

---

# Letters to the Editor

---

## Political Science 400

---

We are indebted to a number of people for calling our attention to errors of omission and commission in the "Political Science 400: Citations by Ph.D. Cohort and by Ph.D.-Granting Institutions," *PS*, June 1989 (Vol. 22, Issue 2), pp. 258-269. We particularly wish to apologize to Sidney Verba (Harvard University) for inadvertently omitting him from the 1955-59 cohort as the sixth most cited person in that highly distinguished cohort. (The careful reader may have noted that the N was 26 but there were only 25 names listed in that cohort.) We also owe an apology to Temple University, which we implied did not have a Ph.D. program though of course it does, and to Daniel Elazar, who we said in a footnote was not among those listed though in fact he was. Finally, we owe a debt of gratitude to Barnett R. Rubin, Yale University, for his honesty in declining credit for citations to B. Rubin that actually should have been credited either to Barry Rubin (Washington Institute for Near East Policy), or to Bernard Rubin (Boston University), or to still other B. Rubins whom we have not yet identified. We also owe Barnett Rubin an apology for misclassifying him as to field of interest. The citations to Barnett Rubin only are too few to rank him in the 1980+ cohort. However, since the last citations we looked at were 1985, the "Political Science 400" listing is not very informative about members of this cohort. Of necessity, citation counting is imperfect because of potential problems in name confounds, etc. If there are other errors in our list, we would appreciate being alerted to them.

Hans-Dieter Klingemann  
Bernard Grofman  
Janet Campagna  
University of California, Irvine

## Political Science 400, Continued

---

In a perverse way I appreciate the reference to me in the letter of 19 July written to you by the authors of the "Political Science 400."

I write now to correct an understandable error. I am no longer, as I was when I wrote to you, employed by Yale University. My only correct identification is as a fellow of the United States Institute of Peace. I hope you can reflect this in your letters column.

Barnett R. Rubin  
United States Institute of Peace

## More on Positive Theory

---

In *PS*, March 1989, I published a "comment" on positive theory, which Edwin Rutkowski attacks in a letter published by *PS* in September (p. 559). Rutkowski seems to think that positive theorists like myself hold the "confused" view that normative theory can/should be arrived at by "positivist" methods. I can reassure him on that point. I became aware of the difference between the "is" and "ought" as an undergraduate, longer ago than I care to recall. I take the difference seriously; I have taught ethical theory, general and political, and I have worked my way through the logical positivists who attack ethical theory (Ayer, Stevenson, and others) as well as people like Northrop and Toulmin who have tried to link ethics to "scientific" method. Doing so induced dismay. Normative theory is simply not what I do, though I recognize its significance.

Nor do I, or the "epistemologically inno-

cent" predecessors I respect, think that normative and positive theory call for the same method. (See Weber on the ultimate "meaninglessness" of science because it does not tell us how to live or what to do; but even Comte was not that "innocent.")

Mr. Rutkowski should have noticed two aspects of my comment. One is that I (and Comte) do not equate "negative" with normative thought, but rather with theological or metaphysical thinking about the nature of things. Secondly, I do not link "positive" thought to the definition of desirable ends, but to the means used to pursue them. The point is, after Weber, surely familiar. Desirable ends, in terms of which "betterness" is defined, do not materialize out of positive theory. However the ends are defined, they must be pursued by working with society as it is—note, not *accepting* society as it is, but also not just by thinking about nice ends.

If, by the way, Mr. Rutkowski is so sophisticated as to have hit upon a method applicable to both normative and positive theories, I would very much like to know what it is, or where to find it. Until then, his letter seems to me to bear out my argument that the early positivists underrated the difficulty of what they tried to do: to base normative action on solid foundations.

Harry Eckstein  
University of California, Irvine

## Disciplinary History as Rara Avis? Not Quite

In a recent *APSR* essay on the writing of disciplinary history, Professor James Farr (1988, p. 1175) contends that "[i]ndeed, from the late 1950s to the mid-1960s, works in the history of political science stand out by their sheer rarity. . . ." Then, possibly to make sure that the reader has not missed the point, the same thesis is repeated on the next page—"political science in the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s rarely recalled its (or any other) history."

This contention can be defended only if

Professor Farr wishes to argue that "works" *must* be full-scale books or monographs. In actuality, the "history of the discipline" was a subject treated not only in the three "works" of which he takes cognizance, but one discussed on many other occasions in the professional literature. It was, in fact, a topic to which presidents of the American Political Science Association have frequently turned—or were driven to—in their eponymous addresses, speeches promptly published in subsequent *APSR* issues. Thus, taking the period specified by Professor Farr, we have Emmette S. Redford's "Reflections on a Discipline" (1961); David B. Truman's "Disillusion and Regeneration—The Quest for a Discipline" (1965); Gabriel A. Almond's "Political Theory and Political Science" (1966); David Easton's "The New Revolution in Political Science" (1969); and jumping a decade, John C. Wahlke's "Pre-Behavioralism in Political Science" (1979)—all concerned with the history of American political science.

The aforementioned items come from the *APSR* alone; a search of our other major professional journals would, I think it safe to say, yield a respectable number of additional examples.

Addressing this same question in an article examining much the same corpus of recent writings, Dryzek and Leonard speak of disciplinary history as a "sporadic and discontinuous genre" (1988, p. 1235). I think this is considerably more accurate. Those of us who have attempted such writing may be discontinuous, but, as the above list suggests, we are not quite rare, let alone an endangered species.

Albert Somit  
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

## References

- Dryzek, John S., and Stephen T. Leonard. 1988. "History and Discipline in Political Science," *American Political Science Review*, 82:1245-1260.
- Farr, James. 1988. "The History of Political Science," *American Journal of Political Science*, 32:1175-1195.

## The Bible & Phone as Barriers to Voting

---

I hope many political scientists and concerned people will read Francis Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward's incisive analysis of low voter registration. Their article ("Government Statistics and Conflicting Explanations of Nonvoting," *PS*, September 1989, pp. 580-588) superbly analyzes some of the modern-day barriers, obstacles and impediments to registering.

Piven and Cloward's analysis reminded me of the difficulties and discouragements I myself have encountered in recently trying to register. My first illustration is from a wealthy suburb in central New Jersey; the second is from the *Bible* belt mountains of western North Carolina. In both instances the offices were remotely located and hard to find; the hours inconvenient; the personnel irritable and intimidating; and the questions long and complicated.

When I traveled to the election office for Montgomery Township, Somerset County, N.J., I was told that telephone ownership was a prerequisite to register. Election officials insisted that I would not be considered a resident until I got a telephone installed and publicly listed the phone number with them. After a heated argument with the officials, they relented. And cursed me. This was 1984.

When I went to the registration office for Henderson County, N.C., I was in-

formed that North Carolina state law required me to swear to God on a Protestant *Bible* that I would support the current state laws. After I expressed discomfort with this requirement, the officials refused to register me. So I backed down and meekly swore as demanded. The year was 1988.

In short, both experiences were disheartening and unpleasant. If I were not a political scientist, I would not register in the future. So Piven and Cloward's conclusions should be heeded.

Ralph W. Bastedo, Ph.D.  
Hendersonville, N.C.

## Recycling the *APSR*

---

Can you help put me in touch with the librarian of some institution who would welcome old copies of the *American Political Science Review*? I am retiring after a long-time membership (35 to 40 years) and would like to see the *Review* in the hands of some institution who needs a set (almost complete). I am not trying to sell them, I am willing to give them away, but I want the receiving institution to have enough interest in them to pay the shipping. (I will pack.)

J. W. Drury  
University of Kansas