

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor:

I do not want to enter deeply into the Great Debate between the Traditionalists and Behaviorists, especially the pejorative perceptions that the protagonists have of each other as "numerologists" vs. "narrativists." There is both room and need for some to ask questions, others to unearth facts, some to rely on good history and insight, others to work on all forms of methodology—and for all of us to write well.

But I do want to offer the following semantic suggestion for the serious consideration of the profession. Those whose major preoccupation is with the application of mathematical and other quantitative measurements to political science should be called *polimetricians* and the sub-field called *polimetrics*. The term is clear, precise, and in keeping with what has been done in some of the other social sciences. Its adoption might remove once and for all the notion that the word "behavioral" is synonymous with "quantitative" or "methodological." More than that, it might get us back faster to the one objective all political scientists share in common: the study of people relating to power.

Edward Bernard Glick
Temple University

The following letter was sent to the Executive Director of the Association.

The recent number of the Association's newsletter includes formal announcement of the Association's decision to remove the 1970 meeting from Chicago. Members of the Association seek to give a reason for their decision in a show of apprehension for the safety of their persons and the inviolability of their discussions. Although the motion for removal might be understood to mean that members are drawing attention to criminality in the streets and to the possibility that conferences will be disrupted by extremist demonstrations, no informed observer can doubt that sectarian narrowness animated the motion and partisan passion assured its passage. Desiring to dissociate myself completely and permanently from both the motion and its adoption, I beg you to accept my resignation from the Association effective at once.

Joseph Cropsey
University of Chicago

To the Editor:

At its September 1968 meeting, the Executive Committee of the APSA voted to grant the so-called Carey group the authorization to organize a series of panels for the 1969 annual meeting on the same basis as the Caucus for a New Political Science. I consider this action as well as the earlier decision regarding the Caucus as ill-advised and I would suggest further discussion of the issues raised by this policy in the Executive Committee and perhaps at the next Business Meeting as well.

In my view, members of the APSA should concern themselves with contemporary political and social issues and the Association should encourage the discussion of such problems at its Annual Meetings. Membership on panels dealing with public policy issues should be determined in the same way as that of all other panels, i.e. according to interest in the topic under discussion and professional qualifications. I regard it as unwholesome and unnecessarily conducive to political polarization to let factions based on political outlook organize parts of the annual program. The fact that the program committee has final control over such panels is not sufficient to prevent these panels from becoming primarily outlets for political activism of various shades or at least to be regarded as such by the APSA membership and outside observers—why else have special panels? Any legitimate scholarly concern with public policy issues can and should be accommodated within the framework of the regular program.

We now have two factions granted the authorization to organize their own panels. Soon other groups may present their demand for equal time. Are we to have Radical Political Science, Conservative Political Science, Liberal Political Science, Black Political Science, Catholic Political Science etc.? The trend set in motion by accommodating the Caucus for a New Political Science is laden with dangers. Should the membership of the Association perhaps be given an opportunity to pass judgment on whether it does or does not want to encourage this kind of political fragmentation? I personally would suggest that we limit the creation of special panels to professional organizations—the practice followed in the past.

Guenter Lewy
University of Massachusetts

To the Editor:

Professor Eulau's age-first-choice tabulation (Winter, 1969) on the members of the Association should not have been surprising to him or anyone else. Those tied to the behavioral movement must not look about very often to note that many younger colleagues find challenges in the legal and historical approaches to political science. Is he suggesting that if the present trend continues shortly most of the membership will be dedicated to more and more psychology and mathematics and less and less to government? I doubt it. There is still a lot of vigor in the "normative, legal and historical" mossybacks.

Adam C. Breckenridge
University of Nebraska

To the Editor:

I welcome with enthusiasm the suggestions advanced by Professors Duncan MacRae, Jr., and Aaron Wildavsky and the related memorandum from Professors Cleveland, Dauer, and Leiserson (*P.S.*, Winter, 1969). My only regret is that so many of us have failed for so long to take the kind of initiative suggested in these communications and have taken so little interest in the governing of our Association.

Surely there can be little objection to the enfranchisement by mail ballot of members who cannot attend the annual business meetings and to the introduction of open, competitive electoral procedures. Not only the Associations enumerated by Professors MacRae and Wildavsky but the AAUP have long followed both principles. Only if we assume that the offices now filled by appointment or acclamation are either unimportant or purely honorific then we remain indifferent to the electoral and nominating procedures. May I suggest that the consideration of an appropriate amendment to the Constitution of the Association also include consideration of nominating procedures that would permit a stipulated number of members to place candidates for different offices including administrative offices on the annual ballot.

I think it is becoming obvious that our Association, no more than the rest of the academic community, can avoid the winds of change and if this means that there will be more controversy and factionalism within the Association, so be it.

Lewis J. Edinger
Columbia University

To the Editor:

May I offer a brief comment to Mr. James Elden's letter in Volume II, Number 1, of *P.S.* I know next to nothing about "The Caucus for a New Political Science," but certainly there is no reason why it shouldn't exist. There is nothing wrong with having some protesting voices within the discipline. What startles me is the inability or unwillingness of Mr. Elden to see the obvious. He constructs a chart to show background, interests and publication record of The New Caucus Members, hoping to provide some sort of guide as to why they act and think as they do. He misses the point, that what really characterizes the group is that they are, according to names, mostly Jewish. Were they all called O'Brien, we could say they were Irish.

Jews dominate academic protest groups, as Professor Nathan Glazer has pointed out in a recent *Fortune Magazine* article. Anti-Semites can see in this proof of a Jewish conspiracy if they so wish, and, they will so wish. But perhaps it is just that the Jew like the Negro has yet to get his acceptance by society and hence wants a better society, a more just society, and who can blame him?

Milton Colvin
Washington and Lee University

To the Editor:

The Executive Committee of the Caucus for A New Political Science has announced plans to contest the elections for officers and members of the Council of the APSA at this September's convention. The Caucus plans to ask for a change in the procedure that has characterized these elections in the past, so that the choices can be made through a genuine democratic process. We will ask that an open election be held, with each candidate presenting a brief policy statement at the APSA's regular business meeting.

The Caucus has decided to conduct a campaign for these offices because:

- 1) We believe that the APSA has within its control the ability to greatly influence the nature and direction of the political science profession.
- 2) We wish to begin a process of re-directing the energies of the discipline so that they can be used to facilitate societal change, rather than to merely describe and perpetuate the social and political status quo.

A Platform Committee has been set up to formulate a draft platform, and to suggest possible Caucus nominees. That committee is

now gathering preliminary information, and it invites recommendations from the Caucus membership on the platform, and on nominees. Please communicate with the committee chairman: Paul Minkoff, 150 West 96th Street, New York, N.Y. 10025. Final decision on the platform, and actual nomination of Caucus candidates will be made at the Caucus' own business meeting on September 2, Tuesday evening of the convention.

Platform Committee
Caucus for A New Political Science

Martin Brownstein
Yale University
David Kettler
Ohio State University
Paul Minkoff
*SEEK—City University of
New York*
Michael Parenti
Yale University
Marvin Surkin
Adelphi University
Alan Wolfe
*State University of New York—
Old Westbury*

To the Editor:

The amendment of Paragraph 2, Article II, APSA Constitution, as adopted in September (see *P.S.*, Winter, 1969, pp. 23-24), will very likely involve APSA in partisan controversies. That the proposed amendment, if adopted, would politicize APSA in a radical direction is indicated by the following facts. (1) The amendment was proposed by the Caucus for a New Political Science. (2) Mr. Michael Parenti's letter in *P.S.*, Winter, 1969, p. 52 indicates that the Caucus has a leftist bias. Mr. Parenti, bear in mind, is a member of the Executive Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science. Witness his own words: "*The Caucus is politically heterogeneous*. Members range from liberal to radical with all the various shades inclusive—a wider political variety than is usually found within the APSA leadership. Generally our orientation is away from many of the models and values of present-day political conformity and toward areas of political protest, challenge and reconstruction, a fact which may explain why conservatives and right-wingers are absent from our ranks." Mr. Parenti is welcome to his interpretation of political heterogeneity. His own words, however, betray the radical orientation of the Caucus. As a life-long liberal, I disapprove of the abuse of the word liberal. I do not consider radicals and New

Left-ists liberal; they are more inclined toward a totalitarian, absolutist attitude. That is, in their eyes they alone possess truth; everybody else is a conservative and right-winger, i.e., ideologically incorrect.

I appreciate Mr. James M. Elden's analysis of the Executive Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science (*P.S.*, Winter, 1969, pp. 47-49), but he missed the point. I am well aware of the credentials of the members of the Executive Committee. However, Mr. Elden's criteria failed to take into account the motivations of the persons involved. Moreover, Mr. Elden does not appear to understand fully the nature of the New Left. It is not limited to "drop outs," the SDS, Yippies, and other young groups. There are members of the academic profession with excellent scholastic credentials, who are also identified with the New Left.

What disturbs me is that the politicization of APSA, in whatever direction, will probably involve it in partisan controversies that will tear the association apart. There appears to be a trend in that direction now with the organization of The Conference for Democratic Politics as a counter-movement. In any event the politicization of APSA will certainly destroy its identity as a scholarly association.

Roy N. Lokken
East Carolina University

To the Editor:

The letter of Messrs Sanford Levinson and others (*P.S.*, Winter, 1969) says that the appointments of Former President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey as teachers of political science raises questions. Without stating one they imply some generalizations which bring to mind an observation of George Polya, a mathematician:

You should not forget, however, that there are two kinds of generalizations. One is cheap and the other is valuable. It is easy to generalize by diluting; it is important to generalize by condensing. To dilute a little wine with a lot of water is cheap and easy . . . (and) is more fashionable nowadays than it was formerly. It dilutes a little idea with a big terminology. The author usually prefers to take even that little idea from someone else, refrains from adding any original observation, and solving any problem except a few problems arising from the difficulties of his own terminology.¹

¹ G. Polya, *Induction and Analogy in Mathematics*, Vol. 1 *Of Mathematics and Plausible Reasoning* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1954), 30.

Put into simple sentences, what do they say?

They say that they question "the hiring of such men to teach political science over an extended period." They do so because they "take the vocation of the teacher of political science very seriously . . ." Messrs. Johnson and Humphrey's role will be principally "apologist for their own crucial decisions of the past decade." The traditional role of "teacher" required "fidelity to the Weberian creed of a teacher's detachment from the product of his analysis . . ." The presence of Messrs. Johnson and Humphrey in the classroom is a "pretense" if they are thought to fulfill the teacher's role.

The writers deal primarily with ambiguities arising out of their own terminology. They (1) attach unstated meanings to the words "teacher of political science"; (2) mistake Weber's code of personal ethic for individual teachers for a universal imperative applying unequivocally to all "teachers of political science" and the American multiversity as well as the German university, and (3) predict that Messrs. Johnson, Humphrey, and W. W. Rostow will use the classroom for selfish ends because they were "governmental decision-makers."

They do not say clearly what normative generalizations we are to draw. They want us to discuss. Discuss what? Whether men who have participated in practical political decision-making should undergo a purification ritual before entering an academic classroom as teachers? Whether the Caucus for a New Political Science (on whose executive board four of the five signers of the letter serve according to the tabulation on page 48) plans to espouse a nonjuror's oath for political scientists? Whether indeed their letter exemplifies the "Weberian creed of a teacher's detachment from the product of his analysis?"

Let me make a modest proposal. Logically the topic of barring books from the classroom would follow the same principles as barring persons from teaching. Hence after refusing to let Messrs. Johnson and others be teachers of political science, we should avoid assigning reading of any book written with other than purely scientific motives. We will dispense with Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Senator Eugene McCarthy. Alas! Science is an unrelenting taskmaster, and pure principles accept no compromises.

Yet this may remain unnecessary. My observation of the students and faculty of the University of Minnesota is that they can learn much from Professor Humphrey. They will question him and judge his motives for them-

selves. I trust that students of Professors Johnson and W. W. Rostow also will be neither silent nor undiscriminating. We students of political science have much to learn, and men who have played central roles in public decision-making often have valuable knowledge which they can teach.

William L. Hathaway
General College,
The University of Minnesota

To the Editor:

I would like to indicate my rather reluctant support for the proposals submitted to the American Political Science Association by Professor Donald G. Herzberg and others, as published in the Fall, 1968 issue of *P.S.*

I attend meetings of the American Political Science Association only occasionally, and have never attended a business meeting. In the past I have not felt the necessity of doing so, because I assumed that those elected to office were elected largely on the basis of professional merit, and that decisions taken at the meeting were made largely on the basis of professional criteria. Even when I have felt that the general tenor of the profession, including articles published in the *APSR* was too one sided, I have not been moved to make this a political matter. It was my conviction that in writing and conversation, I would attempt to press my own views as to the direction the profession should take.

This seems about to change. I welcome the new emphasis on increased discussion of current substantive issues. However, I very much fear that at least some of the members of the Caucus for a New Political Science have a propensity to substitute what I consider political for professional considerations at key points. I can foresee the possibility of their dismissing at least some of the kind of analysis which I consider important as irrelevant at best in making decisions as to the kind of activities in which the Association should engage, or the kind of articles which should be published in the *American Political Science Review*.

We all know enough about politics to recognize that a relatively small dedicated group can dominate any organization by packing poorly attended business meetings. Since I have no desire to try to counteract this by becoming a political activist within an organization which I still regard as primarily professional, my only recourse is to insist that all major decisions affecting the association be submitted to the membership as a whole. Such procedures provide no absolute guarantee, but as a demo-

crat with a small "d," they are the best I can think of.

This means that, in the future, the membership will have to be appraised as to the views of those wishing to serve as officers of the *Association* as well as those who serve on the editorial board of the *American Political Science Review*. Fortunately, with the establishment of *P.S.*, we now have the means of circulating such information rapidly.

I noted that I support Professor Herzberg's recommendations reluctantly. I do so because the trend toward politicization distresses me. In the end it will very likely reduce the amount of rational discourse that goes on, and of course, the new procedures are likely to prove both cumbersome and time consuming. However, since there seems to be no other course, I urge that an advisory referendum be held on Professor Herzberg's recommendations and that as many members as possible attend the business meeting next fall to support his proposals. I intend to break a long standing rule and be there if I possibly can.

I should also like to submit the following amendment to the constitution, which can be appended to the end of paragraph 1 of article VII

Further, upon petition of five per cent or more of the full membership of the *Association*, any proposed amendment to the constitution of the *Association* or any decision taken at the Annual Business meeting or by the Council, shall be submitted for approval to the entire membership under conditions prescribed by the Council, except that all such decisions shall be determined by a majority of those voting.

If it is at all possible, I would urge that this amendment be submitted to the total membership in any advisory referendum.

Stanley Rothman
Smith College

Additional supporters of this amendment are:

Cecelia M. Kenyon
Thomas Jahnige
Smith College

W. Havard
H. Wiardia
Edward Feit
Lewis Mainzer
Herbert Steeper
John Harris
Loren Beth
University of Massachusetts

To the Editor:

I am writing a second letter to *P.S.* [the first also appears in this issue] because I simply must comment on the rather curious letter from Professor David Kettler in the Winter, 1969, *P.S.*, which concerns the issue raised in the amendment my colleagues and I have proposed. I say curious, because I find it difficult to understand why Professor Kettler wrote it. He is opposed to the election of officers of the Association by the entire membership and to referenda on constitutional issues because, he feels that these are "plebiscitarian," and hence not really democratic.

This surprises me for referenda on major issues have been standard practice with our neighbors, the sociologists, where, I might note, they were pressed by the "left" (if I may use the term) as a more democratic practice. They have also been used extensively by the peace movement, with which I assume Professor Kettler identifies.

More importantly, to describe a proposal for referenda as "Gaullist plebiscitarianism" is simply ridiculous. The major feature of Gaullist plebiscites has been his use of referenda as a vote of confidence in his regime, by threatening to depart should the voters reject the proposal at hand. Of course, a good argument can be made against the use of referenda in contrast to elected representatives, but the business meetings of the Association are not representative, nor would they be even should we get three or four thousand members to attend, in which case any real discussion would be impossible. Real discussion becomes difficult even when attendance exceeds one hundred or so. Why Professor Kettler feels that referenda would be less meaningful than having a large and still unrepresentative (since self-selective) assembly attempt to discuss issues is beyond me. After all, a vote in a referendum would theoretically occur after issues had been discussed in *P.S.* and in relatively small groups. He mentions that university departments are hierarchically organized as if this constituted an argument. Since I assume that ballots would be secret I find it hard to see the relevance of his point. His suggestion that votes on candidates for office by a self-selected business meeting is somehow more democratic than a vote on them by the entire membership is so fantastic that it simply boggles the imagination.

Stanley Rothman
Smith College

P.S.

With this issue, P.S. will begin regular publication of the list of college and university administrations currently on the censure list of the American Association of University Professors, for the information of the profession.

Administrations Censured by the AAUP

The censured administrators, with dates of censuring, are listed below. Reports were published as indicated by the parenthesized *AAUP Bulletin* citation. Reference should also be had to "Developments Relating to Censure by the Association" (*Bulletin*, spring, 1968, pp.7-11), and to the "Report of Committee A, 1967-68" (*Bulletin*, summer 1968, pp. 169-181).

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Lowell Technological Institute (Winter, 1959, pp. 550-567) | April, 1960 |
| Benedict College (Spring, 1960, pp. 81-104) | April, 1961 |
| Alabama State College (Winter, 1961, pp. 303-309) | April, 1962 |
| South Dakota State University (Autumn, 1961, pp. 247-255) | April, 1962 |
| (Censure was voted specifically on the Board of Regents of Education of the State of South Dakota, and not on the institution's administrative officers.) | |
| Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College (Autumn, 1962, pp. 248-252) | April, 1963 |
| Grove City College (Spring 1963, pp. 15-24) | April, 1963 |
| Sam Houston State College (Spring, 1963, pp. 44-51) | April, 1963 |
| College of the Ozarks (Winter, 1963, pp. 352-359) | April, 1964 |
| (Censure was voted specifically on the Board of Trustees, and not on the institution's administrative officers.) | |
| Wayne State College (Nebraska) (Winter, 1964, pp. 347-354) | April, 1965 |
| (Censure was voted specifically on the Board of Education of State Normal Schools of the State of Nebraska, and not on the institution's administrative officers.) | |
| St. John's University (N.Y.) (Spring, 1966, pp. 12-19) | April, 1966 |
| Amarillo College (Autumn, 1967, pp. 292-302) | April, 1968 |
| Texas A & M University (Winter, 1967, pp. 378-384) | April, 1968 |
| Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College (Winter, 1967, pp. 385-390) | April, 1968 |
| Cheyney State College (Winter, 1967, pp. 391-399) | April, 1968 |
| Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College (Spring, 1968, pp. 14-24) | April, 1968 |
| Wisconsin State University at Whitewater (Spring, 1968, pp. 25-36) | April, 1968 |
| Saint Mary's College (Minnesota) (Spring, 1968, pp. 37-42) | April, 1968 |
| Trenton State College (Spring, 1968, pp. 43-48) | April, 1968 |
| Lorain County Commounity College (Ohio) (Spring, 1968, pp. 49-58) | April, 1968 |