

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Son of Nasty Letters. A few random comments to us by political scientists suggest that the Editorial Comment about nasty letters (December, 1971, p. 961) may have given an inaccurate impression of the quality of life in the editorial office. In fact, nasty letters are few and far between. Most of the transactions that occupy our days are simple, pleasant, and courteous. And some of our correspondence is a good bit more gratifying than that.

Recently, for example, Professor Edward Tufte of Princeton, perceiving correctly that we have had difficulty standardizing the presentation of tabular and graphic materials, and making them readable, wrote to suggest criteria that we might use in putting these sorts of material in shape. We do not know how faithfully we will be able to follow his suggestions, but they seemed to us to be sensible, and they were undeniably addressed to a real problem. Substance aside, the kindness and good will that animated this unsolicited professional contribution made us feel cheerful for quite a while.

To Encourage Promptness. On August 28, 1970, the APSA Committee on Professional Ethics approved its Advisory Opinion No. 8, titled "Promptness in Appraising Manuscripts." This Opinion reads:

1. Editors of professional journals, and readers who advise them, have an ethical obligation to act promptly in appraising manuscripts submitted for their consideration.
2. An editor should aim to inform the author of his or her decision within two months if possible, or within three months at most. If three months elapse without a decision, the editor should inform the author of the circumstances; and the author will be free to withdraw his or her manuscript.
3. A reader should report his or her appraisal of a manuscript to the editor within one month unless he or she and the editor agree on a different limit.

At the time this Opinion was approved, the current management of the *Review* had very little experience. Consequently we had no idea whether this Opinion expressed feasible hopes or suggested reasonable constraints. Two and a half years later, we can make the following observations—also neatly numbered:

(1) Authors are always free to withdraw manuscripts from consideration. This is a free-

dom seldom exercised in practice. As a matter of principle, however, the circumstances under which a manuscript might legitimately be withdrawn run beyond those contemplated in this Opinion.

(2) We make a considerable effort to secure prompt evaluations of manuscripts. Our standard request—infrequently modified by negotiations—asks for an evaluation within two weeks. We have an elaborate system of reminders and entreaties that we wheel into action when a reader is delinquent.

(3) We aim to give authors decisions on their manuscripts as soon after receipt as we can, within two months if possible, and longer only if necessary.

(4) In a more than negligible minority of cases, we fail to send word to authors within three months. The reasons for delay vary slightly from case to case, but usually boil down to three rather boring variations on a single theme: (a) we couldn't induce two qualified referees to appraise the manuscript in time; (b) we found two referees and one reported promptly but the other evaluation became seriously overdue and we couldn't get the delinquent referee to answer mail or come to the phone; or (c) the original referees disagreed and we had to send out for more help.

(5) Nervous authors sometimes query our office about the fate of their manuscript. They do not always observe a three-month moratorium before launching their inquiry. We endeavor to respond cheerfully and informatively to such inquiries, regardless of the time we have the manuscript in custody.

(6) We do not seek out authors when three months are up to inform them of the circumstances of delay. It is our judgment that our limited resources are better invested in getting the answers authors are waiting for than in making a special effort to commiserate with them. This managerial decision can result in circumstances in which we do not comply with the recommendation in the text of the Opinion.

(7) As we read the intention of the Opinion, it is to encourage promptness in transactions between journals and prospective authors. We applaud this aim, and try to do what we can to further it.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

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

Timothy Almy, University of Georgia, "Resi-

- dential Location and Electoral Cohesion: The Pattern of Urban Political Conflict"
- Herbert B. Asher, Ohio State University, "The Learning of Legislative Norms"
- Robert Axelrod, University of California, Berkeley, "Schema Theory: An Information Processing Model of Perception and Cognition"
- Louis P. Benson, Kansas State University, "A Research Note on Machine Politics as a Model for Change in a Philippine Province"
- Harry W. Blair, Bucknell University, "Minority Electoral Politics in a North Indian State: Aggregate Data Analysis and the Muslim Community in Bihar, 1952-1972"
- Bernard H. Booms, Pennsylvania State University and James R. Halldorson, F. W. Woolworth Co., "The Politics of Redistribution: A Reformulation"
- Steven J. Brams, New York University and Morton D. Davis, City College of New York, "The 3/2's Rule in Presidential Campaigning"
- Eric C. Browne, University of Georgia and Mark N. Franklin, University of Strathclyde, "Aspects of Coalition Payoffs in European Parliamentary Democracies"
- Andrew T. Cowart, University of Oslo, "Electoral Choice in the American States: Incumbency Effects, Partisan Forces and Divergent Partisan Majorities"
- Harry Eckstein, Princeton University, "Authority Patterns: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry"
- Virginia Gray, University of Kentucky, "Innovation in the States: A Diffusion Study"
- Bernard Grofman and Edward N. Muller, State University of New York at Stony Brook, "The Strange Case of Relative Gratification and Potential for Political Violence: The V-Curve Hypothesis"
- 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"
- Richard S. Katz, Yale University, "The Attribution of Variance in Electoral Returns: An Alternative Measurement Technique"
- Chong Lim Kim and Donald P. Racherer, University of Iowa, "Candidates' Perception of Voter Competence: A Comparison of Winning and Losing Candidates"
- Fred Kort, University of Connecticut, "A Theoretical Relationship for the Application of Multiple Regression Analysis to Discriminant Analysis"
- Warren Lee Kostroski, Wittenberg University, "Party and Incumbency in Postwar Senate Elections: Trends, Patterns and Models"
- Lawrence B. Mohr, University of Michigan, "The Concept of Organizational Goal"
- Peter B. Natchez, Brandeis University and Irvin C. Bupp, Harvard University, "Policy and Priority in the Budgetary Process"
- Bradley M. Richardson, Ohio State University, "Urbanization and Political Behavior: The Case of Japan"
- William H. Riker, University of Rochester, "The Paradox of Vote-Trading"
- David W. Rohde, Michigan State University and Kenneth A. Shepsle, Washington University, "Democratic Committee Assignments in the House of Representatives: Strategic Aspects of a Social Choice Process"
- 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"
- Donald D. Searing, Joel J. Schwartz and Alden E. Lind, University of North Carolina, "Political Socialization and Political Belief Systems: An Essay on the Theoretical Relevance of Some Current Research"
- Brian Silver, Florida State University, "Social Mobilization and the Russification of Soviet Nationalities"
- A. H. Somjee, Simon Fraser University, "Caste and the Decline of Political Homogeneity"
- Richard Stillman, II, California State College, Bakersfield, "Woodrow Wilson and the Study of Public Administration: A New Look at an Old Essay"
- Michael W. Suleiman, Kansas State University, "Arab Elite and Palestine-Israel"
- Peter J. Taylor, University of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, "A New Shape Measure for Evaluating Electoral District Patterns"
- Edward R. Tufte, Princeton University, "The Relationship Between Seats and Votes in Two-Party Systems."
- Vernon Van Dyke, University of Iowa, "Human Rights Without Discrimination"
- Susan Welch, University of Nebraska, "The Impact of Party on Voting Behavior in a Nonpartisan Legislature"
- Eugene R. Wittkopf, University of Florida, "Foreign Aid and United Nations Votes: A Comparative Study of Aid Allocations and Voting Agreements"
- Donald A. Wittman, University of California, Santa Cruz, "Parties as Utility Maximizers"
- William Zimmerman, University of Michigan, "Issue Area and Foreign Policy Process: A Research Note in Search of a General Theory"