

Communications

To the Editor:

My favorite reading matter in hotel rooms, along with the Gideons' *Holy Bible*, is the local telephone book, especially the Yellow Pages, or, if you are so lucky as to be served by Conrad the Intellectual, *The Hilton Bedside Book*, now available in several editions.

But nothing to-date compares with the *Cumulative Index to the Proceedings of the American Political Science Association*, (University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106, 1971, \$18.95) just published. As I'm writing this letter from the Washington Hilton, and as I have just spent a profitable evening tucked down in one of Conrad's beds with a hot-off-the-press copy of the *Cumulative Index*, and as I wish my colleagues soon to assemble here in September the same experience, I cannot resist the temptation of recommending this Iris-compiled, Janda-supervised and Kirkpatrick-prefaced 876-page work to all those who are curious about "Who does what?" (the book is silent on "to whom?") at our annual pow-wows.

Not that I exploited all the data (because I'm mindful of the need for secondary analyses), but I tested a well-known, well-accepted hypothesis: "the same crowd, year in, year out, dominated paper-giving at the annual meeting"; or its corollary: "Most people have no chance giving a paper" (obviously!). The following table presents my initial findings (which I dedicate to Robert Lane). It is a simple tabulation of the number of people who, between 1956 and 1969, gave one, two, three, four or more papers, solo or jointly.

<i>(Solo or Jointly)</i> Number of Papers	Contributors	
	N	%
1	899	78
2	171	15
3	52	5
4+*	20	2
	<hr/> 1142	<hr/> 100

I shall leave inferences and interpretations to your learned readers. But I wish to alert them to the technical constraints under which I labored in making the tabulation: (1) my position in tabulation was horizontal; (2) my computer was either the forebrain or midbrain, I'm not sure which; (3) percentaging was done by the long-hand method;

* Includes seven notorious Stakhanovites (with more than four papers and in alphabetical order to avoid invidious comparisons: P. David, H. Eulau, N. Long, K. Prewitt, F. Riggs, R. Sigel, and D. Stokes.

and (4) I was simultaneously watching the Miss U.S.A. Beauty Pageant. Hence I cannot guarantee the reliability of the tabulation though I stand by its validity.

Heinz Eulau
Stanford University

To the Editor:

Professor Thomson's article on Canadian studies in the U.S. is informative and brings to mind a number of important questions. Perhaps no question in this area of concern is as interesting to political scientists, however, as the one raised by Professor Thomson: whether the conflict of national interests between Canada and the U.S. has "offered scholars a new and significant area of study."

The obvious response to this is that it certainly has. Beyond this point, one is required to ask what kind of research agenda is contemplated by the small but growing numbers of scholars concerned with Canada. Professor Thomson rightly points out that Canadians may regard the attention of American academics to their country with suspicion, and one should add that there is ample reason for such an attitude.

It seems sensible, given the present delicate state of Canadian-American relations, to discuss the research emphasis in Canadian studies which is being undertaken on this side of the border. I realize that I risk being charged with telling others what they should do, but these are suggestions which anyone may accept or reject.

It is clear, first of all, that U.S. scholars should not prescribe public policies for Canada. This is not a suggestion that can easily be followed. Prescriptions can be made or assumed unconsciously, and in areas such as regional development or resources utilization (topics suggested by Professor Thomson), policies are implied in suggestions of "mutuality." But Canadians have had more than enough of this, and American political scientists should not add salt to the wounds. It is impossible, of course, to avoid all hints of prescription in any social science writing; this has been one of the foolhardy assumptions which has brought political science to its present dismal state. It is possible, however, to avoid the overt assumption that "what is good for the U.S. is good for Canada,"

which has too often been made in the past by U.S. policy-makers.

Secondly, it is important that the relative strengths of U.S. and Canadian political, military, economic and cultural influences be taken into account in analyzing and dealing with matters affecting Canada. Canada is at a severe disadvantage in any of these bi-lateral relationships, and the ability of its people and leadership to resist even hints and suggestions of the U.S. policy-makers is often limited. This is a particularly important consideration since social scientists in this country have some influence on policy-making.

Thirdly, one should note and be aware of the fact that Canada has no visible spokesman in this country providing inputs into the policy process. (Canada is seldom mentioned even in the *New York Times*.) I am aware that pluralist theory and other concepts of our political system usually extend only to national boundaries, and this is not a serious deficiency of such concepts when they apply to Nepal or Belgium. In Canada's case, the policy processes of many decision-making areas can have profound and often immediate effects, whether one is concerned with Great Lakes pollution, trade and payments policies, or the NORAD arrangement.

Finally, it appears that a number of policies and policy areas considered on either side of the border involve class issues. This variable is seldom stressed, but it is of great (or even transcendent) importance in assessing the collaboration of U.S. and Canadian political and economic elites in carrying out policies in such critical areas as employment, trade, utilization of resources and protection of the environment.

Gerald L. Houseman
Indiana University at Fort Wayne

To the Editor:

Over the years we have come to believe that a serious study of professional criticism in political science could make a significant contribution to the discipline and to the lives of those political scientists who seek to publish. We are prompted by knowledge of cases in which articles have been accepted or rejected by even the most prestigious journals for reasons which we believe to be semi-professional at best. For example, we have

been told that a manuscript was inadequate because it was "soft on communism," that another was shallow because it neglected to mention the condition of homosexuals in a discussion of civil rights, that a research note was superfluous because it was "already said in Matthew Krensen's M.A. thesis," and that, for one article given to two readers, "the theory is good but the data are worthless," and "the theory is worthless but the data are interesting." In other instances readers' comments indicated that manuscripts had been almost completely misunderstood and/or unread. Apart from substance, there is also the question of style. Who, for example, has not met the "I could point out at least another [insert number] instances of this" ploy? We have also noticed that at least one editor of a prominent journal signs off his rejections by wishing the author "good luck" in placing the manuscript elsewhere.

For the study we are working on, we would appreciate receiving copies of manuscripts, readers' comments, and the author's brief appraisal of the latter. This material can be sent anonymously and we hope to receive responses from people who have found criticism to be good, bad, or indifferent.

David Rosenbloom
David Nachmias
Tel-Aviv University

To the Editor:

I was happy to read in the Winter issue that Professor Douglas M. Fox of the University of Connecticut had discovered the value of using politicians, newsmen, lobbyists, and government employees as speakers in his American politics classes.

In the Washington Semester Program at The American University we have been using such speakers for twenty-five years. (Editor's note: see page 362 for news of 25th Anniversary of The Washington Semester Program.) I have attempted from time to time to urge this technique on other institutions around the country located close to state capitals or large metropolitan centers.

Outside speakers may be used in regular courses as described by Professor Fox or the students can be brought to the speakers in field study sessions as we do. The field study technique has been

developed successfully by several Pennsylvania colleges with Harrisburg as the base, by Hamline University in the Twin Cities, and by others. If I recall correctly, the University of Southern California has just joined the ranks with an urban program.

I feel a little like Russell Conwell suggesting that there is a diamond mine in every political scientist's back yard, but I am happy to join Professor Fox in urging our colleagues to go dig in it.

Nathaniel S. Preston
Director, Washington Semester Program
American University

To the Editor:

Although recent years have witnessed a renewed (though at times rhetorical) emphasis upon teaching, publication continues to be a critical ingredient of academic life. At the same time, publishing has become an increasingly hazardous venture. The economic squeeze of the last few years has forced some publishers to cancel contracts they negotiated in good faith — decisions that, although unpleasant for authors, may be justifiable on pragmatic grounds. A few other publishers, however, appear to have taken advantage of the economic situation to engage in ethically questionable practices. In either case, it is important to focus attention on safeguards and remedies available to the unsuspecting authors. Let me begin by reviewing a personal case that illustrates some questionable practices and then turn to the more general issue.

The highlights of the case in question are these:

1. In October 1969 I discussed the possibility of doing a book for a relatively small commercial publisher. Before actually signing an agreement, I mentioned to the publisher that, since I expected the study to be somewhat specialized, I was interested in submitting it to a university press. He insisted he wanted the manuscript. I agreed to the contract for two reasons: (a) the publisher and I were on very friendly terms, since he had already published a book of mine and was in the process of publishing another; and (b) I would save myself the trouble of finding a new publisher.
2. When we met in the fall of 1970, I reiterated to the publisher that the manuscript was turning out rather specialized. He stated he wanted it.

3. Just before mailing the finished manuscript in December 1970, I telephoned the publisher to ask whether, in view of a pending merger with another publishing house, he had reviewed his commitments and still wanted my manuscript. He said he had reviewed his commitments and indeed still wanted the manuscript.

4. The manuscript was read by an eminent authority in the field who recommended publication. Parenthetically, I hope someday someone does a piece on readers. As it happens mine was a model reader: (a) he read the manuscript promptly and thoroughly; and (b) having apparently determined that the manuscript was worthy of publication, he concentrated on comments and suggestions to improve the manuscript (I incorporated many of his suggestions in my revisions). This type of reader contrasts sharply with the sort who: (a) takes four-five months to read a manuscript's introduction and conclusion; and (b) writes a review, not of the manuscript he has (in part) read, but of one *he* might have written. I suspect that the practice of not reviewing a manuscript on its own merits is more widespread than we think. All too frequently, reviewing a manuscript becomes an ego trip for the reader.

5. The publisher kept the manuscript for ten months before hinting to me in the fall of 1971 that he thought the study too specialized to sell well but that in view of the reader's review he was proceeding with publication. I received the copy-edited manuscript in September 1971 and corrected and returned it the same month.

6. Having heard nothing in over three months, I telephoned to inquire about the fate of the galleys. Hiding behind the perennially convenient cliché of "collective decisions," the publisher informed me that due to financial exigencies (something about a "cash flow problem") they were unable to proceed with publication. However, since they were interested in having my book on their list, he suggested that I pay \$5,200 toward its publication. I withdrew the manuscript and started a search for another publisher.

As it happens, I have been fortunate to have found a new publisher, though of course I have no guarantee that the same cycle will not repeat itself. The more important question, however, is: In principle, what safeguards and remedies are available to innocent authors? The answer, unfortunately, is: Extremely few.

One can of course institute legal proceedings on the basis of a properly executed contract. But since legal proceedings are always hassles, to say nothing of being expensive, one instinctively tends to avoid them. More importantly in this case, one must bear in mind the little known fact that a publishing contract is legally binding on the author but not on the publisher. The reason is very simple. Every publishing contract contains a paragraph to the effect that the author shall deliver a "satisfactory" manuscript, but the meaning of "satisfactory" is nowhere clarified. It can of course refer to the quality of the manuscript but it can also relate to writing style or to marketability. From the publisher's standpoint, in short, a contract is an option that he may or may not exercise. And legal proceedings are unlikely to be productive.

An equally elusive safeguard is the publisher's reputation. Regardless of their stature, commercial publishers publish primarily to make money. If for any reason this expectation is deemed unrealizable, then publishers will engage in questionable practices. Not all such practices are equally objectionable, however. For example, I am reminded of a book salesman who stated that his company had cancelled some fifty contracts. "What does this do your reputation," I asked. "Hell!" he said. "It is not a question of reputation, but of survival."

The only concrete safeguard available to an author is that he do all he can to obtain a cash advance from the publisher — the bigger the advance, the better. Although an advance is usually charged against one's royalties, it does mean that the publisher has a stake in honoring his contract; and if he does not, he is in no position to ask for repayment.

Another recourse is to turn exclusively to university presses for the publication of one's work. The major advantage is that, since university presses are not obsessed with profit, they are more likely to honor their contracts. The principal drawback is that not all books are suitable for publication by university presses. Moreover, university presses being prime examples of academic institutions without identifiable constituencies, their budgets have been cut drastically in the last few years.

It is striking how helpless authors really are vis-a-vis publishers. There are a couple of weak safeguards against publishers' abuses, but no effective remedies. Can we do something to improve the author's position? Or do we have to live with a situation of publish (read "write") and perish?

Mostafa Rejai
Miami University

APSA HOSPITAL CASH PLAN

The American Political Science Association announces its new low cost group Hospital Cash Plan designed to provide participants with a cash payment of \$20.00 or \$40.00 a day depending upon the program selected. The Plan, underwritten by the Hartford Accident and Indemnity Co., pays for every hospitalized day for up to 365 days for each period of hospital confinement. Benefits are doubled if the participant is hospitalized for cancer.

For further information on the APSA Group Hospital Cash Plan write to:

**Director, Insurance Programs
The American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036**