

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Volume Sixty-six. A while ago (June 1972, pp. 585–586) we published a short, snappy analysis of the contents of Volume 65 of the *Review*. Now we can do the same for Volume 66. In keeping with trends in the profession, we are pleased to be able to refer readers to Table 1, which gives 16 sets of figures for Volume 65, and includes lots of blank space for those who want to fill in comparable figures for Volume 66. Our comments will adhere only in part to the rather arbitrary format provided by the table, and in part we will wander off in other directions.

For example, we have noticed a bump in the number of articles devoted to Congress: six if you count articles on congressional apportionment, four otherwise. This is very suspicious; we all know that in a previous life the managing editor used to lurk around Capitol Hill. How ironic that none of the congressional articles are by associates, former associates, colleagues, former colleagues, students or former students of the managing editor. For some years now congressional scholars have been making the claim that theirs is a burgeoning field of study. Perhaps the word is beginning to reach the *Review*, even without the benefit of the managing editor's encouragement.

Nothing we have printed in the *APSR* in our time has earned us more favorable comment than the long symposium in Volume 66 on positivism and historicism. Why? We do not know. Is it an occupational disease of political scientists for us to be what David Braybrooke might call frustrated paraphilosophers? Is there something about the din of battle that pulls us out of the woodwork, rivets our attention, and sets the applause meter skyrocketing? Of course it is possible that no motives as base as these are involved, and that it is the substance of the issues debated in the symposium that really interested readers. In that case, it would appear that for many of us, there is something intriguing about cosmic hiccoughs emanating from far parts of our solar system, which may or may not make waves closer to home.

At any rate, the favorable response to this particular symposium gives us courage to persist in our occasional use of this device to stimulate thought and scholarship. The growth of this format reflects, we suppose, the managing editor's view that when we can get it, good conversation is better than a good monologue. Mounting symposiums is risky work, since it entails finding commentators who are not only appropriate but prompt, making certain that contributors get timely opportunities to see the

materials they are supposed to comment on, assembling all the parts of the package in the proper order, and getting it into print seasonably.

We think all this effort is worthwhile in several circumstances. Occasionally we accept an article that criticizes, continues, or amplifies the work of another scholar in such a way as to create a presumption of scholarly privilege. Once in a while we accept an article that divides our readers in a fashion that suggests they had better have it out in public. In these cases, we try to provide a forum for the direct exchange of ideas on controverted topics. We think that direct exchange leads to less misunderstanding in a scholarly community over the long run than is the case when scholarly discourse develops, as sometimes happens, into piecemeal guerrilla warfare.

A third occasion for a symposium comes about when articles arrive from disparate sources dealing with similar or closely related problems, or with a topic that seems especially timely or urgent or newly emergent or crucial from the standpoint either of the theory or the practice of politics. In this case the symposium format may underline a theme, or announce a new community of interest. We do not do this third type of symposium as much as we could, if we knew more, or knew better how to predict or to identify important new areas of study.

Another continuing feature of the *Review* which made its debut in Volume 66 is the review essay. We think this is an appropriate vehicle for the stimulation of thought about major figures in political science, for the presentation of a synoptic view of reasonably well-bounded fields of study, or for the extended analysis of a cluster of books. No doubt other rationalizations will occur as time goes on.

A stray thought tugs at our mind as we contemplate the uses of the review essay. As our discipline flourishes and proliferates, it is bound to be increasingly true that in any given issue of the *APSR*, fewer and fewer major articles will address all our readers. Specialized knowledge, to which we are willingly and unavoidably committed, means that any one reader will as time goes on find the front of the book harder to read, and less of it directly engaging to his interests—whatever they are.

This creates a special opportunity for features in the back of the book: reviews, review essays, correspondence, editorial comments. Here, surely, we should all feel comfortably at home. If the front of the *Review* is a series of boutiques, the back should resemble an old-

Table 1. Some Comparisons

	Volume 65 (1971)	Volume 66 (1972)
1. Articles	46	42
2. Review Essays	0	3
3. Comments and Rejoinders	10	10
4. Political Psychology, Mass Voting, Attitudes, Participation	19	
5. Articles Having At Least One Table or Figure	35	
6. Presidential Addresses	1	1
7. Focus on U.S.	20	
8. Data About One or More Foreign Countries	12	
9. Formal Theory	13	
10. Public Law	2	
11. Public Administration and Organization Theory	1	
12. Policy Analysis	3	
13. Political Philosophy	3	
14. Elite Politics	2	
15. International Politics	2	
16. Congress	1	6

fashioned general store, where one shopper in search of a few yards of muslin can pause and exchange a word with another who wants a keg of nails.

Underlying this conception of the back of the *Review* is of course the notion that enough of us still have a need or at least a desire to cultivate our peripheral vision, that there are some things worth sharing that we can all share, that specialization, while important and probably indispensable for the increase of knowledge, is not all-important.

Having Fun? Colleagues occasionally ask the managing editor whether he enjoys the job. The fact is, like nearly everything else when seen from up close, there are joys and sorrows. Things to like about the job: The secretarial help. The chance to talk on the telephone. Advance looks at what interesting people are writing. The unmerited high status in the profession. Things not to like: Getting nasty letters. Having to say no. The high visibility in the profession that occasionally draws hostility.

The job description for the managing editor is somewhat deceptive. There are the daily chores that we all know about: answering the mail, assigning referees to manuscripts, reading evaluations, and deciding whether or not to publish. These activities can be worked without strain into even the busiest day provided good secretarial help is available and provided also

that they are done on a daily basis and are not permitted to pile up.

The imposition of a daily routine on the managing editor probably does levy a hidden toll insofar as it interrupts the longer cycles associated with the production of serious scholarship. But that is a risk that most managing editors knowingly face when they take on the job.

In addition to these daily tasks, however, are activities that are more time and energy consuming than many people realize. The managing editor is a constitutional officer of the Association. This makes him a voting member of the Council, and takes him to the three or more Council meetings that are held each year. As the person responsible for the source of the largest part of the Association's income—and for a major fraction of its expenditures as well—the managing editor ought no doubt to participate as a member of the Council. At a minimum this arrangement gives other Council members a chance to complain about the contents of the *Review*.

A certain number of queries and invitations also come into the office, we assume *ex officio*. Our judgment is that we ought to respond affirmatively to a decent percentage of these, so as to fulfill the main long-range duty of the managing editor, which is to try to stay abreast of what's happening in the discipline. In a discipline as variegated and amorphous as political science, this is not an easy task. No single political scientist, no matter how well acquainted, can afford to rely for long on the network of colleagues he has when he assumes the managing editorship. So part of our job is to attend to the continuous renovation and renewal of the managing editor's knowledge of the profession.

These long-range items are not part of the conventional job description for the managing editorship. Nevertheless, they constitute real obligations, they take time, and they are important sources of the drudgery and fascination of the job.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

Paul R. Abramson, Michigan State University, "Generational Change in American Electoral Behavior"

Peter H. Aranson, Georgia Institute of Technology, Melvin J. Hinich, and Peter C. Ordeshook, Carnegie-Mellon University, "Election Goals and Strategies: Equivalent and Non-equivalent Candidate Objectives"

Robert Axelrod, University of California, Berkeley, "Schema Theory: An Information Processing Model of Perception and Cognition"

Harry W. Blair, Bucknell University, "Minority

- Electoral Politics in a North Indian State: Aggregate Data Analysis and the Muslim Community in Bihar, 1952–1972”
- Steven J. Brams, New York University and Morton D. Davis, City College of New York, “The 3/2s Rule in Presidential Campaigning”
- Christopher Bruell, Boston College, “Thucydides’ View of Athenian Imperialism”
- Walter Dean Burnham, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Theory and Voting Research: Some Reflections on Converse’s ‘Change in the American Electorate’ ”
- Blair Campbell, University of California, Los Angeles, “Helvétius and the Roots of the ‘Closed’ Society”
- William Cavala, University of California, Berkeley, “Changing the Rules Changes the Outcome: Party Reform and the 1972 California Delegation to the Democratic National Convention”
- Harry Eckstein, Princeton University, “Authority Patterns: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry”
- Peter Eisinger, University of Wisconsin, Madison, “Racial Differences in Protest Participation”
- David J. Elkins, University of British Columbia, “The Measurement of Party Competition in Multi-Party Systems”
- John A. Ferejohn, California Institute of Technology, “The Paradox of Not Voting: A Decision Theoretic Analysis”
- Peter C. Fishburn, Pennsylvania State University, “Paradoxes of Voting”
- Ronald P. Formisano, Clark University, “Deferential-Participant Politics: U.S. Political Culture, 1789–1840”
- Virginia Gray, University of Minnesota, “Innovation in the States: A Diffusion Study”
- A. James Gregor, University of California, Berkeley, “On ‘Understanding’ Fascism: A Review of Some Contemporary Literature”
- Nobutaka Ike, Stanford University, “Economic Growth and Intergenerational Change in Japan”
- Donald B. Johnson and James R. Gibson, University of Iowa, “The Divisive Primary Revisited: Party Activists in Iowa”
- Kenneth Jowitt, University of California, Berkeley, “An Organizational Approach to the Study of Political Culture in Marxist-Leninist Systems”
- Stanley Kelley, Jr., Princeton University and Thad W. Mirer, University of Wisconsin, “The Simple Act of Voting”
- Warren Lee Kostroski, Wittenberg University, “Party and Incumbency in Postwar Senate Elections: Trends, Patterns and Models”
- Eugene B. McGregor, Jr., University of Maryland, “Politics and the Career Mobility of Bureaucrats”
- Arthur H. Miller, Ohio State University, “Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1964–1970”
- James T. Murphy, Wesleyan University, “Party and Pork: Party Conflict and Cooperation in House Public Works Committee Decision Making”
- John C. Pierce, Washington State University, and Douglas D. Rose, Tulane University, “Nonattitudes and American Public Opinion: The Examination of a Thesis”
- David Ray, Stanford University, “Membership Stability in Three State Legislatures: 1893–1969”
- William H. Riker, University of Rochester, “The Paradox of Vote Trading”
- Douglas D. Rose, Tulane University, “National and Local Forces in State Politics: The implications of Multi-level Policy Analysis”
- Lester M. Salamon, Vanderbilt University, and Stephen Van Evera, University of California, Berkeley, “Fear, Apathy, and Discrimination: A Test of Three Explanations of Political Participation Among the Poor”
- Stephen G. Salkever, Bryn Mawr College, “Virtue, Obligation and Politics”
- Kenneth A. Shepsle, Washington University, “On the Size of Winning Coalitions”
- Brian Silver, Florida State University, “Social Mobilization and the Russification of Soviet Nationalities”
- Arthur G. Stevens, Jr., University of Virginia, Arthur H. Miller, Ohio State University and Thomas E. Mann, American Political Science Association, “Mobilization of Liberal Strength in the House, 1955–1970: The Democratic Study Group”
- Timothy A. Tilton, Indiana University, “The Social Origins of Liberal Democracy: The Swedish Case”
- Glenn Tinder, University of Massachusetts, Boston, “Beyond Tragedy: The Idea of Civility”
- Vernon Van Dyke, University of Iowa, “Human Rights Without Discrimination”
- Herbert Weisberg, University of Michigan, “Models of Statistical Relationship”
- Roger E. Wyman, Rutgers University, “Middle-Class Voters and Progressive Reform: The Conflict of Class and Culture”
- William Zimmerman, University of Michigan, “Issue Area and Foreign Policy Processes: A Research Note in Search of a General Theory”