

## To the Editor:

I write this to take sharp exception to some of the conclusions reached by Ladd and Lipset in *The Politics of American Political Scientists* which betrays the typical "in house" bias and faulty perceptive apparatus of "clubby" political scientists. I refer to their attempt to correlate "career in academe" as an independent variable with the dependent variable conservative and liberal bias on both national-international issues and campus activism.

They correctly describe the factors that make intellectuals critical of the status quo. But *then* they associate "scholarship" with intellectuality and criticism of the status quo! In their words, "academics the most involved in creative scholarship—and thus the most engaged in the work of the intellectual" are "the most liberal politically" (my italics). Correspondingly, they hypothesize that those most successful in research and publication should be the most resistant to change within the campus. In a neat, perhaps unintended way, liberalism nationally is okay because the "haves" support it, but campus activism is suspect because the "academic proletariat," the privates of the profession, have impure motives!

Then, of course, the authors rather snidely and subtly inject the dagger.

*All this gives loose support, then, to the conclusion that scholarly members of the profession are pushed by their intellectuality to a more critical position in national controversies; but as more successful academic men have a greater stake in the university status quo and hence in campus politics are less 'liberal.'*

Nonsense, gentlemen. The problem with all survey data is that it seldom explains itself. While not arguing the point that their data may "prove" that "successful" academics are more "liberal" I doubt if *any* data can prove that this is due to any greater "intellectuality," which is something that is highly subjective, except perhaps to Messrs. Lipset and Ladd. Publication is a matter of fads, trends, fortune, hard work, etc. "Workmanship" often counts more than "intellectuality," especially in journals which worship at the bier of technique and I find it surprising that two political scientists are unaware of this.

As for the greater liberalism the authors found, I have a few "homelier" and less "supportive"

observations I could use to explain this. Academics at big schools are in a mutually reinforcing community, immune to a greater extent from the more conservative community outside the campus than their less "insulated" brethren. Also, greater deviance in opinion from the outside "norm" is tolerated because of the impersonality and anonymity of large universities as much as anything else. The same could be said of cities like New York. New York cab drivers, as anyone knows who cares to talk to them, are no more liberal than rustic types; it's just that in large metropolitan centers to a great extent anonymity protects eccentricity. The authors conveniently forget the extent to which political or social opinions depend greatly on social support and sustenance. This is available in large universities which are a microcosm of urban America (often drawing in disproportionately large numbers of urban "types") and inject part of this urban culture into an often hostile "hinterland."

I suspect that there may be other reasons for "liberalism" on national issues, but certainly these are more complex than the absurdly misleading research and creative scholarship—intellectuality—liberalism. As for campus activism, it is of course "self-evident" that those who benefit from a present reward system locally are less willing to change it, and I don't find *that* particularly startling though I do feel that this "conventional wisdom" is terribly short sighted.

**Roger Hamburg**

Indiana University at South Bend

## To The Editor:

On January 22nd, Evron Kirkpatrick, APSA Executive Director, sent out a two-page letter to all department heads, calling their attention to the wording of the Association's anti-nepotism and part-time professional employment resolutions. It noted that the members of the Association had also passed a resolution calling upon the Association to "seek legal funds for members who wish to file sex discrimination charges with the OFCC under Executive Orders 11246 and 11375." Dr. Kirkpatrick's letter closes by asking the department heads "to forward information they may have on cases of discrimination on the basis of sex."

Although this request for data on alleged cases of sex discrimination is for the purpose of seeking foundation funds to help women, I must question

the effectiveness of this procedure for implementing resolutions on the status of women in the profession. Isn't the Association, in fact, asking the persons most likely to be responsible for, or condoning, discriminatory practices to publically confess, stating how many times they have sinned? Isn't it somewhat absurd to believe that by such a disclosure these offenders will magically mend their ways? Tell us, Dr. Kirkpatrick, how many responses have you gotten?

How then to proceed? The APSA needs a staff person totally devoted to encouraging minorities in the profession that, among other things, can proceed with discretion to instigate for example, suits with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of HEW when charges against a department (or university) are lodged. In other words, the Association should work to lessen the constraints upon a complaineer who fears that starting a procedure against a department is tantamount to throwing a career away. Yet this procedure will not work as long as the APSA appears to be an "establishment" organization, which operates for the benefit of those against whom charges would most likely be brought. Although the Women's Caucus knows of several cases of discrimination, none of these have been brought to the attention of the APSA for the Caucus cannot find a complaineer who will trust the Association to protect her anonymity, let alone to act in her behalf.

The APSA can take the first steps toward changing its image in the eyes of many members of the profession by reassessing its priorities. Presently faced with a severe financial crisis, the Association rips whole programs from its ledger book by following the traditional guideline, "last hired, first fired." Long-standing programs stay, while the discipline's new range of activities suffers. This approach is justified by a majority on the Executive Council who assert that the APSA is a general membership organization that misuses its funds when it supports activities benefiting small, special groups. It is to be noted, however, that those so arguing are the elite who dominate the profession, and who benefit most from the traditional allocation of funds—by the Association as well as foundations. In this sense, the majority faction is as much a special interest as any other minority group with the profession. The question, then, is not who speaks for the general membership, but which special interests are to be fed? Can the Association afford to sacrifice further work on advancing the status of minorities in the profession, while continuing to operate, for

example, the Study of Congress project under a Carnegie Corporation grant, which to date has contributed 15 studies, by a homogeneous group of males, and has plans for another 11 studies by these same persons?

The "politics of exclusion" which denies new interests in the profession the opportunity to participate in the Association and benefit from it thwarts the very mandate under which the Association operates: to encourage minorities into the profession. Moreover, it garners their mistrust, and fails to take advantage of an opportunity to increase our discipline's knowledge. At stake is the very nature of the Association. A professional association should sensitize its members to new aspects of the discipline; and it should initiate these new inputs, not merely respond after they have come into being. Are only self-supporting groups going to be allowed into the profession? Are disadvantaged groups, which are often non-self-supporting, going to be denied into the Association for that reason? In short, who is going to determine what is an essential activity of the profession?

**Katherine M. Klotzburger**  
National Chairwoman,  
Women's Caucus for Political Science

## To The Editor:

A letter in *PS* last winter seeking to find political scientist interested in American Indians brought a number of replies. Two newsletters incorporating information from these replies have been sent to interested persons, and will be sent to anyone writing the undersigned, at the Department of Political Science, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada 89507. We would particularly like to hear from American Indians who are or might become political scientists.

**Elmer R. Rusco**  
University of Nevada

## To The Editor:

At the last Council meeting, it seemed refreshing to hear the proposed 1972 convention program presented as a return to a conventional pattern. A shameless exercise in banality appeared to have its uses. Still, I don't think I am alone in being troubled by the Council's failure to ponder the arrangements being made. I don't see why the

Council or one of its committees might not *discuss* ways of changing the pattern of the annual convention so that we might gradually begin to respond to widely made criticisms.

To start moving away from what has become an unwieldy, disaffecting, if not monstrous affair, we could perhaps attempt two things at once: (1) encourage the meeting of specialized groups within the profession in conjunction with the Convention and (2) confine the Convention itself to activities concerned with professional interests generally.

The national office might facilitate the simultaneous meeting of the growing number of disparate specialized groups such as the Association for Asian Studies, the Conference for the Study of Political Thought, the Communist Studies Group, the Committee on Comparative Politics, the Society for International Law, and the society for Legal and Political Theory. Supporting these groups, each of which would be responsible for its own program, would mean arranging for space in various hotels in the convention city, printing a common program, reserving time for such central convention affairs as the business meeting, and offering whatever services might be required by the individual groups.

At the center, the convention itself would provide the occasion for meetings, workshops, and panels restricted to subjects which touch on the *shared* concerns of the entire Association membership—*common* problems of methodology, teaching, professional ethics, research support, and APSA business.

What I am urging should allow us to disprove the notion that everything must get worse before it gets better. It should allow us to proceed piecemeal, to begin in 1972 to encourage and facilitate the coordinated meetings of specialized groups.

**Henry S. Kariel**  
University of Hawaii

## To The Editor:

The note by Gerald Benjamin "On Making Teaching 'U'" in *PS*, IV, No. 1 is important and valuable for the future of Political Science as an academic discipline. Benjamin makes several suggestions to give teaching more recognition within the profession (pp. 46-47).

Given the state of the Political Science profession and the academic world in general in 1971 perhaps the most fruitful of his suggestions for immediate action would be that concerning student evaluation. The lack of recognition for teaching in existing professional norms makes it unlikely the graduate schools could be persuaded to add courses on teaching to already crowded programs or that graduate students would take such courses, if added, with the seriousness they deserve. Colleague evaluation would probably be too expensive in terms of the tension and anxiety that it would produce to be immediately useful. But the idea may be fruitful in the long run. The use of external examination to measure the impact of specific courses (or teachers?) would be administratively difficult. Perhaps the Undergraduate Record Exam in Political Science published by ETS could be used as a start in this direction to provide, in conjunction with their aptitude tests, a means of ranking departments.

In any event, it seems important not to overlook one thing. However we are to recognize teaching effectiveness or ability it would have to be done on a nation-wide basis for only then could it be used as a supplement to the already existing "publish or perish" norms. Evaluation which allows only for local comparison within a given department or school can hardly help to persuade those Political Scientists with more "cosmopolitan" outlooks to concentrate on their teaching.

We are entering an era when teaching is finally to be given more recognition and it would behoove the Council of the Association and the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction to begin to make meaningful and concrete suggestions in these areas. Perhaps the first would be an attempt to develop an instrument for student evaluation. Would they be able to do so by September of this year or by September of 1972 so that it could be discussed and approved at the annual meeting? And if such an instrument was developed, would the Association begin to put its money where its mouth is by rewarding those who rank high on its instrument?

**William D. Muller**  
New York State University College, Fredonia