

EDITORIAL COMMENT

An International Journal. In American movies of a certain genre during World War II exquisite care was always taken to call attention to the wide diversity of national origins among the occupants of the bombers, infantry companies, and PT boats that we hurled against the enemy. The aim, obviously, was to make a point about the special sweetness of cooperation in a common aim among persons of heterogeneous backgrounds. Those of us who run the *Review* feel much the same as the Warner brothers on this point, although we get to express these feelings on a somewhat lower budget. We operate, also, under additional constraints. We cannot simply assign various foreign-sounding names to our authors, nor can we depart from standards of excellence and merit, applied as evenhandedly as we humanly can manage, and without regard to persons, in deciding what we publish.

Thus it is a matter of some satisfaction to us that the *Review* circulates worldwide, and that manuscripts come to us with regularity from far corners of the earth. In the last few months we have accepted articles from Kampala, Uganda; Leiden, The Netherlands; Montreal, Canada; Melbourne, Australia; Colchester, England; Jerusalem, Israel; and Los Angeles, California. There is something pleasant about the idea that we are able to sustain at least a few scholarly conversations over many thousands of miles, that our colleagues in Cambridge, Massachusetts, for example, can speak their public-regarding thoughts to political scientists on five continents, as well as to Cabots and Lowells and God.

Toward Ethical Reviewing. People may wonder if there are any rules that govern the workings of the Book Review section. Sharp-eyed observation of our own behavior these last few months suggests that in fact there are. For example, most of us know that scholars have an obligation to document assertions with accurate and responsible citations; to decline an invitation to review the work of a colleague, roommate, relative or collaborator; to refrain from reviewing a book one has commented on earlier elsewhere. These self-restraining ordinances are so thoroughly internalized throughout the profession that they need no further mention. At least, that is the conclusion warranted by 99 per cent of the transactions involved in producing the Book Review section during the last six issues of the *Review*.

We turn to that remarkable one per cent in which there were charges by an aggrieved author or reviewer of scholarly malpractice traceable to ideological bias. It is remarkable because it represents such a tiny portion of the whole, even given the profound professional differences within the discipline and those that often separate us in our lives as citizens. We exempt from this category, of course, those differences of interpretation, emphasis, and judgment that are inevitable when scholars evaluate one another's work. Such differences have led to a handful of useful exchanges in the Communications section of the *Review*; they have clarified disagreements or joined some issue more effectively.

But what about more serious problems? It would be miraculous indeed if someone were to devise an infallible means to discover and blow the whistle on transgressions against scholarship motivated consciously or unconsciously by bias. As most of us know, this simply isn't possible. The best a conscientious but fallible editor can do is to keep two caveats in mind. He must read each manuscript remembering that the reviewer has a right to state his case within the confines of scholarly discourse and civility. But an editor also needs to protect the author of a book under review from an unwarranted or prejudiced judgment. And there's the rub. While it may be somewhat easier for an editor to dispense justice than it was for Solomon to divide the baby, it turns out that in some cases there is a problem almost as bewildering of choosing between contending claims. The line between prejudiced judgment and responsible judgment may be as elusive as the missing link.

And there are practical complications. For one thing the sheer number of books received and reviewed makes it impossible for us to check systematically every suspect assertion made by a reviewer. Even if the book were still available in our office, we simply don't have the staff for such monitoring, nor could any single editor know enough to cover all cases. Moreover we do not have the warrant for such monitoring, since in dealing with our professional peers we assume their autonomy, responsibility, and accountability.

We are not in any way committed to producing a journal reflecting some ideological orthodoxy. Still, if the editor doesn't have some responsibility in trying to assure that the game is fairly played, who does?

So here is what we do. When a review is discovered to contain ad hominem remarks or what we think is ferociously aggressive editorializing, or when a review neglects the book in order to moralize about this or that fatal flaw in the American or the Uzbekistan national conscience, we talk over the problem with the reviewer hoping to achieve some agreement about the need for change. If that fails, we fall back on the principle of peer-group judgment. At least two specialists are asked to judge the merits of the review from the point of view of its propriety, scholarship, and fairness. They recommend its rejection or publication. They read the review anonymously; in this respect the same procedures are followed as those used to referee articles. The comments of the referees are passed on to the author without breaching the confidentiality that the arrangement requires from all parties. In addition, after a review reaches print, an aggrieved author still may submit a letter to the Managing Editor for publication and thus make a claim for redress before all readers of the journal. As our readers are no doubt aware, some of them do.

Errata In "To Nurture a Discipline" by Robert E. Lane in the March 1972 issue, footnote 13 (p. 167) should read "Unpublished report sent to me (8/6/71) by John Orbell, Alvin Mushkatel, and Lawrence C. Pierce, Department of Political Science, University of Oregon."

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"
- Louis P. Benson, Kent State University, "A Research Note on Machine Politics as a Model for Change in a Philippine Province"
- David W. Brady, Kansas State University, "A Research Note on the Impact of Inter-Party Competition on Congressional Voting in a Competitive Era"
- Michael Brecher, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, "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, "House Careerists: Changing Patterns of Longevity and Attrition"
- 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 Technology and Talbot Page, Resources for the Future, "A Note on 'Voting or a Price System in a Competitive Market Structure'"
- 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"
- Richard S. Katz, Yale University, "The Attribution of Variance in Electoral Returns: An Alternative Measurement Technique"
- Fred Kort, University of Connecticut, "A Theoretical Relationship for the Application of Multiple Regression Analysis to Discriminant Analysis"
- Carl H. Landé, 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"
- Richard M. Merelman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "The Structure of Policy Thinking in Adolescence: A Research Note"
- Lawrence B. Mohr, University of Michigan, "The Concept of Organizational Goal"
- Sarah McCally Morehouse, Manhattanville College, "The State Political Party and the Policy-Making Process"
- Walter Odajnyk, Columbia University, "The Political Ideas of C. G. Jung"
- Bradley M. Richardson, Ohio State University, "Urbanization and Political Behavior: The Case of Japan"
- Bruce W. Robeck, Texas A&M University, "Legislative Partisanship, Constituency and Malapportionment"
- Thomas W. Robinson, Council on Foreign Relations, "The Sino-Soviet Border Dispute: Background, Development, and the March 1969 Clashes"
- Howard Rosenthal, Carnegie-Mellon University and Subrata Sen, University of Chicago, "Electoral Participation in the French Fifth Republic"
- 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"
- 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, "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"
- A. H. Somjee, Simon Fraser University, "Caste and the Decline of Political Homogeneity"
- 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"
- Michael W. Suleiman, Kansas State University, "Arab Elite and Palestine-Israel"
- 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"
- 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"
- Herbert F. Weisberg, University of Michigan, "Scaling Models for Legislative Roll-Call Analysis"
- 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"