

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### To the Editor:

President Ranney should be congratulated on laying before us so many of the details connected with the choosing of a Managing Editor. Any attempt to be "open" is worth applause, but we should not be content to let the matter rest there without examining the record for indications of how we might improve things. What follows should be taken less as a criticism of Ranney and the Council than as a criticism of a social paradigm which compels individuals to behave in certain ways.

Ranney's report begins with a forthright declaration of how a Managing Editor *ought* to be selected: "Only *after* the Managing Editor is selected will the Council set the conditions of the appointment . . . the benefits offered by the institutions . . . are, at most, very peripheral matters. We should select a person . . . , and then negotiate the best deal we can with that person's institution." (p. 27). The remainder of the report demonstrates that under the pressures which face organization managers in today's world, this procedure was *not* followed.

When the agreed-upon "short list" emerged (p. 27), the Executive Director immediately contacted the institutions of those on the short list who agreed to run. *Before* the choice of the ME was made final, four institutions formally outlined the support they would provide: Michigan State, Pittsburgh, Cornell, Northwestern (p. 28). Obviously, then, the final selection was based on some *combination* of individual qualification and institutional support.

The anomaly can be briefly stated. If the Council insists that institutional support means nothing, it can be accused of imprudently managing APSA resources. If the Council admits support is significant, it can be accused of "auctioning" off the position and of denigrating the qualifications of the individual ultimately selected. In attempting to head off all such criticisms, the President and Council compromise their own integrity by saying one thing and doing another. Under existing conditions, there was very little else they could do.

Given contemporary social structures, the procedures actually used (as opposed to those announced) were as appropriate as they could be. Obviously, institutional support is important; it would be absurd (indeed, an impossible situation) to appoint an ME, then discover that his/her institution would provide no support at all. Why, therefore, the contradictory explanations? Chuck Jones, obviously an outstanding

nominee, is not made any less so by an admission that institutional support played some part in his selection. The tragedy is that the present procedures lead to a situation wherein the President and Council, by insisting that institutional support is not important, implicitly suggest that the candidates *not* be selected are *inferior*. Meanwhile, the reputation of the institutions involved in a "bidding war" is protected by concealing the nature of the bidding.

What we need, I suggest, is a procedure which (1) removes even the suggestion of competitive bidding by institutions and (2) enables us to make a simple and honest statement, to wit, that *all* candidates on such a "short list" are outstanding political scientists, and it is not necessary to insist that any one is superior to the others. I suggest we begin by establishing *in advance* the precise conditions for the appointment, then contacting the institutions to determine if they will meet those conditions, and those conditions alone; no add-ons ("sweeteners"?) should be solicited or accepted. Were this to be done, there could be no suspicion of the sort that surrounds athletic recruitment. Immediately, however, another change is required.

It is a terribly heavy responsibility to place upon the President to require that he announce to the world *his* nominee, and to do so in a way which requires him to imply that one political scientist is better than all other candidates. Given this type of pressure, any organizational leader is likely to search for a method of reaching a decision which provides some "objective" basis for making distinctions. My suspicion is that Presidents may feel compelled to rely upon differentials in institutional support in order to avoid the too-heavy burden they are assigned. This means, if only to me, that the decision should proceed immediately to a vote after a "short list" of candidates emerges, and after each institution has guaranteed it will meet the specified conditions. One day we will discover that voting is not really the best decision process, but that is the subject of some other essay. The immediate problem, I suggest, is to remove even the taint of competitive bidding.

Frederick C. Thayer  
University of Pittsburgh

### To the Editor:

I should like to voice my opposition to your editorial advising the number of admissions to doctoral programs be reduced due to shrinking market demand for Ph.D.s in Political Science.

That advice is objectionable because its philistinism is so rigorously matched by its elitism.

Essentially, it suggests that education and higher learning are valuable only in proportion to their commercial lucrativeness, and that it is the right of a hallowed few to control the open market as well as the opportunity for an "examined life."

First, it is simply barbarian that graduate study be regarded as an economic skill immediately and exclusively correlated to market placement. The value and relevance of education should, in a liberal society, remain an assessment determined by each individual. And individuals who decide they desire further education for the impact it has on their attitudes, perceptions, consciousness and behavior (i.e. minds and souls) have every right to such education, regardless of the commercial rivalry it may promote. No one is obligated to the empirical age and its embarrassment at beliefs in the quiddity of philosophy or in the spiritual element of education. Thus, each should determine for her/himself the reasons for, and rewards from, continuing education and not be subject to criteria dogmatically decided by an economic-minded group.

Secondly, it is not the role of those political scientists fortunate enough to hold teaching positions to exclude others from that opportunity. If in fact the premise of capitalism is an open market, then it is the *market*, and *not* an elite filter of powerful arbiters, which should choose who is hired. More supply of qualified candidates means more selection and choice for those hiring. Are they not entitled to that? Certainly, graduate students should be thoroughly advised of the unlikelihood of placement. But if they are, and nonetheless choose to continue education, they have the right to that informed decision. The role of faculty is to facilitate learning and guide students; it is not to dominate the field by restricting input. Faculty participate in the discipline of Political Science—it is not their domain.

Having myself been confronting the contracting teaching market, I would the more adamantly oppose restricted graduate admissions, for I know, quite simply, that my graduate experience overwhelmed any financial repercussions. Learning is unabashedly transcendental and no one should be denied the opportunity.

Robin Gass  
Berkeley, California

#### To the Editor:

I would be interested in hearing from anyone teaching or planning to teach a course in personality and politics as well as receiving syllabi if available. Anyone who contacts me will receive a list of all other individuals who have contacted me with a view to the exchange of course materials and other information.

Fred I. Greenstein  
Princeton University

#### To the Editor:

On April 2-3, 1976 at Widener College, the Pennsylvania Political Science and Public Administration Association had their Annual Meeting, at which time I circulated a petition in support of a Ukrainian Historian, Valentyn Moroz, who is tortured at Vladimir Prison, Moscow, for his defense of human rights and national respectability in Ukraine. Some 29 signatures were collected; among them, two former U.S. Ambassadors to Uganda and Thailand, the President of the above mentioned Association, three political-science chairmen, and a score of professors engaged in teaching political science.

Therefore, I, as executive director of this Association, appeal to our colleagues in the field of political science to voice their concern for Professor Valentyn Moroz, to the President of the United States and Members of Congress for his release so that he may accept the invitation of Harvard University to lecture for the 1976 academic year. A resolution in Congress has the support of Congresswoman Millicent Fenwick and Congressman Edward Koch. The Amnesty International is already on record in support of this petition.

For further information write to Petro Diachenko, Executive Director, Ukrainian Political Science Association in the United States, 815 Grant Road, Folcroft, Pennsylvania 19032.

Petro Diachenko