

Communications

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

This marks the seventh year that I'm reporting on the sex participation balance at our national meetings. (Virginia Sapiro and I are preparing a more comprehensive assessment of participation opportunities for the Winter *PS*. We would appreciate hearing from those with either horror or success stories to relate or with suggestions about strategies for getting onto the program or institutional changes for opening up the process.)

	Chair- persons	Paper Givers and Workshop Participants	Discussants
1978	15.3% (20/131)	19.8% (99/500)	16.7% (35/210)
1977	15.5	16.8	14.7
1976	19.0	13.6	18.2
1975	9.6	12.6	9.9
1974	12.2	13.4	10.0
1973	13.0	11.3	13.6
1972	5.6	12.1	10.8

Thus, female participation has become substantial. Yet it is distributed unevenly, being highest in sections and panels chaired by women. The two (out of 16) sections chaired by women had women as 41.2% of the chairpersons, 18.2% of the papergivers and 33.3% of the discussants. The 20 panels headed by women had women as 32.9% of the papergivers and 30.3% of the discussants. (These panels contained 28.3% of the women giving papers at the convention and 28.6% of the convention's female discussants.)

There were the usual assortment of stag panels:
 Intergovernmental Systems in Urban Areas (0-1, 0-6, 0-2)
 Science and Humanism in Teaching Political Science (0-1, 0-7)
 The Political Scientist on the Policy-Analytical Team (Roundtable) (0-1, 0-6)
 Empirical Applications of Analytical Political Theory (0-1, 0-6, 0-2)
 Overseeing or Overlooking?: New Techniques of Legislative/Executive Review (0-1, 0-5, 0-2)
 Theory of Legislation (0-1, 0-8)
 Models of Institutions and Institutional Processes (0-1, 0-5, 0-2)
 Methodological Problems in Policy Analysis (0-1, 0-4, 0-3)
 The Use and Abuse of Scientific, Technical and Privileged Information in Policy Making (0-1, 0-8, 0-1)
 Contemporary International Developments and

America's Changing Political and Commercial Interests (0-1, 0-8)

There were other customary variants:

(a) A virtually stag panel: Contributions of Analytic Theory to Normative Theory (0-1, 1-10).

(b) A female chair but an otherwise male panel: Alternative Policy Instruments (1-1, 0-6, 2-3).

(c) A woman as chair and women as discussants: Cross-National Comparative Public Policy (1-1, 0-6, 2-3).

(d) A male chairman but a balanced panel: The Methodological Issues and Concepts in Experimental Research (0-1, 3-5, 1-2); Impact of Minorities [racial not sex] on Urban Politics (0-1, 3-6, 1-2); and Group Identification, Political Ideology and Participation (0-1, 3-6, 1-2).

(e) Other examples of where a female chair makes a difference: East-West Comparisons: Views from Below (1-1, 3-4, 1-2); Determinants of Urban Policy: Public Opinion, Interest Groups and Movements (1-1, 2-4, 1-1).

(f) Women Studies topics: Sociology and Politics: New Directions in the Political Participation of Women at the Local and National Levels (1-1, 2-6, 2-2); The Role of Women in Development (1-1, 3-4, 1-1).

It is with relief that I report that the Business Meeting voted overwhelmingly not to hold the 1979 meeting in Illinois, a state which has failed to ratify the E.R.A. I had great apprehension that failure to move the meeting would have resulted in a catastrophic downturn in female participation at the 1979 meeting.

Martin Gruberg
 University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

To the Editor:

May I offer some observations regarding W. Landis Jones' remarks in the Summer 1978 *PS*? As Director of the President's Commission on White House Fellowships he is concerned that only 7 percent of the people awarded Fellowships in 13 classes have been political scientists. He concludes that an explanation ("The simple answer") may be that political scientists do not apply in great numbers.

It is certainly true that those awarded fellowships do seem to come disproportionately from major industries and the military. It would also appear that they come predominately from major urban centers. This last point suggests one of two additional, if not alternate, reasons why more political scientists are not Fellows.

Educators in general are not uncommonly consigned, for purposes at least of feeding and clothing themselves and any family, to institutions only indirectly linked to urban environments at best. As financing of education becomes tighter, all institutions, but particularly those not convenient to urban settings, suffer deterioration or absence of facilities. Thus "making a name" becomes progressively more difficult as does publishing. Furthermore, encouraged anonymity impedes advancement (service) which is one criterion of the Fellowship selection process.

Thus the second reason for the dearth of political science White House Fellows appears. Jones notes that "[t]he readers of the applications are looking for people early in their career who are showing signs that they will one day be leaders in their professions." Yet proof of this potential lies in establishing the fact that one is *already* a leader: "too few political scientists stress on their applications the community service aspect of their professional lives (Ah ha! we do apply, we just don't get accepted!). This community service can be to the broader community . . . or to the profession."

In short, the White House Fellowship is not a fellowship in the traditional sense. That is, it does not assist those whose potential may be real but whose isolation professionally (as with the stereotype of the community college) and environmentally (rural wilderness) deters all but minimal evidence of that potential. Instead, those already in leadership positions are *rewarded* for their success. To paraphrase an old adage, the President's Commission on White House Fellowships will give you a fellowship the way banks will give you money, provided you can prove to their satisfaction that you don't need it.

Herein also lies a challenge to the Association: find ways to help those newer to the discipline and/or leadership, who want to produce, overcome accidents of geography and sociology.

Raymond L. Chambers
Bainbridge Junior College

Dear Professor Epstein:*

We know we speak for a considerable number of political scientists when we say there is reason to be distressed (to put it mildly) by the action taken at the recent business meeting to boycott the City of Chicago because of the failure of the State of Illinois to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. We insist that this action is (as it was ruled by President Wahlke to be) a clear violation of the constitution which provides (in Article II, section 2) that the Association "will not commit its members on questions of public policy nor take positions

not immediately concerned with its direct purpose," which purpose is described as the encouragement of "the study of Political Science." By overruling President Wahlke and then voting to boycott Chicago, the meeting made it appear that the American Political Science is no respecter of rules (even its own rules) and no respecter of constitutions (even as it agitates for an amendment to the Constitution). We think it essential that you act to prevent this sort of thing once and for all.

The Constitution of the United States may or may not require amendment—we take no stand on that issue—but the constitution of the APSA is quite obviously in need of amendment. It was written for a profession that is no longer what it was. Its authors assumed that political scientists could be trusted to govern themselves or, even in the absence of the instruments of enforcement, could be trusted to observe rules mutually agreed upon. In short, unlike James Madison and his colleagues, our particular founders assumed that, whatever might be said about men and women in general, political scientists were indeed "angels" whose government required no "auxiliary precautions." That, quite obviously, has now been proved to be not applicable to the present membership and the Association must act accordingly. As the rules now stand, the Association cannot be prevented from marching to the beat of any zealous drummer who manages to pack a business meeting, and with fewer members in attendance at the annual meetings, and fewer still at the business meetings, it is becoming easier to do this. What is required, therefore, is a constitutional amendment further limiting the authority of these business meetings; to bring this about is, we think, the most important business likely to arise during your term of office.

Sincerely,
Walter Berns
University of Toronto (on leave)
Valerie Earle
Georgetown University
Robert A. Goldwin
American Enterprise Institute

To the Editor:

I was one of about 9,600 in the 10,100 member APSA who thought he had better things to do with the Saturday evening and Sunday morning of Labor Day weekend than attend yet another lengthy and rancorous association business meeting. I therefore found George Will's syndicated column of September 14 an informative account of some disturbing events. I recommend it to the 9,599 or so others in whose name 360 were able to defy President John Wahlke's ruling on the clear meaning of the APSA Constitution's ban on committing its members on questions of public policy. Surely we political scientists can think of a better way

*The above letter is published in *PS* at the request of the writers.

of governing ourselves than to make the constitution subordinate to whatever temporary majority happens to control a rump business meeting.

Here is Will's column:

Such Resolute Political Scientists *

Enough of sobriety, gentle reader. Let us turn, instead, to the recent convention of the American Political Science Association. "Let other pens dwell on guilt and misery," said Jane Austen, and so say I, turning to APSA's business meeting in New York earlier this month.

In 1976, the APSA, always energetic about occupying the moral high ground, declared that it would not convene in any state that refused to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, as long as ERA was pending before the states. That strategy of trying to buy ratification reflects the understandable reluctance of ERA supporters to rely on their arguments about the merits of the amendment.

But in 1973, APSA contracted with the Palmer House, a Hilton hotel in Chicago, to convene there in 1979. In 1976 Illinois had not (as it still has not) ratified ERA, but the deadline for ratifying was March 1979, before APSA's autumn convention, so APSA assumed that ERA could not be pending at convention time.

However, it now seems possible that Congress will extend the deadline to 1982. Faced with the prospect that ERA might be pending and unratified in Illinois in autumn 1979, APSA this month voted, by 4 to 1, to renege on its Palmer House contract.

Hilton sent a tough (well, semi-tough) talking fellow to threaten to sue APSA—unless APSA agreed to meet in another Hilton hotel. But Hilton also sent another fellow to say how much Hilton valued APSA's friendship. This demonstration of the fiber of the business community left APSA convinced that Hilton was not to be taken seriously.

Had the vote gone against Chicago by less than a two-thirds majority, the issue would have been submitted to the entire APSA membership by mail ballot, and the outcome might have been different. APSA business meetings have a peculiar composition: Imagine the political temperaments of people whose idea of a well-spent Saturday afternoon is one spent passing resolutions in hotel ballrooms.

The meeting overturned a ruling by the chairman that support for ERA violates APSA's constitution, which stipulates that APSA will not take stands "on questions of public policy," except regarding academic freedom and freedom of expression. Not even political scientists can believe ERA is such a matter, but the majority at the business meeting was at least even-handed. It showed as much contempt for its constitution as for its contractual obligations.

Next, the meeting rejected, overwhelmingly, a

proposal that APSA not participate in the International Political Science Association's 1979 meeting in Moscow. Those opposed to participation argued the impropriety of holding a political science convention in a nation where political science is impossible. (Free investigation of, say, power relations or interest groups in Soviet government is unimaginable.) They also argued that to hold the IPSA meeting in Moscow at a time of increased repression, and when many natural scientists are refusing to go there, would amount to "scabbing against the protest movement."

Those who favored going to Moscow used the arguments and rhetoric that have been used for about 61 years. From the IPSA: "... influence on the growth of international dialogue and increasing levels of mutual knowledge, tolerance, and the reduction of extreme aspects of ethnocentricism ... contribute to the building of bridges of trust and confidence. ..." From the State Department: "... influence Soviet and Eastern European behavior on human rights by continuing contacts. ..."

So it came to pass that political scientists, having voted to shun Chicago in the name of "human rights," voted to go to Moscow.

By this time all but the most avid activists had drifted away into the scented dusk of Manhattan, and the meeting looked like something left on the beach by the tide. Fortunately, someone had the wit to notice the absence of a quorum. That dissolved the meeting before it could vote to condemn the University of Maryland, without an investigation, for not giving the chairmanship of its political science department to a Marxist who, his supporters say, has a "right" to the job.

"But, my dear sir," cried Mr. Weston (in Jane Austen's "Emma"), "if Emma comes away early, it will be breaking up the party."

"And no great harm if it does," said Mr. Woodhouse. "The sooner every party breaks up the better."

Michael J. Malbin
National Journal (on leave)

To the Editor:

Last year I participated in the evaluation of applicants for the NSF Graduate Fellowship program. For the purpose of this program political science is grouped together with several other fields including philosophy and history of science, geography and economics. I was surprised to discover the very few number of political science applicants. A number of individuals on the panel had served in this capacity for several years and they indicated that this showing for political science was in no way unusual—students entering graduate school in political science apparently do not often apply to this program.

Undoubtedly, there are several reasons for this. To qualify for the award, an individual must

either be completing his/her senior year or have completed the senior year but be no further than the first semester into a graduate program. My guess is that these students tend to fall between two stools with respect to counseling in most institutions. Undergraduate counselors are typically more concerned with lower classmen and their problems as related to such matters as curriculum; most of these counselors are not particularly aware of fellowship opportunities for graduating seniors. Typically a graduating senior turns for advice to a mentor with whom he/she has worked over the years and my guess is that, like myself, not too many of us are informed about fellowship opportunities that exist independent of graduate institutions. Or, if informed, the strong scientific aura of the National Science Foundation may have made some feel that unless a student had the equivalent of a major in mathematics and science, he/she would not qualify. If the graduating senior faces a problem, just imagine the plight of the entering graduate student. He/she typically knows no one in the department and must rely on a frequently overworked and too busy graduate advisor for information and counseling; there is no one who specially looks out for his/her interests and can alert the student to the possibilities of the NSF grant. By the time the graduate student becomes known to a faculty member of the December deadline has passed and with it the very last chance to qualify for the fellowship.

Obviously the purpose of this open letter is to urge the political science community to encourage more students to apply for this very

lucrative and prestigious award. As fellowships and scholarships shrink in number and size, it seems incredible that our good students are not utilizing the opportunities that do exist. The National Science Foundation award is for THREE YEARS at the current rate of \$3,900, and the student can use the fellowship at any accredited institution he/she chooses. This is not to imply that the award is easy to win; the competition is certainly stiff and only those students with excellent backgrounds and good references should be encouraged. But surely there are many of these around. It should also be noted that the scientific aura of this granting agency has been overblown. A student who proposes to follow a typical program in political science involving some aspect of research almost surely qualified. Someone who wishes to study political science in order to become a better politician is not too likely to win an award; but most individuals who propose the standard graduate program leading to a teaching-research position are eligible.

I hope the political science community will make the work of the next set of panelists harder than it has ever been by encouraging a large number of students to apply. The interesting thing about these fellowships is that as the number of applicants, especially quality applicants, increases, so do the funds. The more top-quality political scientists that apply this year, the more fellowship money there will be in subsequent years.

Dina A. Zinnes
Indiana University