

To the Editor:

Though my scholarly concerns have probably never been labeled "advanced numerology" by either friend or enemy, I must nonetheless take issue with Robert Dixon's estimate of how public law research ought to be redirected.

At bottom, Dixon contends that the subfield should opt for an emphasis upon social engineering, and a particular kind of problem-solving by boot. He notes that it is the lawyer who has opened the door to "the new political science" by working up theories of due process and equality so as to shake up the Establishment. His article reaches a crescendo when he argues: "... what does modern political science research have to offer the Black, the Chicano, the Indian?"

The answer is that neither the discipline in general nor public law in particular have anything to offer these groups by way of overt orientational bias. It is not the purpose of public law to advance the interests of the over-represented, the underrepresented or the public interest through the invocation of Marxist, racist, egalitarian or Naderist predilections. Of course, individuals may be "turned on" by various issues, and these appetites will have a considerable impact on the problems they study and the interpretation of data. This bears no relation to the doctrinal redirection which the piece endorses for a group of professionals.

It also does not appear that the author's concluding remarks are an accurate reflection of what comes before. The policy-oriented approach of the pre-1950's must be merged with the quantitative techniques featured in contemporary scholarship, he urges. But the tacit premise that the former was wedded to the destiny of any set of interests in the polity will not hold. The research of Alpheus Mason, Robert McCloskey, Carl Swisher, *et al.* may have typified the liberal spirit (broadly construed), but surely it did not reflect agreed-upon support for the kind of parochial ideological commitment which Dixon seems to think is the wave of the future.

Ira H. Carmen

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

To the Editor:

In the rush to be concerned and "relevant," the Association appears to be falling over its feet. The Winter 1971 *PS* reported that the last business meeting passed a resolution, moved by Josephine Milburn on behalf of the Committee on the Status of Women, calling on employing institutions "to give priority to hiring qualified women political scientists until the ratio of women to men faculty equal (*sic*) that of women to men graduate students" (p. 64). Two institutions had apparently anticipated this resolution and had attempted to use the Association's placement service to remedy the sexual imbalance on their faculties as compared with the sexual ratio existing in the student body. In its job listing form, Loyola University had stated: "Since Loyola is *de facto* a coed school we are especially interested in interviewing women applicants because of an existing lack of full-time women faculty." For taking this position, which seems so admirable in view of the resolution subsequently passed by the business meeting, Loyola (together with one other institution) was in fact censured by the meeting for sexual discrimination, on the motion of Miss Kay Klotzburger on behalf of a committee on which Mrs. Milburn also served (p. 58).

Assuming that all this was accurately reported, which at first I found hard to credit, it seems to me that 1) apologies should be made to the two censured institutions; 2) Association committees should beware of falling into ideological rigidity; 3) motions to be introduced at business meetings should be prepared and circulated in advance to allow for their more careful consideration.

Martin C. Needler

University of New Mexico

To the Editor:

President Lane has requested in the Winter 1971 number of *PS* that members of the association aid in the construction of a list of the practical benefits of political science. This is part of a larger effort to sell science to the public, long unsuspecting but lately more skeptical. I would like to suggest that the Association not participate in this sales job. In the few words that follow I will assert why, in my judgment,

scientists particularly and scholars generally should not become salesmen.

I cannot deny that such sales jobs have been done and done very effectively if viewed strictly in monetary terms. But even when done as effectively as possible this selling involves a *hidden and non-monetary cost*. I for one find this cost in the eyes of a good number of undergraduates who have measured science by the criteria of practical benefit and monetary effectiveness and rightly found it wanting. (1) For each so-called practical benefit of science there is somewhere a practical disbenefit of equal importance. One need consider only atomic energy to see what is involved here. (2) The practical benefits that science produces are minute as compared to the size of our practical problems. As long as science is justified to the public as being for practical benefit it will always be found, on close examination, wanting.

It is important here to comment on three points that are often carelessly tossed into the *consideration of this sort of issue*. First, the quality of scientific work has nothing to do with the intentions of the scientist, the Caucus notwithstanding. Second, any one who thinks that he could serve humanity by being a scientist, if only the system were not corrupt, is a fool. Even if the system were not in some sense corrupt the probability of a noticeable contribution coming so indirect a route is, again, minute. At best this line is balm to one's conscience and at worst it is a cruel joke. Third, if science is judged only on the basis of its practical benefits then academic freedom cannot be claimed as a protection, nor for that matter neither can truth. Both of these values become means to that which is adjudged to have practical benefits. The dangers here are *surely so apparent that their elaboration is unnecessary*. In fact one might have thought at one time that much of the point of a university as we know it was to avoid this kind of situation.

We are all of us as men responsible for the world's problems. The machines and their creators, the scientists, did not create the problems and they cannot, even with barrels of good intentions, create the solutions. We all of us must create these solutions. If one is concerned to do so in fact as well as in rhetoric then the only place for him can be in the community where such issues are lived and

fought for real and not in the convenient and artificial atmosphere of the university.

M. W. Jackson
University of Alberta

To the Editor:

Let me propose—to whomever it may concern—the creation of a data and measurement journal in the cross-national and inter-national field. Such a journal might include articles which: a) propose and justify a given index, reporting some resulting scores as well as tests of its validity; b) describe and justify a given procedure for coding, classifying, or scaling, with some representative results; c) report on software programs developed for the generation, management, and analysis of cross-national and inter-national data; d) propose and evaluate procedures for data quality control; e) propose and evaluate procedures for estimating missing data; f) report on the condition of a given researcher's data sets within the context of its *original theoretical purpose, with sample series*; and g) report on the condition of the consortium and other archives. While the journal would probably not publish full data sets and series, it could include some samples of these along with instructions for requesting the complete set.

While one possible liability of such a journal might be to create or widen the gulf between "theorists" and "empiricists," this *need not occur*. Among the advantages might be to: a) provide authentic information as to data availability; b) improve data quality; c) enhance the academic prestige of those who are "doing the Lord's work"; d) keep empirical activity in a consistently explicit theory-oriented context; e) emphasize the importance of measurement and *detection of traces to the growth of our science*; f) provide a free forum for the exchange of views on all aspects of research design and strategy; g) make available for pedagogical purposes the explicit intellectual activities surrounding our measurement and enumeration procedures; h) make it less necessary to treat these matters in much detail when reporting substantive findings in the regular journals; and i) make it less necessary to load the regular journals with articles that do not report substantive findings.

As to a title, *Interpolemetrics* comes to mind (a la *Biometrika*, *Sociometry*, *Psychometrika*,

Econometrics, etc.) and it might even be that the new ISA section of that title could become its publisher. Another might be *Evidence and Measurement in World Politics*.

As to financing, I have no particularly novel ideas, but if a temporary project or program could launch the enterprise, any of the standard options could then be pursued: a professional society or one of its sections, a university, the Consortium or its archive, an international agency such as UNITAR or UNESCO, or even a national governmental agency. If the current folklore is correct, foundations are *not* likely to be interested.

The past decade has seen some promising developments in the international and comparative politics field: concepts, methods, research strategies, etc. To my mind, the most important of these is the shift away from mere speculation and toward the search for systematic evidence for model testing, etc. Without denying the need for more creative and rigorous modeling, I don't see how we can move to a cumulative science unless we continue allocating a large fraction of our intellectual and material resources to the acquisition and analysis of data.

This view is now coming under heavy attack from two rather different quarters. First, there are the "new radicals," who *deny one or more of* the following in regard to a rigorous social science: the possibility, the relevance, and the normative desirability. Second, there are those who (as in other disciplines at similar stages) believe that armchair exercises and mathematical gymnastics will suffice. If our objective is to increase our understanding of the natural world of social phenomena, and mankind's capacity to shape that world, knowledge is essential.

The creation of a journal of evidence and procedure would constitute a timely reassertion of our discipline's commitment to the pursuit of such knowledge.

J. David Singer
University of Michigan