

Letters to the Editor

Tullock on Steiner:

Jurg Steiner (March 1990) wants to mix his personal political philosophy with the teaching of rational choice models. Since I personally am in favor of freedom of speech, I see no reason why he should not do so. The question, however, that I wish to address is whether his remarks about the possible bad effects of teaching Public Choice without that philosophy is correct.

Before turning to this, however, I should say that he has a misstatement about the training of graduate students in economics. The Marwell and Ames article has been superseded by a very large body of work. What actually happened in their case is that the graduate students in economics understood the situation which they were in immediately. Since Marvell and Ames only permitted their subjects to play the game once, the economists' behavior was quite different from other people who did not understand the situation. There are now a large number of experiments¹ in which people play the game often enough so that all of them understand it. Under these circumstances, there is no difference in the behavior of economists and non-economists.

Turning to his main problem, the justification of politicians simply taking that course of action which will lead to their winning the next election or occasionally winning more than one future elections. Clearly, in a democracy we want politicians, our rulers, to do what the people say, and the mechanism that we have to see to it that they do so is the election. The politician who takes action which is most likely to return him to office is carrying out the will of the people as expressed in their votes in a better way than any other possible arrangement. He does not, of course, substitute his own judgments for that of the voter. I think that Steiner rather thinks that this is a bad thing. It may be a bad thing, but that happens to be the characteristic for which we normally argue when we advocate democracy.

It may, of course, be true that the voters have very short-run perspectives and think only of narrow issues. My own impression is that neither of these is true but the voters, in fact, are pretty badly informed. This means that democracy won't work very well, but I know of no other system which does better. I presume Steiner would agree with my judgment on this point.

The real problem that someone like Steiner who feels that the people need a guardian should face is the fact that study of Public Choice models is rather apt to undermine faith in democracy. It will not convince people that there is any better form of government but it may make them skeptical about the outcome of the political process. Since this skepticism is well justified, I think this is a good thing but I suspect Steiner would not.

Gordon Tullock
University of Arizona

1. R. Mark Isaac, Kenneth McCue, and Charles R. Plott (1985), "Public Goods Provision in an Experimental Environment." *Journal of Public Economics* 26:51-74; and R. Mark Isaac and James M. Walker (1987), is a direct retest and refutation of Marvell and Ames. For a comprehensive bibliography of work on the problem see: "Success and Failure of the Voluntary Contributions Process: Some Evidence from Experimental Economics." Department of Economics Discussion Paper No. 87-1. University of Arizona.

Another Reply to Eckstein

Perhaps my exchange of letters with Harry Eckstein (*PS* September and December 1989) can go one more step, and possibly an irenic one at that. For his second letter introduces much that I found missing in his original "Comment on Positive Theory" (*PS* March 1989), much to which it would be hard to take principled exception.

This is not to say that differences of emphasis in the pursuit of political science do not remain. For Mr. Eckstein deserves an answer to the question he asks of me about a method applicable to both normative

and scientific theories.

That answer can begin by considering the authority Eckstein cites, Max Weber, whose influence has indeed made his thought central to any discussion of social science methodology in this century. Should we accept Weber's view that value conflicts are essentially unresolvable, that all we can turn to in such cases is whistling in the dark (or "forceful sinning accompanied by still more forceful faith," as Leo Strauss put it) when we make, as we must, our fundamental political decisions?

I confess to having no easy solutions, but can point to a position that would go beyond the implications of Weber's "meaninglessness" in the scientific quest for knowledge. Two-and-a-half millennia ago the most successful among the earliest attempts to treat this problem found the fulfillment of the meaning of politics in the very discussion and deliberation of policy questions. In its own way, is not the discourse between Eckstein and myself another productive example of this? I leave it to our readers to judge for themselves.

Edwin H. Rutkowski
SUNY at Binghamton

Advice to the Dissertation Writer

In the December 1989 issue of *PS* A Wuffle wisely advises dissertation-stage Ph.D. candidates to "write your literature review chapter last." He echoes, perhaps equally vainly, the final paragraph in the 1966 report of the Leonard D. White Dissertation Award Committee (which I chaired):

"The first chapter of a dissertation is often an impressive, sometimes pretentious, display of the concepts and methodologies of contemporary social science, creating high expectations of the quality of research and analysis to be reflected in the chapters to follow. The promises thus made are not always

kept. One kind of student, with the first chapter behind him and out of mind, proceeds to write a competent, straightforward, fairly orthodox treatment of his subject. Another kind of student takes his first chapter seriously and persists through the remaining chapters in high-level theorizing and the squeezing of empirical findings from bodies of data that his own resources of time and money could not cure of incompleteness and unreliability. Either way, readers such as the members of this committee, are disappointed by the disparity between the author's promises and his performance. One solution suggests itself, and is our parting word. The prospectus for a dissertation probably should not become the first chapter nor should a paper done in the scope and methods course be retyped as the first chapter. It is perhaps after the student has fought the good fight of field research and discovered that meeting the enemy may lead to a distant acquaintanceship rather than to a thorough understanding that he is ready to describe what he proposes to do in the dissertation—because he has already done it. In other words, there is something to be said for advising students to write their first chapter last."

James W. Fesler
Yale University

The Letters of P. A. Kropotkin:

I have been asked by Frank Cass Publishers of London and Progress Publishers of Moscow to prepare an edition of the letters of P. A. Kropotkin for publication in 1992, the 150th anniversary of his birth.

I would be most grateful for any help you might be able to give me with regard to locating Kropotkin letters or in the United States.

Dr. John Slatter.

Department of Russian,
University of Durham,
Durham DH1 3JT.
Fax address: 3743740
Telex address: 537351, then
DURLIB G

E-mail address:
john.slatter@uk.ac.durham

An Author's Disavowal:

Karl Jaspers, *On Max Weber* (New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1989), edited by John Dreijminis, contains numerous omissions, distortions, and typographical errors in the view of the editor and Dr. Hans Saner, former close associate of Karl Jaspers and the seller of the English translation rights to the publisher. Drs. Dreijmanis and Saner have demanded, the former through his attorney, that the publisher recall the book and issue a corrected version. The publisher has refused to recall the book.

Dr. John Dreijmanis

Editor's Note: Several PS readers have taken exception to portions of Harry V. Jaffa's eulogy of John Adams Wettergreen, reproduced in the In Memoriam section of the March 1990 issue. The intensity of their feeling is evident from the excerpted letters below.

It is PS policy not to edit obituaries and, in particular, eulogies delivered at funeral or memorial services. We let the words of those mourning the loss of a colleague and friend stand for themselves, conveying the character and accomplishments of the deceased, as well as the feelings of the memorial's author or authors. We apologize that our policy has resulted in the publication of offensive language.

We will allow our policy towards memorials to stand, but will make every effort to extend to the In Memoriam section our general editorial practice of not publishing demeaning language and gratuitous criticism.

I read with astonishment the following sentence on page 75 of the March 1990 issue of *PS: Political Science & Politics*:

John showed—beyond a reasonable doubt, I would say—that public health officials had put the perverse interests of sodomites

ahead of the health of the public they were elected to serve.

As a gay man, I am outraged by your publication of this disparaging and tasteless characterization. Is it the policy of *PS* and the APSA to disseminate blatantly bigoted commentary? Your conduct reinforces the fact that gay men and lesbians remain the last minority group in this country for whom public derision is still intellectually and socially acceptable.

Daniel R. Pinello
University of New Orleans

To what lengths may someone go in spewing hatred and bigotry before a funeral oration fails to meet your criteria for publication?

Paging through the issue of *PS* that arrived in today's mail, I read, on page 75, ". . . public health officials had put *the perverse interests of sodomites* ahead of the health of the public. . . ." (emphasis added). I went back and re-read it to make sure that I had not missed a phrase such as "what he believed to be the perverse interests." But no, there was no such effort to describe someone's benighted views, there was merely a slander on gay people. I presume that at *some* point, *PS* would refuse to print racist, anti-semitic, or otherwise bigoted views. It must be, however, acceptable academic discourse to refer to peoples' efforts to protect their rights under the U.S. Constitution as a perverse interest.

No doubt *PS'* editors were publishing such offensive trash only to expose it for what it is.

I certainly hope that I have not been unfair to you. You must have known what you were doing. I do hope, however, that you will rethink these issues before once again providing a platform to the miserable merchants of hatred.

Kenneth S. Sherrill
Hunter College, CUNY

I was shocked and outraged that you allowed an obituary for the late John Adams Wettergreen, written by Professor Harry V. Jaffa, to read

that Professor Wettergreen's research "proved . . . that public health officials had put the perverse interests of sodomites ahead of the health of the public they were elected to serve." (*PS*, March 1990, p. 75).

I wouldn't bother to write to you if I had merely read of the absurd research findings of Professor Wettergreen that an oppressed minority is in control of a complex set of bureaucratic structures. (And I am assuming that Professor Jaffa really means to be talking about gay men, not the vast majority of all people—gay, lesbian, straight, and those who don't fit nicely into any of these categories—who regularly participate in the joys of sodomy.)

And I wouldn't even have bothered to write just in response to Professor Jaffa's assumption that gay men (and people with HIV infection?) are not a part of "the public."

My principal grievance here is that the editor of *PS* would allow the invective "sodomite" to be used in this publication, when gay men and lesbians have made it quite clear that we prefer to be called "gay" and "lesbian." As to whether our interests may appropriately be labeled "perverse," I suppose it is a matter for debate. But I can't imagine you allowing any other community's interests to be labeled as such.

I think that the readers of *PS* are owed an apology.

Jeffrey Edwards
Roosevelt University

Statistical Programs for Apple's MacIntosh Line

The recent article by Anne Permaloff and Carl Grafton on student versions of statistical programs was comprehensive and interesting. As is often the case with articles in *PS* concerning microcomputers, however, the emphasis was almost entirely on programs for IBM and IBM compatible machines.

This might have made sense a few years ago, but the rising tide of "the rest of us" makes it important to include programs written for Apple's MacIntosh line of microcomputers in any such survey. There are several

besides the Mac version of MYSTAT mentioned by Permaloff and Grafton. I have included a set of tables like those used in their article that set out the major characteristics of three other general purpose programs (Data Desk, JMP-IN, and WormStat) that are easily available. I have added a table to describe some of the more unusual features of these programs. I have also included a contact list for the vendors.

In addition to these packages, SPSS informs me that the MacIntosh version of SPSS-X, due in February, 1990, will probably be followed by a student version at a later date. It will

be roughly comparable to the professional program. There are also other specialized programs that instructors might find useful: Stat-Calc, a highly capable statistical calculator program, and the student version of CLR Anova—both from Clear Lake Research—and TrueStat, a "statistical construction set" instructional program from True Basic, Inc., deserve mention.

I hope these tables provide a useful addition to an otherwise excellent presentation.

Tracy Lightcap
Judicial Council of Georgia

TABLE 1.
Basic Characteristics

| Database Capacity | Data Desk | JMP-IN | WormStat |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Maximum # Variables | 15 ^a | disk | 10 |
| Maximum # Cases | 1,000 ^a | disk | 1,000 |
| Maximum # Data Points | — | 500 ^a | — |
| Manual or text | T | M | M |
| Command or Menu | M | M | M ^b |
| Import ASCII | Y | Y | Y |
| Import Lotus WKS | N | N | N |
| Import dBASE | N | N | N |
| Cost | \$25 | \$89 | \$19.95 |

^aWorking data files are limited only by disk size in JMP-IN and Data Desk. However, JMP-IN restricts saved files to 500 data points and Data Desk to 15 variables and 1,000 cases.

^bThis program uses a MacPaint-like palette as part of its interface.

TABLE 2.
General Statistical Techniques^a

| | Data Desk | JMP-IN | WormStat |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|----------|
| ANOVA | Y | Y | Y |
| ANCOVA | N | Y | N |
| MANOVA | N | N | N |
| Cluster | N | N | N |
| Discriminant | N | N | N |
| Factor/Prin. Comp. | N | Y | N |
| Non-parametric | N | N | Y |
| Sample Size | N | N | N |
| Time Series | N | N | N |

^aAll perform general descriptive statistics and t-tests.

TABLE 3.
Correlation and Regression

| | Data Desk | JMP-IN | WormStat |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| Correlation | Y | Y | Y |
| Multiple Regression | Y | Y | N |
| Nonpar. Correlation | Y | N | N |
| Residual Analysis | Y | Y | Y |
| Stepwise | N ^a | N ^a | N |
| Curvilinear | Y | Y | Y |

^aThese programs have flexible modeling routines that make stepwise options redundant.

TABLE 4.
Frequencies and Crosstabulations

| | Data Desk | JMP-IN | WormStat |
|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| Multi-variables | N ^a | N ^a | N |
| Maximum # variables | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Created from raw data: | | | |
| Contingency table | | | |
| with Chi Square | Y | Y | Y |
| with other tests | N | N | N |
| Table labels: | | | |
| Variable name | Y | Y | N |
| Value labels | Y | Y | N |
| Cell display format: | | | |
| Frequency | Y | Y | Y |
| Column percentage | Y | Y | N |
| Row percentage | Y | Y | N |
| Cell/total percentage | Y | Y | N |
| Expected frequency | Y | Y | N |

^aThe number of breakdowns of tables by control variables can be expanded in both programs through selection routines, but basic tables are for 2 variables.

TABLE 5.
Graphics

| | Data Desk | JMP-IN | WormStat |
|-----------------|-----------|----------------|----------|
| Histogram | Y | Y | Y |
| Scatter | Y | Y | Y |
| Box-and-whisker | Y | Y | Y |
| 3-D scatter | N | Y ^a | N |
| 3-D histogram | N | N | N |
| Time series | Y | Y | N |

^aThis program has rotating 3-D scatter plots.

TABLE 6.
Transformations and Data Base Utilities

| | Data Desk | JMP-IN | WormStat |
|----------------------|-----------|--------|----------|
| Arithmetic | Y | Y | Y |
| < > = | Y | Y | N |
| If-then | Y | Y | N |
| And | Y | Y | N |
| Or | Y | Y | N |
| Mean | Y | Y | Y |
| Median | Y | Y | Y |
| Standard deviation | Y | Y | Y |
| Standard normal CDF | N | N | N |
| Inverse normal CDF | N | N | N |
| Select-if or equal | Y | Y | N |
| Sample | N | Y | N |
| Log e | Y | Y | Y |
| Log 10 | Y | Y | N |
| Square root | Y | Y | Y |
| Exponential function | Y | Y | N |
| Absolute value | Y | Y | N |
| Cumulative sum | Y | Y | N |
| Cumulative product | Y | Y | N |
| Lag | Y | Y | N |
| Standardize | Y | Y | Y |
| Sort | Y | Y | Y |
| Max | Y | Y | Y |
| Min | Y | Y | Y |
| Current case # | Y | Y | N |
| Random normal | Y | Y | Y |
| Random uniform | Y | Y | Y |
| Concatenate columns | Y | Y | Y |
| Break down columns | Y | Y | Y |
| Horizontal merge | Y | Y | N |
| Vertical merge | Y | Y | N |

TABLE 7.
Special Features^a

Data Desk

Interactive Linked Graphics: Brushing, slicing, case identification, moving graph elements, isolation and resizing, symbol assignment for selections.
Special Graphs: Pie charts, bar charts, line plots, normal probability plots, dot plots, regression diagnostic plots.
Special Techniques: Standardized residuals for contingency tables, Bonferroni adjustment for multiple confidence intervals, generates random numbers from normal, uniform, binomial, Bernoulli trial, or Poisson distributions.
Other: Pop-up menus lead to additional steps in analysis.

JMP-IN

Interactive Linked Graphics: Brushing, case identification, moving graph elements, isolation and resizing, color and/or symbol assignment for selections.
Special Graphs: Mosaic plots, bar graphs, mean circle graphs, normal probability plots, scatter plot matrices, biplots, regression diagnostic plots.
Special Techniques: Spline-smoothing regression, full complement of GLM techniques, maximum-likelihood logistic and cumulative logistic regressions.
Other: Word processing support for reports, on-line help.

WormStat

Special Graphs: Scatter plot with hand-drawn regression line, graphs of probability distributions showing areas associated with test statistics.
Special Techniques: Chi-square goodness of fit test, generates random numbers from normal or uniform distributions.
Other: Displays formulae for statistical techniques, uses MacPaint-like palette to select techniques.

^aThis does not include all additional techniques, just the most important. Unfortunately, the considerable contribution that interactive linked graphic interfaces, such as those found in Data Desk and JMP-IN, make to understanding statistics and to flexibility in analysis cannot be reduced effectively to a tabular description.

LIST OF VENDORS

Data Desk:

W.H. Freeman Co., 41 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

JMP-IN:

SAS Institute Inc., JMP Sales Department, SAS Circle, Box 8000, Cary, NC 27512-8000.

WormStat:

Small Business Computers of New England, P.O. Box 397, 4 Limbo Lane, Amherst, NH 03031.
A \$600 perpetual site license with unlimited use is available.

StatCalc and CLR Anova:

Clear Lake Research, 2476 Bolsover #343, Houston, TX 77005. StatCalc costs \$35, the student version of CLR Anova \$24. A \$125 annual site license with unlimited use is available for StatCalc.

TrueStat:

True Basic Inc., 12 Commerce Avenue, West Lebanon, NH 03784. \$49.50.