

Communications

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

This is the fifth year that I've monitored the sex participation balance at our annual meetings (see my letters in *PS*, Fall, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975). I am pleased to report that 1976 was the most favorable reading to date:

Year	Chairpersons	Paper Givers and Workshop Participants	Discussants
1976	19.0% (24/126)	13.6% (65/477)	18.2% (31/170)
1975	10.6%	12.3%	9.8%
1974	12.2%	13.4%	10.0%
1973	11.8%	11.2%	13.6%
1972	5.7%	11.4%	12.1%

As was true in previous years, there were areas of strength and of weakness. Where women were in a position (as panel and section chairpersons) to select participants, other women were more apt to be selected. The four (out of 18) sections chaired by women had women as 28% of their paper givers and 12.5% of the discussants. The 25 panels headed by women had women as 27% of the paper givers and 35% of the discussants.

Some topics could predictably be counted on to display female talent. The Roundtable on the Equal Rights Amendment had 100% female participation as had the panel on Women and Politics in Comparative Perspective. It was probably the vantage point of a woman as chairperson which resulted in other women being given a predominant position in the panel on Worker Participation and Development and near parity on the panel on State Political Institutions.

The Stag Prize for 1976 is shared by the section on Challenges to the Rule of Law in the United States (practically a total female shutout: 0 women out of 6 chairpersons, 1 in 20 paper givers, 0 out of 6 discussants), though the section on Epistemology and Methodology did little better (0 in 7, 3 out of 25, 1 in 6), and the panels on Scientific Studies in International Relations (1 female papergiver, part of a 3-member team, out of 10 paper givers and a female as the lone discussant) and The Chinese Model and the Third World (0 in 10 papergivers, plus a lone male discussant).

The section on Political Behavior relegated women to a handmaiden role—not a single chairperson in its 8 panels, a solitary female papergiver (again part of a 3-person team)

among 15 papergivers, but 7 out of the 21 discussants.

Despite some efforts to desexregate the evening plenary sessions, the three evenings each displayed three males as the featured performers. The Program Committee will have to try harder next year.

The improved showing in 1976 shouldn't lead to complacency. As reported in *PS* in the Summer, 1976, issue, though women are 11% of fulltime faculties (and 18% of parttime faculty members), they were 16% of those receiving Ph.D.'s in 1975 and 24% of those enrolled in a Ph.D. program in Fall, 1975). There's still some distance to go before this observer will conclude that he's reached the point of diminishing usefulness for his annual tabulations.

Martin Gruberg
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

To the Editor:

The distinguished editor of the American Political Science Review has informed me that one fragment of "Political Science Isn't as Political Science Does" does not meet the exacting criteria for objectivity and accuracy maintained by the *Review*. My article stated that all members of the *APSR* Editorial Board were academics. One member, previously on the faculty of M.I.T., was not employed at the time the article was written. This factual mishap, however, does not impair the conclusions drawn about the exclusion of non-academics from APSA positions.

Non academically,

Allen Schick
Congressional Research Service
The Library of Congress

To the Editor:

Now that Heinz Eulau has informed the American Political Science Association through the pages of *PS* that he would not be at the 1976 convention in Chicago, may this opportunity be taken to reveal that a very loosely-structured survey centered on that published absence was carried out amidst the conventioners gathered at the Palmer House? Unfortunately, much of the survey effort got soiled and was almost damaged beyond use when a rather behaviorally-oriented waiter at Trader Vic's spilled a tray of Tiki Puku Pukus and Pino Pepes, but some information has survived which can be passed on to the profession.

One respondent, for example, said that he really did not care about Eulau's absence in Chicago but wondered whether Eulau would be present at the Tractor Pull at the Nebraska State Fair. Another pondered whether Eulau would be writing next to tell us all what he did in England. Yet another is reported to have said that Eulau's absence did not bother him as much as would have Preston Dexterion Collingswoode's. One woman just laughed when approached in the Palmer House lobby, saying she did not know Heinz Eulau from Heinz 57 and was simply resting her feet inasmuch as she was in the city shopping only for the day, soon to return home to Hammond, Indiana. An obviously heavily-tenured Ivy Leaguer replied with a query on whatever happened to the Heinz of *The Behavioral Persuasion in Politics* wherein Eulau had written: "New ways of saying and doing things have always tempted some and terrified others." Still another political scientist offered that at the Stanford Dutch Treat Cocktail party no one seemed to be much interested in anyone's absence, but allegedly a small tankard-lifting chorus was said to have been heard singing: "Heinz, Zwi, Drei, Vier, lift your stein to the One not here." There was no confirmation as to whether this was in reference to the self-publicized absentee.

Wherever Eulau was, others were in Chicago—even some who appeared not to be as outraged as Eulau at having been listed in the alternate program as compared to the regular sequence. Among those in the alternate program one found listed: Samuel P. Huntington, Seymour Martin Lipset, Aaron B. Wildavsky, James Q. Wilson, Austin Ranney, Nelson W. Polsby, William H. Riker, Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr. and others, to say nothing of Harold D. Lasswell. One hopes they were not as outraged as Eulau.

Surely change in APSA convention format can be suggested in *PS* columns without the temperament, elitism, ego, *chutzpah*, and Mickey Mouse to which we had been exposed.

James S. Pacy
University of Vermont

To the Editor:

In a letter to now President Sam Beer dated July 8, 1976, I requested that the Council "adopt a policy of holding conventions *only* in Equal Rights States." The wording of my proposal was altered when it was considered by the Council and later at the Association's business meeting. One modification made it possible to meet in Washington, D.C. That seems reasonable to me since the District has no opportunity to ratify the ERA. However, a second modification was made and I would never have consented to the change if I had been consulted. Moreover, I *did* make myself available for consultation only ten days before the convention began.

That change provides that the policy will hold only so long as the period provided for ratification, i.e., to March 1979. Thus, the APSA would in effect, take *no* action since the 1977 convention will be in Washington, the 1978 convention in New York (ratified), and the 1979 convention *could still be held* in an unratified Illinois in September.

I am demeaned when my equal rights are even made the subject of a vote. To be voted against is intolerable. A professional organization should not ask its members to come to a state which denies their equality in order to participate in that profession's meetings. Now is the time to start looking for another 1979 site or to formally tell women political scientists that their participation in the Association is contingent upon their putting themselves in a jurisdiction which does not consider them legal equals.

If Minneapolis is good enough for Mary Tyler Moore it should be good enough for the APSA!

Judith Stiehme
University of Southern California

PS welcomes material for its sections. Deadlines are: Fall—August 15; Winter—December 15; Spring—February 15; and Summer—May 15.

Your cooperation in listing items for the news and notes section in the appropriate format as used in *PS* will be appreciated.