

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor:

Professor Dufault's letter to *P.S.* (Spring, 1968) concerning Willmoore Kendall and the "price" he had to pay for being out-of-step in this profession is timely. We *do* need to engage in some introspective thought concerning the state of our profession. If the shameful treatment accorded Kendall proves anything, it is this: Those who have legitimate reason to feel ill at ease in the Association and the profession are those who cannot swallow the prevailing orthodoxy which is, to say the least, far left of center. These individuals, to our knowledge, fill the ranks of the more silent and indulgent members of the profession, including a large number of liberal persuasion. They are not among the "heroes" of our profession, in part, because they are seldom asked to head panels, to deliver papers, or even, dare we say it, to act as discussants. They do not push for the adoption of "resolutions" intended to advance their partisan goals; to do so, most of them feel, would be to violate the ethics of the profession. Some of them have even developed a false sense of humility about their talents and their potential because they steadfastly refuse to attribute their rather innocuous status to the blatant and self-serving left wing bias of the profession. (Admittedly, the New Political Science panels at the Washington Convention did help immeasurably to dispel any such sense of humility.)

How different matters are if you are left of center. The New Left, or more exactly, the Caucus for a New Political Science, now has twelve panels of its very own, with the approval and under the auspices of the Association. Beyond this, Christian Bay and H. Mark Roelefs (leading members of the New Politics group) have, by dispensation of our presiding president, six panels apiece to control on our "regular" program. This means, if the past serves as any guide, the New Political Scientists will control roughly 30% of those panels scheduled at our next convention in New York City.

But this is not all. The New Left clearly seeks to intimidate the profession: annual membership fees, the New Left says, should not include subscription to the APSR unless, God forbid, our journal becomes more "relevant" for its purposes. Failing this, it will try to start a new journal of its own. Very well. But as one of its more obstreperous spokesmen boasts in *The Nation* (September 23, 1968),

the New Left is just warming up for the "take-over." Says he: "There is even talk of running—and electing—a slate of APSA officers." And well it might. At the very least its implied promise is continued "conflict and confrontation" designed to bring the Association around to compliance with its future demands. In this spirit, the theme for the New Politics panels at the 1969 convention is "Prospects for Revolution in America."

The Association and its leadership have been bullied by the New Political Science. Like thoroughly spoiled children this group will press on and on with its demands; and, like indulgent parents, the leadership of the Association—at least as far as we can tell from the record—will give in.

The time has come for some changes. The leadership of the Association is clearly and unjustifiably placating what the New Political Scientists themselves admit is nothing but a "splinter group," (according to their estimates, there are 500 members; about 160 did attend their business meeting—understandably enough, only 60 of them showed the perseverance to stay up past 10:30 p.m.). The changes we suggest would be these: Either (a) tell the New Political Scientists to "disassociate" from the Association, which would really impose no real demand on them since "disassociation" is one of their favorite pastimes; or (b) acknowledge the demand of those of us who do not like the current divisive policy of the Association leaders and grant us equal time to develop program panels at the convention and equal treatment in all other matters. Alternative (b) would, of course, involve the probability of a fragmented Association, something that we regret very deeply. But so long as the leadership of the Association is going to cater to the whims and follies of the New Left, whatever blame attaches to fragmentation falls squarely on the shoulders of those who have allowed this disgraceful state of affairs to develop.

George W. Carey
Georgetown University
Edna R. Fluegel
Trinity College
Walter D. Jacobs
University of Maryland
James P. McClellan
Emory University
Stanley Parry
Trinity College

To the Editor:

Will you please publish a notice in the next issue of *P.S.* announcing that I wish to disassociate myself from the judgments made by Professor Lipsitz and his co-signers concerning the judgments made by Professors Scammon, Penniman, and Herzberg because, in my opinion, their letter in the last issue of *P.S.* was not good political science nor do they speak for the political science profession.

William G. Andrews
*State University College
at Brockport*

To the Editor:

This letter is an explanation of the motion prepared for consideration at the Annual Business Meeting, to recommit the Final Report of the Committee on Professional Standards and Responsibilities. The motion [which was referred by the Annual Business Meeting to the Committee on Professional Ethics without approval or disapproval] read:

The report of the Committee on Professional Standards and Responsibilities is to be returned to committee with instructions to reconsider its recommendations in the light of two issues slighted in its thoughtful report: 1. the relationship between the Association and many questions vitally affecting the profession which are decided by the key institutional agencies of our profession, the departments of political science; and 2. our professional obligations to the defense and promotion of serious political discourse.

In thinking about proposed changes in the constitution of the American Political Science Association and about proposed codes of ethics, a distinction should be made between the discipline of political science and the profession of political scientist. Obviously the care and cultivation of the former is the prime objective of the latter, and this objective quite properly defines most of our obligations to each other, to our students, and to other segments of society. But we are not now asked to deal with the obvious problems, but with hard problems which arise out of the actual social impact of our profession at work, as it is presently organized and recognized as it claims a special expertise and a certain standing with regard to matters having profound ethical and political implications, as it exercises control

over resources important to political conflict. It may be that some or many of these consequences are not desired by most of us, that we would like our life in the discipline to be neatly separated from our life as citizen, but we ought to start our ethical inquiry with an empirical appreciation of the situation and not with our wishes. The choice before us in many vital matters is whether to think through the obligations relating to the social consequences of our activities as a profession or to let our conduct and the impact of our work continue to be governed by the presently prevailing parallelogram of forces. Consider two examples.

1. Political science departments help to shape university policies concerning the direction of research, student and faculty participation in university decision-making, relations to segments of the population seeking new kinds of services from the universities—notably the black communities in our cities—and many similar matters. In addition, departments have almost total control over the directions within political science which they choose to foster through policies of employment, promotion, fellowship and leave allocation, and the like. In all these matters, departments do in fact now orient themselves according to expectations about “the profession” and its standards. But we have neither guidelines nor machinery for giving explicit attention to such things. The objective is less the establishment of new rules and regulations than it is taking organizational initiatives and launching collective consultations to end the present largely unthinking subservience to impressions of the “main stream” and sheer momentum. A political science department, for example, has a voice in the use of university research funds and decides to spend these as “seed-money” for developing proposals which can then be funded through government contracts and grants, instead of using them up “less productively” in supporting independent projects not attractive to government. Such decisions have major impact on the situation accepted passively as a given in the Bernstein Committee report; such decisions are also often shaped by the belief that the professional standing of a department will be measured by the *amount* of research being carried on. An APSA policy of encouraging independent research, of countering through programs of special recognition the growing dependence on government, can help to change such departmental policies. The ethical question of whether an individual researcher

may properly accept a government contract is altogether different from the social and political—but also ethical—question of whether the profession ought to use such resources as it has at its disposal to fight a monopoly of the politically important instruments of information and control over definition of problems. The same reasoning applies to the need for pluralism within departments, the support by the profession of staff and programs in specializations which are not stylish or profitable, when measured by the availability of outside research funds or consultantships. Political scientists are asked to advise on university responses to demands for changes in the structure and mission of our institutions; and it seems clear that our professional interest requires us to attend to these problems, while our professional competence should help us to interpret these important political developments to administrators and to colleagues in other fields. Needless to say, political scientists differ among themselves on many of these issues (as witnessed by events at both Berkeley and Columbia), but we have a collective responsibility nonetheless to pool our experiences, subject ourselves to mutual criticism within a professional setting, and to work towards some distinctive professional contributions to these decisive controversies. The American Political Science Association need not presume to dictate individual judgments, but it should exercise leadership and accept the responsibilities arising out of its place in the institutional structure. Increasingly, political scientists supply high administrative officials; professional scrutiny and comment on their work may well be in order. Perhaps what is needed is a national advisory committee of political scientists who are not caught up in administrative roles to make recommendations for new procedures in universities, to offer service as mediator and interpreter in cases of confrontation, or more generally to build towards a more political and subtle understanding of present tensions than those associated with repression and coercion. We may not approach these problems simply with a view to protecting our scholarly detachment; it is our students after all who are coming to despise us and our work and it is our colleagues who are coming to be proponents of the billy-club. In summary, then, a *statement of the standards and responsibilities of our profession must make provision for the problems we encounter when organized as departments of universities and must recognize the special tasks and obligations which attend our*

participation in those institutions at this time in our national history.

2. Political scientists do lend their names and professional authority to various political causes and they often do so not, as some smirkingly suggest, in devious misuse of their positions but in the reasoned conviction that our discipline entitles them to claim such authority. Everyone recognizes the dangers of abuse here, but few would presume to compel colleagues holding such beliefs to change them. One thing that can be done is to set up guidelines of decorum and tone. But that skirts the real problems and even runs the danger of systematic bias, since it is usually easier to adopt a style of composed reasonableness when defending established practices and policies than when opposing them, struggling to re-define issues and to counter a consensus on premises. Something different is needed. If we cannot agree that the profession can have a collective political judgment (as urged by Christian Bay, for example) we can perhaps agree that we have a collective interest in the integrity of certain central concepts which are at once the stuff of political debate (insofar as it aspires to reason) and the framework of much of our professional work. Is the policy in Vietnam right or wrong? Let us agree that there is sharp disagreement within our profession about the ability of political science as such to answer that question. But if the policy is attacked as an aspect of imperialism or as unlawful intervention in a civil war or it is defended as resisting aggression or honoring treaty commitments, political scientists will still initially disagree but should be willing to work on procedures for developing a professional judgment upon these reasons. *At minimum, then, it should be possible to take on as a collective professional obligation a critical function, challenging the ideological abuse of the language of politics.* Where contrasting interpretations confuse public judgment and divide professionals on matters of vital public policy, it would appear to be a proper professional activity of the American Political Science Association to solicit the help of its members towards the clarification of alternatives and for the critical appraisal of reasonings publicly offered; and, in principle at least, it seems a proper objective for the Association to make a professional judgment on the relative adequacy of contrasting contentions of this sort. Clearly, the APSA would not “impose” its judgment upon its members through sanctions, even where it has determined that a given mode of reasoning is relatively less ade-

quate than another. The fact is, however, that sanctions do now exist within much of the profession (when seen as organized in departments) against those who take "strident" and "irresponsible" views; but there is no professional forum before which there might be argument, for example, about the relative merits of classifying the present government of the Republic of Viet Nam as "imperialist clique" or as "representative government based on free elections." There is a danger that such processes will lead to tyranny of the majority and proscription of unpopular views; but the unchecked work of informal pressures moves in this direction even more effectively. An opportunity for debating such conflicting contentions before a professional forum and the development of mechanisms for registering distinctions between the least and the most adequate alternatives would affect the present situation in two ways:

- a. it would mobilize the political science profession against the devaluation of political language and the attendant emphasis on calm or strident irrationalism in political discourse (all this with a minimum of illusions about the impact on the total political process);
- b. it would substitute a more nearly rational forum for the existing network of tradition and habit and widely shared but unexamined doctrinal consensus as instrument for making those judgments about propriety which in fact are constantly made and implemented by the profession, especially with regard to junior members.

These brief comments have been limited to general references and a few examples. But they should suffice to show that an examination focused on problems of personal intentions and duties cannot touch on a whole range of problems, genuinely ethical in character, which confront our profession. Moreover we must look at the consequences of our efforts and failures as social actors in the larger society as in the university, and not simply at the implications of our commitments to scientific discipline. Most of the "rules" proposed by the Bernstein Committee are unexceptionable, but such sweeping phrases as "impose his partisan view" (Rule 2) and "endorse political positions" (Rule 8) need to be rigorously clarified in the light of problems raised in this memorandum, and the discussions of research must be complemented by consideration of initiatives towards a more pluralistic and critical discipline available to the profession.

Fall 1968

The major value of such a report as that issued by the Bernstein Committee is not its catalog of rules, but its clarification of issues and its assault on our complacency. Let us not put the discussion to rest as yet, as we tend to do when we adopt a report, until some of these crucial issues have been thoroughly considered. It is a mark of respect to the Committee, after all, and a tribute to its success to say that it has just started us thinking about these problems, that we need more time, and that we want continuing discussion with them.

David Kettler
Ohio State University

To the Editor:

According to a story by Morton Mintz in the *Washington Post*, September 1, 1968, the Caucus for a New Political Science wishes to amend the APSA charter so as to substitute for scholarly detachment a "radically critical spirit." The spokesman of the Caucus is cited as being disturbed that several officers of the APSA have, as individuals, served their country in one capacity or another. The language of the story indicates that the Caucus is incensed that Mr. Kampelman and Mr. Kirkpatrick are indirectly associated with the CIA and what the Caucus calls "the establishment," i.e., our social economic, and political institutions. The activities of Mr. Kampelman and Mr. Kirkpatrick as private citizens do not concern the APSA, however, as long as they do not involve the APSA in whatever partisan politics or public service they may engage in. The Caucus' proposal that they be removed from their APSA offices is without merit or justification.

The Caucus for a New Political Science is a thinly disguised front for the "New Left" radical activists who are trying to subvert and destroy our educational and scholarly institutions, to undermine the structure of our society, and, ultimately, to subvert our political institutions. The APSA is only one target of the radical activists. If the APSA charter is amended in accordance with the demands of the Caucus, the APSA will be converted into a front for radical action and propaganda. Its usefulness as a scholarly organization will be at an end.

If the Caucus for a New Political Science succeeds in subverting the APSA, I shall withdraw my membership. I cannot and I will not associate myself with any organization which is oriented toward the destruction of the very system which has made this nation prosperous

43

and powerful and which has given us the highest standard of living and the greatest degree of intellectual freedom in the history of mankind. I believe that current domestic and international problems can and should be discussed by APSA panels meaningfully and intelligently within a broad frame of reference (not as current, temporary, and emotionally-charged controversial issues), but such discussions should always be conducted in an atmosphere of scholarly detachment. I doubt that this is the purpose of Professor Roelofs and his group.

Roy N. Lokken
East Carolina University

To the Editor:

In the heat and confusion of the Annual Meeting I believe a motion was passed of whose full implications the members present certainly did not realize.

For the first time the APSA is now on record as denying the right of a Communist to be democratically elected to the Council. Furthermore, by the resolution adopted no Council member may have an affair. Furthermore, it would now be improper for a group of members of the Council, such as those belonging to the Caucus for a New Political Science, to meet privately before a Council meeting to organize strategy on behalf of their views.

All of these absurd consequences follow from the statement that, "Officers . . . are engaged from engaging in . . . covert activities." Clearly these results were not the intent of the framers of the motion, nor of the membership that absentmindedly voted for it. The intent was presumably the same as that expressed in Rule 21 of the Bernstein Report and in the policy of the United States Government expressed in the President's order to intelligence agencies not to use educational and scholarly institutions as covers or to compromise their integrity.

I trust that over the coming year the Council and the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics can draft a statement that is carefully worded to properly express the Association's consensus, to replace the unfortunate parliamentary error inadvertently perpetrated by the Annual Meeting.

I would hope that this experience might be a lesson to us (who as political scientists should understand it better than anybody else) that sensible legislative drafting can not be done in a mass meeting, that careful committee procedures to formulate the alternatives in advance are necessary so that the Annual Meeting can

vote among well-stated alternatives. The Council did an excellent job in preparing a majority recommendation. One could only wish that the Council minority on any particular issue would do an equally careful job so that when the Association assembled in its Meeting it is not called upon to weigh the wording of a mass of poorly framed and ill-coordinated resolutions. If the Caucus for a New Political Science wishes to act as an opposition within the Association we have the right to ask that it at least do its homework.

Ithiel de Sola Pool
*Massachusetts Institute
of Technology*

To the Editor:

My colleagues listed below and I wish to submit the following amendment to Article VII, Section 1 of the Constitution of the American Political Science Association for the consideration of the Council and the membership at the next Business Meeting of the Association [See ASSOCIATION NEWS for full text.]

The amendment is intended to broaden the base of participation in the affairs of the Association. It proposes three changes: 1) that any contested election for office in the Association be submitted to a mailed vote of the entire membership with a plurality of those voting determining the winner; 2) that any proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Association be submitted to a mailed vote of the entire membership with a majority of those voting determining the outcome; 3) that whenever twenty per cent or more of the members present and voting at any Business or Special Meeting contest any resolutions or actions that such contested matters be submitted to a mailed vote of the entire membership with the outcome determined by a majority of those voting. In all three instances the Council shall set the terms and conditions of the voting procedures.

The reasons for suggesting this amendment seem clear. According to the 1968 APSA *Biographical Directory*, membership in the Association totals 15,185. With a membership this large, it is obviously undemocratic and unrealistic to settle important matters at an Annual Business Meeting with the bulk of the membership unable to participate in its decisions.

Furthermore, at the present time, Association rules require the payment of a registration fee for those in attendance at the Annual Convention; this fee is, in fact, also a poll tax since it is required that one must register for

the Convention in order to participate in the Business Meeting.

While we recognize that present Association rules do not require the submission of amendments to the full membership, this amendment calls for such a broad change in the conduct of Association business that we urge the Executive Committee to arrange for an advisory referendum by mail of the membership during this academic year, well in advance of the Business Meeting in September when the amendment will be formally submitted.

Donald G. Herzberg
Eggleton Institute

Stephen K. Bailey
Robert P. Boynton
Sebastian de Grazia
David Fellman
Stanley H. Friedelbaum
Charles O. Jones
Milton G. Lodge
John F. Manley
James L. McCamy
James N. Murray
Samuel C. Patterson
Jack W. Peltason
Robert L. Peterson
James A. Robinson
Alan Rosenthal
Russell N. Ross
Ira Sharkansky
Peter G. Snow
Joseph Tanenhaus
John C. Wahlke

To the Editor:

This is an appeal for support.

As most members of the Association already know, the Caucus for a New Political Science is an established fact and already enjoys considerable recognition as a reform organization within the American Political Science Association. As you may also know, the Association adopted a resolution at its 1968 Annual Meetings changing Article II, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution to one which commits the Association to active encouragement of "research in and concern for significant contemporary political and social problems and policies . . ."

The Caucus was responsible for change in the Constitution of the Association, and the Caucus considers itself an early, although by no means an exclusive, channel for reform in the Association. At the moment the Caucus is developing various programs, and it considers itself strongly committed to bringing about a

closer accord between the program and activities of the Association and the new spirit of intellectual excitement and the growing desire for relevance among students of politics today.

The operating expenses of the Caucus and its activities and meetings have so far been borne almost entirely by the initial membership of the Caucus, sometimes by the Executive Committee of the Caucus from personal resources. We are searching for foundation support but feel that this will never be fully satisfactory for such an organization. The Caucus feels, quite the contrary, that it must seek a base of support, including financial support, inside the Association.

Our appeal is to all members of the Association who feel that a serious self-analysis is called for in the 1960's and 1970's. We will consider each contribution an expression of support for this commitment and not necessarily for any particular stand or recommendations for which the Caucus or some of its members have been recognized. The Caucus members feel that the Caucus is and should be sufficiently broadly based to represent all members who feel that the Association can only gain from increased dissent and focused ferment inside its own ranks. Further information on the Caucus and its current activities can be found in a report submitted for this issue of *P. S.*

The Caucus needs the support of a large number and a wide variety of political scientists if it is to operate. Interested persons can support the Caucus in any of three ways. Option 1: A contribution of \$2.00 or more and entry as a member of the Caucus. Option 2: A contribution of any size to be used for the expenses of the organization. Option 3: A request, without financial contribution, to be entered on the mailing list of the Caucus.

All funds will be used for the operations of the Caucus during the current academic year and for preparation of special panels for the 1969 Annual Meetings. There is also a strong prospect that the funds will become the basis for a matching grant from a foundation. Checks and requests for information should be addressed to:

Caucus for a New Political Science
Department of Politics
University College, NYU
University Heights
New York, New York 10453.

Theodore Lowi
Morris Janowitz
University of Chicago