

Communications

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor:

Through no fault of *PS*, the number of political science graduate students and faculty listed for the Claremont Graduate School in the Winter, 1975, issue was quite misleading. The problem results in part from the fact that the Claremont Graduate School (CGS) is not attached to an undergraduate institution but is one of six independent, federated colleges which constitute the Claremont Colleges system. These colleges comprise one large campus consisting of six smaller, contiguous campuses. A student in any of the colleges may take courses in any of the others, and there is a certain exchange of faculty. Thus the graduate faculty is composed not only of full-time appointees of CGS but also of joint appointments of CGS and certain of the undergraduate colleges plus those professors of the undergraduate colleges who teach graduate courses.

The correct figures for political science graduate faculty and students at CGS during the 1974-75 academic year, therefore, are the following:

FACULTY				Number of Students in Ph.D. Program		M.A. Prog.	Total Ph.D. Degrees in Last 3 Years
Full	Associate	Assistant		M	W		
M	M	M	W	M	W		
16	8	8	1	150	27	36	72

The Claremont Graduate School also has an entirely separate Department of International Relations, whose faculty, but not students, in a number of instances overlaps with those of Government (political science). For International Relations graduate faculty and students at CGS, the 1974-75 figures are these:

FACULTY			Number of Students in Ph.D. Program		M.I.S.* Program	Total Ph.D. Degrees in Last 3 Years
Full	Associate	Assistant	M	W		
M	M	M	M	W		
14	8	4	31	5	15	10

*Master of International Studies, a two-year professional degree program.

George Blair, Chairman
 Department of Government
 Claremont Graduate School
 Fred Warner Neal, Chairman
 Graduate Faculty in
 International Relations
 Claremont Graduate School

To the Editor:

At the recent annual meeting of the Midwestern PSA, a new committee was formed to confront some of the discouraging aspects of membership in both the regional and American associations, and to consider whether we might better drop present memberships and form a new association to publish a new journal and plan meetings which would meet the needs of many members whose views are being ignored.

Many association members have been turned off increasingly over recent years by the insensitivity of our leadership to the full needs of the discipline. They have seen our affairs carried on in the interest of a vested group, officers often obtaining their positions by what is known in Chicago politics as "clout" (See, Len O'Connor, *Clout: Mayor Daley and His City*, 1975).

Fatcalf members adhere for the most part to the "behavioristic" wing of political science, those concerned exclusively with computer read-outs, correlation curves, questionnaire techniques, endless hair-splitting about models, in the cause of a value-free, positivistic political science. In our view, this kind of political science has produced an amoral, if not immoral, discipline, contributing to the undermining of the humanistic values in our culture. It has helped produce the moral climate making Watergate, the over-riding secret CIA and equivalent state and local police intelligence-gathering, and the military-industrial complex under the leadership of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who negates democratic controls of foreign policy in favor of secret, executive control stemming from the White House.

E. F. Schumacher (*Small is Beautiful*, 1975) has called the metaphysics underlying the social science positivists as "a bad, vicious, life-destroying type of metaphysics" with the result that "we are suffering from them as from a fatal disease." (p. 84) He quotes Etienne Gilson, who wrote more than 20 years ago, that in rebuilding these disciplines after the pattern of the physical sciences, this "very dangerous move" has accounted for "the perilous position in which western culture has found itself."

The non-behaviorists have voiced complaints for many years, but to no avail. Officers and "papabiles" (those deemed worthy of the succession) mock opponents. Finally, at long last, some are seeing the light. The only way is to organize a new committee which can talk turkey to the leaders, or agree to "come-out."

We call our committee the Committee of Radical Political Scientists (CORPS). CORPS is necessary because the older, leading dissident group, the Caucus, prevalingly is neo-Marxian in some vague revolutionary, anti-structural, anti-institutional point of view, with Maoists, Stalinists, and quasi-anarchists leagued in a curious anti-podal union of extreme, mind-boggling egalitarians, with those who would become the new executioners if they gained control of society. We also reject right conservatism if it follows some unyielding traditional religious or laissez-faire position.

If my letter strikes an accord, I hope readers will please let me know, and pass the word to those who have terminated association membership already. We can gain some voice to obtain meeting programs which offer more than a bone to humanistic political science and relieve our being a captured non-readership, paying for journals which are largely waste paper for us, or if not, "come-out."

Dale Pontius
Roosevelt University (Emeritus)

To the Editor:

You saw fit to publish the "United States National Commission for UNESCO Statement on Exclusion of Israel from UNESCO's Regional Grouping" in *PS*, Winter 1975. Hope you will find it fit to publish the clarifications below:

1. Israel's status as a full-fledged member of UNESCO remains unchanged. Israel has not been ousted from UNESCO or deprived of its rights.
2. It is equally untrue to suggest that Israel has been excluded from all the regional activities of UNESCO. In fact, Israel has not been excluded from any of the organization's regional work. UNESCO established five regional groups to facilitate the working out of limited regional activities by certain countries. These are: Europe, Latin America, Arab States, Africa, Asia and Oceania. At the last General Conference Israel introduced a request to be listed in the European regional group. This request was turned down. Israel made no request to belong to the Asian group although it had participated

in several Asian regional activities in the past. However, prior to the General Conference Israel had *never* belonged to any regional group so that its status has not changed. Israel can continue to participate as an observer in European and other regional activities in UNESCO in exactly the same manner as it has done in the past. In this respect, Israel's situation is no different from that of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand prior to the last General Conference since these countries like Israel for many years belonged to no regional group.

3. The second resolution the "United States National Commission" chooses to ignore relates to the preservation of the cultural heritage of Jerusalem. It was the culmination of six years of repeated UNESCO appeals to Israel to cease its archaeological excavations and alterations in the cultural and historical sites, particularly Muslim and Christian Holy Places in the Old City of Jerusalem. As early as November, 1968, UNESCO's General Conference addressed an urgent international appeal to Israel to this effect. Similar appeals were reiterated by UNESCO's Executive Board twice in 1969, once in 1971, twice in 1972 and again by UNESCO's General Conference in 1972. Hence, the 94th session of UNESCO's Executive Board voted to "condemn the persistent violation by Israel of the (previous) resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Conference and the Executive Board" and decided to submit the matter again to the 1974 General Conference.
4. The statement you published could give the impression that the UNESCO's decision was motivated by political considerations and a desire to "gang up" on Israel. I hope that the above will clarify matters to your readers.

Tawfic Farah
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

To the Editor:

A group of scholars headed by Henri Favre of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris is collecting information on Indian and peasant rebellions in Latin America. The goals of the group are: to coordinate information on current research and availability of source materials; to prepare a report on the state of current research, for presentation at the 1976 International Congress of Americanists; and to establish an information center and archive of research materials.

We request individuals engaged in research on this subject to contact us. We will prepare and circulate a list of individuals and research topics.

(Mexico and Central America)
Victoria Bricker
Department of Anthropology
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

(Andes)

Benjamin Orlove
Division of Environmental Studies
University of California
Davis, California 95616

Benjamin Orlove
University of California, Davis

To the Editor:

A comprehensive and creative effort to establish a world-wide network of information centers oriented to the needs of natural science and engineering, has been launched, through UNESCO. It is referred to as UNISIST and obtains support from several governments. Americans, acting primarily through the National Academy of Science and the International Council of Scientific Unions, played a leading role in launching this structure.

Belatedly, the Social Science Department of UNESCO followed this lead by deciding to launch an effort tandem with UNISIST, to encourage the establishment of a global network of social science information programs. A strategy designed to achieve these objectives was worked out during a meeting of experts called by the UNESCO Social Science Department, which met at Valescure, France, in June 1974. A structure has been established through the National Academy of Sciences, with support from the Office of Science Information Services of the National Science Foundation, to backstop UNISIST as it relates to the natural sciences and engineering, but *no comparable effort has been mounted on behalf of the social sciences*. Moreover, it seems apparent that no such effort will be mounted unless the serious interest of social scientists at the working level can be demonstrated, and concrete, economical project proposals can be formulated.

It is now appropriate for American social scientists and information specialists to take another serious look at this situation. Eight years ago the National Academy of Sciences sponsored a comprehensive inquiry into the state of information in the behavioral sciences through a committee chaired by David Easton. The Easton report, published in 1967, called attention to some crucial problems and urged that high priority be given to its recommended solutions. Unfortunately subsequent inability to secure requisite funding has meant that not only were the recommendations not implemented but some of the previous efforts to which the Easton committee pointed with satisfaction—notably the establishment of a Council for Social Science Data Archives—have collapsed for lack of funding.

Paradoxically, although no single agency in the U.S. seems prepared to take responsibility for providing leadership in this field, there are many agencies, professional societies, and concerned individuals who have a legitimate interest in the subject. Accordingly an expanded circle of concerned scholars and information specialists is forming to promote studies of the International Social Science Information System—its basic weaknesses and requirements as

well as its capabilities and accomplishments, treated primarily in terms of American needs, both domestic and international.

The mode of operations proposed through this call for action is informal and open. Studies will be launched primarily through round tables and interest group meetings at the conferences of professional societies.* If appropriate, articles and memoranda will be produced for distribution through journals and newsletters. If you are interested and/or you have suggestions to make, please write to the undersigned,

Fred W. Riggs
Political Science Department
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

To the Editor:

In last fall's edition of *PS*, I was taken to task by Martin Gruberg, without my name specifically being mentioned, for not having appointed a woman as a panel chairperson in the section on Epistemology and Methodology which I was then in the process of organizing for this year's convention in San Francisco. I have waited this long to reply because I wanted to go through all my files on a month-to-month basis, in order to provide a detailed picture of the total context in which all selection decisions were made. Such detail is necessary, I believe, if a distorted view of that part of the selection process with which I happen to be familiar, is not to prevail.

During the first three months in which I was engaged in the process of weeding out ideas and selecting individual panel topics and the chairpersons, I wrote some 181 letters, but telephoned and personally spoke to approximately 100 other persons, soliciting their recommendations. Of the persons contacted, between 30 and 40 were women—including several members of the Women's Caucus, of which I have been a member almost since its inception. At the Midwestern Political Science Association meeting in Chicago at the end of April, 1974, I personally asked several members, including past officers of the Caucus, to provide me with recommendations. By June 30th I had written another 109 letters and had made approximately 50 more telephone calls seeking additional recommendations and proposals. The intention was to have all panel topics and chairpersons selected early enough so as to give as many people as possible an opportunity to apply. Most of the people with whom I communicated did eventually come up with positive recommendations and names of prospective participants. In all, some 18 women replied to my inquiries or wrote on their own—but of that number, only 13 actually asked to be placed on panels. The rest simply acknowledged my letters, offered suggestions on topics, or referred me to others—most of whom, by the way, were men.

*An open meeting on this topic has been scheduled for the APSA conference in San Francisco, September 3, from 11:45 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. You are invited to attend.

In the midst of all this activity I did ask a prominent women epistemologist to chair a panel. Initially she agreed to do so, but later, when, in the interest of making all the epistemology panels parallel in their treatment of the topic—*i.e.*, to have *alternative viewpoints* rather than single approaches represented on each panel, I asked if she would be willing to do likewise, she refused. Since I had come to the conclusion that this would be the best approach only after considerable consultation and discussion with many other members of the profession, I tried on several occasions to get her to change her mind. But she held firm and another section chairperson eventually provided her with the opportunity she preferred. During this same period I also asked two other women if they would be interested in chairing panels, but demurred on the basis of prior commitments.

Finally, at last August's convention of the APSA in Chicago, I once again expressed my concern about finding qualified women participants for my section at one of the business meetings of the Women's Caucus. However, only one woman volunteered as a result of this meeting, and I immediately forwarded her instruction on how to proceed. At that meeting I also requested that a notice be placed in the Caucus' newsletter.

In all, some 109 individuals applied to me personally for placement on one or more of the panels. Of that number 96 were men, of whom two were Orientals and one was from Puerto Rico. All requests and topics were forwarded to the appropriate chairpersons, and to the best of my knowledge were treated equally and judged on the basis of merit. In cases where the applicants were newcomers or unknown to me, I asked that they send copies of their vitae to me or to the respective chairpersons, along with copies of their paper proposals. In many instances they or their letters were referred to more than one panel and to other section chairpersons as well. In addition, guidelines were *twice* sent to each panel chairperson concerning APSA directives on panel construction, including the need to give ample opportunity to women, Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Orientals and other minority groups.

After the panels were completed, I asked each panel chairperson (seven in all) to tell me exactly how many of their applicants had been women, Blacks (if discernible), Orientals, Chicanos, etc. The response was the following: Of a total of 177 applicants overall, 161 were white males, 10 were women (obviously some did not follow up on their original intentions or else were lost in the count), 5 were Orientals, 1 was from Puerto Rico, none was Black as far as anyone could tell, and none was a Chicano. This number is somewhat inflated because several people applied or were referred to more than one panel, and in more than one capacity—discussant, paper-giver, etc. Nevertheless, the women, it would appear, were outnumbered approximately 17 to 1.

In all, my personal correspondence for the 15 months in which I was actively involved in organizing these panels amounted to well over 500 pieces of mail. The volume of work was such that, many worthwhile proposals and individuals of whatever sex and minority persuasion were by-passed. In fact, in several instances I was given to understand that certain persons had actually been placed on panels (at least two other women, one Oriental, and several *very* well known white males) only to discover later that they were not. It seems their beautifully thought-out projects just did not fit into the panels which eventually emerged.

It is my sincere hope that this response will help to settle some of the doubts which may have arisen concerning the way in which participants were selected for the San Francisco Convention. There is still much room for improvement in the procedure which I and most of my colleagues followed, I am positive, but good faith and the desire to give equal opportunity to as many qualified individuals as possible, is the ethic which I believe currently governs (for the most part) the panel selection process of our association. Nevertheless, a higher level of participation by all our constituent elements is a goal truly worthy of additional and concerted effort.

Maria J. Falco
Stockton State College