

Letters to the Editor

1983 Annual Meeting Program

To the Editor:

Unfortunately the APSA does not have a good institutional way to recognize the large number of people who work so hard to make its Annual Meetings a success, but at least I wanted to thank publicly those who helped so much on the 1983 meetings in Chicago.

First, the members of the Program Committee did an excellent job in setting up the panels. Each of the section heads did a large amount of work and came up with a strong set of panels. In particular, a special debt is owed to Jim Caporaso who served as Associate Program Chairperson for International Relations. Largely because of his efforts and those of the section heads he appointed, the number of international relations panels doubled from 1981 and 1982 to 30 in 1983. Special thanks are also due to Carolyn Geda for her work in setting up the very successful microcomputer demonstrations.

Additionally there are several people who provided me with special assistance for which I am personally grateful. First among these is William Riker with whom I worked closely throughout the year in setting up the program. Ada Finifter was constantly available with invaluable advice and encouragement based on her work on the Denver meetings. And Larry Baum provided essential assistance when I was out of Columbus and good counsel whenever I needed advice. Finally, the "people at APSA" should be recognized for their continual helpfulness.

Each of these people has my most

sincere thanks and deserves that of the Association.

Herbert F. Weisberg
Ohio State University
1983 APSA Annual Meeting
Program Chairperson

Analysis or Tirade?

To the Editor:

The response by Arnold Beichman (*PS*, Summer, 1983) to "The State of the Discipline: One Interpretation of Everyone's Favorite Controversy," by Michael Parenti (*PS*, Spring, 1983), is of interest.

I happen to find Parenti's argument accurate in terms of my own experience. But that is not the point. The real issue is why any critic of the American system, or any part of the American system, such as the political science profession, is responded to not with an analysis but with a tirade as to what is wrong with the Soviet Union. I wonder if Mr. Beichman would be willing to do us the favor of showing the connection.

Paul N. Goldstene
California State University,
Sacramento

Parenti Responds

To the Editor:

In a letter to *PS* (Summer 1983) Arnold Beichman of the Hoover Institute makes a number of imbalanced charges regarding my article "The State of the Discipline: One Interpretation of Everyone's

Favorite Controversy" (*PS*, Spring 1983). He says that "Parenti's letter" finds behavioralism to be "the enemy of humanity, the scourge of proletarian freedom, the betrayer of mankind's fondest hopes. . . ." Is Mr. Beichman serious? If so, he indulges in an unfortunate polemical tactic: he enunciates a ridiculous position and then ascribes it to me. As I explicitly noted in my article, I do not fault the behavioral methodology for the deficiencies within the profession (let alone for the evils of the world), rather I criticized the hidden political biases which, I said, cut across methodological persuasions. Mr. Beichman should read more carefully before he launches his attacks.

Mr. Beichman says that the kind of critique I make in my article causes him to pity "the victimized graduate students who have to submit to such propaganda masquerading as truth." Nice man, that Mr. Beichman. He also says "To attack him [Parenti] as he has attacked Joseph LaPalombara or Evron Kirkpatrick will elicit loud cries of 'McCarthyism' and 'red-baiting.' Well, I'll take my chances." Mr. Beichman certainly does take his chances, but he would do well not to misrepresent my article. The criticisms I made of the LaPalombara and Kirkpatrick positions were not personal ones and showed none of the capacity for low blows that Mr. Beichman displays.

Mr. Beichman's main grievance seems to be that I did not rage against the Soviet Union with all the cold war hatred and fury he himself is capable of expressing. I plead guilty. In fact, I did not mention the USSR at all in my article. In case Mr. Beichman did not realize it, I was writing about the methodological paradigmatic conflicts within the American political science profession.

Michael Parenti
Institute for Policy Studies

Fierce Competition

To the Editor:

Jean L. Woy's "Getting Published" (*PS*, Summer 1983) is a very helpful and informative piece containing much sound advice. However, having been addressed primarily to "the uninitiated young scholar" who may be interested in writing "books designed as college undergraduate textbooks" (pp. 521, 522), the article is misleading in at least two important ways:

1. As a matter of practice, an uninitiated young scholar has virtually no chance of publishing an undergraduate text. For one thing, competition for such books is literally fierce and a depressed market already well saturated. For another, even a casual glance at successful undergraduate texts in any field of political science will reveal that, with rare exceptions, they have all been written by well-established "names."

2. Even if by some miracle the uninitiated scholar does publish an undergraduate text, this feat will do nothing at all to advance his career. Indeed, most likely such a publication will backfire, since senior colleagues almost always denigrate writers of undergraduate texts. Having made his or her mark, an established scholar will not jeopardize his or her credibility by publishing an introductory book every now and then. Not so for the uninitiated scholar who is expected to focus on research monographs and research articles.

Accordingly, I hope that *PS* will address the problems of placing manuscripts (of various forms and sizes) based on original research.

Mostafa Rejai
Miami University, Ohio