

Letters to the Editor

Women Gain

To the Editor:

Once more I present my tabulation of participation by women in the annual meeting of the Association. In a number of ways the results were an improvement over the 1981 convention. I had reason to expect this inasmuch as the Program Chair was female as were five of her 19 section organizers. (One factor conducive to representation of women on the programs has been the presence of other women as section heads and chairpersons.) However, the results were not as stellar as might have been hoped.

Women had their best showing in the sections dealing with Legislative Politics, Judicial Process and Public Law, Public Opinion and Political Psychology, Politics of Gender, Race, and Ethnicity, and Political Science as a Profession. They were frozen out completely from the section on Empirical Theory and Research Methods.

The five sections headed by women had other women as 25.6 percent of the chairs, 23.3 percent of the paper givers, and 19.6 percent of the discussants (down from last year's figures of 30.8

percent, 27.4 percent, and 17.4 percent respectively). Where women chaired panels other women were 43.0 percent of the paper givers and 20 percent of the discussants (cf. 31.7 percent and 25 percent in 1981).

As for some panels which were lopsidedly stag: Public Policy and Egalitarianism (sic), A Renaissance of Ideological Politics?, Dissent and Protest, Franchise Expansion, Partisan Mobilization and Regime Transformation, Congressional Committees, Roundtable on Judicial Conflict and Consensus, and Longitudinal Models of Courts, Law and Judicial Behavior.

Women were somewhat more conspicuous in the panels sponsored by the unaffiliated groups than in the official program: 20.1 percent of the chairpersons, 19.5 percent of the paper givers, and 17.9 percent of the discussants. Their best showing, as expected, was in panels sponsored by the Caucus for a New Political Science and the Women's Caucus.

Martin Gruberg
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

Year	Section Heads			Chairpersons		
	Total	Women	%	Total	Women	%
1982	19	5	26.3	163	22	13.5
1981	16	3	18.8	137	16	11.7
1980	18	3	16.7	139	29	20.9
1979	16	4	25.0	129	23	18.0

Year	Paper Givers			Discussants		
	Total	Women	%	Total	Women	%
1982	557	109	19.6	184	28	15.2
1981	520	98	18.8	161	28	17.4
1980	453	99	21.9	160	19	11.9
1979	525	77	14.7	184	35	16.7
1978	500	99	19.8	204	30	14.7

Small Print

To the Editor:

This letter contains a major proposal for expanding attendance at the Association's annual meeting. The proposal, quite simply, is to double the size of the lettering on the nametags distributed to registrants at the meeting. The beneficiaries of this change will be the elderly, the short-sighted, and those who wear bifocals. There are many afflicted members who now stay home because they are unable to read the tags and do not want to be embarrassed when they see someone they think they know but are unable to read their nametags. Let me tell you a true story about this problem.

At the Denver meeting I came back to the hotel about 10:30 p.m. on Friday. The lobby was well-lighted. I looked around and spotted Chuck Jones and went up to talk to him. I wasn't quite sure it was Chuck, so I said "Hi, Chuck," *sotto voce*. He said something that sounded like a muffled "Hi, Bill," though I couldn't be sure. Nevertheless, I concluded this was indeed Chuck, even though I could not read the name on his tag. I noticed that he kept stealing glances, trying to read my tag as well. In any case, we stood there and talked until 3:00 a.m., and all the time I thought I was talking to Chuck. The longer we talked, the more certain I became that it was Chuck. Because of our long friendship, I told him some of my innermost thoughts, and he confided in me even more. You can't believe what he told me. What is more, he trotted out one theory after another that would make your hair stand on end. In fact, we exchanged theories, any one of which properly fleshed out, would win the Woodrow Wilson Award.

Yet, truthfully, I was vaguely uneasy, and every now and then when he would say something that didn't sound like Chuck, I would steal another glance at his nametag; but I could never make it out. He would do the same, cocking his head, leaning over, tilting his glasses, trying to read the name on my tag. At times we were so active in trying to read each other's tag that it was almost as if we were dancing.

Will you try to imagine my chagrin when around 3:00 a.m. Nelson Polsby came in, walked over and, looking at Chuck, said "Hi, Bob"? While "Chuck" was looking at Nelson I edged to within an inch or two of "Chuck's" nametag and read it. It said "Robert Peabody." While I was apologizing for having mistaken him, he said, "That's okay, Heinz." For nearly five hours, I then learned, he had thought he was talking to Heinz Eulau. I suppose this was a natural mistake, because I had been laying one parameter-busting theory after another on him, but it was still a mistake.

Do you see the problem that your small-type nametags is creating? There were probably several thousand such incidents at the Denver meeting. As for me, I have no idea of who any of the people were I was talking to there, except for one person who may have been a member of the Pitt Department. I couldn't read his tag either, but he kept chanting "We're No. 1, "We're No. 1" as he tried to throw crack-back blocks on people walking by. I suppose he was from Pitt.

In any case, a lot of us are going to be counting on this macro-type proposal being put before the Council. And if it is adopted, attendance at the annual meeting should jump by about 25 percent.

William J. Keefe
University of Pittsburgh

Should the Caucus Form an APSA Section?

Readers who see the "six questions" on the status of the Caucus for a New Political Science in the article in this issue which deals with the establishment of official Sections within APSA, may be aided by the following explanatory comments.

From extensive discussions we have had with APSA Executive Director Thomas Mann, the following points can be made. CNPS should decide to continue what it presently does, i.e., present panels each year under the APSA courtesy listing of "unaffiliated groups." However, in the future (once the section system is set

Letters

up), the priority for having panels will go to (a) APSA's regular panels and (b) the various sections. These categories, as presently envisioned, will have no limits on the number of panels they can present. However, this opportunity will be limited with respect to what will then be a third category, (c) unaffiliated groups. Such limitation will occur if and whenever space problems become so great that rooms are not available to accommodate everybody.

At and especially between the meetings in Denver, conflicting views were expressed from people important to the Caucus over a proposal to encourage the formation of a Socialist Feminist section. Some were clearly uneasy with Socialist Feminism for a variety of reasons; others were equally at odds with a counter-proposal which advocated using only the word socialism in the Section title. Once again, as so often in the past in Caucus history, one felt the full force of factionalism. Therefore it seems wiser, and perhaps more inclusive and effective in the long run, to opt for socialism *and* feminism as a generalized rubric within which the dialogue (or conflict!) can go on.

My opinion on whether or not to form a Section has gone up and down; and then up again, as the details of what APSA has in mind became more clear. I think that on balance this is a workable arrangement, that the Caucus will not be disadvantaged by it (will not be "swallowed up" by APSA) and may indeed gain from it. It can help the Caucus' own professed intention to help invigorate and transform APSA and the discipline through a continuing process of debate. It could effectively complement traditional activities of the Caucus qua Caucus and complement the critical voice of *New Political Science*.

John Rensenbrink
Bowdoin College

Microcomputers

I am interested in finding out about micro-computer applications in research and teaching in such areas as American government, formal models, political

behavior, and research methods. In particular, I would like to know about micro-computer labs. Additionally, I might be interested in collaborating in applications for the Apple.

Herb Weisberg
Ohio State University

More Ukrainian Addresses

Please be informed of the enclosed addresses that have been changed since they were published in the Summer edition of *PS*, 1982, p. 478. Also, please note the additional sources on Ukraine. Hence, a total of five changes are noted:

Changes

Smoloskyp Publishing House, P.O. Box 561, Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Digest of Soviet Ukrainian Press, Sucasnist-Prolog Research, 254 West 31st Street (15th floor), New York, New York 10001

Additions

UNR—Library & Research Center, 1211 68th Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19126

Ukrainian Free University Foundation, 203 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10003

Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Smithsonian Institution Building, Room 320, Washington, D.C. 20560

Also, your readers who speak any of the Slavic languages, especially Ukrainian, may consider attending the Ukrainian Free University in Munich, West Germany during the summer months of July and August. This University is fully accredited by the ministry of higher education in Bavaria, West Germany. Course work specialization is in law, political science and Soviet economics; however, area study concentration is in Soviet and Ukrainian history and politics. Scholarships are available through: Ukrainian Free University Foundation, 203 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10003. *Please* note that the course work is taught in Ukrainian for those interested in graduate and post-graduate studies in political science. Anyone wishing more

information may write to the Foundation,
c/o Dr. P. Goy or myself.

P. Diachenko
Ukrainian Political Science Association
in the United States

CORRECTION

On page 440 of the summer issue, *PS* incorrectly identified the date of the most recent Virginia gubernatorial election. The correct year is 1981.