

To the Editor:

In a statement in the August 1969 issue of *P.S.*, Anthony King wrote: "If, as they claim, the members of the Caucus [for a New Political Science] want to create a new political science, they really ought to caucus less and write more." At a panel at the Association's September meeting, Robert Dahl expressed a similar sentiment, and even quoted Mr. King's admonition. At the same meeting, Karl Deutsch saw fit to compare the "loud and emotional" dissenters to the sober, scholarly empiricists.

I believe such views as expressed by Messrs. King, Dahl and Deutsch create a rather misleading and unfair impression. A moment's reflection would tell us that many of the most active members of the Caucus have made worthy contributions toward developing a new political science. One might consider: Henry Kariel's *The Decline of American Pluralism* and his *The Promise of Politics*; Theodore Lowi's *The End of Liberalism*; Charles McCoy's fine collection of critical analytic articles on behaviorism and pluralism entitled *Apolitical Politics* (co-edited with John Playford) including McCoy's own introductory essay; Christian Bay's *APSR* article "Politics and Pseudopolitics" reprinted in the McCoy reader; the essays by David Kettler and William Connolly in the latter's *The Bias of Liberalism*, also Connolly's *Political Science and Ideology*; Philip Green's article in the January 1968 issue of *World Politics* raises new critical questions about decision-making in foreign policy. A book edited by Green and Sanford Levinson, soon to appear, contains a number of articles written by Caucus members pointing to new directions in our discipline. James Petras has written, among his forty or fifty publications, one of the most telling critiques of American political science literature from what might be considered a Caucus viewpoint (also found in the McCoy reader). And a number of the more enthusiastically received papers presented at Caucus panels over the last two years — soon to appear in a volume edited by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe — should also be counted.

All of the above mentioned colleagues, of course, have published numerous works on various other subjects and all are Caucus activists. Connolly, Green, Kariel, Kettler, Levinson, Lowi, McCoy and Petras are, or were recently, members of the Caucus Executive Committee; and Bay heads the Caucus slate.

It might be added that certain of the recent writings of other Caucus supporters, such as Peter

Bachrach and Jack Walker on elites, Grant McConnell on interests groups, Edgar Litt on universities, Herbert Spiro on totalitarianism, Michael Lipsky on protest groups, also raise questions which are of concern to political scientists seeking relief from the prevailing orthodoxy. And I am sure I have failed to identify still other contributors to a new political science from among the Caucus ranks.

Admittedly, a call for a new political science does not produce an entire literature overnight. But even the early returns listed above represent a fairly impressive scholarly contribution by Caucus activists.

The stereotype of the activist as someone who is strong on emotion but weak on scholarship is a cheap and easy one to cultivate. In their insistence that political scientists spend less time polemicizing others and more time informing themselves, Messrs. King, Dahl and Deutsch — on this particular question — are their own best critics.

Michael Parenti

Institute of Government
and Public Affairs
University of Illinois, Urbana

To the Editor:

I must express my disagreement with the final report on the Committee on Journals (*P.S.*, Summer, 1969) and particularly with the recommendation that "No new APSA-sponsored journals be established at this time." While the committee argued that the need for new journals on legislative behavior, methodology, and public policy was being met by existing publications, it failed to mention either its earlier recommendation (*P.S.*, Summer, 1968) that "serious thought" should be given to the possibility of establishing a new journal "devoted to articles on urban politics and problems" or its announced intention to create a subcommittee to investigate this possibility. I feel the committee owed political scientists generally, and especially specialists in urban politics, a published explanation for its apparent change of plans.

The conclusions of the Committee on Journals may have been influenced by the nature of its membership, which was restricted to some of the most distinguished and established men in the discipline. Unlike other Association committees, no effort apparently was made to secure broad representation in the appointment of the Committee on Journals.

Perhaps the major contribution of this committee resulted from its delegation of the problem of multiple submissions to the Committee on Professional Ethics and from its ensuing Advisory Opinion that authors should inform editors of multiple submissions without any assurance in return that such manuscripts would be considered. While this opinion places all editors in the enviable position of being able to ignore without notification any manuscript submitted to more than one journal, it establishes no corresponding rights for authors. At the very least, consideration should be given to granting authors an acknowledged right to resubmit a manuscript if they have not received a report from the original journal to which the article was sent after a specified reasonable period of time such as six or eight months or even a year.

Although the Committee on Journals dismissed any attempt to "rationalize" the journal structure of the discipline because of both a lack of resources and a fear of "freezing" the major fields of political science, it gave little thought to other alternatives. Ours is a discipline characterized by some eclecticism and growing specialization. To permit increased access to articles by other scholars that are denied publication because of space limitations, consideration might be given to the distribution of all articles that meet accepted professional standards in an inexpensive and perhaps almost self-sustaining mimeographed or microfilmed form. Outstanding articles in flexibly defined fields of the discipline might be selected by a board of editors for publication in periodic digests to preserve the status associated with publishing in a journal.

The growth of the discipline, the publication lag, the relative lack of political science journals in comparison with other social science periodicals, and the growing backlog, which has now reached five years in some journals, all seem to testify to the need for increasing outlets for research findings in political science. What is most disturbing to me is the fear that journal publication is rapidly becoming less a means of exchanging information or of promoting the advancement of knowledge than a commodity to be traded for personal prestige and promotions. I hope that the Committee on Scientific Information Exchange will devote renewed attention to additional problems and alternatives related to journal publication in political science.

Harlan D. Hahn

University of California, Riverside

To the Editor:

I was much interested in the communications in *P.S.*, Summer 1969, Vol. II, no. 3, pages 426-428, reporting the passing of two grand men, both able political scientists, and former presidents of the APSA, — Robert Eugene Cushman, and John Merriman Gaus. These men were both good friends of mine, and colleagues, for a number of years here at the University of Minnesota. The fact that they were such fine and close friends and colleagues leads me to write this note concerning some almost identical omissions from the records you published of both men. Both omissions relate to their services in the Political Science Department of the University of Minnesota.

When Robert Cushman got his Ph.D. degree at Columbia University in 1917, Cephas Daniel Allin, then chairman of Political Science at Minnesota, a man who was always on the look-out for able young men to strengthen the Department, with departmental approval had Cushman appointed as an Assistant Professor of Political Science, to teach American government and constitutional law. This work Cushman did very effectively for five years, 1917-1922, while also beginning work on his projected casebook and writing some articles for law reviews. Promotions came to him rapidly, to associate professor and then to professor at Minnesota; but when Cornell University, a more prestigious, affluent, and Eastern university, offered him a professorship and an even higher salary, he could not be held back. He accepted the Cornell offer at the end of his fifth year at Minnesota, and left for Cornell.

When John Gaus got his Harvard Ph.D. in 1924, he was already holding (since 1923) an assistant professorship in political science at Minnesota to teach *public Administration and Public Planning*, both subjects very congenial to him. Between 1924 and 1927 he was promoted by steps to the rank of Professor. He had also gained many friends and strong support in the Department of Political Science, among the students, in the general faculty, and in the community. But the University of Wisconsin, also an older, more easterly, more prestigious institution than the University of Minnesota was at that time, made a strong appeal to him, and so he resigned his position at Minnesota, sold his East River Road home in Minneapolis, and accepted a professorship at Madison. I think the appeal of Wisconsin as a supposedly more progressive state, and the drawing power of the La Follettes at that time, turned the scales in favor of Wisconsin. The Political

Science Department of Minnesota let him go with great regret.

So Cushman in his first five years, and Gaus in his first four, since getting their respective doctorates, served ably at Minnesota, and acquired much of their teaching experience and skill at Minnesota. Their passing from the human scene will be regretted here as it will be everywhere that they were known.

Please note, however, that the University of Minnesota "saw them first" and gave them their first real chance to reveal and develop their professional abilities. So it still has a real claim upon them, in its records and its memory.

William Anderson

University of Minnesota

To the Editor:

As a nominee for the APSA Council in 1969, and without regard to outcome of the elections, I want the membership of the Association to know that I had no opportunity to submit a "Statement of Views" to accompany the ballot. I left the convention September 5 for motor travel in Europe and the election committee communication contemplated by Council action of that date is probably drifting along one or two countries behind me.

Ellis Waldron

University of Montana

To the Editor:

James W. Prothro, University of North Carolina, circulated the following letter to political science departments in October. He has requested that the letter appear in *PS*. The letter is followed by one from Donald G. Herzberg, and the original letter of the Ad Hoc Committee for a Representative Slate, mailed to individual Association members.

I am writing for two purposes: 1 To defend the professional reputations of Lewis Lipsitz (University of North Carolina) and Henry Kariel (University of Hawaii) against the charges in the letter Donald Herzberg recently distributed to the 13,000 members of the APSA. (I shall concentrate on Lipsitz because I know his professional competence at close hand, but anyone who consults the APSA Directory or Kariel's article in the current *APSR* will agree that the same case can be made for him), 2 To defend the official Nominating Committee of the APSA against the implicit charges of incompetence levelled at it. A third purpose would underlie this letter were it not for my realization that most of you will have cast your ballots before you receive it: to urge you to vote for the nominees

of the official Nominating Committee of the APSA, including Lipsitz and Kariel.

I know Herzberg intended to be fair, so I assume he failed to realize the implications of his remarks. And I assume he regrets that his letter has the same effect, however unintended, as the kind of last minute smear tactic associated with the dirtiest level of ward politics: a denunciatory letter timed to arrive just before receipt of the APSA ballot with no time for those attacked to defend themselves. (The "Ad Hoc Committee" spent \$780 on stamps alone.) The need for an early rebuttal and lack of funds require me to take the less efficient route of sending this letter to departments in the hope that enough of my colleagues will see it to help Lipsitz and Kariel win seats on the Council. Even if I fail in this hope, I can defend people who have been maligned.

Herzberg says, with great solemnity, "This election will determine whether the Association is to be a professional organization based on shared interests and expertise in scholarship, research, and teaching or whether it is to become a political action group." Why? Because Lipsitz and Kariel might win two of the 8 Council seats being filled. One response is that if the two are so clever as to dominate the other 6 (or 14, if we count carry-over members), perhaps such superior skill should be rewarded. But the charge is so serious (if foolish) that it deserves a serious reply. Two things are wrong with it, one ethical, the other logical.

First, Herzberg impugnes the professional competence of two colleagues, suggesting that they have neither "shared interests" nor "expertise" in what they depend on for professional status: "scholarship, research, and teaching." This may not be libel in the legal sense but it is clearly scurrilous. Lipsitz received a \$1,500 award, the highest offered by UNC, for outstanding competence as a teacher last year. At the age of 30, his publications include articles in the *American Political Science Review* and the *American Sociological Review*.

Second, Herzberg's apocalyptic prediction suffers the illogic of the "monolith delusion." He assumes in predicting our doom that every member of the Caucus has such identical views that their commitment to its platform will produce lockstep conformity. Some employers in the 1930's similarly viewed all C.I.O. members and Joe McCarthy tended to an equally monolithic view of all Ivy Leaguers. I attended the Caucus meeting in New York and can attest to the divisions which it suffers

(or enjoys). Anyone who watched the voting at the Business Meeting on the mail ballot system of elections knows that caucus members did *not* vote as a bloc, contrary to Herzberg's allegation.

Herzberg's attack on the APSA Nominating Committee is less blatant but equally unfair and ill-informed. He says, "It seems clear that the Nominating Committee did not *intend* to nominate them as representatives of a sub-group." Political propagandists, but not political scientists who are self-appointed spokesmen for a disinterested "expertise in scholarship," may lightly explain the intent of others. I have consulted with the Chairman of the Nominating Committee and can report that Herzberg never inquired as to the intentions of the Committee. With \$780 for stamps, surely he could have afforded one telephone call? I am told that Lipsitz and Kariel were nominated because of their professional competence *and* because they would bring some new ideas to the Council. Obviously, the Committee knew that these new views would be each new member's particular interpretation of the Caucus viewpoint. Lipsitz informed the Chairman of the Committee that before he decided whether to accept the nomination he intended to discuss the matter with members of the Executive Committee of the Caucus. Hence Herzberg's chronicle of what transpired is clearly misleading. The Nominating Committee knew the Caucus intended to offer nominations for the Council and was obviously aware that Lipsitz and Kariel might well receive the nomination of the Caucus. Let me emphasize that Lipsitz and Kariel were nominated as competent political scientists first and not as "ambassadors" of the Caucus. Herzberg fails to recognize among other things, that many of us who have not formally joined the Caucus agree with many of its ideas and can be represented by Lipsitz and Kariel as well as — or better than — by other nominees of the Committee.

Herzberg's statement that "No representatives were chosen for other sub-groups" is difficult to attribute to a member in good standing of the APSA. Read the judicious statement of the Committee on the back of your ballot about its effort to achieve "balance." As a former Chairman of the Nominating Committee, I can attest to the great care given to the problem of representing various sub-groups within the discipline. But direct experience with the APSA nominating process should not be necessary for any bona fide political scientist to know that the allocation of values, including honorific and/or decision-making positions, must take all the relevant subgroups into account. I recommend a study of any group

from the Supreme Court of the United States to the Committee on Graduate Studies in Mr. Herzberg's own department.

If this letter is as solemn and "up-tight" as Herzberg's, I am sorry. But I think something more important than the membership of the Executive Council is at stake here. (Herbert McClosky and Allan Sindler are not only highly competent political scientists but personal friends whom I hold in high esteem.) The professional standing of a close friend and colleague has been challenged before every one of his colleagues. The defense of one person's stature in a profession to which he has dedicated himself so fully and with such early distinction is infinitely more important than the composition of the Executive Council of the APSA.

If this attack on two distinguished scholars is the way Professor Herzberg proposes to *avoid* "the politicization and fragmentation of the APSA," let us all be thankful that he is not consciously striving for the ends to which he has contributed so well.

James W. Prothro
University of North Carolina

To the Editor:

It is my understanding that Professor Prothro has asked that his letter to departmental chairmen be printed in *P.S.* Since *P.S.* is becoming the journal of record, I would ask that my letter to the profession be reprinted also so that members of the Association will have an opportunity to compare and contrast what he says and what I said. I appreciate your courtesy in letting me do this.

Donald G. Herzberg
Egleton Institute

The following letter was the original communication referred to in the preceding letters, from the Ad Hoc Committee for a Representative Slate, sent to APSA members.

Dear Colleague:

In a few days you will receive a ballot with which you may vote for officers and Council members of the American Political Science Association. It is our hope that you will vote. This is the first opportunity for all members to participate in decisions about APSA governance. After the hard fight to gain this right, it would be a shame not to have a large turnout.

Before you vote, however, you should consider carefully what kind of Association you want, and

what the various candidates stand for. There are important differences among the Candidates. Much more is involved than a clash of personalities.

This election will determine whether the Association is to be a professional organization based on shared interests and expertise in scholarship, research, and teaching or whether it is to become a political action group.

The Ad Hoc Committee for a Representative Slate wants to maintain the Association as a non-partisan professional organization devoted to shared professional purposes. For this reason we ask you to vote for the Ad Hoc Slate, all of whose members were chosen for professional, rather than political, reasons. The Ad Hoc Slate is identical with the slate proposed by the nominating committee of the APSA, with two exceptions. We have nominated for the Council of the Association Herbert McClosky (University of California, Berkeley), and Allan Sindler (Cornell University), instead of Lewis Lipsitz and Henry Kariel.

McClosky and Sindler are scholars of high competence and achievement. Both have broad experience in the academic world. Though they have been politically active, both believe it is important to distinguish between the roles of citizen and scholar. Both believe in a professional association devoted to shared professional interests. Both oppose the use of APSA to advance the political purposes of any portion of its members.

Professors Kariel and Lipsitz, on the other hand, are Members of the Executive Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science. They are pledged to "stand on the Caucus platform" and serve as "spokesmen for the concerns and views of the Caucus". (*Caucus Newsletter*, June, 1969.) Since these two proposed Council members will represent Caucus commitments, you should take note of some recent Caucus positions and actions.

1 The Caucus for a New Political Science adamantly opposed the popular vote amendments (proposed by Donald Herzberg, David Fellman, Stephen Bailey, Jack Peltason, Samuel Patterson, and others), which have given all members a voice in these elections and in other important Association decisions. Spokesmen for the Caucus argued against these amendments in the debate printed in the *P.S.*, Summer, 1969 and fought the adoption of these amendments at the business meeting in New York.

2 The Caucus advocates the full-scale politiciza-

tion of the Association and the use of its resources to advance a political action program. The Caucus platform, adopted recently in New York, provides a blueprint for the political use of the APSA.

It is important to note that the priorities of Caucus members were not clear at the time the Nominating Committee of APSA met and nominated Lipsitz and Kariel to the Council. Only *after* they were nominated to the Council did Lipsitz and Kariel pledge to serve in the Association as representatives of the Caucus if they are elected. It seems clear that the Nominating Committee did not *intend* to nominate them as representatives of a sub-group. No representatives were chosen for other sub-groups. Furthermore, it would obviously have been absurd to award the Caucus — which has never claimed more than a few hundred of 13,000 individuals members — two of eight nominees for the Council seats.

In fact, the Caucus orientation is already represented on the Council of the APSA. If, in addition, two new Council members are elected with an explicit Caucus commitment, the professional character of the Association will be endangered.

To prevent the politicization and fragmentation of the APSA, vote the Ad Hoc Slate, vote for: Lane, McConnell, Riker, Ward, Dye, Rourke, Huntington, Kessell, McClosky, Prestage, Salisbury, Sindler, Waldron, and Johnson.

Donald G. Herzberg
for the Ad Hoc Committee
for a Representative Slate

To the Editor:

Would you please publish the following Declaration of Latin American Specialists on Professional Responsibility?

Our profession is the study of human affairs.

We are particularly concerned with the Western developmental problems and caught up in the Hemisphere, which is wracked with serious conflict between East and West.

Our task is at once scientific and humanistic. We are convinced that independent scientific and scholarly study of hemispheric problems can and should contribute to the improvement of the conditions of human life in Latin America and ought, simultaneously, to bring about greater understanding between the United States and our neighbors to the South. However, not all studies being carried out by North Americans in Latin

America have been independent and scholarly. Nor have these studies contributed to the improvement of international understanding.

Some recent events, of which the most notable has been *Project Camelot*, have aroused our deep concern. *Camelot*, a U.S. Department of the Army intelligence-gathering and contingency-planning study focused on Chile, was initiated under the guise of a university-sponsored social science research program. Unfavorable publicity forced the project's cancellation in that country, but left a residue of distrust for North American social scientists all over Latin America. Revelations subsequent to *Camelot* have documented that "research" for interventionist, manipulative, and militaristic ends has been carried out for some years, primarily by the Department of the Army, through "fronts" staffed by civilian social scientists. This "research" continues today. The number of research corporations entirely funded by U.S. military agencies and the scope of projects undertaken continues to increase. Several U.S. universities have contracted "defense" and "national security" projects which constitute gross violations of the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and which call into question the integrity of cooperating institutions and academicians.

Now, the extent to which the Central Intelligence Agency has penetrated and manipulated private American institutions for its interventionist policies abroad has become widely known. Latin America is one of the principle centers of CIA operation. Certain private institutions and foundations concerned with Latin America have been identified as CIA "fronts." It is now known that the CIA has used American citizens, including academicians, returning from Latin America as "consultants," that is to say, as informants on political events and on the attitudes and affiliations of Latin American acquaintances.

As a consequence of these situations and from conviction in the worth of our intellectual work and in consideration of our common values and professional interest, we make the following declaration:

1 We consider it our individual and collective professional responsibility to promote improved conditions of human life, political and economic independence, political and social democratization and economic development in all countries of the hemisphere. We are firmly committed to the principles of non-intervention and self-determination. It is our considered judgment that recent

United States military and other forms of intervention, including programs of research and planning for such intervention, are contrary to our principles and objectives.

2 Therefore, we shall not participate in any research or other activity ordered or paid for in whole or in part by any military or governmental agency or private corporation unless the involvement of such agency or corporation and its objectives, is made clear and public. When such involvement is known, the decision to participate is dependent upon ethical and professional-interest considerations herein expressed.

3 We appeal to all professionals and students in the social sciences, history, and other academic fields to adhere to and support our commitment and our purposes. We submit that the distrust of American intellectuals in Latin America and elsewhere in the world will not be overcome until such time as it is made clear that the American scholars and their professional associations have totally disassociated themselves from the interventionist, activities of U.S. government agencies. We therefore call upon the professional associations in the various academic disciplines to strengthen and accelerate the work of committees appointed to investigate the relationships between the government and the professional communities. We urge that the associations act upon the reports of investigating committees with all due speed.

4 We ask colleges, universities, and private foundations presently cooperating with government-sponsored research programs closely related to the planning and implementation of Latin American policy to evaluate their participation in terms of the problems of institutional independence, academic freedom, and the interests and collective ethics of the intellectual community.

5 We call upon U.S. Government agencies sponsoring intelligence-gathering or contingency-planning in Latin America not to attempt to pose their work as scientific research.

Coordinator: **Dale L. Johnson**
Pitzer College

(Signed by 277 Latin American Specialists.)