were no doubt an early factor working against women's participation.

At its inception, the association had embraced the notion of branch associations. In volume 1, number 1 of the *Publications of the American Economic Association* (1886), the names of the officers of the Connecticut Valley Branch were provided and all were men. However, as described the following year in his Report on the Connecticut Valley Branch of the Second Annual Meeting of the AEA (1887), Dr. E. W. Bemis (secretary of the Connecticut Valley Branch) brimmed with

5. As a public intellectual, Gilman would come to be known as "the greatest writer that the feminists ever produced on sociology and economics, the Marx and Veblen of the movement [who] always asked the brutal question, and was never satisfied with the easy answer" (Sinclair 1965: 272). Being at the margin of the discipline was not the same as being completely outside the discipline: she later published a discussant's comment on child labor in the proceedings of the AEA annual meeting (Gilman 1907)—possibly the only woman on the program of any AEA annual meeting or in AEA conference proceedings between Coman (1891) and Eastman (1909). See R. Dimand, Black, and Forget 2011; the programs for 1895 through 1898 have not been found. Moreover, Gilman's *The Home, Its Work and Its Influence* (1903) was extensively reviewed by Caroline M. Hill in the *Journal of Political Economy* in 1904.

enthusiasm over the prospects of these branch associations, explaining that this association (Connecticut Valley) "has grown steadily in numbers and influence until it now counts upon its rolls sixty-two members, *including eleven ladies*."[6] Bemis went on to ask, "May it not be one mission, and an important mission, of the American Economic Association to organize such branch associations of men *and women*" (AEA 1886: 42).

The Connecticut Valley Branch was the first, but other branches were soon formed in Orange, New Jersey; Buffalo, New York; Galesburg, Illinois; Washington, D.C.; Canton, Ohio; and Austin, Texas. Officer rolls were reported periodically and were all men in 1886 and 1888, but in 1889 Mrs. Annie H. Barus became vice president of the Washington, D.C. branch as did Miss A. McGregor of the Canton Ohio branch.

However, the 1894 handbook reported what appeared to be the first sign of trouble for the branch associations. No names of branch officers were published in this handbook, but instead we read, "It was ordered that the names of all members of branch associations over one year in arrears in their dues be dropped from the rolls" (AEA 1894: 44). Concern was clearly emerging about the growing financial pressures brought about by having branch associations. The problem is that branch associations provided the national office with only half the dues but were provided with full access to published monographs. When even this share of the dues was not passed on to the national office, action was swift. In the following year of 1895, the association reported, "Of the branch associations, none remain. All of them had by the beginning of this year ceased active work and had ceased to pay dues some years before, though we still continued to send them monographs. Repeated letters to Secretaries and much diligent work on the part of some of them have succeeded in *settling our business* with all of them but one, and we hope to get a final settlement with this in due time" (AEA 1895: 43–45).

As the "Report of the Secretary" showed, the loss of branch members was not insignificant for a fledging association. The report of the seventh annual meetings showed a decline in branch members from 132 to 0 from January 1, 1894, to December 27, 1894, at a time when regular members totaled a mere 482 in January of that year (AEA 1895: 44).

6. Women constituted 18 percent of the membership of the Connecticut Valley Branch.

The demise of the branch associations is particularly noteworthy in terms of its impact on women's participation in the AEA. Women were active participants in the club movement and what little we know about the membership of these branch associations shows a much higher proportion of women than the national rolls show. The branch associations allowed women's participation when they were limited by geographic (mobility) constraints. Clearly, the movement toward a national association without these branch associations worked against women's overall participation.

Along with the demise of the branch associations, other changes were under way as well including the decline of clergy as members. A careful review of the 1902 membership list of the AEA would reveal a change in the reporting of titles for individual memberships that reflected more perhaps than simply the desire to save space, for in that year remaining clergy were listed by their names alone and their credentials, where applicable, Doctor of Divinity—D.D. The transformation of E. Benjamin Andrews from "Rev. Elisha Benjamin Andrews D.D. L.L.D. Chancellor of the University of Nebraska" to "Elisha Benjamin Andrews, Chancellor of the University of Nebraska" speaks to this transformation and the decline of the authority of the clergy. In 1902, the number of clergy with the title "Rev." fell to a mere three (AEA 1902: 39–50).

The decline in the representation of clergy among the AEA's member ship has been well recognized as an indication of the changing character of its membership (Bateman and Kapstein 1999). Less well understood was the role of the first membership drive and its impact on women's membership, but a parallel change in the representation of women received less notice.

In the early years of the association when Richard T. Ely was secretary, "determined efforts were made to enlist the support of a wide variety of nonacademic persons, and the early membership lists included a high pro portion of clergymen." Yet when Ely became president in 1900 and the first membership drive began, a conscious effort was made to "arouse the support of business and professional men" (Coats 1993: 241). Charles H. Hull, serving as secretary and treasurer of the AEA, admonished members of the council to "actively interest themselves in adding to the Association's members" (AEA 1901: 47). Following suit, the council resolved to call upon its members to "suggest each at least five candidates for membership in the Association" (AEA 1902: 48). That there was not an increase in the number of women members from this solicitation may not be surprising. Although the council consisted of 154 members in 1902, only 1 member was a woman.[7] In the end, as A. W. Coats points out, the first membership campaign was undertaken almost single-handedly by Ely (Coats 1993, 241). Pointing to the largest increase in membership in recent history, as acting Secretary Frank A. Fetter put it, "The secretary may perhaps be permitted to record his opinion, that while this result could not have been reached without the cordial cooperation of the members, it would not have been reached save for the energy of President Ely, who has given much time to advancing the Association's interests" (AEA 1902: 49). While the first membership drive successfully added 279 men to the association's membership rolls, it added not a single woman.

A Membership beyond the Professoriate Per Se

From 1900 until the mid-1920s, the AEA struggled with securing adequate resources to support its growing list of activities directed toward expanding its influence. The cost of the decision to begin publishing the *AER* in 1911 and other initiatives made the slow growing revenues from membership all the more problematic and led to additional membership drives designed to increase membership. Efforts to solicit the support and membership of businessmen were particularly pronounced in the second membership drive. This effort reflected not only the desire of the leader ship to obtain an increasing source of membership revenue, but also reflected the status seeking desire of those seeking to build a new profession with increased influence. This drive toward professionalization had an important impact on women and their participation as members of the fledging organization.[8]

It was, in part, this financial stress that brought leaders of the AEA to see the business community as a source of needed support. In the words of A. W. Coats, "In practice, however, at least until the

7. Mary Roberts Smith, New York City.

8. See Helene Silverberg (1998) for a complete gender analysis of the history of American social science

mid-1920's, the organization could not both survive and perform the full range of its self-appointed tasks without the financial aid provided regularly by businessmen's subscriptions or, intermittently, in the form of gifts, life membership payments, and financial aid towards the publication of mono graphs, the awards of prizes, and the administration of new membership campaigns" (American Economic Association Records ([AEAR] Box 1). In the Report of the Secretary dated December 27–31, 1909, T. N. (Thomas Nixon) Carver offered up an extensive review of the association's activities and did so to "show why the finances of the Association will remain in a somewhat unsatisfactory state unless we do one of three things: (1) increase our membership, (2) increase the annual dues, or (3) reduce our publications." Of the three possibilities, he went on to say, "the first seems to the Secretary to be the most attractive" (AEA 1910: 63). The association's leadership concurred and a second membership drive was launched. The president was authorized to appoint a committee on membership to work with the secretary to increase the number of members. Appointed to the committee were Roger W. Babson, Frank H. Dixon, and A. W. (Arch Wilkinson) Shaw (AEA 1911: 133). Clearly, the composition of the committee reflected the desire of the leadership to increase businessmen among its members while showing little interest in expanding women's member ship. Roger W. Babson was an entrepreneur who had worked for investment firms before founding Babson's Statistical Organization and Babson College; Frank H. Dixon was professor of economics at Dartmouth and member of the AEA executive committee from 1906 to 1912; and A. W. Shaw, founder of Shaw Company—a publishing company. Shaw would later return to Harvard to study economics, thus straddling both milieus.

The effort to recruit businessmen extended, at various times, to most officers of the AEA and is evident in the activities surrounding recruitment during the second membership drive. In a letter dated October 6, 1913, Davis R. Dewey, editor of the *AER*, wrote to Charles L. Raper of Chapel Hill to solicit names of potential members. Raper was apparently not the only individual from North Carolina receiving such a solicitation. In a letter dated October 20, 1913, William H. Glasson responded to another of Dewey's recent letters drawing attention to the "comparatively small number of members of the Economic Association in North Carolina." Glasson responded by suggesting the following names of persons who ought to be interested in membership: Mr. George Stephens (banker), Mr. Joseph G. Brown (banker), Col. J. F. Bruton (banker), General J. S. Carr (banker), Mr. J. F. Wily (banker), Hon. J. A. Long (banker and state senator), Hon. Victor Bryant (lawyer and state senator), Mr. George Watts (capitalist), and Mr. John Sprunt Hill (banker). Noting that they were nearly all bankers, Glasson suggested that Dewey direct their attention to the “great value of our publication to them as a class” as they “are apt to regard our association as a purely academic organization” (AEAR Box 67). Dewey responded as directed including in his solicitations articles that might be of particular interest to businessmen.

The second membership drive was, however, also accompanied by an increase in annual dues from three dollars to five, which brought with it reductions in members. In the final year of the drive, dues were raised and the secretary was loath to report that this was “the first year that the present Secretary has had to record in his annual report a loss in membership” (AEA 1913: 202). In the winter of 1914, when memberships continued to fall, then secretary Allyn Abbott Young embarked on a campaign sending letters to 5,300 potential members (Bernstein 2001: 18). However, measured in terms of association memberships, these and other solicitations produced seemingly poor results. As Allyn A. Young noted in 1914, the returns to this investment would appear to be “disappointingly small.”

Nonetheless, officers continued to solicit memberships after the second membership drive had concluded. In a letter dated May 13, 1918, Dewey directed his secretary to obtain a Boston directory in order that addresses might be obtained for “a list of names to use for circulating for members” (AEAR Box 71). Although the Boston directory provided few names of women, there is some evidence that women economists were also solicited as well for membership in the AEA in this period. In a letter dated March 30, 1918, Dewey wrote to Young suggesting the following names from the staff of Bryn Mawr for membership in the AEA: Angie L. Kellogg, Anna C. McBride, Clara E. Mortenson, and Anne Bezanson (AEAR Boxes 70–71).

This letter soliciting the memberships of women from Bryn Mawr stands out in the records of the AEA as a bit unusual for this period when almost all of the membership letters were to businessmen. However, the records yield some indication as to the possible origin of this invitation. On January 30, 1918—just a few months prior to the membership letter, Professor Dewey received a letter from Susan Kingsbury of Bryn Mawr pointing out that the list of doctoral dissertations recently published in the *AER* had not included Bryn Mawr students. She went on to request that the Department of Social Economy be put on the mailing list to which such requests for information are sent (AEAR Box 71). Dewey's secretary replied on January 31 by providing a copy of the letter that goes out to departments in request of dissertation subjects and adding, "I presume that the reason this name of Bryn Mawr was dropped from the list was that in years past we had not been able to get any reply to letters sent and so concluded that theses were not being prepared." In February, Professor Kings bury replied to Professor Dewey providing names for the list. She added a handwritten note "with profound apologies but no excuses!" While the letter of invitation from Dewey to members of the Bryn Mawr staff to join the AEA may have been unrelated to the earlier miscommunication, it appears more likely that this was an attempt on the part of Dewey to smooth over and respond in kind to Professor Kingsbury's generous comments.

World War I, by focusing attention on wartime funding needs, offered a unique opportunity to secure donations and appeal to the business class for membership. However, problems were raised by this particular solution to the association's financial difficulties. During this time officers worked to notify members of ongoing war related activities while raising funds to support the work of war related committees as seen in a letter by Allyn Young to Miss Anne E. Gardner of the AEA dated May 22, 1918. In this letter, Young informs Miss Gardner of his proposed circular letter to be sent to all members of the association. He goes on to explain the "real rea son" for his sending a circular to all members lies in the fact that, "Professor Seligman had been offered a fund of $50,000 for the work of his committee and that, while it comes from perfectly good sources, we do not feel that we want to use it except as part of a general fund contributed by members of the Association."[9] Young went on to explain that the "New

9. Professor Seligman's committee was the special committee on war finance—a committee established to undertake a thorough study of the war revenue system of the United States and other countries. See American Economic Association, "Report of the Secretary for the year ending December 18, 1918," p. 355.

York business men who will contribute to the Seligman committee expenses, including particularly Mr. Straus of Macy and Company and Mr. Thomas Lamont of J. P. Morgan and Company, will join the Association if they are not already members, so that the whole amount will come from members of the Association" (AEAR Box 16).[10] This letter demonstrates the sensitivity that officers of the association had on the appearance of non-members providing resources and the flexibility that they nonetheless mustered to move forward with such donations.

Irving Fisher, then president of the AEA, focused his efforts on recruiting members of the business class and crafted his rhetorical appeal around the war effort. In a letter dated October 30, 1918, Fisher wrote:

> Dear Sir: I am sure that you, as a lawyer, are deeply interested in the great economic problems of the war and of the period after the war. For this reason I venture to call your attention to the work of the American Economic Association. This Association is the representative organization of the professional economists of the country, but its membership includes an increasing number of men in other professions, in business, and in the government service, who are interested in the wider aspects of business and economic problems. (AEAR Box 16)

Included in Fisher's letter was an application blank which, along with a "check for one year's dues ($5.00)" would be sufficient for membership.[11]

The new memberships among the business class were often short lived and members often resigned after only one year. More annoying perhaps, their resignations were often communicated through letters from disgruntled former members explaining the reasons for their departure. In this regard, the chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was uncharacteristically blunt when he wrote: "There seems to be so little of interest in your periodical and so little of real vital interest in your meetings."[12]

10. While Mr. Eph. A. Straus had joined the AEA in 1916, Thomas Lamont did indeed join in 1918.

11. Letter from Fisher to H. S. J. Sickel dated October 30, 1918, in "Correspondence 1918–1919; Allyn A. Young, Secretary-Treasurer," Box 16, AEAR.

12. Letter from E. E. Pratt to Young dated November 8, 1915, in "Correspondence, including reports, 1914-1915," Box 14, AEAR.

Of course there was the delicate problem of what the association had to offer to the non-academic business class in an association increasingly focused on academic pursuits and what might be expected in return—a problem that continued to trouble Young especially. These tensions would emerge periodically in letters such as the one received by then secretary Young in 1918 from Erastus W. Bulkley who took it upon himself to investigate the membership of the committees he was being asked to support. Bulkley, responding to Young's request for contributions to support the "necessary expenses of various special committees appointed to work on the economic problems of the war," wrote to express his concerns:

> In looking over these committees, I find that they are composed almost entirely of professors in various institutions. While I do not wish in any way to minimize the work of professors, especially professors of economics, it has always seemed to me that if economics was to make any progress in this country consistent with its general importance, there would have to be close cooperation between the professors and the business men. (AEAR Box 16)

Bulkley, having copied the letter to then president Irving Fisher, received Fisher's carefully framed response admitting that the "suggestion was a good one in so far as it is consistent with the character of the American Economic Association which is primarily an association of academic economists." Not leaving well enough alone, Fisher added: "I would suggest that you write to Professor Seligman. His committee is closely in touch with businessmen. When the Committee on the Purchasing Power of Money was formed I suggested having a number of business men as members and the Executive Committee took the ground that every business man would prefer to have a committee of professional economists" (AEAR Box 16).

Fisher's short letter elicited a three-page (single-spaced) response from Mr. Bulkley, which began with the somewhat acerbic observation that "I was rather under the impression that the membership of the American Economic Association included not only academic economists, but also not a few business men" but went on to entice Fisher with the suggestion of an "institution for economic research, properly endowed." Communicating his strong belief that it would perhaps fall to economists to initiate this delicate relationship, Bulkley referred Fisher to a Dr. Edward D. Jones, professor of commerce and industry, University of Michigan, who apparently had the admiration, not to mention support, of Bulkley and other businessmen in realizing "that he cannot sit in his study and evolve [the] science of economics." After suggesting that "there is no subject before the economic interest of the country today of more importance than his matter of cooperation between academic economists and businessmen and the enlargement of facilities for the scientific study of various business matters," Bulkley closed by indicating "I will not be writing Prof. Seligman, as suggested. I have put this general broad question to you" (AEAR Box 16).

A few days later Young wrote again to perhaps smooth things over, explaining how it is that many businessmen find little time for the work of committees while professional economists often find that this work comes "so directly in the line of their work vocation that they usually regard it as more or less important" (AEAR Box 16). Responding to Young's letter of July 22, Bulkley wrote to indicate that Young's viewpoint "might be open to considerable discussion for and against," insisting again that economists and businessmen would have much to gain by greater cooperation. Bulkley, apparently not convinced that he had succeeded in influencing Young, closed by inviting him to "have luncheon" with him sometime now that he was in New York. It is not clear whether or not Young ever took him up on this offer of lunch, but what was clear was that Bulkley had no intention of letting go of the issue. In a letter dated October 1, 1918, Bulkley wrote to Young requesting a copy of the constitution and bylaws, list of members, and "any other general information you have regarding the aims, purposes and accomplishments to-date of the Association" (AEAR Box 16). This hard fought battle produced seemingly short-lived results. Mr. Bulkley was listed as a member in the 1919 membership rolls but no record of his membership is found following that date.

Emerging Independence for a Primarily Learned Society

The correspondence between Mr. Bulkley and Professor Young illustrates a significant underlying conflict within the AEA—a conflict that would ultimately be resolved to a great extent during the 1920s. The second membership drive, with its emphasis on recruitment of business men, had sparked concerns about just what kind of organization the AEA was to be. As secretary during this time, Young expressed growing concerns. Confiding in Dewey, Young admitted in a letter dated November 15, 1915:

> I am inclined to think that sooner or later we shall have to face the question of just what kind of an association we want to be. My own efforts, as you know, have been devoted to strengthening our hold upon those persons who might be counted upon to support a strictly professional and scientific association. I do not believe that Babson's efforts among business men have done us any good, for few of his nominees remain members for more than one year. (Coats 1993: 249)

By 1919, when a deficit again appeared and the association was debating how best to address the problem, Young made his views clear and public. In his last report as secretary, Young explained:

> The apparently obvious way to increase our income is by increasing our membership. But it has been our experience that efforts to extend our membership list meet with rapidly diminishing returns if we go very far beyond the regrettably small group of persons who are definitely interested in the scientific study of economic problems. We cannot go very far in the direction of securing and holding a larger number of members without lowering standards, and it is to be feared, diminishing our influence. Our fundamental purposes must be defined by the fact that we are primarily a learned, or if you prefer, a professional society. (AEA 1919: 234)

When the third membership drive began, a shift was under way. In 1922, a Special Membership Committee was established—the same year that the association's Executive Committee voted to move forward with incorporation. The committee, chaired by F. S. (Frederick Shipp) Deibler, indicated that they had turned their attention toward "graduate and advanced students, to bankers, and lawyers, and to associations of business men where there has been any indication that a library or a research department was maintained" (AEA 1923b: 256). Importantly, the Membership Committee's attention to graduate students and young instructors demonstrates a widening of the net that appears to have opened the door for women in this decade. While the subtle shift to "associations of business men" where a library or research department has been maintained also reveals a slight shift away from businessmen as members.

At the same time, a Special Committee on Finance was established headed by Edwin R. A. Seligman. In 1919, the association had a net deficit for the first time since 1911. The net deficit in 1919 was $1,688.48 and to make matters worse, grew to $2,366.60 the following year (AEA 1920: 237). This committee not only called for an increase in membership to address the association's financial needs, but also called for the development of a permanent endowment. The association's financial needs were uppermost in the minds of those on both committees in the years leading up to this final membership campaign and their recommendations brought both financial independence from businessmen as well as needed long term financial support for the association.

In their 1922 report, the committee identified donations totaling $10,000—donations that helped to pay off the association's debt and balance the budget. As Coats reports, "thirty gentlemen" had made substantial progress in starting an endowment and by January 1923 Seligman suggested, "The committee believes that an attempt should be made to raise a fund of $5,000 for three years" (AEA 1923a: 255). In the end, the outcome was evident in the growth of the association's cash, savings, and investments, which increased from $7,481.54 in 1920 to $39,077.13 by 1929 (AEA 1921: 189; 1930: 190).

The priorities and ultimate success in recruitment during the three membership drives is evidenced by the growth in membership broken down by institutional membership, male, and female members. The first membership drive from 1900 to 1902 actually resulted in a decline in institutional memberships as a proportion of total memberships. Institutional memberships went from 17.7 percent of total memberships in 1900 to 13.5 percent in 1903. As previously noted, the number of women members from 1900 to 1903 stayed the same while the number of men rose from 560 to 847 by 1903. As a result, the percentage of women members declined from 3.6 percent of total memberships in 1900 to 2.4 percent in 1903.

During the second membership drive, institutional memberships increased from 153 to 301. Female membership increased from 33 to 78 while the number of male memberships increased from 948 to 2,070. As a result, as a percentage of individual memberships, women's member ships grew ever so slightly from 3.4 percent in 1909 to 3.6 percent by 1914. Like the first membership drive, the majority of the increase in total membership occurred with an increase in individual memberships by men.

Finally, the last membership drive, which took place from 1922 to 1926, reflected a growing interest in graduate students and young instructors as well as bankers, lawyers, and "associations of business men where there has been any indication that a library or research department was maintained" (AEA 1923b: 256). This widening of the pool of potential members to graduate students and young instructors, along with the more narrowly defined interest in associations of businessmen, brought about changes in the association's membership. Institutional memberships grew from 611 (20.7 percent of total memberships) in 1922 to 803 (23.1 percent of total memberships) by 1928. More interesting perhaps, is the modest, but steady growth in women's membership in the 1920s. Women memberships grew from 83 to 148 by 1928 or from 3.5 percent of individual memberships in 1922 to 5.6 percent in 1928. In contrast, individual membership for men went from 2,257 to 2,518 by 1928 but fell in percentage terms from 96.5 percent of individual membership in 1922 down to 94.5 percent by 1928.

Gender, Professionalization, and Jurisdictional Disputes

The membership lists of the AEA in the early years of its existence provide a window into the shared character of the men and women drawn to the AEA and help to expand our understanding of what members were like in the early years and how the backgrounds of these members changed over time. The membership of the AEA is punctuated with numerous well known individuals including Woodrow Wilson, Ivy Ledbetter Lee, Andrew Carnegie, Seth Low, Ralph Easley, Learned Hand, Benjamin Strong, and J. Pierpont Morgan, not to mention economists such as Alfred Marshall, John Neville Keynes, Léon Walras, F. Y. Edgeworth, Thorstein Veblen, John R. Commons, and John

Maynard Keynes.[13] But what is often overlooked were the women reformers, philanthropists, and academics of note that were also members of the AEA.

Although Charlotte Perkins Gilman's membership in the AEA lasted only a few years, she was in many ways indicative of the women who joined the AEA in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Among the early members of the AEA were many other well-known women activists and social reformers—a membership extending well beyond the professoriate per se. Moreover, those members who were women scholars often shared the same commitment to activism and reform evident in women members from outside the confines of academic walls.

The first women members of the AEA reflected the reform-minded nature of its female contingent. The first organizing meeting of the AEA held in 1885 had only one woman in attendance, Professor Katharine Coman of Wellesley College. In 1886—the first year memberships were recorded, women were 7 of the 182 members listed and these women members included scholars and reformers. Included as members were scholars such as Coman, full professor of history and economics at Wellesley; scholar-activists such as Helen Stuart Campbell, who taught briefly at the University of Wisconsin and at the Kansas State Agricultural College and is considered a pioneer in the home economics movement; and social reformers such as Mrs. C. R. (Josephine Shaw) Lowell, founder of the New York Consumer's League.[14]

In the first ten years of its existence, the AEA continued to expand in membership and the "Membership book, 1890–96" listed a total of 866 different members. Included among the nearly 50 women members listed during this period were again, scholars and reformers. Included were scholars such as Miss S. P. (Sophonisba) Breckenridge who graduated from Wellesley College in 1888, became the first woman to be admitted to the Kentucky bar in 1895, and also earned a PhD in political science and economics from the University of Chicago

13. It may be noted that William Graham Sumner and J. Laurence Laughlin long refused to join the AEA (Laughlin until 1905) because they disapproved of Ely's Chautauqua and Verein für Socialpolitik-style social reform emphasis.

14. Also members in the first year of the association were Mrs. Mary W. (White) Bond, Mrs. Imogene (C.) Fales who, together with Helen Stuart Campbell, organized the Sociologic Association of America, Miss Mary A. Wilcox, professor of zoology at Wellesley, and Miss Jeannie R. Lippman, educator of the Mary Institute—a school for girls founded by William Greenleaf Eliot.

in 1901; scholar-activists such as Mrs. Florence Kelley who did graduate work in economics and social science at the University of Zurich, received a law degree from Northwestern University School of Law, collaborated with Jane Addams at the Hull House, and helped create the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); Miss Carrie L. Chapman (Catt) was active in the suffrage movement serving as president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association and later founded the League of Women Voters; and, Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Stetson (later Gilman), author of *Women and Economics* (Gilman 1898; M. A. Dimand 1995b; R. Dimand 2000).[15]

Although the total membership of the AEA had increased to 1,510 by 1910, the number of women members was only slightly higher in 1910 than it had been in the mid-1890s. Moreover, while the membership rolls of the AEA in 1910 showed the continuing membership of reformers, also included were a growing number of women academics—many with doctoral degrees.[16] The 1910 membership rolls included Edith Abbott (author of nineteen *Journal of Political Economy*

15. Also listed as members were women such as Miss Jane M. Bancroft (Robinson) studied at the Sorbonne University in Paris and went on to found the Western Association of Collegiate Alumnae and become dean of women and professor of French at Northwestern University; Mrs. Alfred H. (Emma M.) Batcheller was the daughter of Francis Amasa Walker, president of MIT and first president of the AEA; Miss E. H. (Emma Helen) Blair did graduate work at Wisconsin State University and went on to edit numerous works including work on the Lewis and Clark expedition; Miss Grace H. (Hoadley) Dodge was a philanthropist who donated roughly 1.5 million dollars to various organizations and played a large role in supporting the Teachers College of Columbia University; Miss Ida M. Mason was active in the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, philanthropist and major contributor to the Tuskegee Five Year fund; Mrs. Emily Tracy (Swett) Parkhurst worked on behalf of women writers and helped to found the Pacific Coast Women's Press Association; and Miss Claire de Graffenreid received two AEA prizes for her studies on child labor and conditions of women's labor, taught at the Georgetown Female Seminary, and pursued a nonacademic (and controversial) career as an investigator with the Bureau of Labor (see R. Dimand and Black 2012).

16. See the entries on Abbott, Balch, Coman, England, Hewes, Peixotto, Sewall, Sumner Woodbury, and Youngman in R. Dimand, M. Dimand, and Forget 2000. There were also a few women contributing to economics in the US at that time who had doctorates from other countries: Agnes Wergeland, who in 1890 became the first Norwegian woman to receive a PhD from the University of Zurich, was a docent in history at the University of Chicago from 1896 to 1902 (and nonresident instructor in the extension department until 1909) and chair of the department of history at the University of Wyoming from 1902 (where she also taught political economy), and published six *Journal of Political Economy* articles from 1900 to 1905 (posthumously republished by the University of Chicago Press as two books in 1916). The only one of these women in the early decades of the AEA who published jointly with a male relative was Gladys McAlpine Campbell Blakey of the University

[*JPE*] articles, AEA vice president in 1918, Chicago PhD in economics 1905; see Abbott (1905); Emily Greene Balch (Nobel Peace Prize 1946, awarded for the same antiwar activism for which she lost her full professorship at Wellesley in 1918); Katharine Coman; Mrs. Mary Roberts Coolidge (Stanford PhD in economics 1895, published by American Statistical Association as Coolidge 1895); Mrs. Minnie Throop England (Nebraska PhD in religion 1906, published on business cycle theory in the *JPE* and *Quarterly Journal of Economics* [*QJE*]); Amy Hewes (Chicago PhD in sociology 1903, published articles in the *AER*, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *JPE*, and *QJE*); Susan M. Kingsbury (Columbia PhD in history 1905, published as Kingsbury 1905); and Jessica Peixotto (UC Berkley PhD in political science 1900, published as Peixotto 1901). [17]

However, as the 1916 *Handbook of the American Economic Association* would show, fundamental changes had overtaken the membership of the AEA. Women members became increasingly academic in background while the proportion of women fell. The 1916 handbook recorded an increase of only twelve women over 1910, while the number of male members had increased from 1,278 to 1,973 over the same period.[18]

---

of Minnesota, who, writing with her husband and University of Minnesota colleague Roy Gillespie Blakey, published ten *AER* articles on the federal tax legislation of the previous year: a thirty-one-page article in 1919 and others in 1932 and in each year from 1934 to 1941 (he was also the sole author of *AER* articles on the same topic in seven years from 1914 to 1928), as well as books on federal income taxation and on taxation in Minnesota (see also M. Dimand 1995a and R. Dimand 1995).

17. Also included in the membership lists were Alice E. (Emeline) Belcher; Marie M. (Manly) Bradley; Elizabeth B. Butler (published in law journals and charities journals); Emilie Josephine Hutchinson (Columbia PhD in economics 1919, published as Hutchinson [1919] 1968); Eleanor Hope Johnson (Hartford Seminary 1925); Caroline Elizabeth MacGill (Chicago 1927); Marion (Smith) Parris (Bryn Mawr PhD in economics 1908, published as Parris 1909); Mrs. Jane Bancroft (Robinson) (Syracuse PhD in European history 1884); Hannah Robie Sewall (Minnesota PhD in economics 1898, published by the AEA as Sewall 1901, reissued by Kelley Reprints of Economic Classics in 1968 and 1971); Helen L. (Laura) Sumner (later Woodbury, Wisconsin PhD in political economy and American history 1908); and Anna Prichett Youngman (Chicago PhD in economics 1908, published as Youngman 1909 and republished 1973, and seven *JPE* articles from 1907 to 1910, three in *QJE* 1913 to 1917, and *AER* articles in 1921 and 1922).

18. The total number of members including institutional membership totaled 2,392 in 1916; institutional memberships were 346, the number of male members was 1,973, and the number of female members a mere 73. Some ambiguity remains for a handful of members for which gender is not determined and some women's membership, while listed as individuals with a library affiliation, were not marked as institutional memberships.

The AEA's ability to recruit within academic circles was indeed limited. As then secretary-treasurer, Thomas Nixon Carver, noted in his communication with Professor Dixon of Dartmouth in a letter dated April 14, 1911, "We have pretty nearly exhausted the academic field, and have practically all teachers of economics in the Association now, though occasionally we find a new one" (AEAR Box 12). Yet, there were many teachers—many with doctoral degrees, who were not members at the time that Carver wrote—individuals such as Ellen Deborah Ellis (PhD in economics Bryn Mawr 1905), Katharine Bement Davis (PhD in economics University of Chicago 1900), Hannah Robie Sewall (PhD in economics University of Minnesota 1898), Helen Page Bates (PhD in economics University of Wisconsin 1896), and more.[19]

At the same time, the AEA resisted initiatives that would have potentially appealed to some perhaps more traditionally minded women. For example, in a letter of July 29, 1916, Theodora B. Cunningham and Virginia King Frye wrote on behalf of the League of American Pen Women suggesting that a valuable addition to the *AER* might be a "woman's Department of household economics, which would be to the busy but intelligent house-wife what the Economic Review is to her thinking husband." This section could describe, they suggested, "what is being done along the line of Household Economics by various State Federations of Women's Clubs." It is not clear whether or not Dewey consulted widely on this question, but his brief reply dated August 9, 1916, was resolute. "In reply to your inquiry of July 29 in regard to the possibility of establishing a women's department of household economics in the *American Economic Review*, I am sorry to say that we have not the space" (AEAR Box 67). Of course it was through the decisions of Dewey and the board of editors that policies and determinations of what was worthy of inclusion in the valuable space of the *AER* were made.

19. Those noted had numerous publications as well. See Ellen Deborah Ellis (published as Ellis 1905, four *American Political Science Review* articles 1920 to 1935); Katharine Bement Davis (four *JPE* articles 1898 to 1900); Hannah Robie Sewall (thesis published by the AEA in 1901); Helen Page Bates (partly published as Bates 1898); and Florence Elizabeth Watson (PhD in political economy Boston University 1890); Mary Graham (PhD in economics Yale 1895), and Sara Scovill Whittlesey Walden (PhD in economics Yale 1898, thesis published as Whittlesey 1901, and wrote three *AER* book reviews in 1916 and 1917) to name a few. Some of these had moved on from economics to other fields (e.g., Davis's 1929 book *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-two Hundred Women* or Ellis's articles in political science) or nonacademic pursuits (e.g., Sewall's career as a special agent of the US Bureau of Labor investigating child labor; see Sewall 1904).

In the nearly three decades of service as editor of the *AER*, Dewey had the opportunity to work with fifty-eight editors who assisted in determining which articles were worthy of inclusion and which were not—decisions affecting the professional lives of countless faculty in the process. The careful documenting of the editors of the journal by Dewey is some what illuminating. The editorial board lists provide names of members, with men's names only initialized and women with full name reported, along with institution and years of service. The importance given to geo graphic representation is revealed by the inclusion of a second list, reporting the editors by geographic region.[20] This geographic diversity may have seemed especially important to document given the accusations by some members of an "east coast" conspiracy to dominate the association.

It is noteworthy that over the period that Dewey served as editor, only two women economists served on the editorial board of the *AER*—Alzada Comstock of Mount Holyoke College 1937–39 and Mabel Newcomer of Vassar in 1940. In other words, women editors did not serve on the *AER* editorial board until the late 1930s, constituted only 3.5 percent of the editorial board in total, and served for only 3 of the 125 person years of service under Dewey's service as editor. When economist and historian Michael A. Bernstein notes that "time and again, Dewey would canvas his editorial board for suggestions regarding article topics and prospective authors," we must surely recognize that it was a particular view that he received as a result (Bernstein 2001: 29).

The history of women and membership in the AEA is not, however, a story of simply overlooking women in the recruitment of membership or even the failure of its officers to recognize the importance of placing women in positions of influence. It is also, in part, a story that demonstrates the ways in which status seeking professionals eschewed a natural constituency of individuals "beyond the professoriate per se"—individuals that, given their practical experience with economic issues, appeared in many ways to be more likely candidates for membership than many of the businessmen so actively courted by the AEA. Already involved in charitable and reform activities, women

20. Also revealed in Dewey's list of editors is his geographic naiveté or his New England– centric perspective, as he lists Johns Hopkins, Vassar, and Princeton, among "Middle States" (perhaps meaning Middle Atlantic) and the University of Kansas and the University of Nebraska among "Western States."

were, in the words of Dorothy Ross, "a natural constituency for the social sciences, but one that could threaten the masculine image of the social scientists' effort to achieve realism, science, and professional standing" (Ross 1991: 102). For this reason, social science was dangerous territory for women academics at the turn of the century.

The discipline of economics was unique in the transformation in higher education in the nineteenth century because, unlike other disciplines, it was one in which the "stakes of the game" were particularly high. Not surprisingly perhaps, the professionalization of economics was accompanied by jurisdictional disputes—disputes between groups over jurisdictional boundaries that determined who would be allowed to engage in the tasks of the profession as well as what those tasks would be (Furner 1973; Abbott 1988; Fourcade 2009; Franklin 2016). The history of women in the early years of the AEA allows us to more clearly under stand the role of gender in the process of professionalization in the "academic knowledge system."

These jurisdictional disputes began with the segmenting of academic labor through the identification of areas of specialization in doctoral degrees, which set a professional trajectory that was difficult to alter— especially for women. Whereas a majority of the founding members of the AEA had doctoral degrees in history, as economics evolved into its own area of study, economists began to argue not only for a greater separation between economics and sociology,[21] but for a separation between economics and home economics. The disestablishment of religion and advocacy (not to mention criticisms of the soft headedness of economists such as Ely) would require disciplinary boundaries that made clear the scientific nature of economics.[22] As Thomas Carver would state it, "Economists would prefer to stick to the subject of Economics. [One] should especially doubt whether

21. In Canada, where the population of scholars, like the population in general, was less than a tenth that of the United States, economists and political scientists shared the Canadian Political Science Association until 1966 and the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* until 1968 (the sociologists seceded in 1963). Mabel Timlin was the first female president of the Canadian Political Science Association in 1960 (Timlin [1942] 1977; R. Dimand 2008).

22. In describing the period 1885–1904, A. W. Coats describes the tensions between economists pointing out that it was perhaps inevitable that some would interpret the strong religious and ethical tone adopted by others as "soft-headedness" and going on to point out that "Ely was indubitably the chief offender" (Coats 1993: 210).

the members of [the] association would easily find a common ground of discussion with Miss [Jane]Addams or Mr. Felix Adler" (Bernstein 2001: 24).

As the press clippings of the "1900–1914 Scrapbook: Annual Meetings Program Clippings" in the AEA records shows, the growing distain for sociology by economists did not go unnoticed (AEAR Box 3). In an article titled "Sociologists Complain of Their Own Standing: Delegates Say They Are Not Regarded as Trained Specialists by Men," these jurisdictional disputes were growing ever larger and sociologists complained that they were not regarded with the proper respect by their fellow men.

The outgrowth of these jurisdictional disputes had indisputable consequences for women. Increasing numbers of women were characterized as having doctoral degrees appropriate for placement in home economics, labor relations, education and home economics, labor economics, and sociology. Whereas earlier male scholars were able to transcend such labels and be accepted as professionals in the field of economics—economists such as Davis R. Dewey who received a doctoral degree in history from the Johns Hopkins University and Allyn Abbott Young who received his doctoral degree from the University of Wisconsin in sociology, women economists would not be so fortunate. There were a very few exceptions: Jessica Blanche Peixotto of the University of California, Berkeley, AEA vice president in 1928, received her PhD in political science (Peixotto 1901), Susan Kingsbury, AEA vice president in 1919, held a Columbia PhD in history (see Kingsbury 1905, 1906–35), and Minnie Throop England of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, took her PhD in religion even though her teaching and publications were about business cycles and crises (see R. Dimand 1999b). Dorothy Stahl Brady of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, an analyst of consumption and savings important enough to be the subject of a *New Palgrave* article (Reid 1987), also held a noneconomics PhD but this was not a barrier to professional acceptance among economists since it was in mathematics (from UC Berkeley, 1933).

23. To a limited extent, essay prize competitions could enhance the credentials of women economists, as with Clare de Graffenreid's winning of two early AEA essay competitions (see R. Dimand and Black 2012) or, after the AEA discontinued such competitions, Hart, Schaffner and Marx Essays Prizes won by Mollie Ray Carroll (1923), Hazel Kyrk (1923), and Yetta Scheftel (1916).

How did the composition of women memberships change throughout the three drives? As previously noted, there was no change in the number of women members after the first membership drive (1900–1902) when we compare 1900 to 1903—the year after the first membership drive ended. In contrast, the number of male members increased. When we compare the backgrounds of women members in 1900 to 1903, we see that of the 21 women members, 11 women (or 52 percent) are considered professional in vocation (having worked on or received a PhD, or having published scholarship, or holding a faculty position as of 1900) as compared to eight women (or 38 percent) in 1903. By 1909, when the second membership drive commenced, there were 33 women (and 948 men) members. Nineteen of these women or 58 percent are considered professional in vocation. In contrast, as of 1914—the year after the second membership drive ended—there were 78 women (and 2,070 men) members. Of those 78 women members, 44 women or 56 percent of women members are considered professional in vocation according to the above definition.

Finally, at the beginning of the third membership drive in 1922, 83 women (and 2,257 men) were members of the AEA. Of those 83 women members, 61 or 73 percent were considered professional in vocation. When we examine the membership rolls for 1928—two years after the conclusion of the third membership drive—we see that of the 148 women members, 113 women or 76 percent are considered professional invocation. This figure reflects the growth in professional women members in the 1920s. At this time, several of the women members had received their doctorate and were working at colleges such as Smith, Barnard, Wellesley, Vassar, Elmira, Goucher, Mt. Holyoke, Hollins, Wheaton, Bryn Mawr, Hunter, and Wells. In addition, a few women were working in teaching positions at universities such as the University of Cincinnati, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Nebraska, University of Chicago, Johns Hopkins University, Boston University, and Ohio State University.

Conclusion

The role of gender is, in fact, often missing in the histories of higher education and largely absent in many examinations of the process of professionalization. Nonetheless, as Mary Ann Dzuback has argued, gender is integral to the history of higher education just as it is an integral aspect of higher education today. Yet, as she points out, “rarely are the processes and institutions of education themselves explored in these accounts” (Dzuback 2003: 175).

Historians of the professions have neglected the degree to which gender and the drive for professional status played a large role in shaping the actions and priorities of professional associations. Associations such as the AEA neglected and sometimes eschewed initiatives that would have brought increasing numbers of women as members at the same time they were trying to expand their membership. Their actions and priorities demonstrate the complex ways that status-seeking behaviors worked, perhaps unintentionally, to limit women’s membership. As we pointed out, there is evidence that women academic economists were on occasion solicited as well for membership in the AEA. Yet, larger forces worked to preclude women’s participation and membership in the AEA in far more fundamental ways. The segmentation of academic labor made women whose degrees were in the social sciences vulnerable to exclusion and prey to ontological disputes. The significant influence of what Virginia Valian (1998) has called “gender schemas” allowed academic economists in the early years of the AEA to characterize women with doctorates in economics as sociologists and men with doctorates in sociology and history to stand as economists, and raised little cause for concern about the discrepancy. Overall, the drive toward “professionalization” interacted with gender in ways that often undermined women academics by excluding women whose degrees were in cognate fields while recognizing and accepting men with degrees in cognate fields.

References

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The Systems of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Abbott, Edith. 1905. “The Wages of Unskilled Labor in the United States 1850–1900.” *Journal of Political Economy* 13 (3): 321–67 (also as “A Statistical Study of the Wages of Unskilled Labor in the United States, 1830–1900,” PhD thesis in economics, University of Chicago, 1905).

AEA. 1886. “Constitution By-Laws and Resolutions of the American Economic Association.” *Publications of the American Economic Association* 1 (1): 35–46.

AEA. 1894. “The Sixth Annual Meeting.” *Publications of the American Economic Association* 9 (1), Hand Book of the American Economic Association, University of Chicago, September 11–15, 1893, 41, 43–46.

AEA. 1895. “The Seventh Annual Meeting.” *Publications of the American Economic Association* 10 (3), Supplement, Handbook of the American Economic Association 1895, 39–50.

AEA. 1901. “The Thirteenth Annual Meeting.” *Publications of the American Economic Association* 2 (1), February 1901: 43–54.

AEA. 1902. “The Fourteenth Annual Meeting.” *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 3rd Series, 3 (1): 42–58.

AEA. 1910. “The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting.” *American Economic Association Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 11 (2), May 1910: 49–79.

AEA. 1911. “Business Meetings at Washington, D. C.: December 27 to 30, 1911.” *American Economic Review* 2 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, March 2012: 131–46.

AEA. 1913. “Report of the Secretary for the Year Ending December 15, 1913.” *American Economic Review* 4 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Twenty second Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March 1914): 201–3.

AEA. 1918. “Report of the Secretary for the year ending December 18, 1918.” *American Economic Review* 9 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-first Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March 1919): 354–58.

AEA. 1919. “Report of the Secretary for the Year Ending December 29, 1919.” *American Economic Review* 10 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty second Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March 1920): 230–34.

AEA. 1920. “Report of the Auditing Committee.” *American Economic Review* 10 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-second Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March): 236–37.

AEA. 1921. “Report of the Auditing Committee.” *American Economic Review* 11 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March): 188–89.

AEA. 1923a. “Report of the Special Committee on Finance of the American Economic Association.” *American Economic Review* 13 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March): 255–56.

AEA. 1923b. “Report of the Membership Committee.” *American Economic Review* 13 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March): 256.

AEA. 1930. “Report of the Auditing Committee.” *American Economic Review* 20 (1), Supplement, Papers and Proceedings of the Forty-second Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (March): 188–92.

Balch, Emily Greene. 1893. "Public Assistance of the Poor in France." *Publications of the American Statistical Association*, first series 8 (4–5): 3–179.

Bateman, Bradley W., and Ethan B. Kapstein. 1999. "Between God and the Market: The Religious Roots of the American Economic Association." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13 (4): 249–58.

Bates, Helen Page. 1896. "State Irrigation in the Australian Colonies." PhD diss. In economics, University of Wisconsin.

Bates, Helen Page. 1898. "Australian Experiments in Industry." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 12 (2): 193–213.

Bernstein, Michael A. 2001. *A Perilous Progress: Economics and Public Purpose in Twentieth-Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Breckenridge, Sophonisba P. 1903. *Legal Tender: A Study in English and American Monetary History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carroll, Mollie Ray. 1923. *Labor and Politics: The Attitude of the American Federation of Labor toward Legislation and Politics*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. Originally a PhD diss. in economics and sociology, University of Chicago, 1920.

Ceplair, Larry. 1991. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: A Nonfiction Reader.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Coats, A. W. 1993. *British and American Economic Essays*, *Vol. 2: The Sociology and Professionalization of Economics*. New York: Routledge.

Coman, Katharine. 1891. "The Tailoring Trade and the Sweating System." *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 1st series, 6 (1–2): 144–47.

Coman, Katharine. 1903. "History of Contract Labor in the Hawaiian Islands." *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 3rd series, 4 (3): 1–74.

Coman, Katharine. (1911a) 2011. "Some Unsettled Problems of Irrigation." *American Economic Review* 1 (1): 1–19. Reprint, *American Economic Review* 101 (1): 36–48.

Coman, Katharine. 1911b. "Government Factories: An Attempt to Control Competition in the Fur Trade." *American Economic Review: Papers and Discussions* 1 (2): 368–88.

Coolidge, Mary Roberts Smith. 1895. "Almshouse Women: A Study of Two Hundred and Twenty Eight Women in the City and County Almshouse of San Francisco." *Publications of the American Statistical Association* 4 (31): 219–62.

Davis, Katharine Bement. 1900. "Causes Affecting the Standard of Living and Wages." PhD diss. in economics, University of Chicago.

Davis, Katharine Bement. (1929) 1972. *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-two Hundred Women*. New York: Harper and Brothers. Reprint, New York: Arno Press.

Dimand, Mary Ann. 1995a. "Networks of Women Economists before 1940." In *Women of Value: Feminist Essays on the History of Women in Economics*, edited by Mary Ann Dimand, Robert W. Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, 39–59. Alder shot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Dimand, Mary Ann. 1995b. “The Economics of Charlotte Perkins Gilman.” In *Women of Value: Feminist Essays on the History of Women in Economics*, edited by Mary Ann Dimand, Robert W. Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, 39–59. Alder shot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Dimand, Mary Ann, Robert W. Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, eds. 1995. *Women of Value: Feminist Essays on the History of Women in Economics.* Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Dimand, Robert W. 1995. “The Neglect of Women’s Contributions to Economics.” In *Women of Value: Feminist Essays on the History of Women in Economics*, edited by Mary Ann Dimand, Robert W. Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, 1–24. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Dimand, Robert W. 1999a. “Women Economists in the 1890s.” *Journal of the His tory of Economic Thought* 21 (3): 269–88.

Dimand, Robert W. 1999b. “Minnie Throop England on Crises and Cycles: A Neglected Early Macroeconomist.” *Feminist Economics* 5 (3): 107–26.

Dimand, Robert W. 2000. “Nineteenth Century American Feminist Economics: From Caroline Dall to Charlotte Perkins Gilman.” *American Economic Review: AEA Papers and Proceedings* 90 (2): 480–84.

Dimand, Robert W. 2008. “How Keynes Came to Canada: Mabel Timlin and Keynesian Economics.” In *The Continuing Relevance of the General Theory: Keynes for the 21st Century*, edited by Mathew Forstater and L. Randall Wray, 57–79. Lon don: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dimand, Robert W. 2011. “Emily Greene Balch, Political Economist.” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 70 (2): 163–78.

Dimand, Robert W., Geoffrey Black, and Evelyn L. Forget. 2011. “Women’s Participation in the ASSA Meetings.” *Oeconomia: History/Methodology/ Philosophy* 1 (1): 33–49. Dimand, Robert W., and Geoffrey Black. 2012. “Clare de Graffenreid and the Art of Controversy: A Prize-Winning Woman Economist in the First Decade of the American Economic Association.” *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 34 (3): 339–53.

Dimand, Robert W., Mary Ann Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, eds. 2000. *A Biographical Dictionary of Women Economists.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. Dzuback, Mary Ann. 2003. “Gender and the Politics of Knowledge.” *History of Education Quarterly* 43 (Summer): 171–95.

Eastman, Crystal. 1909. “The American Way of Distributing Industrial Accident Losses: A Criticism.” *American Economic Association Quarterly* 10 (1): 119–34. Ellis, Ellen Deborah. 1905. *Introduction to the History of Sugar as a Commodity*.

Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company.

Folbre, Nancy. 1998. “The ‘Sphere of Women’ in Early Twentieth-Century Economics.” In *Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years*, edited by Helen Silverberg, 35–60. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Folbre, Nancy. 2009. *Greed, Lust and Gender: A History of Economic Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Forget, Evelyn L. 1995. "American Women Economists, 1900–1940: Doctoral Dissertations and Research Specialization." In *Women of Value: Essays on the His tory of Women in Economics*, edited by Mary Ann Dimand, Robert W. Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, 25–38. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Forget, Evelyn L. 2011. "American Women and the Economics Profession in the Twentieth Century." *Oeconomia: History/Methodology/Philosophy* 1 (1): 19–31.

Fourcade, Marion. 2009. *Economists and Societies: Discipline and Profession in the United States, Britain, and France, 1890s to 1990s*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Franklin, Jonathan S. 2016. *A History of Professional Economists and Policymaking in the United States: Irrelevant Genius.* New York: Routledge.

Furner, Mary O. 1973. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865–1905*. Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. (1898) 1962. *Women and Economics*. Boston: Small, Maynard. Reprint with introduction by Carl N. Degler. New York: Harper and Row.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1903. *The Home, Its Work and Its Influence.* London: William Heinemann.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1907. "The Extent of Child Labor in the United States: Discussion." *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 3rd series, 8 (1): 260. Hammond, Claire. 1993. "American Women and the Professionalization of Economics." *Review of Social Economy* 51 (3): 347–70.

Haskell, Thomas L. 1977. *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Crisis of Authority*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hill, Caroline M. 1904. "The Economic Value of the Home." *Journal of Political Economy* 12 (3): 408–19.

Hutchinson, Emilie Josephine. (1919) 1968. *Women's Wages: A Study of the Wages of Industrial Women and Measures Suggested to Increase Them*. Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law 89 (1). New York: Longmans. Reprint, New York: AMS Press.

Kies, Marietta. 1891. "The Ethical Principle in Industrial Relations." *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 1st series, 6 (1–2): 46–48.

Kingsbury, Susan Myra. 1905. *An Introduction to the Records of the Virginia Company of London, with a Bibliographical List of the Extant Documents*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office (also as PhD diss. in history, Columbia University, 1905).

Kingsbury, Susan Myra. 1906–35. *Records of the Virginia Company of London*, 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Kindleberger, Charles P. 1991. *The Life of an Economist: An Autobiography.* Cam bridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell.

Kyrk, Hazel. 1923. *A Theory of Consumption*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Libby, Barbara S. 1984. "Women in Economics before 1940." *Essays in Economic and Business History* 3:173–90.

Libby, Barbara S. 1987. "Statistical Analysis of Women in the Economics Profession." *Essays in Economic and Business History* 5:179–89.

Libby, Barbara S. 1990. "Women in the Economics Profession 1900–1940: Factors in Declining Visibility." *Essays in Economic and Business History* 8:121–30.

Libby, Barbara S. 1998. "As Time Goes By: A Chronological Study of Women in the Economics Profession." *Essays in Economic and Business History* 16:261–76.

Madden, Kirsten K. 2002. "Female Contributions to Economic Thought, 1900–1940." *History of Political Economy* 34 (1): 1–30.

Madden, Kirsten K., Janet A. Seiz, and Michèle Pujol. 2004. *A Bibliography of Female Economic Thought to 1940*. London: Routledge.

May, Ann Mari. 2006. "Sweeping the Heavens for a Comet: Women, the Language of Political Economy, and Higher Education in the US." *Feminist Economics* 12 (4): 625–40.

May, Ann Mari, ed. 2008. *The 'Woman Question' and Higher Education: Perspectives on Gender and Knowledge Production in America*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

May, Ann Mari, and Robert W. Dimand. 2009. "Trouble in the Inaugural Issue of the *American Economic Review*: The Cross/Eaves Controversy." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 23 (3): 189–204.

Parris, Marion. 1909. *Total Utility and the Economic Judgment Compared with their Ethical Counterparts*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company.

Peixotto, Jessica Blanche. 1901. *The French Revolution and Modern French Social ism*. New York: T. Y. Crowell (also as PhD thesis in political science, University of California, Berkeley, 1900).

Pujol, Michèle. 1992, 1998. *Feminism and Anti-Feminism in Early Economic Thought*. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

Reid, Margaret. 1987. "Brady, Dorothy Stahl." In *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*, edited by John Eatwell, Murray Milgate, and Peter Newman. London: Macmillan.

Ross, Dorothy. 1991. *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge, UK: Cam bridge University Press.

Scheftel, Yetta. 1916. *The Taxation of Land Value: A Study of Certain Discriminatory Taxes on Land*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sewall, Hannah Robie. (1901) 1971. *The Theory of Value before Adam Smith*. New York: Macmillan for the American Economic Association. Reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelley. Originally a PhD diss. in economics, University of Minnesota, 1898.

Sewall, Hannah Robie. 1904. "Child Labor in the US." *US Bureau of Labor Bulletin* 52 (May): 485–637.

Silverberg, Helene. 1998. *Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sinclair, Andrew. 1965. *The Better Half: The Emancipation of the American Woman*. New York: Harper and Row.

Timlin, Mabel. (1942) 1977. *Keynesian Economics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Reprint, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. Originally a PhD diss. in economics, University of Washington, 1940.

Valian, Virginia. 1998. *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.

Whittlesey, Sarah Scovill. 1901. *Massachusetts Labor Legislation: An Historical and Critical Study*. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 17, Supplement 15 (January): 145–57.

Youngman, Anna. (1909) 1973. *The Economic Causes of Great Fortunes*. New York: Banker's Publishing Company. Reprint, New York: Arno Press.