

**To the Editor:**

Roger Hamburg raises some interesting challenges to our conclusions concerning the relationship of scholarly achievement to political liberalism as reported in "The Politics of American Political Scientists" (*PS*, Spring 1971). He argues correctly that we assume, but in no way prove, that publication record may be treated as an indicator of intellectuality. Space considerations required that we leave out some things which we would have liked to develop more completely. There are, in fact, a variety of other data in our survey which shed some light on the matter Hamburg raises. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: "I consider myself an intellectual." They were also requested to indicate the time they spent in scholarly pursuits (serious professional reading as well as writing), and the extent to which they participated in extravocational cultural activities. We find (1) that these several indicators of intellectuality are highly inter-correlated, and (2) that whatever the measure, the "more intellectual" academics are to the left politically of their "less intellectual" colleagues.

Mr. Hamburg's further contention that the greater liberalism of the "achievers" is largely a by-product of the ability of the academic community at "big schools" to insulate itself from "the more conservative community outside the campus," and that "anonymity protects eccentricity" may also be tested in our data. Size of school may be held

constant. When we do so, we find that within the same size category, professors at the scholarly more selective schools (as measured by the SAT scores required for undergraduate admission) are significantly more liberal than faculty at the less selective institutions. Further, academics at small but selective schools are just as liberal as those at large institutions of comparable selectivity, and are much more liberal than the faculty at large but less scholarly places. This is true not only for political scientists but for the entire professoriate, as the following table demonstrates.

A final comment. Although Mr. Hamburg is right that no empirical data can "prove" the relationship between a concept like "intellectuality" and political orientation since there is no way to create agreement as to what "intellectuality" is, the fact remains that a large number of surveys of academics from James Leuba's analysis of the factors associated with religious belief (*The Belief in God and Immortality*, The Open Court Publishing Co., 1921) through to the Carnegie data gathered in 1969, all agree that "achievement" in academe — whether measured in terms of those faculty members starred in *American Men of Science* (that is, ranked as significant contributors by a panel of their colleagues), by a high score on an index of publications, or by location at the better institutions — has been associated with more liberal to left views on many different social and political issues. Perhaps most startling of all is the conclusion, first presented by Lazarsfeld and

Distribution of the Faculty on the Liberalism-Conservatism Scale, by School Size and Selectivity

Institutions Which Are:	Very Liberal and Liberal	Middle-of-the-Road	Conservative and Very Conservative
Size — Under 2,500 SAT Scores — Over 1,200	59	13	28
Size — Under 2,500 SAT Scores — 1,000-1,200	41	17	42
Size — Under 2,500 SAT Scores — 800-1,000	30	16	54
Size — Over 10,000 SAT Scores — Over 1,200	58	15	27
Size — Over 10,000 SAT Scores — 1,000-1,200	44	16	40
Size — Over 10,000 SAT Scores — 800-1,000	33	15	52

Thielens (*The Academic Mind*, The Free Press, 1958) with respect to support for the rights of Communists and other minorities, reiterated by Noll and Rossi (*General Social and Economic Attitudes of College and University Faculty Members*, NORC, 1966) with regard to opposition to the Vietnam war, and then found by us in the 1969 Carnegie data, that consultants for business and for the federal government were more likely to support Communists' rights or to oppose the Vietnam war than faculty not on the consulting payroll of the business and political establishments. The reason for these curious findings, of course, is that The Establishment draws its consultants from the ranks of the "achievers," which means that it draws them from that segment of the academic community most disposed to left views. Political analysis and argument can never be simple in a world full of dialectical contradictions.

**Everett Carl Ladd, Jr.**

University of Connecticut

**Seymour Martin Lipset**

Harvard University

## To the Editor:

I read with interest Mr. J. A. Stegenga's article on book reviews in your distinguished journal. Parts of it contained several interesting and noteworthy points to which all scholars would be glad to subscribe. Other parts of this article, however, covertly impugn the strictly professional objectivity of a review I wrote of Mr. Stegenga's book for the *American Political Science Review* as well as the judgment of the book review editor of the APSR, Professor Fenno, who invited me to write that review. Thus, these points cannot be left unanswered.

In that book review I praised Mr. Stegenga's study. Well aware that this was a book "first and foremost about UN peace-keeping and secondarily a book about Cyprus," as he himself quite correctly underlines, I observed in my review, first, that his laying the entire blame for the Cyprus crisis of 1963 on President Makarios was somewhat injudicious in terms even of what Mr. Stegenga wrote about the unwieldiness of the Constitution of Cyprus and, second, that his omission of any analysis of the Status of Forces agreement between the United Nations and the Republic of Cyprus was regrettable if not inexplicable.

With regard to the first point, any political scientist is — or should be — careful in dealing with even the most centralized and personal systems of top-level decision-making. In the specific instance of Cyprus, the severe crisis created by the bloody fighting between Greek and Turkish Cypriots in December 1963 in Nicosia, when viewed in historical and political context may have been provoked by either side, if it was not a result of a case of nonpolitical violence. No impartial international observers were on the spot as they are today, to place the blame where it justly lay. Nor did any international investigation commission ever examine this point of fact, after the crisis was over. If the Greek side provoked this violence, this would not necessarily mean that President Makarios had deliberately instigated it. One of his ministers, for instance, might well have done so for reasons of his own. It should be recalled that one of them was later implicated in a plot to assassinate the President of the Cyprus Republic.

With regard to the second point — the omission of any reference to, or analysis of the international instrument which established the juridical foundation for the presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus — any political scientists dealing especially with world politics knows — or should know — that those matters which Mr. Stegenga dismisses in his article rather cavalierly as "fine legal intricacies" usually conceal or reveal various political *modi vivendi*, whose understanding and importance should never be underestimated. Events connected with the controversial withdrawal of UNEF in 1967 from the territory of the UAR abundantly illustrate this point.

Finally, I am fairly sure that political scientists will view with justified misgivings Mr. Stegenga's implications that because of their national extraction, they are inevitably biased, are unable to live up to the principles of their profession, and therefore, should never be invited to review books which deal with questions that directly or indirectly are connected with the country of their origin.

**Stephen G. Xydis**

Hunter College

## To the Editor:

Your all-too-modest piece on "Voting Participation in the 1970 APSA Election" (Summer 1971, p. 365), heralds a scientific revolution of Copernican, nay Einsteinian dimensions, whose repercussions will

State	Total Vote	Percentage of APSA Members Voting	Number of Political Scientists		
			Min.	Median	Max.
Alaska	4	66	6.02	6.06	6.11
Arkansas	9	40	22.25	22.50	22.78
Delaware	24	70	34.09	34.29	34.53
Idaho	12	54	22.06	22.22	22.43
Montana	16	66	24.10	24.24	24.43
Nevada	14	53	26.22	26.42	26.67
New Hampshire	38	80	47.27	47.50	47.79
North Dakota	19	98	19.31	19.39	19.49
. . . etc.					

Source: Columns 1-2, *P.S., loc. cit.*; columns 3-5 my calculations with aid of logarithmic table and long division.

be felt not just in political science but in demography, biology, and astrophysics.

Let no one sneer that quantitative social science confirms the obvious. Who would have guessed that there were 6-1/16 political scientists in Alaska, 22¼ in Idaho, and as many as 34⅓ in Delaware? The first censuses, taken by Swedish pastors the better to enforce the conscription laws of the Vasa kings, established the unimaginative habit of counting human beings as integers. More than two centuries later, a number of German professors such as Planck, Einstein, and Schrödinger adapted the same poor practice to the counting of photons, energy particles, and what not.

At long last your Antiquantum Revolution has established beyond the scintilla of a doubt the possibility, nay the functional necessity, of fractional human beings — or at any rate, fractional political scientists. To make sure that physicists and mathematicians will not again lag centuries behind, I have already arranged for your article to be reprinted in the September 1971 issue of the *Zeitschrift für Höhere Mathematik und Kabbalistik mit Besonderer Hinsicht auf Ihre Anwendungen in Subatomarer Physik*.

The second line of your table makes apparent the revolutionary nature of your findings. Four political scientists voted in Alaska so as to secure for that state a voting participation of 66%. How many political scientists were there, then, in Alaska? Not 6, for that would have made the percentage 66.6 (or, rounded, 67), and not 7, for that would have given 57.142857 (or, rounded, 57). And, a few lines down, how many were there in North Dakota, where 19 political scientists secured a precedent-shattering participation of 98%.

Back in my *Gymnasium* days, long before the invention of computers, we would have treated this as a problem of proportions, thus:

$$\text{Alaska} \quad x = \frac{4 \times 100}{66} = 6.06$$

$$\text{North Dakota} \quad x = \frac{19 \times 100}{98} = 19.39$$

Upon progressing to sliderules and logarithms (and reflecting that 66% might represent any fraction from 65.5 to 66.4%) we would have come up with a table such as the one above:

And if only our math teacher had had the benefit of Douglas Rae's writings, he might have had us calculate Indices of Maximum and Minimum Fractionality of Political Scientists, and correlate them with size of population and occidentality of states in the union.

The religion teacher, of course, would have frowned upon these proceedings and even nipped your neo-Einsteinian Antiquantum Revolution in the bud. Looking at your original article he would have demanded: "If the quantifiers have lost their math, wherewith shall we salt them?"

*PS* had better confound such sceptics once and for all by giving us full details on those half- and quarter-political scientists that seem to abound beyond Peoria, Illinois. Are they underpaid? Do they work part-time or commute in interstate commerce? Do they speak with quavering voice? Or are they half-dead with the fatigue of reading computer printouts?

**Dankwart A. Rustow**  
City University of New York (Brooklyn)

## To the Editor:

Two recent articles in the Winter 1971 issue were, I felt, really worthwhile reading experiences, and I wish to express my gratitude that you published them.

The first was by Robert G. Dixon, Jr. ("Who is Listening? Political Science Research in Public Law"). My reaction, very simply, was hooray! He has thrown down the gauntlet to those who feel they are students of the law and I for one am going to try to do something. Specifically, I hope to do some research on differences in public response to school desegregation in the north and the south. If anyone else is working on this or has a proposal to do it in the works, I wish he would let me know so I can decide whether to pursue the work, and if so what ground to avoid.

The second article was the one by Gerald Benjamin, ("On Making Teaching 'U' "). (I am also aware of the "rejoinder" in the subsequent issue which I feel further supports Benjamin's argument rather than weakening it.) He has done a very sound job of pointing out how poorly graduate students are prepared for the responsibility of teaching. His proposals for reform are far less satisfactory, but they certainly offer a fruitful place to begin building an effective system of evaluation of instruction and training of future instructors. I am looking forward to a follow-up by him or others, particularly at conventions and in the departments.

**Stephen Herzog**  
Moorpark College

## To the Editor:

For several years I have felt the urge to emulate Tom Paine when he made "a few remarks on that much boasted constitution of England." Although "noble for the dark and slavish times in which it was erected," even the English constitution was imperfect. According to Paine, unravel its past and you find a cover for "two ancient tyrannies compounded with some new republican material." There is no tyranny hidden in the old or the proposed constitution of the Association. But there are hidden purposes, and the membership showed its wisdom while the Business Meeting proved its value in rejecting a new constitution that meant little more than "no more Caucuses."

Yet, the urge for some kind of change is probably very strong because, with Wilson, it has gotten to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one. The problem was with the particular constitution, not with the reform spirit itself.

When the organization and constitution of a learned society becomes so complex and the real purposes for change become deeply covert, it is time to close shop for a while and think about revolution. A sovereign state cannot do that, but actually a learned society not only can do it, it can carry out revolution without violence.

If the learned society has become a professional society, the constitution has to accommodate to this, or the professionalism has to be cast off. When a learned society has become an interest group, the constitution must also provide for that, or a decision has to be made not to be an interest group. When a professional society has become a service station, the constitution must also provide for that, or the society must decide whether to continue with the services.

The old arrangement and the new proposal reflect no such consideration of what the Association is and what it ought to be. The old constitution simply grew naturally to accommodate whatever existed, and the new constitution accepted all that and tried to find a way to be sure that no direct and open confrontation of these issues would ever take place.

To help dramatize the nature of the learned society in its pure, ideal-typical sense, let me propose what a constitution for a learned society could actually look like.

The constitution for the American Political Science Association would begin with a preamble that defined itself purely as a learned society, existing to foster the study of the subject of political science. Virtually all of the rest of the constitution would be a list of *expressly* delegated powers.

The Association shall have power

- (1) to compile and maintain an up-to-date list of members, classified according to status, age, etc.;
- (2) to hold one Meeting per year;
- (3) to publish one official Journal and to encourage the publication of one or more specialized journals;

(4) to publish a Biographical Directory every five years;

(5) to provide assistance before the AAUP and, if necessary, the courts, in cases of alleged infringement of academic freedom;

(6) and, at a Business Meeting, to be held in conjunction with the annual Meeting, to make all "laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers," provided however that no law or resolution be considered at the Business Meeting that has not been presented at least one month before to a duly elected Council of the Association.

Since this proposal is made primarily to illustrate the point that a good constitution for a real learned society would be very easy to make and to run, many structural details have not been attended to. But I don't think there needs to be any doubt that a proper concept of the Association does not require fancy constitutions or Lilliputian politics.

**Theodore J. Lowi**  
University of Chicago

## To the Editor:

On page 41 of the official program of the recent 67th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association appears the listing of a paper by Sanford V. Levinson of Stanford University entitled, "Fucking v. Making Love: The Problem of Political Education."

I find this kind of language wholly indefensible at a scholarly convention which would hopefully pride itself on the pursuit of excellence, civility, and the life of the mind. This is the hallmark of the anti-intellectual. At best it is crude and callow (it doesn't even have the merit of titillating), but more importantly it is obviously calculated for shock effect and thereby inhibits rather than facilitates reasoned discourse and civilized inquiry.

I think the membership of our Association is entitled to an official explanation from our officers.

Moreover, I think it appropriate to wonder aloud why it is that in scheduling programs at our annual Conventions the Conference for Democratic Politics should encounter resistance from certain

quarters in the Association's leadership. This resistance is particularly disconcerting in view of the fact that the Conference's programs uniformly reflect scholarship and civility, while other groups, such as Levinson might represent, seem to encounter a permissive national leadership, which remains passive even in the face of undeniable obscenities.

**John P. East**  
East Carolina University

## To the Editor:

In the Summer, 1971 issues of *PS*, Charles L. Taylor and Gordon Tullock, "The 1970 APSA Elections" wrote the "official" APSA interpretation of the 1970 APSA election results. Unfortunately the article contained factual errors and erroneous statistical assumptions and interpretations which shortchange the letter and spirit of scientific investigation to which the Associational officers have committed themselves and the APSA resources. It is in the spirit of scientific investigation that I wish to set the record straight.

On page 352 the authors refer to the "electoral literature" of the Caucus. The Caucus, however, had no campaign literature. The only partisan literature aside from the Committee for a Responsible (sic) Political Science and the Ad Hoc committee was distributed by one of the Caucus candidates at the candidate's expense. It is for this reason that the literature did not mention Victoria Schuck's Caucus endorsement or any other Caucus candidate.

On the same page the authors point out correctly that the Caucus endorsement of Miss Schuck did not appear on the ballot. The authors incorrectly imply that the Caucus did not want our endorsement publicly known. The members of the Caucus Executive Committee assumed that since Victoria Schuck and the Women's Caucus had actively sought her endorsement by the Caucus for a New Political Science that she would refer to the Caucus endorsement in her personal campaign statement. Moreover, since the APSA Executive Council and Election Committee were told at the Business Meeting in which the nominations were made that Miss Schuck had the Caucus endorsement, it was assumed that the endorsement would appear on the ballot. Why the endorsement did not appear on the ballot is a question which

must be directed to Victoria Schuck and the APSA Election Committee.

In their text and in the figures presented in Tables 2-4 the authors discuss straight Caucus ticket voting on the basis of the false assumption that the Schuck endorsement was known to all potential Caucus supporters. Since this was not the case, the best statistical interpretation of straight slate voting would have eliminated the voting on vice president because of the ambiguity of the endorsement situation for the Caucus. The next best statistical assumption would have been to limit the definition of straight Caucus voting to the 13 to 14 openings from which the Caucus endorsement appeared on the ballot. The third best assumption is to take the weaker definition of a straight Caucus ticket described and rejected by the authors in a footnote to Table 2. The fourth assumption which the authors parade as the best was to ignore the ambiguity of the Schuck endorsement and treat her vote as part of straight ticket voting. At the very least the authors should have presented data for the three stronger assumptions which they ignored.

In footnote 5 the authors imply that the 569 votes given to Victoria Schuck deprived David Spitz of victory in the vice presidential elections. Given the simplicity of running a cross-tabulation between their voting support, it is surprising the authors offer no data to support this dubious assumption. In point of fact, it is more reasonable to assume that most of the straight Caucus vote for Schuck would also have gone to Spitz.

Finally, the authors suggest that Caucus voters have a "sexual prejudice" which predisposes them to vote for a woman under any circumstances (P. 352). No data is offered to support this hypothesis, but the forthcoming 1971 APSA elections should provide at least a partial empirical test of the assertion. The disturbing aspect of the assertion, however, is that the authors do not suggest the equally plausible hypothesis of male prejudice on the part of the Ad Hoc and APSA supporters. The authors would have done well to heed their own advice about the limitations of the data (P. 349) and avoided one sided speculations about the motives behind raw voting statistics.

**Edward Malecki**  
California State College, Los Angeles

## To the Editor:

We are indeed glad that the only objection which has been raised against our analysis is that the classification of voters for Victoria Schuck was improper. As made clear in our article, this is a most difficult problem and we could hardly argue with great force that our method of dealing with it was eternally right. Indeed, we did *not* so argue, and ended our discussion, "The matter cannot be said to be settled, however, and we have dealt with it by various devices in the other tables" (354). In Tables 2 through 4, we followed the practice of Professor Malecki ("Letter to the Editor," *P.S.* [Winter 1971], p. 96) in listing Schuck as a Caucus candidate. We differed from Malecki's treatment in his letter in that our footnotes to each of these tables indicated the practice was questionable. Nevertheless, we were rather surprised to find that the Malecki-Taylor-Tulloch method of classification is now objectionable to Malecki. We ourselves were not particularly enthusiastic about this classification and, therefore, put a good deal of data for other classifications in our article.

The second paragraph of Malecki's letter is distinctly misleading. Each of the groups nominating candidates for the APSA election was given the opportunity to provide a statement which was mailed out to the members with the ballot. Since the Caucus had complete control over what was said in this statement and since Malecki assures us that not all potential Caucus supporters knew of the Schuck endorsement, it surely would have been sensible to mention it. According to the statement, the Caucus has a "commitment . . . to responsiveness" and "responsiveness requires transparent procedures . . ." At the very least, the Caucus' procedures on this matter were not transparent.

We are sorry Malecki was upset by our little joke about sexual prejudices. We are also sorry that he is disturbed by our failure to canvass the "equally plausible hypothesis of male prejudice on the part of Ad Hoc and APSA supporters." An inspection of Tables 5 and 6 should convince even the most dire Caucasoid that the evidence for "male prejudice" is not especially greater for Ad Hoc voters than it is for Caucus voters.

**Charles L. Taylor**  
**Gordon Tullock**  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
and State University

## To the Editor:

I believe many of your readers would want to know that the Caucus For A New Political Science, although it has been excluded from participation in the official program of our annual meetings, nevertheless is alive and well, and expects to continue to grow.

Apart from nominating a full slate for the elective offices of the APSA (and you will know about that from the election ballots; but note that, apparently due to a clerical error, Judith Stiehm was wrongly listed as our nominee for Secretary, instead of Judith V. May), members and friends of the Caucus took part in a Caucus program of about a dozen panel discussions dealing with some of the most pressing issues of our time. Also, we had a number of business meetings, and I would like to report here, with extreme brevity, on certain major decisions and issues.

Prior to the election of our new Executive Committee, Joel Edelstein (Wisconsin: Green Bay), Benjamin Smith (SUNY: College at Cortland) and I were elected to prepare for a Program for the 1971 APSA meetings in Washington. Subsequently, Craig Peper, NASA; home address: 515 Seward Square, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003) was elected editor of the Caucus Newsletter, and William Hellert (1011 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002) was elected Membership Chairman/Treasurer. In addition to the five referred to so far (and I was elected Caucus Chairman), our Executive Committee consists of the following: Charles Fox (Claremont), Gerald Houseman (Indiana: Fort Wayne), Judson James (CUNY: City College), Ed Malecki (California State College: Los Angeles), Justine Mann (Georgia Southern College), James Petras (Pennsylvania State University), Jeffry Radell (Western Illinois University), Stephen Sacks (Indiana — Purdue: Indianapolis), and Philippa Strum (Rutgers).

The Caucus is not wealthy, and it was agreed that membership of the Executive Committee would entail an obligation to promote the Caucus on the local scene but no obligation to travel. Consequently, it was decided that a core group would be located in Washington, charged with (apart from keeping the files and issuing the newsletter) making preparations for a broader radical presence in the next annual meetings. The Executive Committee as a whole, as well as the

core group, was given the right to co-opt additional members.

Among the issues discussed in our business meetings were: employment discrimination against radicals in the profession, and possible counter measures; the possibility of militant confrontations in Washington if the APSA establishment should prove unwilling to provide reasonable facilities for us; the relative advantages of doing political work inside and outside the framework of the APSA. These and other issues will be further ventilated in the Caucus Newsletter, and contributions of opinions are solicited. The first Newsletter will be published in late November.

Dues for 1972 will be \$6 for faculty (and other employed political scientists), and \$2 for students (and unemployed), and this includes payment for the Caucus Newsletter. If you are interested, write to Mr. William Hellert (1011 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002).

### **Christian Bay**

Chairman  
Caucus For A New Political Science

## To the Editor:

At the annual business meeting of the American Political Science Association in Chicago, September, 1971, the Women's Caucus for Political Science nominated Prof. Judith May for the office of Secretary. The Caucus for a New Political Science indicated its desire to leaders of the Women's Caucus that it would like to endorse the Women's Caucus candidate for this office rather than submitting its own nominee.

Through an error, Prof. Ed Malecki, speaking for the New Caucus at the nominating meeting, first nominated Prof. Judith Stiehm for the office. Several members of the Women's Caucus were present and one of them immediately informed Professor Malecki of the error. President Robert Lane noted the error and said that it would be corrected. A transcript of this exchange of statements is available for inspection.

The change was, however, not made in the official list of nominees. When Professor Stiehm received

notice of her candidacy in the mail, including a request for a biographical sketch and candidate's statement, she immediately returned the notice, together with a written statement that she was not a candidate.

There is no dispute with the Association regarding the fact that an error was made. President Eulau has confirmed this. The Women's Caucus is seeking a reballoting for the office of Secretary as the only fair way to correct the error. A reasonable choice could not be made by any voter under the circumstances since only a few members of the Women's Caucus for Political Science were aware that an error had been made, and the handful of APSA members who were present at the meeting.

The request for a reballoting for the office for Secretary with the correct nominees for the position listed should be answered affirmatively, immediately.

**Suzanne Cavanaugh**

Election Chairman,  
Women's Caucus for Political Science