

This is by way of saying that I fully support the proposals of Herzberg et al. and MacRae—Wildavsky. It is manifestly absurd for the business meeting, rarely attended by more than a few hundred members, to make governing decisions for the world's largest and most influential political science association. (I shall not discuss Kettler's conclusions which seem to me to be the result of somewhat forced, not to say tortured, logic, unless he intends that the entire annual meeting be given over to business matters.) I don't think it can be overemphasized that American political science is finally coming into its own as a policy-shaping force in society and as the principal determinant for the rest of the world of what constitutes the proper scope and method of the discipline. From an ethical, moral, or values point of view, this may or may not be a desirable development (I personally have some major reservations about it). But what is important in this context is that the Association, especially its officers, is increasingly turned to as *the* spokesman for all of us. I should imagine, for example, that Association officers are now appearing fairly frequently before Congressional committees, and that their formal and informal contacts with government agencies, foundations, the mass media, and other policy- and opinion-making bodies have increased enormously in recent years. It therefore is extremely important that they represent their constituency in something more than name only, and I feel that the proposals of Herzberg et al. and MacRae-Wildavsky will help toward that end.

That being said, I should like to make some related suggestions. (1) I strongly recommend that *all* elections of officers be contested elections, i.e., that the nominating committee be required to submit at least two names for each position of president-elect, vice president, secretary, and treasurer, and that the number of those nominated for the Council exceed the number to be elected. It would still be possible, of course, to nominate other candidates through membership petitions. (2) I also recommend that a formula be found to give representation on the Council to certain relatively neglected constituencies within the Association. I have the impression that the colleges are underrepresented, for instance. I urge that one or more posts on the Council be allocated to graduate students—again I leave open the question of formula—and that thought be given to representation for undergraduate political science majors (perhaps in their senior year?). If there is a demand on the part of Black colleagues that Black political scientists as such be represented, I favor their demand being met.

Finally, I want to offer the opinion that no official of the Association, elected or paid, should authorize the use of his name and title for any purpose whatever without the approval of the Council or perhaps a special committee of the Council. I am distressed to find that a variety of enterprises, including research organizations, book clubs, and consulting bodies, have appointed to their boards officers of the Association who are identified as such. I fear that this gives the impression that the enterprise in question has been endorsed by the Association, and while it is flattering to think that our names and titles may be worth something, we must be careful about possible abuses. I am suggesting, in effect, that the rules of the Association include safeguards against such abuse. It may even be desirable to place an absolute prohibition on outside activities especially of appointed officials.



Michael Parenti
Yale University

THE UNDERLYING POLITICAL VALUES

I would like to discuss the underlying political values relating to the governance of the Association. It is my view that any profession which performs meaningful functions in this world must thereby propagate certain values and interests at the expense of other values and interests. This value selectivity is an inescapable condition of life. However, most professional orientations are so representative of the dominant socio-political system as to appear not as entrenched normative dedications

but as "value-free" approaches to "the nature of things." Political scientists who argue that our profession and our Association must remain "neutral" for the sake of scholarly objectivity mistakenly assume that neutrality is attainable and that, indeed, it is part of our present accomplishment. Practices and programs which arouse little controversy are considered of *neutral* value when more often they are of *conventional* value. Accusations of "partisanship" and "lack of objectivity" are readily leveled against those scholars who challenge—but rarely against those who reinforce—ongoing socio-political orientations.

Yet certain conditions in our discipline should leave us skeptical of all claims made on behalf of a value-free profession. Consider the following items:

1. Most American government textbooks, those instruments of undergraduate political socialization, propagate conventional biases in the guise of political verities. Behind the whispers of self-criticism one detects the roar of self-congratulations, a celebration of the dominant values and institutions of "our" system. The same may be said of most texts on U.S. foreign affairs which long have championed the orthodoxy of American cold-war policy.

2. The greater portion of our literature is composed of studies whose principal effect is to reinforce the prevailing definitions of political reality, treating the present socio-economic framework as a structural-functional necessity and rarely as an object of critical analysis. There persists the unspoken presumption among traditionalists and behavioralists alike that studies which implicitly share the normative perspective of the phenomena they are investigating somehow represent a value-free empiricism, a researching of the world "as it is." But the very manner in which some questions are asked—and some questions left unasked, and the frames of references and modes of analysis employed by most researchers reveal the loaded premises and ideological confines from which they work, and point to the value-laden implications of their conclusions.

3. Many colleagues also presume that the more devoid their work is of recognizable political content, the more scientific and professional it is. The pages of the *APSR* amply document this curious fact. The effect is to discourage scientific analysis and investigation of vital but politically controversial phenomena thereby too often reducing our science to a dull and paltry thing.

4. The best of our undergraduate and graduate students increasingly complain of the monochromatic brand of political science that is offered them and of the frequently unaccommodating responses within their departments to new scientific and scholarly perspectives. Armed with the power of certification, the departments usually prevail over the students. While making claim to intellectual and ideological independence, most departments produce Ph.D.'s who are remarkably standardized in their views about what constitutes scholarly research, what ideas are important and how ideas (and careers) shall be advanced.

5. There are a disturbing number of colleagues whose political beliefs and activities have become a consideration in decisions relating to their appointment and tenure. The victims of this liberal backlash can provide eloquent testimony to the "value-free" "professional" standards maintained by some people.

6. Capable scholars who have pursued questions falling beyond the pale of ideological respectability have enjoyed far less access to research funds than their more orthodox colleagues. (David Horowitz reports that "after writing *The Power Elite* Mills was abruptly cut off from foundation financing.") There are immense value implications in the ways and the reasons why government agencies, corporations and foundations finance research. I refer readers to Horowitz's article in *Ramparts*, May 1969, for a disclosure of who gets what among political scientists in the foundation circuit.

Now the APSA is hardly an innocent bystander to all this. The Association, like the universities, is much engaged in activities relating to power and wealth in this society. A closer study of how prominent Association members fit into the interlocking system of foundations, corporations, institutes, councils, centers and sundry conduits and agencies would bring us to the realization that the APSA is something other than an academic club grown large.

The Association confers scholarly honors in such a way as to give priority and

special legitimacy to certain kinds of research at the expense of other approaches. Furthermore, the Association conveys an impression of what is to be considered *politically*, as well as scholarly, acceptable. Thus the Bernstein Report instructs us as follows: "Effective service as a faculty member is often compatible with *certain types* of political activity, for example, holding a part-time office in a political party or serving as a citizen of a governmental advisory board." (Italics mine) But why are only "certain types of political activity" compatible with a faculty position? What types are not? What is it about government boards and political parties that make them acceptable? And what "neutral-professional" criteria allow us to draw distinctions?

The APSA lends its imprimatur to mainstream institutions and political figures by awarding merit citations and sponsoring Congressional fellowships and bi-partisan conferences for freshmen state legislators and Congressmen (complete with four pages of inane photographs in the Winter 1969 issue of *P.S.*). That the advertising and servicing of Republican and Democratic politicians qualifies as a value-free professional activity is at least questionable.

Some colleagues may feel quite content with ongoing arrangements: they *want* the profession, the Association and the universities to sustain and service our government and the interests it serves. Be it the right of any political scientist to accept and defend the status quo, but surely others of us are equally within our rights in trying to change present commitments. In a world replete with exploitation, institutional authoritarianism, racism, militarism and mass murder, we would like to see the Association and the profession become, at least in part, a force which challenges rather than supports the dominant ideology and practices of this unhappy society, an organization which will be reluctant to lend its moral, intellectual, scientific and material resources to established powers and values—even at the risk of straining relations with the NSF and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations.

Such a new commitment would not entail a sacrifice of scholarly quality nor a neglect of the more ordinary chores of our profession. The various moves made by the Association (of which this symposium is but one) toward more controversial and self-critical subjects have not threatened the intellectual quality of our work. If anything, they only threaten to bring us back to life.

It is time some of our colleagues disabused themselves of the illusion that conventional political values are somehow more professional than unconventional ones and that polemics and journalism are the only alternatives to their particular definition of the one true science. I, for one, need be treated to no further preachments about the untainted wonders of an allegedly non-normative empiricism. It is not that we dissenters wish to abandon our science but that we wish to introduce new questions to it, broaden its systematic applications and its theoretical scope, deepen its critical thrust and make explicit its value-laden premises and effects.

Like the university, the Association can support political and scholarly orthodoxy or it can encourage political and scholarly heterodoxy. It can ignore the purge mentality behind certain hiring and firing practices or it can push for fair play and respect for individual rights and scholarly accomplishment. It can court the powers that be or it can question and challenge such powers in the light of urgent social problems. The one thing the Association cannot do is pretend to a professional neutrality that never was.



Harry M. Scoble
University of California, Los Angeles

REASONED AND EFFICIENT PARTICIPATION

Messrs. Herzberg *et al.* propose elimination of the *de facto* poll tax, via the registration fee, for participating in business meetings of the APSA. They suggest that amendments to the APSA Constitution be ratified by majority vote on a mailed ballot submitted to the full membership. And they also propose a similar referendum on any item, at an annual or special meeting, to which twenty per cent or more of those voting