

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor:

The growing discussion within the Association about its proper concerns as a professional organization, and about the proper activities of its officers, reveals an inadequacy in our internal processes of representation. Rather than deciding controversial questions in stormy sessions of the Annual Business Meeting, we should establish regular procedures which insure that the officers of the Association adequately represent the membership, in order that the actions of the officers receive fuller support. This calls for amendment of the Constitution of the Association. While such amendments should not be contemplated frivolously, we hope that a single set of changes, toward greater internal democracy and responsibility of the officers to the membership, will provide a representative structure that will satisfy the needs of the Association for many years. Such changes require ample deliberation and a broad consensus if they are to be adopted and to last. Our aim in this letter is to encourage such deliberation by stating certain general principles that a revised Constitution should meet.

The officers of the Association should be elected by mail ballot and there should be competing candidates for the offices to be filled. Mail ballots with competing candidates are used by the American Sociological Association, American Psychological Association, American Anthropological Association, and American Economic Association—though the Economic Association provides contests only for Vice-Presidents and Executive Committee, and not for President-Elect. With due regard to the excellent choices that have been made by the Nominating Committee in the past, we believe that genuine responsiveness to the membership requires both a competition between alternative candidates and the broader electorate that a mail ballot would provide.

The administrative staff of the Association should be fully responsible to officers elected by the membership. In this respect the Executive Director and the Managing Editor of the *Review* occupy anomalous positions: they are appointed by the Council, yet are now regular voting members of the Council and of its Executive Committee. The Chairman of the Program Committee, though only an annual appointee, occupies a similar position. We believe that appointive officers should have no

vote. Adequate responsiveness of the officers to the membership requires a clear distinction between elective and appointive officers, with major policy decisions lodged in the hands of elective officers.

We hope that our fellow members will reflect on these principles, and will embody them in a constitutional revision. We also believe that the proposal by Herzberg *et al.*, to have constitutional amendments submitted to mail ballot, is obviously in accord with the spirit of our proposal.

Duncan MacRae, Jr.
University of Chicago

Aaron Wildavsky
University of California, Berkeley

To the Editor:

The decision of the Executive Committee at the fall meeting, to accord the so-called "Carey group" authority to organize a series of panels for the 1969 annual meeting on the same basis as the "Caucus for a New Political Science," has given rise to a group which calls itself "The Conference for Democratic Politics" (CDP). We fully intend to hold twelve panels at the next annual meeting. To date we have been able to secure the services, in one capacity or another, of Charles S. Hyneman, John Roche, Richard Scammon, Frank Trager, Ernest van den Haag, M. J. C. Vile, Bertrand de Jouvenel and Karl Wittfogel. We have already received a limited amount of money so that we will be able to pay the expenses for foreign scholars who would like to participate in our activities. We hope to obtain more funds so that we can, on the same basis, invite other scholars from Africa, Asia, Latin America, Australia, and Europe for our future programs. The theme for our panels at New York is "The Future of Democratic Politics."

For obvious reasons we have had to move rapidly to organize these panels. As a consequence we have not been able to communicate with all members of the profession who share our views and who might want to help or participate in our efforts. Let me take this opportunity, then, to urge those of you who are interested in our organization and goals to contact me at the address below. At the New York convention we can meet with the goal of building a permanent and more broadly based

organization. My address is Department of Government, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 20007.

We do need and seek help.

George W. Carey
Georgetown University

To the Editor:

The recent appointments of both President Johnson and Vice-President Humphrey to academic positions in political science raise interesting questions both about the relationship of our discipline to government and about more abstract issues of standards and professional competence. We would like to discuss some of their implications.

First, let us consider the argument for the appointments. It would, we imagine, run something like this: The President and Vice-President of the United States are, by definition, men of rare distinction and attainment. As successful combatants in the wars of politics, they can bring to the academy insights about the political process that can complement the more abstract, and sometimes lifeless, analyses of the professional political scientist. Furthermore, to oppose their presence on the teaching faculty because of qualms about the morality of their positions and decisions in regard, say to the War in Vietnam would be to set up ideological tests for academic appointment that would challenge the basis of the liberal university.

Let it be said at the outset that this argument is persuasive—but not convincing. Its weaknesses stem not from its formal inconsistencies, but rather from the ideological bias of the actual appointments themselves. If one accepts the implications of the argument, then what reasons could be given against offering academic positions to, for example, Eldridge Cleaver, Stokely Carmichael, or Tom Hayden? Indeed, when Cleaver became the victim of political reprisals when it was suggested that he be the chief lecturer at a course at the University of California at Berkeley, political scientists were not notable for their quickness to defend his right to lecture—a defense that could have been based on the new insights into America's political structure that might be provided by listening to representatives of the dispossessed elements of our society. Why, to ask the questions frankly, are not Cleaver, and other young radicals, as qualified to teach the young as our President or Vice-President? And what likelihood is there that our great universities, such as Rice or Minnesota or

Texas, will tender such appointments? Indeed, to move back into the conventional political spectrum, why is Lyndon Johnson more qualified to join a department of political science—and give seminars for credit—than was Barry Goldwater, to whom no similar offers were made after 1964?

There might be two kinds of arguments made *against* the appointments. One might be strictly “professional”: Neither man has his Ph.D. A second strand would stress one's moral revulsion against the particular policies of the President and his associates as evidence of their unfitness to teach on a campus.

The willingness to appoint non-Ph.D.'s is, we think, healthy; the only question, again, is *which* non-Ph.D.'s are to be the beneficiaries of such departures from union-rules, and we question the extent to which the precedent will be applied to individuals other than top governmental or proto-governmental (e.g. Urban Coalition, Ford Foundation) officials whose opinions are in accord with liberal conventional wisdom.

The second raises a much more fundamental issue, one, indeed, that is so complex and emotionally loaded that intellectual clarity is especially important. Let us state at the outset that this is not a question of “tolerating” the expression of views on a campus which might be hostile to the policies being attacked or defended. A wide range of guest speakers, defending many points of view, is a *sine qua non* of the free university. Protests against the liberty of men to speak, especially if opportunity is provided for debate or questioning, indeed strikes at the heart of the civil libertarian tradition. What we are questioning, instead, is the hiring of such men to teach political science over an extended period. It is precisely because we take the vocation of the teacher of political science very seriously that we wonder what criteria are applied to the appointments of the men we are discussing. A similar question could be raised, incidentally, about the appointment of W. W. Rostow (albeit to the history and economics faculty); his academic credentials appear impeccable, but questions remain about the propriety of the linkages between governmental *decision-makers* and university departments. We stress the italicized word because it is crucial to differentiate between, for example, Mr. Rostow and Professor John Roche. Though the latter supported the Vietnam War, there is no evidence that he ever had any significant voice in any important decision of the Johnson Administration: no question is raised, therefore,

about the propriety of his reappointment to Brandeis. Mr. Rostow, on the other hand, was apparently one of the most important non-elected architects of a disastrous and inhumane War; moreover, presumably his understanding of the world—of “social science,” if you will—both mirrors and is mirrored by some of the American policies he fought so valiantly to adopt.

The point is that it takes little imagination to perceive that one of the principal roles of Messrs. Johnson, Humphrey, and Rostow, will be that of apologist for their own crucial decisions of the past decade. Any fidelity to the Weberian creed of a teacher’s detachment from the product of his analysis is absolutely demolished by the pretense that these individuals are fulfilling the traditional role of “teacher.” Let us admit that this point could be turned around, and it could be argued that Carmichael *et al.* would be similarly incapacitated. There would be some strength in this assertion.

But if Johnson, why not Carmichael? And if not Carmichael why Johnson? Again, all we can say is that our purpose is to initiate discussion, not to resolve in a single letter a host of issues which go to the core of the meaning of the University.

Sanford V. Levinson
David Kettler
John Champlin
Ohio State University

Martin Brownstein
Yale University

David Morris
Institute for Policy Studies

To the Editor:

The ostensible reasons for the decision to instruct the Council of the American Political Science Association to seek a meeting place other than Chicago in 1970 are without foundation. The profession of political science is practiced in Chicago with a freedom and vigor equal, I should think, to any place in the country, as the work and position of the president of the Association attests. Whatever the evils of Chicago, there is no responsible ground for thinking that they will interfere with the high work of an annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.

It appears to me that the real reason for the resolution was a desire to follow the intellectual crowd in making a political point and a

political protest. This behavior seems to me inappropriate, imprudent, and demeaning.

Please record my resignation from the American Political Science Association.

Herbert J. Storing
University of Chicago

To the Editor:

It is a commonplace that the government of private groups is rarely democratic. Typically, a self-perpetuating group of dignitaries controls the affairs of such organizations, with their control sustained by the relatively small investments made by most members or by the real or supposed imperatives of pursuing common objectives. The American Political Science Association has been no exception to this rule during most of its existence. At the last convention, however, the political life of that organization began to change: members previously inactive discovered that the organization commands values in which they have a legitimate interest, and the membership meeting was taken up with serious debate about serious questions. Instead of a few dutiful voters routinely approving the recommendations and nominations of the leadership, there were almost a thousand members, arguing and politicking. Since the officers were not prepared for a politics of controversy, inadequate use was made of standard parliamentary techniques for managing such situations. Nonetheless, many of us came away from the convention with a feeling that an important step had been taken towards the involvement and contest which are the hallmark of the democratic process.

In the letter and proposal published in the last issue of *P.S.*, however, Mr. Herzberg and his associates would have us understand that an extension of democracy within the Association in effect requires us to devitalize the annual membership meeting once again. They propose to submit to a plebiscite any constitutional amendment, any contested election, and any resolution or action opposed by twenty percent of those present. Professional courtesy obliges us to assume that these colleagues do not mean to manipulate us with misleading and simplistic invocations of a “broadened basis of participation”; but professional respect for their abilities makes it hard to believe that they do not recognize that a shift from a forum where debate takes place, coalitions form, active political involvement occurs to a forum where a dispersed membership (organized, if

at all, in hierarchical departments) responds to a mail inquiry will almost certainly re-establish the routine control historically monopolized by the notables on the Executive Committee. Or perhaps, since the issues raised at the last meeting and others like them are matters of high salience to a sizable and active proportion of the membership, the constitutional processes of the Association would be discredited and the politicking seen at future meetings would take new and perhaps less desirable forms.

There is a problem of democratization within the American Political Science Association. Funds must be found to bring members from impoverished schools to meetings; more time must be allowed for transacting business; procedures must be adapted to the facts of conflict; new ways must be found for using regional groupings and meetings; contested elections must be properly fought, with candidates asked to state their qualifications and their views on issues in dispute. The Caucus for a New Political Science hopes to present some proposals for moving in these directions, and it hopes that others will do the same. But the Gaullist recourse to plebiscite cannot be offered to the profession as some sort of signal extension of democratic participation. Someone ought to go through the textbooks and monographs published and sponsored by the well-regarded political scientists who somehow came to sign Mr. Herzberg's letter, in order to collect and publish their recorded judgements of such a simplistic conception of democracy. Someone probably will.

Let us welcome political life and political conflict. Let us come to the next convention prepared to debate these kinds of proposals, with a view to forging decisions which meet legitimate concerns without inhibiting creativity and innovation and change of direction. This process itself would be hampered by the kind of "advisory referendum" requested in the letter. Does not this commonplace observation too underline the inappropriateness of the plebiscite device as an instrument of democratic politics dealing with hard issues?

David Kettler
Ohio State University

To the Editor:

As a sociologist member of the APSA I read with some amusement the letters of Professors Lokken and Carey, *et al.*, concerning the "subversive" and "New Left" threats posed by the Caucus for a New Political Science (*P.S.*,

Fall, 1968). I think that they should be assured that the Caucus, with sociologists such as Pat Moynihan and Morris Janowitz on its Executive Committee, is henceforth quite unlikely seriously to disturb the status quo of the Association, much less express the views or implement the values of the "New Left."

Professors Lokken and Carey, *et al.*, would have a much better case if they were to object not to the ideological pretensions of the Caucus, but to the participation of notables who showed little or no concern for radical reform—social or professional—until, in the backwash of the failures of the Great Society, it became professionally profitable to do so.

Clearly, Gresham's Law, set into motion by opportunities for self-aggrandizement, has taken its toll of the Caucus. Critics of the right and center, if not the left, should relax and tend to the important business of building careers—through the Caucus, if necessary.

J. David Colfax
University of Connecticut

To the Editor:

My reactions to Mr. Lokken's letter (*P.S.*, Fall, 1968) about the subversive dangers of the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS) ranged from laughter to dismay but settled down as concern. Initially I appreciated the humor of Mr. Lokken, in effect threatening to burn his APSA card (" . . . I shall withdraw my membership.") and then concluding his impassioned discourse with a note about the importance of "scholarly detachment." But, on re-reading, I was struck by the near hysterical red baiting (e.g., the Caucus " . . . is a thinly disguised front for the 'New Left' radical activists who are trying to subvert and destroy . . . to undermine . . . and ultimately to subvert our political institutions.") that should not go unchallenged. Moreover, his letter was in such contrast to other material about the Caucus in the same issue and elsewhere * that I, never having attended a national meeting and knowing almost nothing about CNPS, felt need for more information. I am writing partly in reply to Mr. Lokken but mostly to pass along some data I have uncovered that may be of interest to others who, like me, are uninformed-but do not wish to be misinformed-about the Caucus.

* For a more objective but still interesting assessment of the "New Left" in academic associations see William A. Gamson, "Sociology's Children of Affluence," *The American Sociologist* (November, 1968), pp. 286-289.

CAUCUS FOR A NEW POLITICAL SCIENCE: 1968-69 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Ph. D. from</u>	<u>Now at</u>	<u>No. of public.</u>	<u>Interests</u>
CHAIRMAN:					
H. Mark Roeloffs	(45)	Oxford	(49) NYU	2	Theory/Philo.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:					
Alex Gottfried	(49)	Berkeley	(52) U. of Wash.	6	Contp. Pol. Syst.
Sanford Levinson	(27)	Harvard*	— Ohio State	1	Con. Law&Philo.
Charles A. McCoy	(48)	Boston U	(58) Lehigh	4	Theory/Philo.
Paul Minkoff	(no data)		SEEK		
David Morris	(no data)		IPS		
Marvin Surkin	(no data)		Manhattan C.C.		
Martin Brownstein	(26)	Yale*	— Yale	—	Contp. Pol. Syst.
Philip Green	(36)	Princeton	(65) Smith	6	Theory/Philo.
Morris Janowitz	(49)	Chicago	(48) Chicago	6+	Pol. Soc/Theory
David Kettler	(38)	Columbia	(60) Ohio St.	6	Theory/Philo.
Lewis Lipsitz	(30)	Yale	(64) UofNC	5	Theory/Philo.
Theodore Lowi	(37)	Yale	(61) Chicago	6+	Contp. Pol. Syst.
John McDermott	(not listed)				
D. Patrick Moynihan	(41)	Tufts	(61) Harvard	6+	Contp. Pol. Syst.
Michael Parenti	(35)	Yale	(62) Sarah Lawrence	6	Theory/Philo.
Joan Rothschild	(not listed)		City College		
Michael Walzer	(not listed)		Harvard		
Alan Wolfe	(26)	U of Penn	(67) SUNY-Old Westb		Contp. Pol. Syst.
Howard Zinn	(46)	Harvard	(58) Boston U.	4	Theory/Philo.

*Assumed to be in final stages

According to Mr. Lokken, it seems that the august American Political Science Association is on the verge of being destroyed from within by irresponsible, "Yippie" revolutionaries (almost, one feels, by the very same long-haired, dropout anarchists who "liberated" the Democratic convention). This raises a question about the professional academic character of the CNPS. Although data are not available on all those affiliated with the Caucus, Chairman H. Mark Roeloffs identified (in the same issue) members of the new CNPS Executive Committee. I therefore investigated the character of the leadership which may be indicative of a larger constituency.

From an examination of the backgrounds, positions, and achievements of the 14 (of a total of 20—70%) Executive Committee members listed in the recently published APSA *Biographical Directory*, they appear to be of high caliber and professional accomplishment. Interestingly enough, this "revolution" by no means excludes those over thirty: only four of the fourteen are under thirty, six are over forty. The average age is 38. If the typical Executive Committee man (there is but one

woman) is approaching middle age, he is also far from being a "dropout." Most of the older members, for example, list at least six publications while the younger, though relatively unpublished, show substantial potential with academic honors (Phi Beta Kappa, fellowships, etc.) at well known institutions (e.g., Harvard, Yale, Columbia and Princeton). Typically, members of the Executive Committee are from the leading political science departments in the country: Yale produced four, Harvard two, and Berkeley, Princeton, Columbia, and Chicago among others one each. Only two doctorates are from departments not generally ranked among the ten most prestigious. Finally, all of the leadership are post World War II doctorates and most of them define their professional interest as either political theory and philosophy or contemporary political systems (including one published poet).

In short, the Executive Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science displays imposing academic credentials. Its members seem to be of the caliber usually sought with great diligence by most departments of political science. Of course, the background of individual

members of a group or their collective accomplishments are not sufficient criteria for either judging or joining it. Nevertheless, in contrast to Mr. Lokken's blind accusations, it appears that the Caucus is composed of reputable, well trained, and probably well regarded political scientists.

In part, however, I agree with Mr. Lokken. The CNPS clearly would move the discipline in new directions. Personally, as a graduate student whose professional training at times seems either distant from or irrelevant to contemporary experience in my own politics, the more I discover about the Caucus, the more in favor of it I am. Whether or not one chooses to participate in CNPS depends on his knowledge and his values. I have attempted to provide some additional information about the Caucus. Yet in the last analysis the probability of one supporting it depends largely on his attitude toward change. To change is not automatically to "subvert," "undermine," and "destroy." As must be clear from Mr. Lokken's own work as a historian, to change may also mean to create, build, and improve.

James M. Elden
University of California, Los Angeles

To the Editor:

The following memorandum has been sent to President David Easton and the Executive Committee.

1. The events of 1967-68 should remind us that twenty years have elapsed since the Association terminated the virtually permanent tenure of the Secretary-Treasurer and the Managing Editor of the *Review*, authorized the establishment of a national office with a full-time Director, and provided for revision of our fifty year-old constitution. Since 1948 the membership has increased fourfold to over 16,000, with attendant shifts in interests, need and expectations. There has been an extraordinary development of national office programs, services and budgets. Within the profession, there has been a so-called behavioral revolution; a Caucus for a New Political Science has appeared. Resolutions have been submitted to successive annual meetings censuring and prescribing the conduct of officers and members. Two constitutional amendments have been adopted, modifying the official objectives of the Association. Now we face numerous proposals to change our methods of electing officers and taking action in the name of the entire organization. Clearly we are in the midst of

far-reaching changes. But it is one thing to recognize that the organization and procedures suitable for a small professional society in 1948 may not be adequate to deal with those of a far larger one in 1968. It is quite another matter to differentiate and identify the problems, to formulate and decide, from the variety of diagnoses and remedies proposed, relevant courses of action to the real issues faced by the Association.

2. Without trying to define such issues at this point, we offer the following list to indicate the range of policy changes that we have seen or heard advocated by two or more of our fellow-members and colleagues:

(i) Revision of present procedures for taking positions on public policy controversies as an Association

(ii) Redefining voting rights appropriate to different classes of members

(iii) "More open" nominating and electoral processes

(iv) Alternative modes of determining and expressing the ultimate constitutional authority of the Association, e.g., mail ballot referendum versus annual membership meeting

(v) Innovations in constructing program of annual meeting as a means of: (a) increasing volunteer participation, (b) increasing attention and discussion of public policy issues and value questions, (c) possibly including more panels to be made up from voluntarily submitted papers, whose value has been approved by a jury selected by the Program Committee.

(vi) Use Association funds to finance one or more additional professional journals as outlets for members' interests

(vii) Increasing members' knowledge of and involvement in the activities of the Association through personal and professional contacts, regional association meetings, and otherwise, to the end that increased awareness by the membership will assure that association programs do indeed reflect widely shared interests among the members provided by the national office.

(viii) Impact of federal government programs and policies upon political science research, research training, and responsibilities

(ix) Relations of private foundations to advancement of research, training, and teaching of political science, both in colleges and universities and in secondary schools.

(x) Responsibilities of the Association to set standards and in other ways seek improvement of teaching political science both at undergraduate college level and in high schools.

3. These issue and problems cover almost the entire functional operation of the Association and its national office. Several have been the object of scrutiny by Association committees, and most of them have been examined and re-evaluated from time to time over the years by the national officers and staff. To the best of our knowledge, however, they have been studied on an *ad hoc* basis, not as part of a systematic re-assessment of the political structure and governing processes of the Association. Nor has there been a deliberate, planned effort to ascertain the extent to which national office performance is related to the discontents of members over their opportunities to participate in Association affairs, their convictions about what the Association is and should be doing, or their feelings of being inadequately represented in the selection and control of its officers and staff. Finally, there has been at least since 1955-56 no explicit, formal examination of the possible and desired effects of alternative proposals for changing the Association's constitutional structure and policies controlling its official decisionmaking. We believe the issues summarized in the previous paragraph warrant the most serious investigation and responsible action, in the context of (a) membership needs and demands, (b) national office performance, (c) clear specification of desired effects as criteria for changes in the Association's political structure and functioning. *We propose careful analyses of these issues through study commissions appointed by the President and specially-convened sessions of the Council, such commissions to be broadly representative of the range of views within the Association, with the following suggested terms of reference and reporting schedules.*

4. *A Committee on Constitutional Revision.* We propose the creation of a Constitutional Revision Commission, not less than six months prior to the September, 1969 Annual Meeting, to consider and make recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Business Meeting on the first four Items in Paragraph 2, and such other matters relating to the political structure of the Association as the Commission deems necessary and appropriate. Proposed constitutional amendments now before the Executive Committee, or received while the Commission is at work, should be referred to it for study and recommendation. The Commission should be asked to make an interim report at the 1969 Annual Meeting, and to schedule a panel as part of the Program to hear and provide full discussion of its preliminary report

and to receive fresh ideas and suggestions from members. The Commission might follow the same procedure at the several regional association meetings before submitting its final report to the September, 1970, Meeting. Political scientists should not be satisfied with less than the most thorough study, consultation and deliberation in improving their constitutional structure and procedures governing their professional organization.

5. *Activation of the Oversight Function of the Council.* At present the Council of the Association is the only autonomous instrument available to the members to provide continuing appraisal and evaluation of the activities of the Association and its national office. We propose that the Council meet at least twice a year with the Executive Committee besides the Annual Meeting, and that the Council through specially-appointed (not standing) committees upon which non-Council members might be co-opted to serve should undertake serious appraisal of Association activities (including but not restricted to items v-vii in Paragraph 2), and report thereon to the full Council and Annual Business Meeting. To emphasize and heighten the salience of the Council's oversight function, we suggest that consideration be given to making the Chairman of the Council a separately-elected office other than the President of the Association.

6. *Leadership in Professional Development.* Notwithstanding the excellent informational values of P.S., we believe that the Association should take more effective steps to focus its members' attention upon the examination of central issues concerning the development of political science as a profession. Items viii-x in Paragraph 2 raise three or four such issues, particularly federal government support of research and research training, the continuing role of private foundations in funding both research and the improvement of teaching, and the standards-setting and other responsibilities of the Association in the advancement of teaching political processes and institutions at secondary school and undergraduate levels. We propose that the Association assert its leadership role in professional development by establishing one or more blue-ribbon commissions of inquiry, composed of non-Council and non-officer members of the Association, to report to the Council and the membership as early as may be feasible their findings and recommendations for action on these problem-areas.

7. In conclusion, we submit that our proposals are responsive to the situation and to the

critics of the Association both among older and younger members. Such steps would help to ensure continued vitality in the American Political Science Association, and renew confidence among our members that their professional organization is indeed committed to maintaining its relevance to the problems of contemporary society.

Frederic N. Cleaveland
University of North Carolina
Manning J. Dauer
University of Florida
Avery Leiserson
Vanderbilt University

To the Editor:

I would like to respond to the various allegations directed against the Caucus for a New Political Science which appeared in the fall 1968 issue of *P.S.*

1. Professor Ithiel de Sola Pool seems to imply that the Caucus was responsible for both the careless wording of a resolution concerning the activities of APSA officers and "a mass of poorly-framed and ill-coordinated resolutions" (presumably the ones on Chicago). He concludes: "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." But if Professor Pool were better informed he would not charge the Caucus with responsibilities it did not assume. The Caucus did not sponsor any of the resolutions on Chicago nor the resolution enjoining covert activities by APSA members. These various proposals were submitted by persons acting as individual members of the APSA, some of whom happened to be, and some of whom happened *not* to be, members of the Caucus. Professor Pool can be assured that when the Caucus takes it upon itself to sponsor a resolution it will not submit six competing ones on the very same subject. (The Caucus did propose an amendment to the APSA Constitution committing the Association to the encouragement of research on significant political problems. That amendment won the favorable recommendation of the APSA Council and was passed by the membership.)

2. If Professor Pool chastizes us for our bungling ways, Professor Roy Lokken condemns the Caucus for its diabolic efficiency and for the danger it poses to the APSA and the USA. While never quite calling us "Communists" he does say that we use the Caucus as a "thinly disguised front" in order to "subvert and destroy our educational and scholarly

institutions, to undermine the structure of our society, and, ultimately, to subvert our political institutions." I shall withhold my expressions of gratitude to Professor Lokken for having alerted us to the Menace within until such day as he produces the evidence that will allow us to share his perception of the conspiratorial enormities he conjures. Meanwhile, he would serve himself well by exercising more care in his public accusations.

3. Despite its brevity, the letter submitted by Professor George Carey and his associates is not wanting in inaccuracies and misrepresentations. After accusing the entire profession of suffering from a "blatant and self-serving left wing bias" Carey *et al.* go on to charge that the 500-member Caucus is composed of "thoroughly spoiled children" who are being "pampered" by the present APSA leadership. They assert that the Caucus has "twelve panels of its very own" (we have ten), and that the Caucus will control roughly 30% of the 1969 panels because two Caucus members are also APSA panel section chairmen; (faulty arithmetic aside, those panel sections are not staffed or organized by the Caucus and have nothing to do with our program). Other misrepresentations in the Carey letter include statements about the number of people attending the 1968 Caucus business meeting, the theme of the 1969 Caucus program, the intentions and objectives of the Caucus, and the Caucus proposals in regard to the *Review*. There are also irresponsible and unsubstantiated references to the way the Caucus "bullies" the Association leadership and "clearly seeks to intimidate the profession"—and so forth.

If our critics are genuinely interested in maintaining responsible and professional standards of discourse within the Association they can best further that goal by refraining from writing the kinds of letters that have been appearing in *P.S.*

In the hope that accurate information is the best antidote to malice and stereotypy, I ask the growing numbers of political scientists who evince a positive interest in the Caucus and the others who are still trying to make up their minds to consider the following propositions. (As is the fashion, these statements should be treated as hypotheses to be tested by direct observation and participation.)

The Caucus is heterogeneous in scholarly orientation. Many vary from old-line traditionalists and classical theorists to hard-core quantifiers and methodologists. Some want to see less computer-type research, but almost all—judging from the comments made at the last

caucus business meeting—want to maintain systematic and scientific modes of inquiry within the discipline. What seems to unite all Caucus members, to the extent they are united on any questions, is: a desire to redirect scholarly research toward vital and fundamental political issues, a desire to engage in, rather than flee from, relevant political discourse and controversy, and a desire to examine the implicit operational values of our science, our Association, our profession and, indeed, our society.

The Caucus is politically heterogeneous. Members range from liberal to radical with all the various shades inclusive—a wider political variety than is usually found within the APSA leadership. Generally our orientation is away from many of the models and values of present-day political conformity and toward areas of political protest, challenge and reconstruction, a fact which may explain why conservatives and right-wingers are absent from our ranks.

The Caucus is interested in political science scholarship. This would seem a superfluous assertion since its members are composed exclusively of political science scholars. Yet the irresponsible charge that the Caucus seeks to undermine standards of scholarship should be laid to rest. The Caucus panels have offered papers and discussions of high quality, as many will testify. That these panels also frequently prove to be lively and interesting does not make them any less scholarly.

The Caucus is democratic. Unlike the larger Association, it holds contested elections for its offices. At our last meeting almost 40 candidates ran for 21 executive seats, each candidate stating his position on various issues concerning the profession. No member can be elected for more than two consecutive years to the executive committee.

It is my hope that we are witnessing the beginning of an exciting period of growth and change within the social science professions. Orthodoxy is giving way to heterodoxy, and service to the establishment is no longer taken as the only order of the day. Many of us welcome the new developments; we invite our colleagues to join us.

Michael Parenti
Yale University

To the Editor:

The last issue of *P.S.* contained a series of letters criticizing the Caucus for a New Political Science. I feel that a response to those criticisms is necessary for at least two reasons. First, the Caucus appears to be focusing atten-

tion within the discipline on such major political issues as racial and ethnic group politics; second, they are questioning the panglossian kind of satisfaction with the American political system, which has been the characteristic position of most political scientists.

In relation to the first of these two concerns, what is most disturbing about the traditional political science approach is the lack of attention toward minority group politics. At the same time we have been neglecting this important domestic problem, sociologists and anthropologists have been engaging in highly productive research and teaching in this area (for a useful review of the teaching programs, see Rose, Peter, *The Subject is Race*, Oxford, 1968). For 15 to 20 years sociologists have offered courses in race relations; how many political science department offer a similar course today? We do at Moorpark College and require it of all law enforcement majors. I received no similar course in my own graduate training at UCLA, and know of no school which yet offers such a program. Similarly, when I presented as a dissertation topic, "Police-Negro Relations in Los Angeles", I was advised that such a topic was more appropriate to sociology. That type of attitude is being attacked by the caucus, and I personally applaud them.

The same type of attack seems necessary on the second point. The position taken by the overwhelming majority of political scientists has been to claim objectivity and neutrality in behavioral studies of American politics, while they in reality have been supporting a pluralism à la Galbraith's countervailing powers theory. They have said what is, is right—*viz.* Dahl's *defense* of community power distribution against Hunter *et al.* and the voting studies people defending non-voting as a natural division of labor in society. Neither group *admits* a value orientation, but claims neutrality in their panglossian defense of the status quo. The pseudo-scientific sterility of many of the behaviorists has not been identified and attacked as effectively as the caucus is doing now. As a theorist dedicated to an Aristotelian model of politics as the highest art in society, I look forward to more and more challenges to the current drift of our discipline by the caucus and others. They are making the behaviorists recognize that they are making important judgments about political and social relations, and that they must continue to make these judgments openly and honestly.

Stephen T. Herzog
Moorpark College