

To the Editor:

I hope I shall not be forced to write an annual letter in response to the campaign circular of the Ad Hoc Committee in connection with APSA elections. This second letter is in response to the bold-face statement of the Ad Hoc Committee, following a list of various opinions, "All Ad Hoc candidates are committed to these concerns."

As one of the people endorsed for election to the Executive Council by the Ad Hoc Committee, I should like to submit that I was never consulted as to whether or not I am committed to the views attributed to me. No impropriety exists in the endorsement of nominees without their consent, but the public attribution of a whole series of views to a nominee without his consent is, I think, highly improper. I have called this matter to the attention of the APSA Committee on Professional Ethics in the hope that it will prepare some kind of statement on fair campaign practices. We clearly need some guidelines.

James W. Prothro
University of North Carolina

To the Editor:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to Jim Prothro's annual post-election letter. If I was surprised by his comments last year, I am astounded by his current complaint. His comments before me, I have scrutinized the Ad Hoc Committee letter. It is true as charged that the letter asserts in bold face, "All Ad Hoc candidates are committed to these concerns." However, the letter makes entirely clear that this sentence applies *only* to our assertion of concern with academic freedom and with needs of such disadvantaged groups within the profession as "women, blacks, chicanos and graduate students." The letter attributes no precise positions to the candidates endorsed by the Ad Hoc Committee, it only asserts their concern.

I am very sorry that Jim Prothro finds it objectionable that we attributed to him a general concern with social justice and academic freedom. His writing and public activities appear to suggest such concerns. Maybe we misread his record. But I still think that we were right,

so I wish to congratulate Prothro on his election to the Council of the APSA and remind him and readers of *PS* that the Ad Hoc Committee did *not* attribute "a whole series of views to a nominee without his consent. . . ." It did assert that candidates endorsed by the Ad Hoc Committee "have diverse scholarly interests and commitments" and it did assert that they "hold diverse views on politics and public policy."

As all students of politics know, it is not uncommon for candidates to protest insults and accusations by opponents in the heat of a campaign. Prothro's letter may well be the first case in history of a candidate protesting a compliment paid him by supporters.

Donald G. Herzberg
Eagleton Institute of Politics

To the Editor:

After the October 27 letter on behalf of the Committee for a Responsible Political Science was mailed it was called to our attention that it contained some misplaced quotation marks in citing a report by the Los Angeles *Times* of remarks by the Caucus candidate for APSA President-Elect to a press conference on September 9. Our letter stated: "The candidate of the Caucus for a New Political Science has declared in a press conference that he and the Caucus 'will try to win control of the APSA because it has avoided the real political issues of the day.' " The *Times* story stated: "A leading critic of the war in Southeast Asia said Wednesday he was going to try to win control of the 14,000-member American Political Science Association because it 'has avoided the real political issues of the day.' "

The responsibility for the misplaced quotation marks is ours alone, for we drafted the letter and the other twenty-eight signers accepted without question the accuracy of the quote. The explanation is simple, if not very flattering to us: a colleague read the *Times* story to us over the telephone after we had returned to our campuses, and it simply did not occur to us to check the punctuation. No doubt it should have, but it didn't.

It still is not clear to us that the statement as given in our letter misrepresented the *sub-*

stance of the Caucus candidate's purposes and objectives in accepting the Caucus's nomination and platform. Misrepresentation was certainly not our intention, but that does not excuse our carelessness, and we offer this apology for it. We only wish we could say it is the first mistake we ever made in our lives.

Austin Ranney

University of Wisconsin

Warren E. Miller

University of Michigan

To the Editor:

Recently, caucuses of the Black and Chicano members of our profession have been organized. While I do not know of any American Indian political scientists, Indians are members of another segment of our society which has experienced oppression and neglect, including neglect by the academic profession. (A check of the *Cumulative Index of the American Political Science Review* reveals no articles specifically about American Indians through 1968.)

There are no doubt other political scientists who think that Indians should be studied by our profession and that Indians should be encouraged to become political scientists. I know of two graduate students doing research involving American Indians: Faun Mortara of this institution and D. C. Braithwaite of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. If there are other political scientists studying in this area or who are American Indians, the undersigned would appreciate hearing from such persons (Department of Political Science, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada 89507). Various possibilities exist for stimulating communication and studies in this area, if there are enough people interested in communicating with each other.

Elmer R. Rusco

University of Nevada

To the Editor:

In *The New York Times Book Review* (Nov. 29) an advertisement (p. 20) for *An End to Political Science, the Caucus Papers* headlines "An Urgent Summons to Radical Politics." Coeditor Marvin Surkin claims (*PS*, Summer, 1970) that he has "applied to social science, to ideology,

and to theoretical criticism an alternate standard of rationality." Is the radical politics also subject to that alternative? If so, for what purpose other than an intellectual ego trip?

Perhaps Surkin is trying to reorient the socialization process so that society will eventually help the unable and disadvantaged populace. But what is to happen to the used and abused in the interim? As an aspirant political scientist and concerned citizen, if Surkin and Caucus have any answers they are not for me because as an economically exploited Army draftee, I cannot afford to pay \$7.95 for what is obviously a product of middle class presumption.

Such operational alternatives only perpetuate the elite, economically privileged, information monopoly that is characteristic of the present establishment. The poor have always had that alternative!

Albert R. Pacer

Walter Reed AMC
Washington, D.C.

To the Editor:

The Caucus for a New Political Science carried on a variety of activities at the 1970 meetings in Los Angeles. The Caucus sponsored a roundtable on political science as profession or vocation, a discussion group on the political left in the 1970's and panels on political repression in the 70's, neo-imperialism, radicalism in the social sciences, student radicalism and ethnic studies, teaching outcomes, and politics and pollution. The Caucus panels and discussion groups provided a format for the expression of dissenting viewpoints which challenge the existing orthodoxies of the regular program.

The Caucus also challenged the business as usual approach of the Association in dealing with its membership. The attempt of members of the Council to rush the new Wildavsky constitution to collective judgment was blocked. The Caucus was instrumental in having consideration of the new constitution postponed for a year so that adequate discussion of its provisions could take place among all the membership. Under Caucus pressure the Association accepted an amendment which gives the membership the right to ratify or reject proposed dues increases. In addition, Caucus

support of the Puryear Amendment, the Chicano resolutions, and the Women's resolutions provided a strong base of support in their successful passage at the business meetings.

Finally, the Caucus offered a slate of candidates with Hans Morgenthau heading the ticket as our presidential candidate. The Caucus slate ran on a strong reform platform which advocated that the APSA encourage: the redirection of scholarly work toward political change and human needs, the elevation of teaching as a professional accomplishment, the development of measures to increase the participation of oppressed people in the discipline, funding agencies to decrease inequalities between rich and poor schools, and steps against institutions which purge radical and dissenting scholars. The Caucus slate as a whole obtained approximately one third of the vote and the following Caucus endorsed candidates won office: Victoria Schuck (Vice President), William Robinson, Sr., Joyce Mitchell, and Dankwart Rustow (Council Members).

Please see the section on Professional Notes in this issue of *PS* for additional information on Caucus activities.

Ed Malecki

California State College, Los Angeles

To the Editor:

Although former President David Easton was quite correct in his statement that one of the difficulties with political science as a discipline at the present point in time is the fact that there is no generally agreed upon methodology or approach to the subject of politics, it seems to me that both he and others have failed to mention an important corollary or aspect of this difficulty.

I refer specifically to the definitions of concepts and words which are frequently used within the discipline. While I think it is probably impossible to arrive at a definition of some words to the satisfaction of everyone, I wonder whether it would not be possible to arrive at a general agreement on the use of some other terms, many of which are not nearly as tinged with the kinds of overtones and connotations which result from different approaches to the subject matter.

A number of other disciplines have seen fit to establish special Commissions in order to trace the use of, and then define for present purposes,

specific and widely used words and concepts. In other words: would it not be of some value to all of us to have some specific guidelines concerning the use of as many terms and concepts as possible?

It may be utopian, but I can see some very great benefits to new scholars, students, and researchers, as well as incumbents, in having literally a handbook of definitions, researched and written as a result of a joint effort on the part of both students and scholars from different subfields of political science. I for one would appreciate the much shorter footnotes and definitional essays which seem to form a growing part of our writings as each author seeks to justify his own particular usage of particular terms and concepts.

Perhaps I should say that I am aware that this was one of the purposes of the new Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. But this is precisely the point: this was an *encyclopedia*, with each article written by one man (a well-known scholar in the field, of course). It is not a *dictionary*, which is what I would like to see. In addition, the former costs hundreds of dollars, and is not a widely-owned reference work; the latter should be a joint effort, inexpensive, and therefore also widely-owned *and used*.

One more point, to the skeptics concerning committees (a group I normally belong to): there have been at least two good dictionaries of the English language compiled by committees in the last decade.

May I hear some reactions?

Manfred W. Wenner

University of Washington

To the Editor:

I would like to take issue with some of the comments in Steven D. Krasner's teaching note, "A Defense of Conventional Grading." (*PS*, Fall 1970, p. 651, 2.) Mr. Krasner states that conventional grading systems perform several functions which "... include giving the student information on his performance . . ." (*ibid*, par. 2, 1. 4.) I believe it would have been more accurate to have said that grades give a student information about the professor's opinion of the student's performance. I believe this is an important distinction in classes where the more stimulating aspects of Political Science are discussed.

Mr. Krasner goes on to say "The present grading system does separate the evaluation of class performance from any other personal or intellectual contact which a teacher may have with his students." (ibid, last par. lines 12 thru 16.) I believe this statement is open to serious doubt, in part because Mr. Krasner neglected to mention a very important subject. This subject is prejudice. When I was an undergraduate, it was often my misfortune to ask questions about a lecture which the professor responded to in an evasive and irritated manner. I have no way of knowing whether or not I was threatened by lower grades for having asked such questions. However, I did give this question serious consideration, and one result was that I had little confidence in the unbiased and "honest" aspects of the grades which I received. The vagueness of letter grades makes them very difficult to challenge. Many are the times that I wished I could have received written comments on my performance. Such comments would have at least illuminated the criteria of excellence used by the professor and made class competition more meaningful. I can agree with Mr. Krasner that to judge students as persons is a step in the wrong direction. (ibid, last sentence.) However, written specific comments have a great advantage over grades. To be specific, the effects of bias and prejudice can be greatly reduced since it forces a professor to - expose his criteria of excellence. I do not object to the "coercion" of reasons, but I do object to the "coercion" of grades. (ibid, par. 3, 1. 2.) When reasons are bad, there are lots of things that I can do. In addition, such written comments provide the beginnings of a serious dialogue between students and teacher. Students think much more clearly about the ideas they put into writing, and the same applies to teachers.

In closing, I would like to ask Mr. Krasner an open question. What would your reaction have been if the editor had rejected your teaching note with the grade of D—? In particular, how might you have decided whether or not the editor had been unbiased and "honest" in his evaluation of your performance, separate from any personal or intellectual contacts he might have with you? (ibid, past par., lines 8 thru 12.) Please note that the subject of honesty is included in this question mainly because Mr. Krasner brought it up. (ibid, last par., 1. 9.) I have very few tests for honesty. By contrast, I have many tests for deciding the question of prejudice versus open mindedness, which are readily applicable to the reasons which people use for the acceptance

or rejection of ideas. From bitter experience, I consider the quality of open mindedness to be of prime importance in a teacher of Political Science.

David A. Ehrenfeld

To the Editor:

It would seem that my colleagues are either angry or silent. Therefore, I will write to say that you may give my name and address to anyone who is interested in sending any propaganda whatsoever to a White- Anglo-Saxon- Protestant- fortish- unemployed female Political Scientist. It is a pleasure to find out what *other* people find important enough to write about.

In exchange, however, please inform Christian Bay and John H. E. Fried (for me) that we do not need more inspirational pludges nor do we need any more ideocentric subcommittees. What this nation needs are more Hippie-Cops.

Somewhere else in *PS* there is mention made that a number of young Political Scientists did not get the teaching and/or research situations they preferred. Did any one even suggest to them that the wall between Academia and Reality is already too high? Instead of damning the Establishment, why not try to change it?

One of the reasons things are the way they are is because the people who are willing to work believe as they do. Instead of heaping wrath and hot coals upon Political Scientists who happen to be where some of us do not think that they should be, let them "do their thing" while we work for differing goals.

A tour of duty as a Peace Officer, or with the Probation Department, or Parole office can be a very enlightening experience. Perhaps some of our idealistic young intellectuals should have this soul-searing touch with "life as it is."

Searle P. Smithson

To the Editor:

Professor Joseph LaPalombara's response to our article on participation in APSA annual meetings published in the Fall, 1970 issue of *PS*

raises several questions of fact and interpretation. We would like to respond briefly.

1. The Editor of *PS* explained to us, in discussing the format in which our article would appear, that he wanted to have a response from a recent program chairman, who might be likely to have a different point of view from ours. It can now be said that Professor LaPalombara has responded as expected, although the extent to which he found the situation during 1964-1969 to be quite satisfactory was somewhat surprising to us.

2. Professor LaPalombara cites five reasons why his efforts to broaden participation in 1956 and 1968 weren't more successful:

- 1) many schools don't provide financial support for potential participants.
 - 2) many who volunteer to participate desire the discussant's role.
 - 3) many volunteered papers are of poor quality.
 - 4) departmental chairmen do not sufficiently encourage departmental members or help them find places on panels.
 - 5) the general structure of decision-making of program committees is not such that a wider distribution pattern can readily be assured.
- Reasons two and three are clearly irrelevant to Professor LaPalombara's point since, as he himself states, these factors apply to all volunteers for participation, not just to volunteers from "under-represented" groups. The other three reasons amount to a pretty fair resumé of Professor LaPalombara's attitude on the subject: universities are deficient; department chairmen are remiss; the structure of the program committee is sacrosanct. In other words, no thought need be given to the possibility that the program committee, too, might change its structure or improve its practices. This attitude constitutes a *leitmotif* throughout Professor LaPalombara's piece. He returns to it explicitly at the end (p. 644), where he introduces proposals for broadening participation by saying that the answer "lies not with the Association but with its members and their academic departments."

3. Professor LaPalombara criticizes us (p. 643) for not documenting "some comments . . . about the existence of an old boy network." He fails to note that these "comments" were clearly offered as *possible, partial* explanations of

participation patterns.¹ They were stated in hypothetical terms precisely *because* they had not been documented. Surely it is reasonable to suggest possible explanations for patterns of participation, which might be subject to subsequent investigation, without having them dismissed out of hand as "undocumented comments." This, after all, is what the interplay of data and theory is all about. Such documentation, of the who-knows-whom, who-is-indebted-to-whom variety so loved by Kremlinologists, is not easy to come by. But for the future researcher of this problem Professor LaPalombara has provided a modest amount of empirical data. He reports (p. 641) that three of the four members of the program committee during his chairmanship whom he can identify by terminal degree institution were from Princeton (LaPalombara's school), and two were his contemporaries there.² He adds that two members were former colleagues at Michigan State. Although the sample is admittedly small, could one expect a more promising start toward confirmation of the old-boy hypothesis?

4. In a brief but remarkable spurt of inaccuracy on p. 642, Professor LaPalombara distorts our findings through a series of misreadings (which invariably lend support to his point of view):

- 1) He writes, p. 642, that he isn't alarmed but reassured that the Rule Violators come from 117 different departments. This is clearly a misreading of Table 5, p. 634: they come from 58 different departments, and 59% of them come from 15 departments.
- 2) He implies, p. 642, that no rule against multiple participation in one year exists and says that only with such a rule could "violators" be "removed from the program." As made clear in our article (p. 629, note 5), APSA officials

1 The passage referred to by Professor LaPalombara on p. 639 reads in part: "But it *may be* that the positions of these schools are *in part* being maintained by the development of continuing participation patterns that amount to an old boy network" (emphasis not in original).

2 Professor LaPalombara writes of 14 program committee members, but the 1968 Annual Meeting *Program* identifies 15 members, in addition to LaPalombara. He says that he could only identify 4 of 14 members by terminal degree institutions, although he could have found this information on all of the others except one in the APSA *Biographical Directory* (1968 edition). The breakdown on the 16 members of the 1968 program committee (including LaPalombara) by institution of terminal degree is as follows: Harvard—7, Princeton—4, and one each for Chicago, Duke, Fletcher, Syracuse and Yale.

concede that there is such a rule and that it has been in existence for some time.³ But it was only with complaints from a sizeable number of APSA members (see reference in our article, note 4) that the APSA leadership began to enforce the rule, and in 1970 a large number of potential violators were indeed "removed from the program."

3) LaPalombara states (p. 642) that "some of the repeaters or RVs coded by Barry are almost certainly those who simultaneously performed administrative (program committee, section chairman) and substantive (panel) roles." Yet we specifically state in two places in our article (pages 634 and 635) that this is not the case. On page 634 we write:

Not counted in these figures were ten RVs who, in years other than those in which there were RVs, functioned during the same year as both a panel member and a member of the leadership group. Also not counted are eleven non-rule violators who held a leadership position and in the same year participated in one of the panels. As mentioned earlier,⁴ participation in the program committee was not classified as contributory to a rule violation."

If we had coded as Professor LaPalombara says "almost certainly" must have been the case, then the number of rule violations would have increased substantially.

5. LaPalombara raises on p. 643 two points that we consider well-taken. First, he wonders whether the leading institutions depicted in our study might actually be "underrepresented" rather than "overrepresented." We agree that this is a crucial point. To relate our "sample" to the universe of APSA members, one would need some kind of composite profile of the latter. We mention this point twice in the article (p. 638 and p. 640, note 20) and we recommend that such a profile be developed. We also proposed this idea to several influential APSA members but did not receive a positive response.

3 The version of our article reviewed by Professor LaPalombara contained only the first sentence of note 5 on p. 629, so he may not have known when writing his response that the rule had been traced as far back as 1958.

4 The words "As mentioned earlier" were inadvertently left in the final version of the article after the passage to which they referred was removed to save space.

Second, Professor LaPalombara would like to know what proportion of the participants discussed in our study have published books. So would we, but we would suggest that the relationship between frequent participation and publication may be somewhat more complex than the one-way street that Professor LaPalombara implies, i.e., that those who publish a lot participate a lot. For instance, certainly the "visibility" gained by participation at annual meetings could enhance a person's opportunities to publish. The whole question of the relationship between participation and publishing is one of several possible areas of future research for which our study provides a point of departure.

There are other thought-provoking statements in the LaPalombara response that deserve comment, but space limitations prevent us from considering these. We would sum up our rejoinder in this way: certain participation patterns exist, and Professor LaPalombara is ambivalent as to whether or not this fact bothers him. But even where he expresses concern, he considers the matter to be no business of the APSA leadership or the program committee: they are not "structured" to cope with such matters. The answer, to quote Professor LaPalombara again on this point, "lies not with the Association but with its members and their academic departments." APSA members should seriously consider this advice.

Donald D. Barry
James G. Bommer
Lehigh University

To the Editor:

Why in the world would Henry Kariel—or the editorial board of *PS*—want to know which article or book published during the last quarter century received too much attention (*PS*, Fall, 1970)? Far more intriguing, and constructive, would be the obverse, which has received too little attention.

William J. Crotty
Northwestern University