

# Communications

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

### To the Editor:

I am appalled at the excessive rhetoric in the otherwise exemplary obituary to the memory of Karl Loewenstein (PS 7:3, Summer 1974, p. 355). I refer to the following sentence:

His sympathies were with the progressive governments of the world and he spoke and wrote vigorously against those who would preserve freedom by forbidding its use, whether they were brown shirts in Berlin, black shirts in Rome, colonels in Athens, or *bureaucrats in Washington*. (emphasis added).

What bureaucrats in Washington are Professors Commagers and Latham talking about, bureaucrats who could be compared to Nazis, Fascists or militarist junta members? Surely not the bureaucrats who resisted the Nixon pressures during the Watergate scandals. Are there bureaucrats in Washington known to be informed by a political philosophy so explicit that they can be compared to Nazis or Fascists, or is it just an unconscious tendency? I write as a political scientist who has found "bureaucrats in Washington" just as interested in preserving

freedom by encouraging its use as any other corporate group in American society.

Arnold Beichman,  
University of Massachusetts,

### To the Editor:

For the past few years I have been monitoring the sex participation balance at our annual meetings (see my letters in *PS*, Fall 1972 and Fall 1973). The trend seemed clearly favorable; women were being represented on the program to the extent of their attendance at the national meetings and the percentage of both were climbing. However, my tabulation this year shows a mixed picture.

Three of the 18 sections (16.7%) were headed by women (compared with only one out of 12 in 1972 and one out of 14 in 1973). This factor made a decided difference in the female participation rate.

Thus, the three sections with female heads averaged 50% female chairpersons, 33.3% female paper givers and workshop participants,

Table I	Chairpersons	Paper Givers & Workshop Participants	Discussants
1974	12.2% (14/114)	13.4% (76/569)	10% (17/170)
1973	11.8%	11.2%	13.6%
1972	5.7%	11.4%	12.1%

Table II Section	Chairpersons	Paper Givers & Workshop Participants	Discussants
1. Political Science and National Science Policy	16.7%	7.0%	15.4%
2. Macro Theory and Micro Analysis	0	10.0%	0
3. Political Theory and Ideological Conflict	0	6.9%	4.1%
4. Experimental Political Research	0	5.3%	0
*5. Comparative Ethnic and Minority Politics	57.1%	43.3%	33.3%
6. Political Change	0	18.4%	0
7. Political Elites and Leadership	16.7%	22.2%	0
8. Theory and Politics of Organization	0	19.2%	0
9. Public Policy Analysis and Evaluation	0	11.9%	0
*10. Politicization and Political Legitimacy	28.6%	27.8%	0
11. Political Communication and Voting Behavior	0	4.0%	20.0%
12. Comparative Party and Electoral Systems	12.5%	8.1%	20.0%
13. Legislatures and Legislative Behavior	16.7%	4.4%	—
14. Judicial Processes	16.7%	2.4%	25.0%
15. Foreign Policy: Processes & Trends	0	3.8%	0
16. Study of International Policy Issues	0	9.8%	—
17. Authoritarian Political Systems	0	13.6%	10.5%
*18. Teaching Political Science	75.0%	27.8%	40.0%

(\*headed by a woman)

and 22.7% female discussants (or viewed another way: 64.3% of the convention's female chairpersons, 36.8% of the convention's female paper givers and workshop participants, and 29.4% of the convention's female discussants).

The 14 panels with female chairpersons had 34.6% female paper givers and workshop participants (34.2% of the women in this capacity at the convention) and 28.6% female discussants (35.3% of the convention's distaff discussants).

Two panels, each headed by a woman, can be categorized as being feminist in subject matter (Women — The Majority Minority and Women in Political Elites). Each had women as five out of the six contributors of papers. (That is, each had a token male, a reversal of the more customary pattern.) (Both the discussants in the Majority Minority panel were also female).

The panel on Women in Political Elites was organized within the same section as a panel on the Troubled Presidency which had a male chairperson, eleven male paper givers, and four male discussants. Almost as stag were two panels in the section on Legislative Behavior and one in the section on Judicial Processes; all three froze out women by 0-10 scores. (Overall, though, the Foreign Policy section had an even worse balance.)

Three panels with female chairpersons had nary another female contributor. Conversely one panel with a male chairperson had three women among its four paper givers.

As usual, the one evening plenary meeting was completely stag. All six contributors and the chairperson were male.

Of the 82 team-produced convention papers, only 19 (23%) included a woman contributor (but that accounted for 25% of the female convention presentations). Only two team efforts were all-female.

I must, therefore conclude, that women in our discipline have not yet overcome prejudices and barriers against them. It would be visible to believe after running down the list of subjects from which they are absent or underrepresented that they haven't been doing significant work in these areas. I guess we need a female equivalent to the "old boy" network to recognize qualified women (or to provide plums for a different group than has thus far benefitted).

Though my tabulations indicate that having a woman as section or panel head is likely to result in greater female representation in the program, this result isn't a certainty. I note that one of the two female section heads for 1975 has already selected her seven chairpersons — all male!

Martin Gruberg  
University of Wisconsin  
Oshkosh

#### To the Editor:

One of the disadvantages of having so many political science books published in the U.S. each year is the speed with which most of them go out of print. While many of these books are

not missed, a procedure should be found to save some of them. If nothing else, a tally might be kept by PS of letters urging the reprinting of certain books. Letters to PS might be more effective than letters to publishers, concerned as they are with potential sales.

I have in mind Leon Epstein's *Political Parties in Western Democracies* (Praeger, 1967). This is the best book I have read in recent years by an American political scientist in the comparative politics field. Only used copies of this masterpiece are now available.

Herbert A. Werlin,  
Hofstra University

#### To the Editor:

At the 1974 business meeting in Chicago, President-Elect Burns (as he already was then) informed the assembled members that they should approve the dues increase recommended by the Council, because he needed as ample a fiscal base as possible in order to support an expanded series of worthy projects that he had in mind for us to undertake. Even now, we as an Association are involved in a diverse array of programs and projects intended to contribute broadly to the resolution of problems in both public and private life that go far beyond our immediate and no doubt rather selfish concerns as affiliates of a particular academic discipline. At a time when we are thus committed to expend our group largess in the promotion of larger causes, it may not be asking too much to call for the appointment of a new presidential or council committee (if that be what it will take to do the job) to reconsider how we can better carry out the rather critical professional task that I shall explicate presently. The expenses of the ad hoc committee that I propose will surely be *de minimis* in comparison to most of our diversified set of standing committees or other institutional spin-offs (cf. 70th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, *Program*, pp. 58-63).

The professional task that concerns me is critical in the sense that it relates directly to the presentation of our own species (*Academicus politicus vulgus*), which depends upon the nurturing of the juveniles who will replace us in academic life. More particularly I refer to the advertisement and classification of the dissertations that are written under our direction. This question was brought forcefully to my own attention just the other day when I was asked, by means of a local departmental memorandum, to provide certain information about doctoral dissertations under my direction, with the request that the data be categorized in terms of the following heading *which are the very ones in terms of which our own Association office in Washington itself collects, files, and publishes these data* in PS (and cf. vol. VI, pp. 485-534, Fall 1973):

Political Philosophy, Theory and Methodology  
Government and Politics of the U.S. and Its Dependencies  
Constitutional and Administrative Law in the U.S.

## Communications

American State and Local Government and  
Politics  
Canadian Government and Politics  
Public Administration  
Foreign and Comparative Government and  
Politics  
International Organization and Law

I submit that it has been more than a quarter-century since these rubrics have provided even a tolerably acceptable fit to the actual activities of political scientists, in either teaching or research. To take a subfield about which I am fairly well informed, "Administrative Law" is virtually a null set for political scientists, and it has been so for a long time (as demonstrated by my report of survey research undertaken almost two decades ago. "Political Science Research and Instruction in Administrative Law," *Journal of Legal Education*, vol. X, pp. 294-311, Spring 1958); while "Constitutional Law" has not adequately described a major part of the relevant activity since about the time when Corwin and the senior Cushman retired from active teaching. Similar comments are warranted in the case of every other one of these anachronistic "subfield" designations.

After making full allowance for the obeisance due to both cultural lag and bureaucratic lethargy, I still feel that the time must be ripe for a change. And there is (Thank God!) good precedent: comparison of the Fifth (1968) and especially the Sixth (1972) with earlier editions of our Association's *Biographical Directory* makes it clear that, even in such a conventional publication as that, it has proved possible to make some concessions in the direction of modernity, in the conceptualization of what we ourselves do. I believe that we owe no less to our doctoral students, so that persons who might be interested in examining their work will be in a position to gain some kind of contemporary idea of what they have been up to.

Glendon Schubert  
University of Hawaii,  
Manoa

### To the Editor:

Now that, according to its most recent election platform, the Caucus for a New Political Science, so-called, "finds its roots in the writings of such as Charles Merriam, V.O. Key, Harold Lasswell, Woodrow Wilson, and E.E. Schattschneider," a valedictory is surely in order. Just imagine how these old friends of ours must have chuckled in their graves (though HDL is still very much with us) on being informed of their elevation into the post-behavioral pantheon of the CNPS! And just contemplate what the dethronement of Mao, Marx, Marcuse and Mills has done for all of us! And I am reliably

informed that the Caucus, having come to recognize the virtue of consensus politics, is about to bestow honorary memberships on Herring, Truman, Dahl, Deutsch and Almond. Like Richard Nixon, Philippa Strum deserves our admiration for bringing us together. May she and the Caucus have many years of productive work in the tradition of Merriam, Key, Lasswell, Wilson and, as we used to call him, "Schatt."

Heinz Eulau  
William Bennett Munro<sup>1</sup>  
Professor of Political Science  
Stanford University

<sup>1</sup> PS Munro, as you may recall, discovered the "law of the pendulum" in his *The Invisible Government* (1928). He has informed me that he is very much hurt by the Caucus' neglect of his contribution to political wisdom.