

Communications

To the Editor:

I salute Richard Merritt for his patient reply to Professor Urban, and implicitly to the numerous colleagues who had struggled so valiantly to keep APSA members from going to IPSA's meetings in Moscow. Merritt's intelligent and fair-minded account of Soviet and East European conference-behavior will no doubt antagonize the cold warriors in the profession, but will be found enlightening by many participants in the IPSA meetings.

I salute Karl Deutsch, too, who led the fight to support the 1979 Moscow conference, against bitter resistance within and also outside the APSA establishment.

In 1980 it would have been too late. After Afghanistan, the USSR is now in our media seen as an "aggressor nation"; unlike, of course, the U.S., with its well-known record of respect for the integrity of all other nations. Meanwhile American public opinion is being readied for an accelerated arms race, and also for the idea of "limited nuclear war," with the connivance of many political scientists; with Professor Brzezinski, for one, as President Carter's National Security Adviser.

Perhaps it is still possible to halt the mindless drift toward a nuclear Armageddon. Perhaps political scientists will yet emerge to challenge the Kissingers and the Brzezinskis, and to convince a larger portion of the public that the nation must be defended against mindless jingoism, militarism, and war, not against paranoid projections of evil Soviet designs.

Some of us who went to Moscow came back with a stronger sense that the Russians, and not only the dissidents, are human beings like ourselves, who would collaborate fully with any U.S. defense policy that aimed at building a non-imperialist peace.

Christian Bay
Baschwitz Institute
University of Amsterdam

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter to the members of the American Political Science Association as Chair of the National Committee for the Defense of Academic Rights. This is an ad hoc group formed to defend Professor Charles I. Stastny, whose tenure was revoked by the trustees of Central Washington University at the recommendation of President Donald L. Garrity. The

Committee consists of some 50 academics of such diverse views as myself, Howard Zinn, Sidney Verba, Noam Chomsky, Stanley Hoffmann, Adam Ulam and others. The fact that we have been able to work together on this issue should indicate its importance to all members of the academic community.

Professor Stastny's tenure was revoked ostensibly because he refused to obey an arbitrary order which would have essentially forced him to cancel a trip to Israel to deliver an invited lecture on his research at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Administrative authorities at first insisted that he return to Central Washington University two days before he could reasonably hope to do so, and then attempted to block the trip altogether. Professor Stastny had, as the faculty committee which heard the charges against him agreed, conscientiously prepared material for his classes to cover his absence.

University officials decided upon an extreme penalty for his "insubordination" because, they charge, Professor Stastny had, in his 14 years at the university, accumulated six unexcused absences ranging in time from an hour or so to two days. When one examines the record, however, this charge simply dissolves. Typical of these "unexcused" absences was one in which Professor Stastny returned a day late from a trip because he had been denied a seat on an overbooked plane. In another instance Professor Stastny cancelled a class which was set to meet from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. the day before Thanksgiving. Since the university was due to close beginning at 12 noon, the class had voted not to meet.

If these "offenses" seem rather absurd, we assure you that they are quite representative. There is a reasonable explanation for every one of Professor Stastny's absences. What is most horrifying is that they were obviously all catalogued for future use.

It is our considered opinion that the actions of the university in denying Professor Stastny permission to make his trip were completely unwarranted, and indeed, so far as we can determine from the records, were quite contrary to normal practice.

We are persuaded that, on the record, Professor Stastny's behavior did not violate acceptable professional standards. If his tenure can be revoked so could that of the bulk of the faculty at many of our institutions. In short, Professor Stastny's actions did not justify the penalty imposed.

Frankly, we suspect a hidden agenda. It is obvious that, for whatever reasons, tensions had developed between Professor Stastny and the administration, as well as between him and some of his colleagues. However, wisely or unwisely (we think wisely), the fact that the powers that be do not like a tenured member of the faculty is not sufficient grounds for dismissal. That is what tenure is all about, especially in fields where passions can run fairly high about social issues.

Steps are now being taken to appeal the University's decision. It is our hope that other members of the academic community will join with us in supporting the important principles that are at stake in this case.

You can assist in any or all of the following ways: (1) Join our committee; (2) Bring this matter to the attention of other members of the academic community; (3) Most importantly, we need money. The case is now before the courts. Professor Stastny is being represented by the firm of Schroeter, Goldmark and Bender. The burden of the work is being carried by Professor David Danelski, Department of Political Science, Stanford University. The brief he has presented to the court challenges the constitutionality and legality of Professor Stastny's dismissal. The cost of appeals is high and Professor Stastny has no funds to pay the legal expenses. Any contributions you may be able to afford will be much appreciated. Please send these c/o The National Committee for the Defense of Academic Rights, P.O. Box 351, Southbridge, Massachusetts 01550.

The APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has investigated this case and has issued a report. The report sharply criticizes university authorities, arguing that the penalty imposed by the trustees was incommensurate to any possible offense. The Committee further states that the action of the trustees is a threat to the tenure system. We would go even further. If Professor Stastny's dismissal is allowed to stand, it will, it seems to us, establish a dangerous and "chilling" precedent.

Stanley Rothman
Mary Huggins Gamble Professor of
Government, Smith College

To the Editor:

The 76th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association was the first in a long time that I attended all sessions, with what in some sections would have been termed motivated interaction, in others existential awareness or heightened consciousness, and in still others a role as minor character in The Dialogue. Each panel attended meant missing several others with promising titles, and when inquiring about those later, or shopping the paper bazaar, I seemed to meet frequently with

the same two comments. One was that too many of the papers were of more interest and use to the authors than to the audiences thus provided for them. The other was to the effect that political science—or at least *other* political scientists—had lost touch with politics in some way: there were differing explanations of the way.

Pursuing a possible connection between these two comments, I began to count the participants listed as governmental or political officials, as compared to scholars and research personnel. Of 600 paper authorships or major presentations in the official panels and roundtables, only 20 were by individuals professionally involved in the operations of government and politics. The unaffiliated groups had about the same number among just over half as many major participants. Both listings also contained a few representatives of non-university research organizations and lobbies, scholars from other countries (mainly Canadian and British), and media representatives, which groups could be assumed to bring some different working perspectives to the discussions. In my count of approximately 1,350 participants of all kinds, however—papers, chairpersons, and discussants, for 230 panels and roundtables—political scientists from college and university departments in the United States comprised close to 90%.

This can be viewed as a reasonable service of the Association to its predominant membership, providing a needed outlet for their works. At the same time, it neither reflects adequately the proportion of practitioners carried on the Association rolls, nor a significant use of the resources of the federal city, as a source of operating experience and points of view that might have added a dimension to many of the discussions. For all the increase in attention to political economy, for example, I was able to discover only three names identified with corporate industry or labor unions, and scarcely more government officials working in these areas. The groups on Comparative Politics of Industrial Societies, Comparative Politics of Developing Societies, and the Political Economy of Advanced Industrial Societies fielded 36 panels among them; in 200 participants were one government official (immigration), one businessman, and possibly one university economist.

Seven groups on public policy, public administration, executive leadership, federalism, the states, and urban studies (50 panels, 265 participants), had just seven government commentators among them. Five groups on legislative politics and elections (30, 195) produced one national committeeman, two congressional staffers, three state legislators who also teach political science, and one congressman discussing the census. Two groups on the presidency (8, 50) had one paper from the Office of Personnel Management, on the civil ser-

vice, and one journalist commenting on the incumbent; all other views of the office's role, staffing, management, and legislative and public communications were academic perspectives.

This is not to say that there were not some excellent papers from the professoriate; or that these should not predominate in future meetings; or that practitioners are sources of political wisdom, or even necessarily of very broad perspectives on the problems they work with. The latter is the task of political science, and I am suggesting that we could do it better with more contacts with those in contact with politics than we can with less, not only in our individual work but in convention assembled.

As for my own field of political theory (5 groups, philosophical and empirical, 36 panels and 175 participants), the panels I attended were mostly enjoyable, if unelectric, and there were actually two papers by federal employees in the total. I hope there may be more in the future, not to mention an occasional professor of philosophy, history, classics, or English, letting the insights fall from whom they may. There seemed to be some agreement that we ought to disagree more directly, having now too little communication between the networks within theory, and even less with other fields in the discipline.

Differences in method and material must continue to divide, but a common interest in politics ought to provide some bond, as well. Perhaps if there were a few more nonacademic participants throughout all the sections, bringing into the panels—and especially into the more fluid format of the roundtables—a direct sense of policy-political operations as they experience them, it might do something to revitalize our study of those operations. I suppose there is some risk of importing arguments over substantive issues in this way, but it might help us to be, as one of this year's roundtablers urged, "less self-conscious as professional theorists."

While Program Committee attention to this problem will help, it is bound up with attitudes of the membership more than any committee can be expected to untangle once a year. As producers and would-be sellers, we press for space on a number of panels too small to hold us all, and as consumer-listeners we complain that the number is too large, which it undoubtedly is. If enough of us express interest in a higher quality of interchange to listen to, with perhaps a greater chance of being heard from the floor, and more opportunities to observe and hear those whose experience of politics is different from our own, we might offset some of the pressures that work in the other direction. After all, there is surely some connection between the reduction of academic insularity I am urging here, and the growing concern over "alternative careers" for political scientists.

There are practical problems in getting non-academic participants, of course: those with the willingness, time, and intellectual capabilities to contribute. Like universities, federal agencies are reducing travel funds. Yet every likely city for a meeting has state, local and party officials, federal regional offices, and usually some unique aspect of politics to look at. I hope that by the next annual meeting in Washington whatever condition of government and politics the city may then present, and whatever may be the state of political science, that there will be more contact between the two, for they ought to see more of one another.

James F. Davidson
Newcomb College, Tulane University

To the Editor:

I am grateful to Professors Richardson and Somit for bringing to the fore some of the problems of APSA awards for outstanding dissertations (*PS*, Summer, 1980). In 1977-78 I served on the Helen Dwight Reid Award committee. I wholeheartedly agree with Richardson and Somit, as follows: that a greater effort should be made so that more political science departments submit their outstanding dissertations; that committees be more representative and that persons serve longer terms. Also probably more committee members should be added in anticipation of a greater load of dissertations, if a wider submission becomes the practice. Further, not only do criteria for evaluating dissertations need to be published, but there should be some way of having continuity over time. Here the answer might include staggered terms for committee members.

However, the most needed reform was not mentioned by Professors Richardson and Somit: it is anonymity of dissertation authors, sponsors and schools. I was astounded to find the names of authors, sponsors and university affiliations on dissertations I read. When this is the practice it may account for some dissertation awards unconsciously or consciously being given disproportionately to persons from the most prestigious schools. Moreover, there is the problem of "personalism" entering. I found myself reading a dissertation sponsored by one of my major professors and another by a former student! Trying to be objective in a situation like this is obviously quite difficult. I believe it is best to adopt the practice of our major journals and keep all submissions anonymous to evaluators.'

Wilma Rule
DeKalb, Illinois

To the Editor:

1980 was, on the whole, a good year for participation by women in the program of the Association. Following is my annual stocktaking.

A greater percentage of women chaired panels and gave papers than ever before. Fewer women, though, were section heads and discussants than has been customary.

	Section Heads			Chairpersons			Paper Givers			Discussants		
	T	W	%	T	W	%	T	W	%	T	W	%
1980	18	3	16.7	139	29	20.9	453	99	21.9	160	19	11.9
1979	16	4	25.0	128	33	18.0	525	77	14.7	184	35	19.0
1978	16	2	12.5	131	20	15.3	500	99	19.8	210	35	16.7
1977	15	3	20.0	129	20	15.5	531	89	16.8	204	30	14.7
1976	18	4	22.2	126	24	19.0	477	65	13.6	170	31	18.2

As noted previously, where women were section heads, other women had a better chance to head panels (30.4 percent); yet in these sections this year, fewer women gave papers (14.7 percent) or served as discussants (12.2 percent). Where women chaired panels, other women had greater likelihood of appearing as paper givers (29.3 percent) and discussants (18.4 percent).

Three sections headed by males had the best records with respect to selecting female performers:

	Chairs	Papers	Discussants
Political Thought and Philosophy	35.7	15.6	40.0
Public Policy	33.3	15.2	33.3
Urban and Ethnic Politics	44.4	30.8	9.1

The worst showing came in these three sections:

	Chairs	Papers	Discussants
Comparative Politics of Industrial Societies	0	12.5	0
International Interactions and Processes	11.1	5.1	5.6
Political Science as a Profession	0	9.1	0

My annual roster of stag panels includes:

	Chairs	Papers	Discussants
Implementation of Civil Rights	0-1	0-6	0-1
Is Directed Change Possible in Federal Systems	0-1	0-5	0-2
Business, Labor, and the State in Industrialized Democracies	0-1	0-7	
Roundtable: Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching of Public Policy	0-1	0-6	
The Political Economy of International Migration	0-2	0-5	0-3
Political Science: Maintaining the Profession's Viability in the Eighties (N.B.!)	0-1	0-6	0-2
Empirical and Analytical Studies of Competence in Decision Making	0-1	0-5	0-2

Communications

It's only fair to call attention to other panels that had done well by our female colleagues:

	Chairs	Papers	Discussants
Political Economy of Communist States	1-1	3-5	0-1
Marriage, the Family, and the State	1-1	2-4	1-1
The International Division of Labor	0-1	2-4	1-1
The Burger Court and the Treatment of the Disadvantaged	0-1	3-3	0-2
Adult Socialization	1-1	3-6	1-2
Race, Ethnicity, and Class in American Politics	1-1	3-5	0-2
The Changing Nature of Political Leadership, Public Lives, and Private Lives	1-1	3-6	2-2
Single Issue Politics in the States	1-1	2-5	1-2
Politics of Criminal Process	1-1	3-4	0-2

One woman performed during the two evening plenary sessions (out of ten luminaries featured). A disappointment was the announcement that only six women were selected for next year's awards committees. (This year there were 12 women. Two 1980 committees even had women in the majority.)

Martin Gruberg
University of Wisconsin (Oshkosh)

TIMELY NEW BOOKS FROM HARPER & ROW

Mao

A Biography

Ross Terrill

Here, the author of *800,000,000: The Real China* captures the essence of China's great and enigmatic leader, Mao Zedong. Drawing on Chinese documentary sources, Terrill produces an unsparingly honest, vivid portrait which shows both Mao's indisputable talents and his flaws.

"A thoughtful, absorbing biography." — *Publishers Weekly*

"Succeed[s] in reaching the private man behind the public idol!"

— *New Republic*

hardcover, \$15.95

The Education of a True Believer

Lev Kopelev

In this masterful autobiography a well-known dissident, still living in the Soviet Union, tells of the development of his now rejected Marxist faith. Describing the progression from an early, eager acceptance of Soviet indoctrination to staunch support of Stalin's dictatorship, his story helps to explain how many genuinely idealistic revolutionaries participated in a system that produced tyranny. "Well written and well translated." — *Library Journal*

hardcover, \$15.95

Facing Reality

From World Federalism to the CIA

Cord Meyer

An insider committed to a strong American intelligence operation writes of his life within the CIA and describes the nature of the Soviet political and intelligence threat. Meyer marshalls overwhelming evidence in support of the belief that our survival depends on a realistic assessment of the USSR—a view of increased significance in light of the recent invasion of Afghanistan and the current crackdown on internal dissent.

hardcover, \$15.00

Independent Journey

The Life of William O. Douglas

James F. Simon

Based on more than three years of research and interviews, this is the first major biography of the most controversial man to sit on the U.S. Supreme Court. Simon probes behind the public image of Douglas as a promoter of the causes of human dignity to find a man of personal insecurities and fascinating contradictions.

hardcover, \$15.00

Now in paperback:

Endgame

The Inside Story of SALT II

Strobe Talbott with a new epilogue by the author

The diplomatic correspondent of *Time* magazine takes us behind the scenes of the climactic phase of the strategic arms limitation talks—the secrecy-shrouded negotiations that produced one of the most disputed agreements of our era. "An exciting account of the SALT negotiation told by one of the best young diplomatic reporters in the business!"

— Marvin Kalb

paperback CN 809, \$5.95

At your bookstore
or from:



Harper & Row

10 E. 53d St., New York 10022

916