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Letter from the Chair

The Board of Regents established the School of Government at UT-Austin in 1910. Celebrating the department’s 100th anniversary offers an opportunity to reflect on what has changed during the course of one century. One obvious and proper development has been the swelling number of females among the department's alumni. In total, since 1910, 37% of department alumni graduating with a Bachelor's degree are female. However, that varies from 17% between 1951 and 1960, to 43% between 2001 and January 2010. The breakdown is in the table and chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Year</th>
<th>Male Alumni (B.A.)</th>
<th>Female Alumni (B.A.)</th>
<th>Percent Male</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910-1950</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1960</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1970</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-Jan. 2010</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-Jan. 2010</td>
<td>9113</td>
<td>5401</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female and Male Alumni (B.A.), Department of Government, in Percent, by Decade, 1951-2010

- Percent Female
- Percent Male
An even better indicator of women's steadily increasing presence within the department comes from looking at the proportion of women who have received Bachelor's degrees in Government and moved on to receive an advanced degree from the University. As the Department of Government is the University's *de facto* pre-law program and, to a lesser extent, since the 1970s, a feeder into the LBJ School of Public Affairs, we have taken a snapshot of our alumni who have subsequently received advanced degrees from this department, J.D.s from the School of Law, or M.P.A.s from the LBJ School. That number totals 1,405 since 1910, with 68% male and 32% female, with significant variation over time; between 1951 and 1960 only 11% of such advanced degrees went to women, but in the most recent decade that number rose to 47%. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Year</th>
<th>Graduate Degree from UT-Austin (M.A. or Ph.D. in GOV; J.D.; or M.P.A.)</th>
<th>Male Graduate Degrees</th>
<th>Female Graduate Degrees</th>
<th>Percent Male Graduate Degrees</th>
<th>Percent Female Graduate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910-1950</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1960</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1970</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-Jan. 2010</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-Jan. 2010</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at this subset of our alumni, it becomes readily apparent that focusing just on the numbers is insufficient to truly appreciate how many talented women have passed through this department. Looking at the 1910–1950 period, only 17 women received one of the four advanced degrees we have tracked, but among these 17 were a handful who truly did change the world. Women such as Marjorie Ann (Logan) Williams, who received her first degree in 1945. A member of the Orange Jackets while an undergraduate, following graduation Marjorie enrolled in a stock broker training school and, after six months of training, led the first nine women ever onto the floor of the New York Stock Exchange during trading hours. Women such as Louise Holman Hancock, who became assistant principal and K-12 curriculum coordinator at the Texas School for the Blind. Women such as Dr. Jacqueline Eckert Timm, who graduated in 1933 and, in 1939, became the second woman (Dr. Gladys Grace Gregory was the first, in 1937) to receive a Ph.D. from the department, and whose estate, in 1993, provided funds for the Jacqueline Eckert Timm Endowed Scholarship in Government to support outstanding junior and senior students majoring in Government.

Going strictly by the numbers, the 1950s and 1960s were dismal decades for women in the department, but, again, the caliber of those women passing through tells a different story. We are talking about women who became the first female partners in the state’s most prominent law firms and others who fill Senior Counsel positions; the first woman to receive the distinguished lawyer award from the Travis County Bar Association; women who help lead prominent public interest organizations, such as the Innocence Project of Texas; women who sit as justices in the state’s courts of appeal; women who have served as state assistant attorneys general, who were career public servants in municipal government, assistant secretaries and deputy directors in federal agencies such as Housing and Urban Development and the Department of the Interior, and professors at leading research universities.

In the 1970s, with numbers beginning to increase and percentages showing glimmers of improvement, exceptional women continued graduating with degrees in Government.

Women who would rise in government, to positions such as chief of staff at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the private sector, and help found the Center for Women in Law in the Law School; women who would serve as chief of staff to Irma Rangel – the first Latina elected to the Texas Legislature – helping Rangel draft and pass the state’s first domestic violence legislation; division directors at organizations such as the Texas Medical Association; leaders of the coalition that brought the Children’s Health Insurance Program to Texas; a former executive director of the Texas Workforce Commission; a division director at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, who for a time was the highest ranking female and minority at the agency; program managers at NASA; treasury managers in municipal government; and a former First Lady of Michigan, who in 2002 was named by that state’s Habitat for Humanity as the Public Leader of the Year.

Beginning in the 1980s and continuing today, the percentages have really started to even out. While still not proportionate, we have nearly achieved parity in the number of men and women who receive Bachelor’s degrees and subsequently receive advanced degrees in Government, Law, and Public Affairs. By December of this year, women could surpass male alumni in this category for the first time in history. And as the numbers have increased, the quality has not suffered. We are still graduating the next generation of female public and private sector leaders – senior research analysts and directors of research at state agencies; directors of corporate communications and external affairs; associates in leading law firms; special assistants in federal agencies; attorneys in state agencies; assistant directors in the University system; chief analysts in gubernatorial planning and budgeting offices; presidents and CEOs of nonprofit associations; leaders at community development financial institutions; senior associates in leading think tanks; chiefs of staff in the state legislature; and professors of political science.

This of course leaves the faculty, where there is also an encouraging story to tell. No doubt, this remains a male-dominated faculty, but a faculty nonetheless that is a far cry from the all-male, all-white faculty of half a century ago.

Focusing just on permanent, full-time faculty, today in Catherine Boone, Gretchen Ritter, Terri Givens, Juliet Hooker, Wendy Hunter, Patricia Maclachlan, Lorraine Pangle, Tasha Philpot, and Bethany Albertson, we have a larger, stronger, and more prestigious female presence than at any point since the University’s founding. While there is abundant room for improvement in the coming century, it is worth taking a moment to appreciate the progress that has been made. And with that, we raise a glass to the Women of the UT-Austin Government Department.

Magic Words

Many of you have graciously expressed an interest in assisting the department. While there are numerous ways to do so, nothing could be simpler than clicking on, uttering, or writing the magic words: Department of Government. Many of you are already dedicated contributors to the University’s Annual Giving fundraiser, and we cannot express enough our appreciation for you supporting the University and the College of Liberal Arts. But do you know that you can contribute directly and specifically to the future of this department? For those of you who give regularly or plan on giving again, we encourage you to designate your gift by clicking on the appropriate link, saying, or writing the magic words: Department of Government, Department of Government, Department of Government. Thanks for all your support. We hope to hear from you soon.

- Stuart Tendler, editor
March was Women’s History Month. As U.S. Presidents generally do, Barack Obama issued a presidential proclamation, and it said: “With passion and courage, women have taught us that when we band together to advocate for our highest ideals, we can advance our common well-being and strengthen the fabric of our Nation. Each year during Women’s History Month, we remember and celebrate women from all walks of life who have shaped this great Nation.”

I have been reminded recently in various ways that I am ‘historic’. Janet Boles, in the column that follows, writes of the growth in the number of female state legislators; Texas’ U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison and I were UT alumnae included in the 1975 statistics she cites. Boles goes on to mention that women are now far more likely to secure presidential nominations, in comparison with the paltry number of women on federal judicial benches when Jimmy Carter took office in 1977. I was Assistant to President Carter and the person to whom he gave the task of finding and shepherding a variety of women and minority candidates through the judicial appointment process. U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was one of the people who became a federal judge through that process.

While preparing my eulogy for Liz Carpenter, whose leadership started as Vice-President of the UT-Austin student government and who rose to the top position for Lady Bird Johnson in the LBJ Administration, I had a mental image of the pantheon of strong Texas women that we have recently lost, including Barbara Jordan, Ann Richards, Lady Bird Johnson, Molly Ivins, and Liz. The UT Department of Government is celebrating its 100th anniversary. Our task now is preparing leaders for the future, and increased numbers of women are among those. Department Chair Gary Freeman has spotlighted the growth of women in the department. Women are now approaching 50% of our undergraduate and graduate students.

My joy in teaching talented junior and senior students flows from the high potential they display. And their belief in their own leadership future is enhanced when they have an opportunity to learn about and to visit and work with current leaders. I found it thrilling to have a recent class discussion that included Colleen McHugh and her status as the newly elected head of the University of Texas System Board of Regents – the first woman to chair that prestigious Board. It was also sobering to share with the class how long it took for a woman to break that glass ceiling. Men have held the chairmanship for 129 consecutive years -- since 1881 -- when the UT system’s board of regents began operating.

There are certainly more glass ceilings to break. I firmly believe that the women we are now teaching will be the pioneers and the record-breakers of the future, aided by the men who are their colleagues and friends here.

Bob Hope is reported to have said to the graduates during a commencement speech, “The world is out there waiting for you. Don’t go.” It is tempting to say that now, given the tremendous financial and issue challenges that are facing our graduates. But I am convinced that the world, our nation, our state, our cities, and our institutions will be stronger and better as these graduates take their places as leaders. I feel so privileged to be among the faculty and staff at the University of Texas who work with these students as they move toward their -- and our -- future.
Women in Politics

By Janet K. Boles, Ph.D. 1976

Between the time when I taught the first course on women and politics offered at the University of Texas (spring 1975), and my retirement as a professor of political science at Marquette University (spring 2009), the number of women in elected office increased exponentially and women and politics research has emerged as a cutting-edge topic within the profession. When I was choosing a dissertation topic in 1973, my advisor, Robert L. Lineberry, suggested that I write every scholar engaged in gender politics research so as to preempt another study of Equal Rights Amendment ratification. This was very doable at the time. In spring 1978, after I had returned to UT as a visiting professor, student interest in the topic was high; my lower-division course on women and politics enrolled 250 students (with another 250 on the waiting list). And today the American Political Science Association Section on Women and Politics Research has 630 members, making it the eighth-largest section (of 38) in the discipline.

The number of female elected officials has similarly increased. The 94th Congress (1975–77) had no women in the Senate and only 19 (4%) in the House. Currently women hold 17% of Senate and 16.8% of House seats. There has been equally dramatic growth in the number of female state legislators. Today 24.4% of state legislators are women, compared to 8.1% in 1975. Women are also assuming key leadership positions. Not only is Nancy Pelosi the House Speaker, but women also chair three standing committees in each house. Likewise, 15.1% of state legislative leaders are women, and women chair 23.4% of the standing committees. Women are also far more likely to be appointed by governors and presidents. For example, when Jimmy Carter entered the White House in 1977, only four federal judges were women and only eight women had ever served on the federal bench. In 2008 around 25% of district court judges were women, as were 27% of federal appeals court judges. Two women of course now sit on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Over time female elected officials and gender politics scholars have developed a symbiotic relationship. As rigorous research and good polling data have shown that many presumed barriers to women’s candidacy (e.g., fundraising, voter bias) are invalid, more women have been emboldened to run for office. And, as the number of women in politics rises, likewise does the legitimacy of women and politics research. In that vein, I was gratified this past year that my department, although still defining my position as one of urban politics, was very interested in also finding someone to teach courses on women and politics. As one colleague put it, “no department worth its salt lacks a gender politics specialist.”

NOTE: Statistics on women in Congress and state legislatures are available at www.cawp.rutgers.edu. Those on women on the federal courts are drawn from an essay posted by Sally Kenney on www.womensnews.org.
Reflections from the South Lawn

By Cassy Dorff, B.A. 2010

I write this while sitting on the sunny South Mall lawn, near the Tower, glancing around at the crowds swiftly walking to and fro. The University of Texas is big in both size and reputation and has some of the most sophisticated, fast-paced academic programs in the nation. It is easy for students to get lost, not because we lack talent, or even motivation, but because often students are as dynamic as the university. Determining a path to take can be overwhelming. Everyone says to pursue your dreams, but finding a way to pursue them all in a parallel, productive way, can be daunting.

In the end, I seem to have survived the hustle and bustle. But my experience at UT was not crafted from some internal spark of ingenuity; it was largely shaped by the support of advisors and professors. To have people willing to sit down and parse out all your options with you, suggest more ideas, or wipe a few off the table, is like a secret weapon in the race for an education and a career.

Although I began and concluded my studies at UT as a Government major, I was increasingly interested in journalism, human rights, international conflict and academic research. Because of the resources at UT, I was able to work at The Daily Texan for a couple of years, be a communications intern at a non-profit in NYC, research for a human rights commission in Mexico, and take part in T.I.G.E.R. Lab, a research center in the Government department that focuses on political violence.

After some time, my involvement with academic research at UT took center stage, and I had the privilege to work with Professor Ami Pedahzur on several projects. I presented at two professional political science conferences and learned a wealth of information about terrorism, insurgencies, political violence, statistics, research methods, and more. I eventually began a project on political assassination for my honors thesis.

This semester, T.I.G.E.R. Lab began a course for undergraduate research. I have worked one-on-one with other undergraduates, sharing ideas for data collection methods and how to handle the challenges of researching terrorism. Our class days are spent debating how to define difficult subjects like state sponsored terrorism and suicide terrorism. It is a unique opportunity for students to get involved with research and a perfect medium for them to express their own original research ideas.

The sun is finally out after an odd winter here in Texas; it even snowed on this lawn not long ago (but was a bright 70 degrees the next day). Many times I have sprinted across this lawn to hand in a paper or eaten lunch on the welcoming green grass with a friend. I am glad to say my experiences here leave me prepared to move on.
Political Science and Leadership

By Bruce Grube, Ph.D. 1975

“If the world was flat,” my California friends opined, “the Texas state line is just about where the world ends at the abyss.” Arriving at UT as a new doctoral student at the start of the 1967 fall semester, I had no vision whatsoever that, having entered the “abyss,” the experience would prepare me for an academic career that would include being a professor of political science at four institutions, provost at two, and president at two others. My decision to enter graduate studies in the Department of Government at the University of Texas, following an undergraduate degree in political science at the University of California at Berkeley, actually turned out to be one of the best decisions I ever made.

Civil Rights and the Vietnam War were in all of our minds at the time. I was clearly a beneficiary of the intense intellectual debates which took place in a state political environment that was not prepared to entertain the perspectives that came with the scholars who had been recruited to UT. I mention this collision of cultures because it was a significant element of the political landscape within which my graduate education took place. Observing the interaction between the University and elected officials in Texas provided many lessons about the nature of politics, particularly as politics can be defined as existing whenever there are disputes to authority.

The study of politics turned out to be a marvelous preparation for the role of provost and university president. Over the years, I have come to think that political science is a discipline that lends itself to the development of leadership. The conventional belief is that universities are communities. They are not. Universities are really collections of constituencies. And, a university president is consistently in interaction with several dozen constituencies, both internal and external. The study of politics prepares one for this reality.

Political science bridges many disciplines. Importantly, political scientists generally engage in a way of thinking that illuminates the connections among many disciplines. This way of thinking is essential to working with diverse constituencies, to bridging differences, to understanding the perspectives of others. It is a way of seeing the world that permits tolerance, flexibility, inclusion, and the general open-mindedness that should be expected of university leaders. It encourages the development of vision and the understanding of how to work with others to pursue a common vision.

So, as it turned out, the world was not flat after all. The road to Texas and the Department of Government at the University of Texas followed the curvature of the earth. Now, my wife, Kathryn, and I have returned to live in Austin. During the time since I finished my graduate work, we have lived in every region of the country except for the caffeinated northwest. We have traveled in many countries, have been involved in relationships with people and other universities throughout the world, have worked directly with governors, members of Congress, Senators, and many other officials to achieve the goals of higher education wherever possible. My California friends were wrong. I did not fall into the abyss. The Department of Government opened for me a world beyond what I had known -- a world that can never be flat. As for California . . . well, that is another story.
At 44, I find my history narrows down to a string of life defining moments – some good, some not so much. And, when asked to write an article for this newsletter, one suggested topic was to describe how my career as a publicist benefitted from my years at UT (’84–’88). Obviously a degree from UT carries a lot of weight, but I can narrow it down to one sentence by a great professor of mine. At the time, I had no idea what her words meant to my future, and it’s important to note that it took almost 18 years for the next life defining light bulb to go off before I had the chance to put the first one to use when I joined the world of public relations.

My professor and I sat (my pocket-sized memory tells me it was in Garrison Hall) discussing a recent poor grade on a paper. Government / History / Art History degrees incur a slew of writing components which kept me tied to the typewriter; and, I was shocked when she looked at me very plainly and said, “Becky, you don’t know how to write a proper paragraph.” Basic grammatical rules escaped me at the time, actually most rules for that matter. Here I was (a junior) at the University of Texas learning how to write a paragraph. This was a perfect example of a mortifying experience that served me beyond measure, and that very moment gave me a voice which I learned how to use to my great advantage. In fact, I always joke that my fingers rapping on keys speak much better than the more traditional use of my mouth. Some might attribute it to the fact that I tend to use little foul language when writing, but I would

defend it by a few solid examples of heatedly fired off emails which could make your hair stand on end.

This voice which has long been a part of me is one of human connection that I exercise professionally through writing. PR comes in all forms. My version is the specific ability to connect people who need and want to be connected. My colleagues and I naturally desire to snap folks together with ideas, images and words, just as kids are fascinated by snapping Legos together to see what comes of it. We’re born communicators; and, with the world of media currently in its most prolific form of “wacko” with digital wizardry versus the fabled world of print, the only real common bond is the ability to communicate clearly and effectively. While my days at UT taught me many things it was the straightforward wisdom of a professor who took the time to be honest that set me on a path (albeit twisted at times) which persuades me to speak each day by the simple good use of the written word.
Anxious Politics

By Bethany Albertson, Assistant Professor

What is the role of anxiety in contemporary political debates, like immigration, the economic crisis or the recent H1N1 scare? In studies of public opinion, emotions such as anxiety have been alternatively ignored and derided. However, current research on anxiety tends to portray it in a positive light: anxiety makes people seek out information and anxious citizens are more likely to base their political decisions on new information rather than standing decisions such as partisanship. Given that the average American citizen has little factual knowledge about politics, the idea that anxiety shakes us up and causes us to learn suggests that anxiety is beneficial.

My co-author, Shana Gadarian, and I started doing research in this area because we could not square these positive implications of anxiety with the way it seems to work in political debates. Politicians sometimes try to make people anxious, and we had trouble believing that their goal was to create an informed citizenry – we assumed that they were trying to win votes, suggesting a persuasive aspect to anxiety that hadn’t been studied before. We also read work in psychology arguing that anxiety causes people to pay attention to threat. We hypothesized that anxiety causes people to learn, but that it causes people to learn in a biased way, paying more attention to threatening information.

So far, we’ve studied these ideas in three substantive areas: immigration, the economic crisis, and the H1N1 scare. Our typical study is an experiment that participants take on their home computer. For example, in our first immigration study we asked half of the participants in the study to list their thoughts about immigration and we asked the other half to list their worries. The goal is to induce anxiety in half the population in a fairly unobtrusive way. After listing worries or thoughts, we ask them to take some time to read some stories. They see a list of article headlines; some are about immigration and some aren’t, and, among the immigration headlines, some are threatening and some are not. Some participants read all of the stories (six total), some read none, but most read about three.

Our study records which stories each participant looks at, and, based on the data, we know that anxious participants (those that listed worries) are more likely to look at threatening information than the non-anxious participants (those that listed their thoughts). They’re also more likely to remember threatening information and more likely to agree with it. In our work, anxiety caused people to learn, but their learning was directed at threatening information. This makes sense given politicians’ use of fear as a rhetorical strategy. In a later study, we used campaign ads to induce anxiety about immigration and had similar findings.

Our most recent study has been on the H1N1 flu. Public health campaigns sometimes consciously try to scare us into healthier behavior and sometimes tone down the threatening aspects of their message. We were interested in the effect of anxiety on learning and on trust in various government groups. Our findings on learning were mixed: politically moderate students who were anxious about H1N1 paid more attention to threatening information, while liberals and conservatives resisted the bias. However, anxious students, regardless of ideology, reported higher levels of trust in governmental organizations such as the CDC, Health and Human Services, and the FDA to provide information about H1N1.

Our next set of studies will look at anxiety and public health campaigns in two different political contexts: the U.S. and South Africa. South Africa is facing a HIV/AIDS crisis, and we’re curious to see how anxiety about health plays out there.
Chechnya’s Refugees

By Michael Dennis, Ph.D. Candidate

When most people hear about Chechnya, they immediately think of war, terrorism, and political violence. Indeed, suicide bombings, purportedly committed by the so-called Black Widows (Chechen women driven to violence by personal loss), rocked the Moscow subway system the last week of March, killing dozens. While this tragedy reveals the consequences of Russia’s decade-long war in the North Caucasus, there is another stark reminder of the human suffering created by these wars – refugees. The recipient of a multi-country Fulbright Fellowship to explore attitudes toward political violence among Chechen refugees, I spent more than two years living with Chechen refugees in the Republic of Georgia, Azerbaijan, Poland, and Belgium, and, in doing so, I came to appreciate the exceptional suffering Chechens endure.

Driven from their homes by Russian guns, Chechen refugees lost most of their worldly possessions and, for many, the lives of loved ones, and once they escaped Chechnya, they were confronted with appalling circumstances and a bleak future. By any measure, the vast majority of Chechens live in abject poverty, barely scraping by on subsistence packages from human rights groups. There are few employment opportunities and many suffer from a host of physical ailments and psychological trauma. Many Chechen refugees fear returning home because they expect retribution from the Russians and Chechnya’s pro-Moscow government run by President Ramzan Kadyrov. Kadyrov has been accused of orchestrating his own regime of terror and torture in recent years. According to Memorial, a prominent Russian Human Rights organiz-

tion, a state of fear reminiscent of Stalin’s Terror pervades contemporary Chechnya.

Despite the poverty, I was always treated as a special guest in each Chechen dwelling, a trademark custom throughout the Caucasus. Precious foods like mutton, a rarity in refugee diets, and bread, pickled vegetables, and cheeses were laid out with copious amounts of tea and sugar. Often I arrived at a refugee dwelling expecting only to conduct an interview, but ended up spending an unexpectedly cheerful evening with my hosts, many of whom were no doubt grateful for a return to some sort of normalcy. These were surprisingly good times amidst many less enjoyable times. A sick mother unable to afford medical fees for her ill children; the young men who left on an errand but never returned; families unable to afford the most basic needs and cramped together in crowded shanties, deserted old-mountain villages, abandoned factories, and discarded train-cars.

A generation is growing up either in destroyed villages in Chechnya, under constant threat, or in dilapidated refugee camps. This generation, much like the Afghan refugees in Pakistan after the Soviet invasion, is growing up without any conceivable hope for a normal future. The Afghan refugees eventually formed the core of the Taliban movement. Will history repeat itself in the North Caucasus and the refugee camps in Europe? Only time will tell. For now, the most pressing concern for the vast majority of Chechen refugees is to provide for their families and to live in peace and security – a simple goal in troubling times.
It’s an exciting time in Africa as 22 states prepare to hold presidential elections in 2010 and 2011. Sudan has emerged from decades of turmoil between the country’s northern elites and the oil-rich south. This month’s elections are supposed to be a significant step on the path to restoring stabil-

ity, but the most important opposition party, the Sudanese People’s Liberation Movement, recently decided to pull out of the elections due to fears of cheating. Other opposition parties followed suit. The SPLM is banking most of its hopes on a January 2011 referendum on southern independence. Their decision to boycott the April elections reflects the desire to focus on southern secession, as well as the sense that the presidential elections are highly unlikely to be free and fair.

Ethiopians vote in May. However, the credibility of the elections is already in question as reports of intimidation and human rights abuses against opposition politicians spread. Prime Minister Meles Zenawi’s ruling party used repression to suppress dissent after the country’s 2005 elections, and most observers doubt that the upcoming elections will be free or fair. Zenawi recently accused the U.S. government-funded Voice of America of broadcasting “destabilizing propaganda” and jammed its radio signal to prevent citizens from listening to the station. The VOA responded by broadcasting its service via satellite.

In Central Africa, Burundi, Rwanda, and the Democratic Republic of Congo are preparing to hold presidential elections. Reports of opposition candidate intimidation led the International Crisis Group to issue a warning about possible election-related violence in Burundi, whose citizens vote in June. In Rwanda, the Tutsi-dominated government is trying to rebuild its public image after reports of opposition candidate intimidation surfaced in the Western media. Opposition candidates accuse the government of using the country’s vaguely worded genocide-prevention laws (which prohibit inflammatory statements about ethnicity) to prevent a serious electoral challenge in the August 2010 polls. Meanwhile, DRC President Joseph Kabila insists that the MONUC peacekeeping force must leave the country prior to elections scheduled for late 2011. No observers believe this is a serious possibility; the DRC government does not control its eastern territories and the absence of the UN peacekeeping mission would be disastrous.

Finally, frustration continues in the Cote d’Ivoire, where elections originally scheduled for 2005 have been delayed yet again. Ivoirian President Laurent Gbagbo has held off the elections due to instability in the country’s north and disputes over the citizenship status of northern Muslims. Once a shining beacon of stability and economic development in West Africa, the Cote d’Ivoire’s descent into ethnic tension and instability has dismayed many Africa-watchers.

As we see from these cases, instability, candidate intimidation, and electoral fraud are problems for many states. It is clear that the process of democratic consolidation requires more than just holding elections. Stable, well-functioning political institutions, a robust civil society, and an independent media are also necessary to ensure democratic outcomes.
Recently, I was privileged to dine at the faculty lounge in the AT&T center on the campus of the University of Texas at Austin. My host was Professor Gary P. Freeman of the Department of Government; the other invitees were our esteemed guest, Professor Emeritus William S. Livingston; Stuart Tendler, Alumni Coordinator … and me.

Of course, it was a day for old war stories to be told of my students days from 1968 and 1969 … from the perspective of an, at best, mediocre student. This day was my first on campus since graduation in May of 1969. So, what was different? Well, Austin was significantly bigger; ‘The Drag’ had become ‘seedy’ in my opinion; and the campus itself was just as beautiful as I remembered.

In reminiscing, I offered in casual conversation the meaning to me of the signatures on my Bachelor of Arts degree: Frank C. Irwin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Regents; Harry H. Ransom, Chancellor; John R. Silber, Dean; and Norman Hackerman, President.

While the credit for the great physical plant, enrollment and capital endowment of the University is rightfully granted to the Herculean efforts of Frank Irwin, I think that the heart and soul of the modern University belongs to the contributions of Professors Ransom, Silber and Hackerman.

In thinking back on all of it, I’d have to say that it was Professor Hackerman who most exemplified commitment and personal contribution to undergraduate students by teaching Introductory Chemistry 301 on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at 8:00 a.m. His was an amazing commitment, especially when one considers his other responsibilities.

Accordingly, other professors of my brief tenure come to mind: from the Department of Government, Doctors Redford, Mendelson, MacDonald, and Taborsky are fondly remembered. From Physical Science, I recall Professor Noyes, and from Germanic languages, Dr. Werbow.

Students are interested in their professors, teachers, and mentors. So, what to say? We government students were always asking Professor Redford about his lifelong relationship with President Johnson. We believed that Professor Mendelson would accept appointment to the United States Supreme Court, if ever nominated. While we all respected Professor MacDonald, we were all terrified at the prospect of taking his course on Anglo-Saxon Jurisprudence. And we always tried to divert Professor Taborsky from his lesson plan in order to tell us stories of Presidents Masaryk and Benes and the escape from Stalin and the KGB!

Dr. Hackerman was a member of the National Academy of Sciences and so too, was Professor Noyes. And we also asked Professor Werbow to tell us of his experiences as a code breaker in World War Two. Professor Werbow was beloved because he was instrumental in providing the first immersion course in German … I enjoyed going at it … eight hours a day, five days a week … for two summer semesters. Aller anfang ist schwere (Nietzsche). Nicht war?

I am proud to have known these men. My professors were all unique, in a very unique time. I am also hopeful that today’s students at the University of Texas are fortunate enough to have encounters with professors who inspire them, and that they will remember them … forty years from now.
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