

To the Editor:

Readers of John Mueller's article, "The Political Scientist Decides," in the Summer 1970 *PS*, may be encouraged to believe in the rationality (or idiosyncrasy) of our electorate and the lack of power of the "establishment" as represented by the Nominating Committee. However, this optimistic conclusion neglects the processes by which the Ad Hoc Committee arrived at its own choices. Choosing *after* the Nominating Committee, it agreed with all but two of that committee's choices. In Mueller's implicit path diagram, the path from Nominating Committee to Ad Hoc Committee is ignored.

Duncan MacRae, Jr.
University of Chicago

To the Editor:

John E. Mueller's article in the Summer, 1970 issue of *PS* on the 1969 APSA ballots well illustrates both the dangers of analyzing aggregate voting results and the corrective potentials of analyzing discrete ballot patterns. Moreover, it is entertaining, and that contribution is also welcome.

Although disaggregated data offers us the benefit of seeing the trees in the forest, we must be careful lest we forget the forest, and good as John's article is, it has occasionally obscured the forest. The popular voting patterns of Table 4 portray the fact that *at least* 59% of the Council ballots were cast for six or more of the seven names endorsed by one of the major slates. Table 4, furthermore, tells us that virtually all of the "popular" patterns reflect preference for more than 85% of a slate's candidates. Finally, almost eight of every ten Vice-Presidential ballot patterns and better than eight of every ten President Elect-Secretary-Treasurer ballot patterns were slate oriented.

Professor Mueller's statement that "half the membership managed deftly to bridge the ideological divide" is true only if the analysis is confined to straight-slate tickets. A slightly wider view allows us to emphasize what John mentioned only in passing: though of course imperfectly, the members of the Association are divided by clashing ideological perspectives.

Jeffrey W. Wides
Southern Illinois University

To the Editor:

Through the medium of our professional bulletin, I wish to address departmental chairmen and chairmen of appointment committees at the universities and colleges of the United States.

During the United States' recent time of troubles we have seen a flood of American runaways taking academic positions in Canada. They have often done so at a loss from the standard of living which they would normally demand in an American institution. Consequently they have presented unfair competition to Canadian academics who would normally seek work in their own country.

As a Canadian, I doubt the moral and professional caliber of Americans who would leave their country rather than stay in the United States and help solve its various problems. When the Vietnamese situation clears, undoubtedly most of these expatriates will seek a return to their own country. If I were chairman in an American institution, I would not hire a returning expatriate unless he could show he moved to Canada for a reason other than moral cowardice. I would be interested in the opinions of other American and Canadian political scientists.

Raymond S. Rodgers

To the Editor:

It was apparent at the Los Angeles meetings that some of my colleagues oppose the continuation of the annual series of panels sponsored by the Caucus for a New Political Science, as an integral part of the A.P.S.A. panel program. And among Caucus members, on the other hand, there was a keen sense of disappointment when it became clear that there would be no time to discuss this issue in our business meetings. Some of the more suspicious among us even thought there might have been a deliberate plan to avoid that discussion, since one business meeting had been dropped and the next one had been cut short, with predictable consequences for the latter part of the agenda.

Instead of speculating about motives I would like to make an appeal to those who are not in sympathy with the objectives or the style of the Caucus. My essential argument is that the A.P.S.A. needs the Caucus more badly than the Caucus needs the A.P.S.A. I submit that the A.P.S.A. leadership,

should the official slate win the next elections, will stand to gain far more than they will lose by way of collaborating closely with the Caucus on programs and policies.

Politically concerned and committed political scientists are here to stay, and quite plainly their numbers and importance within the profession are increasing rapidly. This may well represent the best hope for the survival of a profession that had become more and more out of touch with the fast-changing political realities of our time; a profession which seemed to have all but abdicated from the timeless task of speaking truth to power while fattening itself on supposedly a political service research at the beck and call of our governmental and corporate establishment; an establishment which by policies of terror and oppression at home and abroad has profoundly alienated more critical and sensitive men and women everywhere.

This is a strong indictment, but it is in fact supported by most of our more politically interested students. Speaking personally, I have most of my adult life considered myself a political moderate in a rightwing society, which has been out of line with the rest of our world if not with history itself; a social order which could not last, and which indeed lately in its weakness has come to rely on increasingly reckless uses of brute military power abroad and of police power at home.

A lot of institutional and policy changes will be required if what is valuable in American society is to survive in a world that has become essentially hostile, for good reasons. I submit that never before was an honest and wise political profession as well as a bold political science profession more badly needed in this country, a political science profession dedicated to serve our best interests as a polity, not the immediate wishes of the powerful and the corrupt among us.

Attempts to reform the A.P.S.A. are of course only a small beginning, of trivial significance when measured against what needs to be done. But the outcome of these attempts, in the next few years, may well determine whether or not the A.P.S.A. soon will be thrown on the scrapheap by our successors, or whether it can be salvaged in the interest of preserving some continuity with the scholarly traditions and styles of the past. I hope we will choose the latter course, and thus keep the bulk of our young and concerned colleagues within a forum in which we can reach them, and be

reached by them. Institutionally speaking, it would seem a small concession indeed to let the elected Caucus leadership continue to sponsor a series of panels each year, in which critical political themes are emphasized, in the context of "what can and must be done." If in the end the Caucus were to choose to conduct their annual meetings, whether nationally or regionally, apart from the A.P.S.A. meetings, the A.P.S.A. would tend to become more of an old people's club and the Caucus more of a young people's movement; I should regret both developments, but the former more than the latter.

Christian Bay
University of Alberta

To the Editor:

The Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction which appeared in the September *PS* indicates an approach to the problem so narrow as to be irrelevant, especially in light of other reports appearing in the same issue. Duncan MacRae makes a strong case for social science as valuable, yet the committee report suggests that the manipulation and collection of data is the "enduring goal" of undergraduate instruction. Is that really all?

The results of the questionnaires sent out by the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession shows, among other things, an extremely high desire by both men and women, 88% and 77% respectively, to teach or do research, jobs that are increasingly in short supply. Even in a sellers market some 35% of the women and 19% of the men failed to get the type of job they wanted for their first one.

The additional questionnaire sent to women in administration reveals that 20% of them NEVER use their political science college training in their present job as compared to 28% who use it most of the time. Further, 6% of these women, including the two women in the sample with the highest level of job – a deputy assistant secretary and a senator's legislative assistant – *never took a course in politics*. Asked for suggestions on training, mention was made of the need for more statistics and computer skills on the one hand, and for broader social science background in comparative societies and in urban planning on the other. Politically involved respondents suggested experience at the state and local level.

Other committees of the association call for a broadening of undergraduate instruction. The committees on Blacks, on Chicanos, and on women call for an examination of courses as they relate to minorities in an effort to correct WASP orientation. The Pre-collegiate Education Committee with its concern for educating teachers of teachers and its field agent project points to the importance of undergraduate instruction outside those in the major. Such widespread need for political education is reflected in the Princeton Plan resolution on time-out for the November election.

Happily the Committee on Undergraduate instruction has concerned itself with teaching techniques; but here again the approach is conservative. With the exception of the internship idea, all suggestions are aids to in-class experience. Students' demands for relevance and action are ignored. Surely an important part of any review of undergraduate curriculum ought to investigate the question of combining academic understanding of politics with field experience integrated into the course.

Also in the summer *PS* is a discussion of the problems of the "passer-by" student as opposed to one committed to the discipline. Is not one responsibility of the profession the training of educated citizenry not only to think, but to act? And should not introductory courses then be designed with such responsibilities in mind? Does not size as well as philosophy need to be discussed? Should we ignore important questions simply because people have debated and disagreed before?

If we are to have a committee on undergraduate studies, let it take on a task fitted to contemporary uncertainties. Ivory tower refection is inappropriate today.

Irene Tinker
Federal City College

To the Editor:

Only such masochists as may be found among the fledgling members of our profession could have enjoyed reading the Summer, 1970 issue of *PS*. Having had some experience in the contemporary job market, I believe I am a competent witness as to its trauma inducing effects.

There presents itself to me no panacea for the

current imbalance between qualified candidates and suitable academic employment. Given the nature of the marketplace, one assumes that system-induced adjustments will eventually be made. Meanwhile, however, it seems imperative that ameliorative or at least palliative measures should be taken by those in position to do so; specifically, department chairmen.

My proposal is simple: chairman, answer your mail. Acknowledge receipt of vitae, let applicants, whether serious contenders or not, know periodically how they stand. When a search is completed, inform unsuccessful applicants of the result.

Virtually all department chairmen command the services of a typist if not a secretary. The mimeograph is an inexpensive apparatus. The U.S. Mail is still, circa 1970, a good bargain. The price in time, money, and effort spent in employing these resources would, I submit, reduce a serious and growing alienation between the haves and have-nots of our profession. The roots of paranoia are nourished, as Kalfa hinted, by our shouts into untended telephones. Tenure is no substitute for good manners.

From the censures implicit in the foregoing, I would like publicly, gratefully, and explicitly to exempt Professor Gene Rainey, U. of N.C. at Asheville, whose own conduct was the model for my recommendations.

Walter G. Markham
University of Pennsylvania

To the Editor:

By this letter, I wish to solicit comments on a proposal I originally made in the May 1970 issue of *War/Peace Report* (Center for War/Peace Studies, N.Y. Friends Group). I do so with the encouragement of the Chairmen of the APSA Committees on Professional Ethics and on Academic Freedom, to which I submitted the proposal for consideration. *For a Political "Hippocratic Oath!"* I propose in that article a pledge for the political profession, somehow analogous to that 'Hippocratic' Oath which for over 2000 years has increased both the physicians' self-respect and the community's respect toward the medical profession. It might contribute to the rededication of our profession. That rededication, I strongly believe, is urgent. Political scientists must

become more fully conscious of their great influence and commensurate responsibility as shapers of attitudes, trends and policies.

The UNESCO Constitution warns that "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be created." Yet, all too much writing and teaching on world politics *weakens* the mental and moral defenses against war. Assumptions, doctrines, stratagems, and expectations of deadly conflicts, of fear, of brutality, are continually being planted in the minds of men – from students to decision-makers. Exceptions exist; and I do not here criticize any specific doctrine. I refer to a widespread emphasis, an almost overwhelming trend, which results in apathy and alienation, in acceptance of a threatening cataclysm and personal helplessness – all the more frustrating as it betrays the aspirations and promises of our era.

It is high time for the experts and opinion-molders to reverse the trend. Their pledge could, in a nonpolemical, positive spirit, express and energize this task.

The initiative should come from American professionals because of the large output and worldwide impact of American teachings; because the negative tendencies have been particularly influential here; and because the ways our country uses its power are so crucial.

Formulation of the pledge. It would be presumptuous for an individual to formulate the pledge. However, the fundamental questions involved have been answered. Formulations are ready: they are contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – that "common understanding" of mankind's "highest aspirations", which, in spite of everything, has since 1948 ever increased in stature; and which, after years of painstaking intergovernmental and interdisciplinary scrutiny, was in essence repeated in the "World Bill of Rights" – the two International Covenants on human rights unanimously adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1966.

The pledge, then, could start by asserting the pledger's "awareness of the responsibilities towards his fellow-men, his nation and the world community, of anybody engaged in the teaching and practice of politics, and in communicating about politics"; and then describe the spirit that, in view of these responsibilities, will guide him, by using verbatim the language of pertinent articles of those three

documents,* as set between quotation marks below.

The pledge would, therefore, assert that the pledger will conscientiously, in good faith and to the best of his abilities, strive "to strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms", "promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace." It would confirm his respect for "the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion", "the right to freedom of opinion and expression", and his determination to abstain from "any propaganda for war" and "any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that [would] constitute incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence."

This, at least, could form the basis for a drafting group or other appropriate APSA body.

Just as the Universal Declaration and the Human Rights Covenants do not deny the world's problems, nor would the pledge; it would, like the former, reconfirm the proper spirit and manner of dealing with them, and proscribe methods destructive of national and international order.

Use. Existence and promulgation of the pledge could of itself make an impact. It would then be up to educational institutions, professional agencies, etc., to have it read or voluntarily administered at appropriate occasions, such as at graduation exercises or start of office. Like the physicians' Hippocratic Oath, its text could be attached to academic diplomas; displayed in schools of all levels, and elsewhere; invoked or exhibited at conferences; be inserted into professional and educational guidelines and programmatic statements.

Efforts should of course be made to have it internationally accepted, perhaps through the International Political Science Association and/or UNESCO.

John H. E. Fried

Lehman College, City University of New York

*Art. 18, 19, and 26(1) of the Universal Declaration; Art. 18 to 20 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and Art. 13 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

To the Editor:

Since your publication is an official one of the Association which is intended to foster expressions of concern over the state of the profession and the discipline, I believe that some of your membership will be interested to learn that over the years the Association's leadership has behaved in an unconstitutional fashion with regard to its mailing policy.

The Association's Constitution states that "the Association as such is non-partisan. It will not support political parties or candidates. It will not commit its members on questions of public policy nor take positions not immediately concerned with its direct purpose as stated above." The stated purpose of the Association is "to encourage the study of Political Science, including Political Theory, Political Institutions, Politics, Public Law, Public Administration and International Relations."

In spite of these clear statements, the Association has a mailing policy which is bipartisan and restrictive. Mr. Walter E. Beach, Assistant Director of the Association, explained it thus in a letter of March 3rd: "With respect to the employment of the Association's membership and departmental lists, the Association's policy has been to provide the list to organizations for a fee with certain provisions. The provisions are that the organization provide the Association a copy of the material prior to mailing for review and that in no case is an organization allowed to solicit for funds."

Of course, I asked Mr. Beach the basis of such a discriminatory policy, and was told that it was established by the Executive Committee on November 5, 1965. On that date, the Executive Committee officially reaffirmed the present rules governing the rental of the mailing list, namely, the list will be rented to book publishers and other comparable users – including the major political parties – except that it will not be rented to those who wish to solicit money. All potential renters must submit copy to be mailed."

When I questioned President Karl Deutsch about the policy, he replied: "I can not see what is wrong with the Association's office making available to its members copies of political documents which are likely to be of interest to a good many of them. Since over 46% of the popular vote was cast for Mr. Nixon in the presidential election, and since his message on foreign policy affects all of us, it seems to me perfectly legitimate for the

Association to help people find out precisely what his message said by getting copies of the text. This would be true, in my view, even if we had sent the message from our own office instead of merely making the mailing list available to Herbert Klein's office. Any important presidential document that anyone wishes to circulate to our membership is likely to be found helpful to most of our members, regardless of whether they disagree or agree with the statements in the document itself.

"The same holds true, of course, for any major statement by members of the other party, whether by Senator Fulbright or even by Senator Eastland. My own basis for judgment would be whether or not the document is important enough to interest many of our members.

"By this same reasoning, I might hesitate, as far as my personal judgment is concerned, to extend the same assistance to some extreme fringe groups, such as Governor Wallace's American Party, the John Birch Society, or the Weathermen. In all these cases my first reaction would be that aiding such groups with our mailing list would help them get more publicity than their intrinsic importance warranted (sic). In borderline cases, however, I should prefer to take risks on the side of greater freedom and circulate the information. Disseminating such information, regardless of our approval or disapproval, does not seem to conflict with the non-partisan character of our Association as stated in our constitution."

At first, my reaction to the policy and explanation was to resign immediately from the Association. The whole thing sounded like something out of 1984. However, I decided to go along with the liberal rhetoric "and try to change the system." Well, my efforts have been worthless, and I won't bore your readers by telling them of the deception, rudeness, and unsensuousness that Professors Deutsch and Frank Sorauf practiced in trying to get me to forget about my complaints. (Those interested, feel free to write.) I just want to say these things:

1 the policy as stated by Beach and explained by Deutsch is unconstitutional since it is bipartisan in nature, restrictive in character, and beyond the scope of the Association's purpose. Consequently, either the policy or the Constitution should be changed. I think that the best thing to do would be to deny our mailing list to all political groups, parties, pressure groups, Foundations, etc.

2 in making the names available to Mr. Klein's office, the Association failed to act in accord with the policy of November 5, 1965 which required all potential renters must submit copy to be mailed. Since President Deutsch has assumed responsibility for this action for which there was no authority, and in a manner which reminds one of the outbursts of Vice President Agnew, I call upon the Association's membership to censure him for misusing his office for the advantage of the White House.

By these actions, the Association could restore a minimum of respectability to itself.

Trowbridge H. Ford
College of Holy Cross

To the Editor:

The Caucus of Foreign-Born Political Scientists was established at the September 1970 APSA Convention in Los Angeles. This Caucus grew in response to an awareness of the problems faced by foreign-born political scientists, especially those from African, Asian, and Latin American countries.

The objectives of this organization are: (a) to investigate and study the status of foreign-born scientists in North America, and (b) to work toward the elimination of possible discriminatory practices directed against foreign-born political scientists, especially those from the Third World. These discriminatory practices may be evidenced in administrative behaviors affecting their recruitment, salary, promotion, tenure, grants and awards, exchange programs, expression of political views, and so on.

The Foreign-Born Caucus intends to request (and if need be, put pressure on) the American Political Science Association to appoint a special committee to study the nature and extent of problems faced by foreign-born political scientists in North America. The Caucus would cooperate with the APSA in whatever manner it is necessary to do so in order to launch such a study.

The Caucus also plans to conduct one or two panels concerned with the problems of foreign-born political scientists at the 1971 convention in Chicago. If you are interested in delivering a paper or in being associated with these panels in some other capacity, please write to the Caucus chairman.

The Foreign-Born Caucus seeks to disseminate information by participating in the regional and state political science conferences. Those interested in helping to organize and recruit membership at the regional levels may contact any of the Caucus officers, whose addresses are given below.

The Foreign-Born Caucus is attempting to locate foreign-born political scientists in North America. It will be appreciated if you could send us your name and address, as well as names and addresses of other foreign-born political scientists whom you may know.

Membership in the Caucus of Foreign-Born Political Scientists is open to all political scientists interested and concerned about the status of recent immigrants in the profession. Please send your name and address and \$1 membership fee to the Caucus Secretary.

The 1970-71 Executive Committee Membership is:
M. Lai Goel *Chairman*
Department of Political Science,
The University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32504
Tel: (904) 476-9500

Yasumasa Kuroda *Vice-Chairman*
Department of Political Science
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Ralph C. Chandler *Secretary*
Department of Political Science
The University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Antonio E. Lapitan
Chairman, Department of Political Science
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio 45409

George Vernardakis
Department of Political Science
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130

Ashok Kapur
School of International Affairs
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario (Canada)

Anne Francis
1784 N. Sycamore Avenue, #314
Hollywood, California 90028

Yu-long Ling
Department of Political Science
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Offiong E. Udofia
P.O. Box 13034
San Diego, California 92113
(Affiliation: San Diego State College)

Jack P. Hahm
P.O. Box 814
Claremont, California 91711
(Affiliation: Claremont University Center)

Yawsoon Sim
Department of Political Science
Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana

M. L. Goel
University of West Florida