

Letters to the Editor

Microcomputers

To the Editor:

Nearly a year ago, after extensive research, I bought a microcomputer. Had I had the benefit of Gregory Marks' article in the Spring *PS*, I would have saved myself considerable effort. It was the best article I have seen on the subject, offering more concrete, practical information than I have seen packed in any one place.

Although the article came a bit late for me, it was just in time for me to show to a colleague who is about to buy a microcomputer. He not only liked that article, but was particularly impressed with the Grafton-Permaloff article on statistical packages. In fact, he was so impressed with the whole issue and with the value of *PS* for a political scientist working outside academia, that he immediately called APSA for membership forms and has now joined.

Please keep up the good work!

J. Michael Carmichael
U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Propaganda

To the Editor:

Michael Parenti's article, "The State of the Discipline: One Interpretation of Everyone's Favorite Controversy" (*PS*, Spring 1983) is remarkable for many reasons. I will deal with only one, keeping in mind that it is he alone who has the right to impute all kinds of conspiracies, sellouts and betrayals to political scientists he disagrees with. To attack him as he has attacked Joseph LaPalombara or Evron Kirkpatrick will elicit loud cries of "McCarthyism" and "red-baiting." Well, I'll take my chances.

Parenti's attack on "centrists" and our "centrist" society and their "behavioralist" supporters is remarkable for its focus on the U.S. as the world's Villain-in-Chief. Our social order, our political system, our "democratic capitalist" society are indicted in one sentence—"there is something very wrong with this society." It is in America that there is "political oppression and systematic conflict."

Is it not extraordinary that at the moment when the onetime head of the KGB now heads the vast Soviet empire; when we have been witness to the awe-inspiring events in Poland; when we have seen worker uprisings in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany; when we see a Soviet empire unable to feed its people yet able to create the most powerful military machine since Hitler's on the eve of World War II; when we see the daily oppressions and punitive psychiatry of intellectuals and workers in the USSR; when we see the daily violations of the Helsinki pact; when we see democracy imperiled everywhere by Soviet nuclear warheads; when we see in every democracy the continued repudiation of socialism, Marxist or otherwise, by working-people and their trade unions; when we see the bitterness between the USSR and the People's Republic of China and the fear by Yugoslavia of the USSR; when we see how hundreds of thousands flee the Communist genocidists of Southeast Asia and when we witness the slaughter of the innocents in Afghanistan—isn't it extraordinary that Parenti finds the enemy of freedom in the political science sect of behavioralism and its putative patron, the United States government?

If this kind of "critical thinking" is characteristic of the radical and leftist scholarship to which Parenti gives pride of place, then I pity the victimized graduate students who have to submit to such

propaganda masquerading as truth. Perhaps when Parenti has a moment he will tell us how American society stacks up against that of the USSR and how the "political oppression" in America which concerns him so deeply stacks up against the oppression of dissident political scientists in the USSR and its satellites. And in case Parenti missed it, he ought to read pp. 243-244 of the very *PS* in which his manifesto appeared, the letter to Yuri V. Andropov about what is happening to dissident political scientists in the USSR. Perhaps Parenti will send his own letter of protest to Andropov (and send *PS* a copy for publication) protesting the persecution of non-behavioralist political scientists.

So far as I can see from Parenti's letter, radical scholars, Marxist scholars are nail-bitingly worried about "centrist" political science serving immoral capitalism but what happens to Lech Walesa is not their business, what happens to Sakharov and Shcharansky is not their business. The enemy of humanity, the scourge of proletarian freedom, the betrayer of mankind's fondest hopes is—behavioralism.

Arnold Beichman
Hoover Institution

A Letter from Prison

To APSA Friends:

Warm greetings!

I was very pleased to receive copies of [letters from APSA] . . . that pertain to my appeal for release from detention. Coming from such an aggregation of distinguished academicians, I am certain your pleas will go a long way in expediting my freedom. More immediately, they make up an invaluable lift to my spirits and brighten the future for me and my loved ones. Our heartfelt gratitude to you! . . .

Notwithstanding, however, the . . . legal impediments to freedom, we, the political prisoners do not lose hope. Our belief in the correctness of our commitment to

social justice and democracy remains steadfast. Despite the odds, we shall persevere with our prison struggles in order to bring to the attention of the world the plight and the violated rights of Filipino political prisoners. . . .

Let me end by telling you once more how grateful I am for the assistance extended by APSA. Assured of your invaluable support, I will, no doubt, feel more confident of every step in this long and tortuous march to freedom.

Mabuhay!

Sixto Carlos, Jr.
Bicutan, Philippines

Editor's Note: The case of Philippine political scientist Sixtos Carlos, Jr. was taken up by APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms in accordance with a new Association policy established by the Council and guidelines set up by the committee (see "Ethics Committee Sets Human Rights Role for APSA," PS, Summer 1982, pp. 534-535).

On April 5, Nancy Zingale, chair of the committee, wrote President Ferdinand E. Marcos, as well as the president of the Philippine Political Science Association, to inquire about Carlos' status. In addition, a small delegation of human rights advocates, which included an APSA staff member and which was led by a representative from the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, visited the Philippine Embassy in Washington and petitioned the Minister Counselor for Carlos' release.

APSA has received no response from the Philippine government. The letter sent to President Marcos follows:

President Ferdinand E. Marcos
Malacanang Palace
Metro Manila, The Philippines

Dear Mr. President:

The American Political Science Association (APSA), founded in 1903, is the national professional organization in the United States that represents the interests of university and college political scientists and others engaged in the study and teaching of government. The

Letters to the Editor

APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms is charged with the responsibility of working to ensure that the academic rights of political scientists are protected.

Our committee has received reports that a political scientist, Sixto Carlos, Jr., has been detained for over three years without formal charges. In May 1982, Mr. Carlos was offered a scholarship by the Catholic Bishops Conference of France and the World Council of Churches. We are informed that Mr. Carlos is prepared to accept this offer and go to Europe along with his wife and two children. Our committee respectfully requests that the Government of the Philippines permit Mr. Carlos to accept this scholarship.

As you may know, Mr. Carlos was head of the Department of Political Science in the Philippine College of Commerce (now the Polytechnic University of the Philippines). Mr. Carlos was reportedly arrested in Manila without warrant on April 23, 1979, and held incommunicado in a "safehouse" at the Maximum Security Unit, Fort Bonifacio, Manila, until September 1979. During this period of detention, Mr. Carlos was alleged to have been subjected to physical and psychological torture.

It is our understanding that Mr. Carlos' case was not brought before the courts until March 1981 when the Judge Advocate General's Office filed a complaint that he had committed the crimes of subversion and illegal possession of firearms. Although the Manila Court of First Instance opened a preliminary investigation of the case at that time, we understand that to date the judge has not decided if there is a *prima facie* case against Mr. Carlos.

In light of the fact that Mr. Carlos has been offered a scholarship and that he is prepared to accept that scholarship outside the country and to go to Europe along with his wife and two children, our committee urges the government of the Philippines to permit Mr. Carlos to accept the scholarship. Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated, and I

look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Very truly yours,

Nancy Zingale
Chair
Committee on Professional
Ethics, Rights and Freedoms

Academic Dues

To the Editor:

Rather than the cynical letter this was slated to be, it is instead a plea that the APSA membership live up to the Association's affirmative action policy.

Your winter 1983 issue ("Finding Jobs: Placement of Political Scientists, 1981-82") carries the astounding statistic that only 41 percent of blacks and 78 percent of Hispanics applying in 1982 for placement found success, down from virtually full placement in 1981. The caveat that the smallness of the numbers involved vitiates any conclusion is one inference. Another is that, precisely because the numbers are so small, the placement percentages are appalling.

These figures, and my own experience as an Hispanic Ph.D. in the academic job market, made me recoil from the spring 1983 issue's report, "The Commitment of the American Political Science Association to the Principle of Affirmative Action." Its wording is gratifying, but it is disheartening to know its distance from the reality I have encountered.

Beginning in March 1982 and ending in April 1983, I submitted nearly 100 complete applications to APSA member universities and colleges without receiving even one invitation for an interview. The positions involved ranged from one year ones to renewable appointments and tenure-track ones, and the institutions from Ivy League to the most modest in your *Personnel Newsletter*. I have avoided tallying up the costs of all this.

My vita is a competitive one—from a Harvard magna cum laude B.A. to Notre Dame graduate degrees in two disci-

plines, including a Ph.D. in political science, with distinction, two years' service as a top research analyst for the ad hoc, inter-agency Cuban-Haitian Task Force in Washington, to a fair number of publications. A professor in one of your member universities said of my application: "We are wary of affirmative action degrees." Although he quickly added that of course he did not mean me, I am astonished by the implications of that remark to this day. Another professor in another APSA member university remarked of my application for a public administration teaching position that my two years of government service were a *liability*, that "you have not paid your academic dues."

A friend of mine, also a Cuban-American . . . hides his ethnicity when he goes before university interviewing committees.

I have been appointed to an assistant professor position in a local Catholic college that is not a member of the APSA's Departmental Services Committee. That was my one interview.

I am a Cuban-American, Cuban born. And that is an additional complication. Although I was raised in a middle class household and have personally been on the fringes of poverty at times, buffeted by ethnic insults at others, and fully committed to social justice—despite all of this, I have confronted the incredible stereotypes of academia concerning my ethnic sub-group: Cuban "exiles" are reactionary Batistianos, wealthy leeches or former leeches, know nothing about Latin American realities, etc. A friend of mine, also Cuban-American and past 35, hides his ethnicity when he goes before university interviewing committees. My experience is multiplied among friends with similar qualifications and background who still seek their first full-time academic position.

The kindest and most objective hypothesis I can think of about all this is that at a time of academic recession, when academic "gypsies" abound and a third

of political science Ph.D.s go begging, affirmative action falls somewhat to the wayside. Compounding this is the fact that women and minorities, who together form nearly two-thirds of our society, shamefully continue to be underrepresented and underpromoted in academia and are set to compete with one another under the "affirmative action" rubric for the few appointments and promotions there are. Finally, there is the reactionary myth, in academia as elsewhere, that we have preferential treatment.

There is more bitterness and cynicism and less of a plea in this letter than I had hoped. But it seems to me that the APSA must take full cognizance of the reality I here outline—not just mine but that of many others in my category.

One concrete suggestion I have is that the APSA broaden its Chicano Committee to subsume all Hispanics (even Cubans), or start a parallel Hispanic American Committee. A second is that ethnicity- or gender-specific efforts of the APSA not preclude the need for advocacy for all of us on the periphery of academia for reasons of discrimination. A third is that APSA member institutions live up to their own and the Association's affirmative action stances. And it may be that APSA sanctions against discriminating—racist or sexist—member institutions need to be strengthened and made very public within the Association.

I hope sometime to have the currency with which to pay "academic dues."

Mario A. Rivera
CARECO, Inc.

Methods for Undergraduates

To the Editor:

Anyone who has taught a methods course for undergraduates and would be willing to share syllabi, ideas, success or failure stories should contact Mary Thornberry, Department of Political Science, Davidson College, Davidson, NC 28036. There is a possibility of putting together a panel at the 1984 convention

Letters to the Editor

to address such issues as: What should we try to teach undergraduates about methodology? Is a separate course necessary? Do we concentrate on statistics or research design? What coordination is possible with math, sociology, psychology, or economics? Do we require the course of all majors? How do we prepare students to read the journals? What type of computer training should we provide?

Thanks so much for your help.

Mary Thornberry
Davidson College

Only Marx?

To the Editor:

The comments in "Significant Works in Political Science: Some Personal Views" in the Spring 1983 issue are valuable in that they call attention to emphases and beliefs which are not necessarily familiar and to works which should have been read or at least heard of and haven't been. But aside from Ted Lowi's criticism, there is another which surely should have been borne in mind: shouldn't you have had some mechanism for pointing out that some statements by your participants are most egregiously erroneous or careless?

Notably, to say, as Philip Green does that "only Marx" has made a major effort to transcend our own social order (p. 197) is simply wrong. Marx may have made the best effort if one can indicate in some believable way why; or he may have made the only major effort if one defines "transcend" in some unusual and unfamiliar way (but that should be indicated).

The fact is that there are quite a number of anthropologists who have made major efforts along this line, some of them with considerable political orientation, such as W. L. Warner and his various associates, particularly in the sections dealing with Bossy Gillis and political campaigning in Newburyport. . . . Sir Edmund Leach's recent book on social anthropology and of course his earlier work on political systems of higher Burma read in reverse, so to speak, shows how to transcend our own social order in a political study as does Barth's study of politics among the

Swat Pathans. In fact, one could list some 40 or so books by political anthropologists, or those greatly influenced by them, which make a major effort of this sort.

In addition to that, there are of course familiar classic works which to the naive mind attempt such an effort, such as de Tocqueville's study of the Ancien Regime or the effort of Durkheim to understand the division of labor. And perhaps most patently contradictory of all, there are a series of works, largely, to be sure, by British and French historians rather than by Americans, influenced by anthropological approaches and produced within the last 20 years or so—Braudel is, I suppose, the most ambitious and macroscopic—which attempt to transcend our own social categories for the purpose of understanding how the societies of Europe came to be. But one should also again mention anthropological writings with a strong historical emphasis such as Fred Bailey's *Stratagems and Spoils*.

I am not saying that Green should not make such a statement; I am saying that some editorial control should be exercised to call for clarification or justification of statements in terms of comparable literature. As it stands, I strongly suspect it is merely an expression of faith and of no scholarly interest at all.

Lewis A. Dexter

Political Mythology

To the Editor:

In your last issue, Professor Lindblom provides a striking illustration of the role of political mythology in the minds of social scientists. I had stated, in a *PS* note in the prior issue, that the selection of American Participants (overseas speakers) is not a partisan issue, and that they are chosen for their expertise. That is the policy, and will remain the policy.

Lindblom in his letter to the editor muddles the issue, stating that this Agency asks speakers to *defend* U.S. policies. That is false; we do ask that speakers on current policy-relevant topics (approximately one-half of the post-requested topics) be able to *explain* present policies

fairly as well as contrary views. Such a principle, enforced by both the Carter and Reagan administrations, will, we hope, guide the program in future administrations as well.

All we ask is that American Participants be able to convey the facts and not be blinded by political myths that seem to inform Lindblom.

Richard E. Bissell
Director
Office of Program Coordination
and Development
United States Information Agency

Editor's note: Richard Bissell formerly taught political science at Temple University and The University of Pennsylvania.

APSRs for Sale

To the Editor:

Thank you for printing my letter in the Spring issue of *PS* in which I offered back issues of *APSR* for sale. Unfortunately, my address was listed incorrectly and should have read 326 State St. Would it be possible to run a correction in the next *PS*?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Joel Margolis
326 State St.
Albany, N.Y. 12210