

# Communications

## Letters to the Editor

### To the Editor:

Intrigued by Professor Gruberg's "annual stocktaking" of participation by women in the 1980 Annual Program of the Association, I did a related examination of the 1980 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.

I was interested in testing the theory that women as section heads appoint more female participants. (This was of particular interest to me as one of the female section heads.) Out of 17 sections, six were chaired by women. The proportion of female participants is shown as follows:

Women and the Political Process: 60 percent (9 of 15)

The Political Science Profession: 23 percent (4 of 17)

Policy Analysis: 22 percent (4 of 18)

Intergovernmental Relations and Urban/Rural Politics: 21.9 percent (9 of 41)

Minority and Ethnic Politics/Public Policy: 18.7 percent (3 of 16)

Judicial Politics and Public Law: 12.9 percent (4 of 31)

In the 11 sections not chaired by women, the proportion of female participation is as follows:

Public Administration and Bureaucracy: 33 percent (10 of 50)

Parties, Elections, and Public Opinion: 22.7 percent (5 of 22)

Comparative Politics-Authoritarian Regimes: 8 percent (2 of 24)

Southern Politics: 7.6 percent (2 of 26)

Legislators and Legislative Politics: 7 percent (2 of 28)

Empirical Theory and Methodology: 5.8 percent (1 of 17)

Executive Politics: 5 percent (1 of 20)

Political Theory and Philosophy: 4 percent (1 of 23)

Comparative Politics-Democratic Regimes: 3 percent (1 of 28)

International Relations and Foreign Policy: 0 percent (0 of 31)

The Presidential Election: 0 percent (0 of 3)

By even the most elementary analysis, it is evident that women in the profession are much more likely to be panel participants in sections chaired by women. Of the approximately 390 participants listed in the conference program (including co-authors regardless of their presence), 58 or 14.8 percent were women. Thus, female representation for the six female chaired sections averaged 26 percent, twice that of the whole conference. In the 11 sections not chaired by women, the average female participation was 8.7 percent.

I will leave for further discussion the question of how many women concentrate their research and teaching in some of the panel subfields, where they were less visible. My closing thought, however, is that it is somewhat discouraging to learn that the 17 section heads for the 1981 conference include only three women.

Patricia S. Florestano  
University of Maryland

### To the Editor:

Perhaps the following facts will be of interest to those who have contributed or intend to contribute funds in response to Stanley Rothman's plea on behalf of Charles Stastny (*PS*, Fall, 1980):

After lengthy public hearings, a hearing officer (appointed by the University's Board of Trustees pursuant to a request by Stastny) recommended his dismissal;

All four of his department colleagues, individually at those public hearings and in response to detailed questioning by the hearing officer, came to the grave conclusion that Stastny should no longer be associated with the University;

After several hours of deliberation and after considering written and oral arguments by counsel, the Trustees dismissed Stastny by a four to one vote; and

On appeal, a judge of the Superior Court of the State of Washington agreed that the charges as set out by the University were supported by the record and affirmed the decision of the Trustees to dismiss Stastny. In the memorandum decision (October 8, 1980) the Court noted, "The record discloses no connection between his right to exercise freedom of speech and travel and the right to take his trip to Israel. The court finds and the records support that his constitutional rights have not been violated."

It seems to us that the political science profession is ill-served by the kind of presentation offered by Professor Rothman. His emphasis upon Stastny's trip to Israel represents an effort to select from a very long record a "fact" which he feels to be supportive of Stastny's case, while ignoring the rest of the record.

Colleagues considering donations to Professor Rothman's committee should be aware that Stastny's absence from his classroom and advising duties on that last occasion was only one of many such instances in the hearing record of irresponsibility toward students, toward colleagues, and towards the University. Furthermore, neither Professor Rothman nor any of the "50 academics of diverse views," to which he refers, has ever made an effort to contact this department to validate Stastny's complaints. We think it strange that a group calling itself the National Committee for the Defense of Academic Rights would behave in such an obviously unacademic manner.

Robert C. Jacobs  
Thomas J. Kerr  
Elwyn H. Odell  
Robert Yee  
Central Washington University