

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

**Present and Absent.** There is almost certainly a relationship between the general subject matter of articles that get printed in the *Review* at one point in time, and the subject matter of the next batch of articles that are submitted for publication. Our casual observation is that scholars who have articles up their sleeves are superattentive to what seems to be getting through the editorial maze, and may attempt to infer the editor's preferences from what ends up in print. If this impedes the *Review* from having a crack at good articles which are nevertheless unlike those we have published recently, it is our loss, and consequently we want to reaffirm that we are in business to serve the scholarly needs of every branch of our discipline.

A glance at articles appearing in the last full volume of the *Review* (Vol. 65, 1971) does reveal some meaningful clusters and some notable absences. There were 46 articles printed in Volume 65. Thirty-five of them included at least one table or figure. This attests to a preoccupation in our discipline with the manipulation of large numbers of examples. It suggests a growing collective capacity to deal with frequently occurring phenomena, including such things as the opinions of mass publics, votes, and responses to large-scale surveys. An important characteristic of frequently occurring phenomena is that properly arrayed and interpreted they can be used to assign known degrees of confidence to propositions offered as explanations for their occurrence or distribution. The fact that so much of the *Review* has recently been given over to this sort of material indicates that a sizable commitment is being made in the discipline to the expansion of what we can be reasonably sure we *know*.

Nineteen articles dealt with some aspect of political psychology or mass voting behavior, value and attitude acquisition by citizens, or low- and middle-level political participation. There is no question that we are in the midst of significant intellectual progress on this cluster of problems. Diverse perspectives are being brought to bear. Scholars are offering new data and new ways of stating questions for research. Although this is not the only main current in contemporary political science, it is without question one of the main currents. The *Review* has always had a major role in encouraging conversation and research in this area, and, apparently, this role is continuing.

Twenty articles were tied fairly closely to U.S. data; 12 were explicitly about activity in

one or more foreign countries; and 14 were not classifiable on this basis. This is a somewhat less parochial showing than one might expect from an American journal.

We classified 13 articles as "formal theory." This meant that their texts contained sentences having Greek letters or algebraic expressions other than formulas for computing statistical tests. Given the spotty mathematical training of most practicing political scientists, and the consequent handicaps that they suffer in attempting to read mathematical material, this finding attests to the willingness of the *Review* to serve as a forum for small groups within the discipline and also, no doubt, to a desire to encourage the growth of new kinds of political science.

Because there is no concomitant wish to discourage more traditional kinds of political science, one deplors the weak representation in Volume 65 of contributions in public law (one American, one comparative), public administration and organization theory (one example), policy analysis (by a generous count, three examples), political philosophy (three articles), elite politics (two articles) and international politics (two articles).

How to explain these absences? We must not rule out the possibility—although it is likely no more than a possibility—that political scientists are simply becoming less interested in these subjects, and hence are writing less about them. No doubt the *Review* is seeing less than its share of articles in some subfields because these fields have first-rate journals of their own, like the *Public Administration Review* or *World Politics*, or *Ethics*, or any one of a flock of law journals. Or, conceivably, our standards are higher in old established areas of the discipline than in the new ones.

Some imbalance in the *Review* is probably inevitable over the short run and—in the short run—this is arguably even desirable. It would, however, be a matter of some concern if over a longer time span the *Review* found itself increasingly cut off from important intellectual currents in the discipline.

We have no sure way of telling whether or not the sample of articles that ultimately finds its way into the *Review* is in fact an accurate reflection of the best among the current intellectual preoccupations of political scientists. We can be reasonably confident that what we print is on the whole the best of what we see. But we should also guard against the possibility

that we are not seeing all the different kinds of articles we should be seeing. It is not entirely clear how to go about doing this, except by pointing to the light in the window, and keeping the front door ajar.

**On the Cover.** One of the master strokes of the new administration of the *Review* has been to shift the bulk of complaints about the magazine from its contents to its cover. The cover of the *Review*, we feel, is something to sink one's teeth into, and although we are told it leaves a gluey aftertaste, it does provide much more nourishment than the ephemera not to say trivia that we have all complained about for so long. In view of widespread interest in the cover, we are pleased to report the following:

We carefully considered, but then rejected the idea of enclosing the *Review* in a plain brown wrapper. Our grounds were that to do so might constitute fraudulent advertising and might, under the rule enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Ginzburg v. United States*, 383 US 463 (1966) seriously discommode the Managing Editor and actually impair delivery of the *Review* to its by then panting subscribers.

From the solution of putting nothing on the cover we leaped to the opposite extreme and considered putting everything there. This, we feared, would make for a cluttered, unattractive, and well-nigh unreadable cover. It also would take from the interior of the magazine a certain element of surprise. How many prospective readers, we wondered, faced with all that exoskeletal prose, would decide not to probe beneath the surface?

Moderate counsel prevailed. It was decided to put just enough on the cover to assure the timid that indeed this publication is the *American Political Science Review*, and to help them differentiate one issue from the next by means of cleverly planted clues. For the reader with an encyclopedic mind, the first page always contains a full synoptic table of contents, and ever heftier appetites can be gratified by immediately succeeding pages of abstracts, and lists of correspondents and books reviewed. By such sneaky means we thought to draw the unwary into the journal proper. Further, we hoped to unclutter the cover sufficiently to permit a little imagination and attractiveness to enter into its design.

All this, alas, has come at a price. Some authors get only their names on the cover. Others get their names and in addition the title of their article. This is invidious. By what criteria are such marks of distinction meted out? Looking

back over the past couple of issues, it seems apparent that we can pretty well rule out alphabetical order. Can it be that the editors of the *Review* play at dice in making up their table of contents? Do they follow, God forbid, some notion of individual preference? Are authors whose names appear above the title personal pals of the Managing Editor? Do they all have some secret connection with the University of Minnesota? Are they authors of the shortest contributions, or the longest? Are they the oldest contributors? Youngest? The mind reels at the possibilities. The editors of *PS* will, we know, be grateful to receive essays from Association members which in twenty-five words or less (or the equivalent in calculus) explain the handicapping system at work in designing covers for the *Review*. Entries must be dated April 1. Winning entries become eligible for inclusion in the special 1984 edition of *An End to Political Science*. Decisions of judges are final, and will be based on originality of expression and neatness. Employees of the Association, the *Review*, and holders of Yale PhD's are not eligible to compete.

#### Articles Accepted for Future Publication

- Paul Abramson, Michigan State University, "Intergenerational Social Mobility and Partisan Choice"
- Herbert B. Asher, Ohio State University, "The Learning of Legislative Norms"
- David W. Brady, University of Houston, "A Research Note on the Impact of Inter-Party Competition on Congressional Voting in a Competitive Era"
- Michael Brecher, McGill University, "Images, Process, and Feedback in Foreign Policy: Israel's Decisions on German Reparations"
- Eric C. Browne, University of Georgia and Mark N. Franklin, University of Strathclyde, "The Perquisites of Government: Aspects of Coalition Payoffs in European Parliamentary Democracies"
- Charles S. Bullock, III, University of Georgia, "Freshman Committee Assignments and Re-election in the U.S. House of Representatives" and "House Careerists: Changing Patterns of Longevity and Attrition"
- Charles E. Butterworth, University of Maryland, "Averroës: Politics and Opinion"
- Peter K. Eisinger, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities"
- Robert S. Erikson, Florida State University, "Malapportionment, Gerrymandering, and Party Fortunes in Congressional Elections"
- John Ferejohn, California Institute of Technol-

- ogy and Talbot Page, Resources for the Future, "A Note on 'Voting or a Price System in a Competitive Market Structure'"
- Alexander L. George, Stanford University, "The Case for Multiple Advocacy in Making Foreign Policy"
- Fred Kort, University of Connecticut, "Regression Analysis and Discriminant Analysis: An Application of R. A. Fisher's Theorem to Data in Political Science"
- Carl H. Lande, University of Kansas, "Networks and Groups in Southeast Asia: Some Observations on the Group Theory of Politics"
- Wallace Mendelson, University of Texas, "From Warren to Burger: The Rise and Decline of Substantive Equal Protection"
- Eugene F. Miller, University of Georgia, "Positivism, Historicism, and Political Inquiry"
- Andre Modigliani, Harvard University, "Hawks and Doves, Isolationism and Political Distrust: An Analysis of Public Opinion on Military Policy"
- Sarah McCally Morehouse, Manhattanville College, "The State Political Party and the Policy-Making Process"
- Donald G. Morrison and H. Michael Stevenson, York University, "Intergeneration and Instability: Patterns of African Political Development"
- Edward N. Muller, State University of New York, Stony Brook, "A Test of a Partial Theory of Potential for Political Violence"
- Walter Odajnyk, Columbia University, "The Political Ideas of C. G. Jung"
- Benjamin I. Page, Dartmouth College and Richard A. Brody, Stanford University, "Policy Voting and the Electoral Process: The Vietnam War Issue"
- Bruce W. Robeck, Texas A and M University, "Legislative Partisanship, Constituency and Malapportionment"
- Thomas W. Robinson, Visiting Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, "The Sino-Soviet Border Dispute: Background, Development, and the March 1969 Clashes"
- Howard Rosenthal, Carnegie-Mellon University, "Electoral Participation in the French Fifth Republic"
- John Gerard Ruggie, Dotation Carnegie Pour La Paix Internationale, "Collective Goods and International Organization"
- Lawrence A. Scaff, University of Arizona, "Max Weber's Politics and Political Education"
- Donald D. Searing, Joel J. Schwartz, and Alden E. Lind, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "Political Socialization and Political Belief Systems: An Essay on the Theoretical Relevance of Some Current Research"
- W. Phillips Shively, University of Minnesota, "Voting Stability and the Nature of Party Attachments in the Weimar Republic"
- Philip D. Stewart, Robert L. Arnett, William Ebert, Raymond E. McPhail, Terrence L. Rich and Craig E. Schopmeyer, Ohio State University, "Political Mobility and the Soviet Political Process: A Partial Test of Two Models"
- John L. Sullivan, Iowa State University and Robert E. O'Connor, Pennsylvania State University, "Electoral Choice and Popular Control of Public Policy: The Case of the 1966 House Elections"
- John L. Sullivan, Iowa State University, "A Note on Redistributive Politics"
- Herbert F. Weisberg, University of Michigan, "Scaling Models for Legislative Roll-Call Analysis"