

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor:

Since I was included in the Preliminary Program as a participant in the panel on the governing of the Association, I ask that you print my letter to Aaron Wildavsky setting forth my reasons for withdrawing.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick
Executive Director
American Political Science Association

The letter follows:

Dear Aaron:

After careful thought and discussion with judicious colleagues, I have reluctantly concluded that I must withdraw from participation in the panel on governance of the Association at the September meeting. My reasons are several; they involve my official APSA role, my own conception of that role, the format of the program, and the institutional and political context of the meeting.

First, because I am and have been Executive Director of the APSA for more than a decade, I am—I suppose—widely identified with past practices and the status quo, despite the fact that my role in determining policy has always been marginal and that the governance of the Association has never reflected my own views about how a professional association should be governed (see, for example, my memoranda in the fifties stating the case for a much more active role for the Council). It seems likely that my participation would tend to personalize the discussion in a way that would be counter-productive for all serious purposes.

Second, as Executive Director of our Association, I—in fact—function as a civil servant; it therefore is inappropriate for me to become actively involved in advocacy on any questions except those directly related to the administration of Association policies. I feel certain that you agree with me about this since it is the view of the office reflected in the letter to *P.S.* by you and Duncan Macrae.

Third, the structure of the projected session enhances the likelihood that I would be cast, in an adversary proceeding, as defender of the Association's past and present. Such a role is clearly inappropriate to the role of the Executive Director. It is also incompatible with my own views about the constitutional and governmental system of the APSA. I do not believe that it would be possible to restrict my participation to a descriptive, historical ac-

count of the governing of the Association, nor would such a presentation properly serve the purposes of the meeting. I also do not believe that a paid employee of the Association should use a public forum to express personal views critical of past policies and policy-makers. Thus, I have become convinced that my participation in the panel would turn out to be incompatible with my professional obligations and my personal convictions.

I regret any inconvenience that my withdrawal may cause you. My longstanding interest in the governance of the Association led me to accept your invitation to participate without carefully thinking it through. Reflection on what I could and could not do—appropriately, usefully and honestly—in the concrete situation leads me to withdraw.

I am certain that there are many others who can do an excellent job. I, of course, will be happy to be of assistance to any participant by supplying relevant information.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick
Executive Director

To the Editor:

I wish to support the amendment to the APSA constitution proposed by Stanley Rothman in the Spring issue of *P.S.* That such an amendment is needed is unfortunate in view of the professional nature of the society; that it is necessary to order to protect the integrity of the Association is obvious in view of the current efforts being made to politicize the APSA.

The Caucus for a New Political Science has been exhorting us to become more concerned with the relevant issues in the United States. No political scientist is likely to deny a need to be concerned with "relevant" issues, here or abroad. In fact, it seems to me that many are very concerned. What the relevant issues are, the order of priority in which they must be arranged, and the nature of the concern, however, are matters that each of us must decide for himself. In reality, we are being urged to accept the Caucus's definition of the relevant issues and their ideas of how we should be concerned. While the positions and assertions of the Caucus and its associates may be justified from the perspective of a normative political philosophy, it cannot serve as the philosophic foundation for a professional society of scholars. It is not likely to

promote dialogue, either, when those who do not agree with the perspective of the Caucus are arrogantly assumed to be "serving the establishment" or fleeing from relevant political discourse and controversy."

Protests to the contrary, the members represented by the Caucus appear to be interested in the Association and the profession primarily as a ready instrument for social change. For example, the Executive Committee of the Caucus states: "We wish to begin a process of re-directing the energies of the discipline so that they can be used to facilitate social change, rather than to merely describe and perpetuate the social and political status quo." (*P.S.*, Spring 1969, p. 191) There is a suggestion, of course, that the direction in which the Caucus has been developing has been well illustrated by the positions taken by them at the recent convention and by their communications in this journal. In the Winter issue of *P.S.*, Michael Parenti asserts that the movement is a politically heterogeneous one whose "members range from liberal to radical with all the various shades inclusive . . ." and then goes on to note why ". . . conservatives and right-wingers are absent from our ranks." Obviously, "all the various shades" are definitely not represented unless the term "radical" is defined in such a way as to include only left-wing radicals. Perhaps there is a special definition for "liberal" as well.

This association has made one mistake already, i.e., the moving of the convention site from Chicago. The stated grounds for this action are irrelevant to the purposes of the Association and to matters of academic freedom. If the fallacious argument were taken at face value it would imply that institutions such as the University of Chicago, Loyola University, and De Paul University exist in an atmosphere that is not conducive to free discussion (!), debate and dissent, and that they apparently must fear private or official intimidation. As for the "fear for the physical security of its members"—if his criterion is taken literally then the Association will have few cities left in which to hold its meeting and certainly would have to eschew the city they chose as a replacement.

A more serious mistake, which can still be avoided, would be to develop a political polarization within the Association. Politicization of a professional association of scholars is a destructive force which will corrode the reputation of the group and lead to an erosion of the attempt to maintain a relatively high degree of objectivity in research and in the transmission of the results of that research.

Adoption of the proposed amendment would, at least, protect the Association from the dangers noted by Professor Rothman. The danger of the Caucus does not come from its raising key issues for discussion but in the attempt to promote political partisanship within this organization.

Richard B. Close
Waynesburg College

To the Editor:

I applaud the variety of reform proposals percolating within the profession. In particular, I strongly support the administrative (and political) changes advanced by Aaron Wildavsky and Duncan MacRae. There is also much merit in the ideas of Professor Cleveland and the "Southern revisionists." However, I have strong reservations about a mail ballot of members who cannot attend the business meeting as a device for determining membership sentiment on specific issues.

First, there is value in interpersonal contact and communication, debate and discussion in a public and non-coercive setting. Don Herzberg and his colleagues do not tell us why and how the annual meeting is "unrepresentative" of the total membership. I would like evidence on that score. Moreover, the regional meetings could be used to sound out the membership in a yearly cycle of "primaries" preceding the annual meeting. I also find the internal politics baffling. Herzberg and others want a mail ballot procedure. Might this have something to do with a challenge to the "Establishment" by the New Caucus? If so, the technique of supporting our leadership (who come to the annual meetings) by asking for mail ballots is astonishing. It is as if John Bailey's supporters in Connecticut demanded a challenge primary because there was a challenge to Bailey's leadership by Connecticut reform Democrats.

Second, despite the precedents of AAUP and other organizations, political scientists ought to be particularly alert to the characteristics of the electorate in alternate forums. I assume that one purpose of a mail ballot is to have more informed judgements not simply more marked ballots. Has all the work of Campbell, Miller, Stokes, *et al.* been in vain? Is it not probable that a fair share of increased turnout to mail ballots will come from the least informed, most isolated, and most apathetic segment of the profession, that is to say, those who most benefit from listening to competing positions explained, debated, and judged? How many regional AAUP candidates are known

to most members of any faculty? And who will supply the relevant information and alternate positions for those whose information costs (and opportunities) differ markedly?

I believe that the tolerance of face-to-face discussions, debate, and politics among mature professionals is high although not limitless and it does not include passivity in the face of Stalinist-tactics at scholarly meetings. If we cannot decide these issues with workable rules of the game, what expectations can we make for students and others? Many members of the New Caucus and individual, unattached scholars are raising serious and thoughtful questions about our profession's structure, allocations and purposes. To flee from them by mailing ballots to one and all is an avoidance technique that may temporarily reduce psychological and political pressure, but will fail to establish the sense of purposive legitimacy and substance that the APSA badly needs in these trouble times.

Edgar Litt
University of Connecticut

To the Editor

For all the wailing for a return to (or in the case of some hardy souls, a continuation of) the pristine purity of the APSA as an association of scholars and gentlemen above mundane politics, one dimension of change is evident in my attitude toward the arrival of *P.S.* I drop everything and read it—almost cover to cover. What a contrast with the advent of the APSR: a desultory leafing through the articles, a quick (and shuddering) glance at what future articles will be like, and then my attention turns to the book reviews and publishers' ads, after which the magazine is put on a shelf.

As a member of the Caucus for a New Political Science, it is a little disturbing at my time of life to be called a radical because suddenly the ideas I have been advocating for years have achieved some attention in the profession. I attended the ABM/Choice meeting in Washington the first of May. There a measure of our failure as political scientists was evident—sociologists, psychologists and "hard" scientists were in abundance. Mostly we political scientists were conspicuous by our absence. If by "radical" is meant one who recognizes that something is radically wrong with our profession then the term applies to me in full measure.

"Business-as-usual" in the universities and colleges can only lead to the destruction of all

we profess to hold dear. Although by marriage I hold a Jewish name, by birth I am pure WASP, (albeit a member of a *very* minority group within this segment of our society—I am a Welsh-American). It is to our shame that the Jews and Negroes among us see more clearly the American dream.

Justine S. Mann
Georgia Southern College

To the Editor:

The Library at the State College of Liberal Arts and Science at Geneseo is interested in building up back issues of professional political science journals. The undersigned would appreciate hearing from any member of the profession who is interested in disposing of runs of professional journals for which he no longer has any use. The address is Department of Political Science, State University College, Geneseo, New York 14454.

E. G. Janosik, Chairman
State University College, Geneseo

To the Editor:

Having just taken part in a discussion here about the role in the curriculum of state and local government, we read Stenberg and Walker's survey (*P.S.*, Spring, 1969) with the hope that we would discover what is happening elsewhere. But no, we were treated to another round of the by-now traditional numbers game in which the participants learn everything but what is relevant.

We knew that state and local government has become an orphan in most political science curricula, and we also knew a great deal of research is being done on the subject. And now, thanks to *P.S.*, we know, down to the nearest tenth of a percentage point, how many schools have how many courses on the subject (we were surprised the figures were not chi-squared into the bargain). But we are puzzled over some rather obvious omissions, and over the unimaginative nature of the authors' "conjectures."

To wit:

1. The authors imply that research in this area is intrinsically important. Has it not occurred to them that research in the area may be outstripping the number of courses taught because of the fact that it is much less expensive and much more convenient to do behavioral studies on the local level (preferably near one's own university) than on a national

level? In addition, the authors have apparently not considered that fact that, given current political realities, more attention is going to be devoted to those areas where power is concentrated—that is, at the national and peak association level.

2. Have they considered the fact that the plight of rural America, for better or worse, is at the moment in the hands of the brokers of power in Congress and the Executive, and that most of the Statehouse crowd is relatively powerless to deal with the problem?

3. How many of the pedagogical functions of state and local courses are being taken over by courses in urban planning and community sociology?

We are, however, gratified to learn that we can safely reach the “inescapable conclusion” that the teaching of courses about state and local government is not very popular.

Richard T. Hardesty
P. J. Ostergren
Ball State University

PROCEEDINGS
of the
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION
1956-1968

The American Political Science Association, in cooperation with University Microfilms, a unit of the Xerox Education Division, is pleased to announce the publication on microfilm of the *Proceedings of the Association* for the inclusive years 1956-1968.

Also available on microfilm from University Microfilms are individual volume-years of *American Political Science Review* from 1906 through 1968, and *P.S.* from its initial issue in 1968.

A new feature of the 1968 *Proceedings* is a three-part index to the papers—by panel section, author and keyword—prepared by Professor Kenneth Janda of Northwestern University.

Xerographic copies of papers presented at the 1968 meeting of the Association are available from University Microfilms for \$2 per paper, prepaid, as well as other panel papers given at previous meetings since 1956 onward.

These new services continue the Association's efforts to improve access to scholarly materials and the exchange of information in the discipline.

For prices and ordering details, write University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.