superiority” over the Mongolian People’s Republic.

As to further research, it is to be hoped that it will be pursued rigorously and systematically to determine once and for all the balance of power in world politics on both the systemic and sub-systemic levels, including the distribution of power between East and West, North and South, and perhaps even between Northeast and Southwest and Southeast and Northwest. Moreover, studies of past Olympic Games could lead researchers to undertake trend analyses. Finally, our modest exploration also indicates the necessity of establishing a data bank on, and an institute for the study of, RP&I and PPQ in world politics. Such an institute could then generate further studies on the problems and symptoms of BS.

Union College and The University of Kansas (visiting)

CHARLES GATI

To the Editor:

Permit me to respond in the Review to the important gap between findings and interpretation offered by Langton and Jennings in the September, 1968 issue. Ken Langton and Kent Jennings are two of the most accomplished students of political socialization, and their large-scale Michigan study ought to have a major impact upon the profession. Therefore, “Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum” raises several questions that are of interest to us all:

1. Why call for “a radical restructuring of these [civics] courses in order for them to have any appreciable pay-off” when it has been concluded that “our findings certainly do not support the thinking of those who look to the civics curriculum in American high schools as even a minor source of political socialization”?

2. Why conclude that the civics curriculum has so little impact, when the reported data show that courses in American Government and Democracy are important sources of knowledge, political efficacy, and civic role for Negro students? After all, haven’t the major public efforts in curriculum and educational development been directed toward the black community and its school system?

3. Why consider the policy and value dimensions of “political socialization” (and the curriculum) when the operational definitions are so narrow (taking 0 versus 1 or more civics courses), there are no behavioral dimensions of political learning and participation (I wonder what those seemingly compliant Blacks were doing between classes in the Afro-American Student Association) and the concept and method of political socialization itself smuggles in numerous assumptions about political impact? I would now give one cheer for the impact of Problems in American Democracy on Black students because of Langton and Jennings’ findings and despite their assumptions and methods.

4. Why reinforce conclusions about curriculum irrelevance by noting that selection for higher education may be confounded with socialization in the schools? Of course it may, but the more important point is that socialization (and the curriculum) influences who is selected. Changing the quality and rewards of school socialization are reflected in college admission practices. Enhanced personal and political efficacy among Blacks is likely to increase the number of Black students selected by the University of Michigan.

5. Why stress “information redundancy” rather than politically relevant uses of acquired attitudes and information in accounting for reported racial differences?

I raise these questions in a spirit of concerned colleagueship because the work of Langton and Jennings is of such high quality in professional and behavioral terms. But the terms of Political Socialization concept and method screen out significant public questions about education’s impact on political learning and behavior. Robert Hess, David Sears, and I speak to this point independently in the Summer, 1968 Harvard Educational Review where Hess raises the issue most pointedly: “Political socialization is a concept which is difficult to apply to the process of political learning during periods of rapid social change or open conflict between major segments of a society. It is of little usefulness in the United States today.” Beyond some constructive criticism about a single article the point ought to be taken seriously in deciding what questions are most important in research for the professional knowledge base of the current generation.

The University of Connecticut    EDGAR LITT

To the Editor:

We appreciate the opportunity to reply to the points raised by Professor Litt.

1. The logic of his first point appears to be based on a misreading of our article. For the great majority (90%) of high school students there is no evidence that the civics curriculum has a significant effect. We did not conclude,
however, that civics courses could not have an impact, only that it would take "... radical restructuring ... for them to have an appreciable pay-off."

2-3. The importance of civics for the Negro subpopulation was emphasized in our analysis. We do not share, however, the reasoning behind Professor Litt’s “cheer” regarding the impact of these courses. Negative relationships between politicization and course exposure among high status Negroes leaves little room for cheer. Their increasingly passive image of their citizenship role is particularly distressing. It should also be emphasized that the vigor of Afro-American movements had not yet penetrated this generation of Black students when the data were gathered (1965). Nor should we delude ourselves concerning the extent to which Negro high school students are even now intensely involved in these movements. Finally, it is not obvious that the major thrust of curriculum reform is directed toward Blacks; such was definitely not true around 1965.

4. Our data do suggest that differences in political orientations between those with high school versus college education—differences usually ascribed to the “education process” at the college level—could be laid to selection rather than collegiate socialization. This does not mean that prior socialization is unimportant in determining who enters college. Increased political efficacy associated with taking civics courses might raise the chances of lower status Negroes going to college. But there are two important qualifications. First, civics has no measurable impact on the efficacy level of either high status Negroes or Whites of any status. Second, most studies reveal that familial factors are the prime predictors of who enters college.

5. We do not understand completely the thrust of Professor Litt’s fifth point. Information redundancy was stressed because it seemed useful in explaining our findings.

6. As for what comes under the rubric of political socialization, we apparently prefer a broader construction of the term than do some scholars. To suggest that the process stops with the advent of the first urban disorder or student protest strains our sense of what constitutes political socialization.

KENNETH P. LANGTON
M. KENT JENNINGS
University of Michigan

To the Editor:

Mickiewiez’s review of my book, Soviet Institutions, the Individual and Society (Boston: Christopher Publishing Co., 1967, co-authored with Irene M. Hulicka) conveys more information about the calibre of the reviewer’s scholarship than about the contents of the book. Whereas one might hope that the misinterpretations on which she bases her review reflect only ignorance, there is room for suspicions about lack of professional ethics. A goodly portion of her discontent with our book is based on our “failure” to fulfill claims invented by her. As nearly as I can tell, the claims which she attributes to us are derived from her inaccurate interpretation of advertising material prepared by the publisher. It is, of course, possible that Mickiewicz is ignorant of the fact that authors are not responsible for the advertising statements made by publishers, but it would be unfair to her teachers to assume that she had never been taught that quotations which are attributed to others must be accurate both with respect to source and contents.

Since APSR policy allows a reviewer several thousands words to comment on a book, but allows the author only 400 words to reply to the comments, space limitations prevent me from discussing in detail Mickiewicz’s misinterpretations, her amazing lack of differentiation between analysis and speculation, and her naivete about institutions, events and processes in the Soviet Union. Moreover, her comments suggest that she failed to read the book; from the entire 680 pages she apparently scanned the 103 page chapter on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, misread the publisher’s statements on the cover pages and the authors’ statements in the preface and introduction, and read the occasional sentence here and there elsewhere in the book. Had her comments been published in any journal other than the A.P.S. Review, I would not have even bothered to answer them.

KAREL HULICKA
State University of New York at Buffalo

To the Editor:

Professor Hulicka’s intemperate charges are unsupported and essentially unimportant. The major question, it seems to me, centers on the role of the reviewer, or for that matter, of the political scientist. Should an analyst of political affairs describe or reproduce official statements about a political system, or should he impose on that material categories of analysis derived from a theoretical source explaining or purporting to explain a wide variety of data? The official political doctrine of the Soviet Union does claim to provide the theoretical framework for meaningful categories of social and political analysis, but it is open to question whether Soviet