

The American Political Science Review

Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley 94720

EDITORIAL BOARD: NELSON W. POLSBY, *Managing Editor, University of California, Berkeley*; PHILIP SIEGELMAN, *Book Review Editor, California State University, San Francisco*; SHLOMO AVINERI, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*; LUCIUS BARKER, *Washington University*; BRIAN BARRY, *Nuffield College, Oxford University*; RICHARD A. BRODY, *Stanford University*; SAMUEL D. COOK, *Duke University*; ELMER E. CORNWELL, *Brown University*; S. RUFUS DAVIS, *Monash University*; ROBERT J. JACKSON, *Carleton University*; ROBERT JERVIS, *University of California, Los Angeles*; DALE ROGERS MARSHALL, *University of California, Davis*; RUSSELL D. MURPHY, *Wesleyan University*; JOAN M. NELSON, *Washington, D.C.*; J. ROLAND PENNOCK, *Swarthmore College*; SAMUEL L. POPKIN, *University of Texas, Austin*; ROBERT D. PUTNAM, *University of Michigan*; DOUGLAS W. RAE, *Yale University*; AUSTIN RANNEY, *University of Wisconsin*; GIOVANNI SARTORI, *University of Florence*; MICHAEL J. SHAPIRO, *University of Hawaii*; JAY STARLING, *Southern Methodist University*; STEPHEN V. STEPHENS, *The Johns Hopkins University*; GEORGE E. VON DER MUHLL, *University of California, Santa Cruz*; RICHARD A. WATSON, *University of Missouri*; RICHARD WINTERS, *Dartmouth College*. **MANUSCRIPT EDITOR:** ELLEN Y. SIEGELMAN. **EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS:** BARBARA EPSTEIN, BETSEY COBB, DENISE DRUCKER. **EDITORIAL INTERNS:** ROBERT ARSENEAU, CHARLES BANN, JONATHAN BENDOR, COLIN CAMPBELL, BETH CAPELL, PETER COWHEY, SHAI FELDMAN, RICHARD GUNTHER, RICHARD G. C. JOHNSTON, YVONNE JONES, ELAINE KAMARCK, HARRY KREISLER, DAVID LAITIN, JAMES I. LENGLE, WILLIAM M. LUNCH, THOMAS REESE, STUART A. ROSS, CHRISTINE M. SIERRA, M. STEPHEN WEATHERFORD.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Happy Anniversary. Professor Herbert Weisberg sentimentally passed up the chance to get "Models of Statistical Relationship" published earlier so that it could appear in this issue, twenty years to the month after the classic article by Leo Goodman and William Kruskal on which it is based.

A pang of envy frequently attacks us when we contemplate the greener and better tended forage available to "harder" disciplines (like statistics), where scholars can actually build upon one another's work, where agreement can be reached about what the problems are, and where consequently there can be such things as "classic" articles, statements which productively focus the attention of many minds and which may be superseded, but are rarely misunderstood.

As little as this thumbnail sketch describes political science, it did occur to us to cast a backward glance at the *Review* of 20 years ago. Would we find anything at all in Volume 48 worth noting today? Any memorable articles, never mind classics? Somehow, we doubted it. Political science lurches from fad to fad, we thought, ignores its roots, cultivates illiteracy. There would be nothing of contemporary interest, only evidence of false starts, blind alleys, brave futile beginnings. We were wrong! Managing Editor Hugh L.

Elsbree presided over what even the most jaded graduate student can recognize as a cornucopia. Not the least interesting was Ralph J. Bunche's Presidential Address, marking the 50th anniversary of the Association. But there was much, much more.

In those days, it appears, political scientists had not yet lost their taste for politics and government. Bertram Gross and John Lewis discussed the beginnings of the Council of Economic Advisors. Richard Neustadt contributed his notable and enduring "Presidency and Legislation: The Growth of Central Clearance." Ralph Huit's "The Congressional Committee: A Case Study" appeared. Happy Anniversary, one and all. In comparative government Volume 48 features (among others) a bibliography on comparative administration by Fred Riggs, an article on Asian neutralism by Robert Scalapino, and a discussion of Great Britain by Leon Epstein.

In party politics there were articles by V. O. Key, Duane Lockard and that odd couple, Ranney and Kendall. David Spitz contributed "Democracy and the Problem of Civil Disobedience"; Sheldon Wolin, "Hume and Conservatism" and Emmette Redford "Administrative Regulation: Protection of the Public Interest."

Henry Kissinger shed his warm-up jacket with "The Conservative Dilemma: Reflections on the Political Thought of Metternich." And there was even something for premature formal theorists: Shapley and Shubik's "A Method for Evaluating the Distribution of Power in a Committee System."

Most of us have seen citations to one or more of these articles within living memory; whether "classics" or not, evidently they have had something to say to political scientists that has been more than ephemeral. And this is why a subscriber would have been ill-advised to wrap fish with old copies of volume 48 of the *Review*.

Can we say as much of more recent volumes? Readers had better decide for themselves. For ourselves, we are reminded of the time we served on a committee to hire a sociology department. One committee member, a very dubious historian, said: "Let's get somebody like Robert MacIver." We said, "O.K., let's." The historian replied: "They don't make them like that anymore."

Emily Post Says. Although norms concerning multiple submissions and appropriation of the work of others are well settled in our profession—and indeed in the scholarly community generally—an occasional slipup comes to our attention, suggesting that it may be worthwhile to describe some of the underlying rationale of *Review* policy for people who may have tuned in late.

Each year, scholarly journals ask scores of scholars to set aside their own work in order to evaluate the merit of articles proffered for publication. An editor of the *Review* has reason to know how many scholars—they are legion—do these unpaid, anonymous chores willingly, graciously, even promptly. This creates an obligation on our part, at the least to avoid bothering our referees frivolously or in vain.

When an author submits the same manuscript simultaneously to two or more unwitting editors, he is asking them to become his accomplices in wasting the time of referees. For only one journal can print the manuscript. Consequently the courteous thing to do is to submit articles to journals one at a time, and hope for the best.

In these harsh days of tenure squeezes and publish or perish, there must be a strong temptation for authors to cut down on the agony of waiting by trying a buckshot approach to all journals at once. That constitutes an imposition on a lot of colleagues, however, and journal editors, fortified by an advisory opinion of the APSA ethics committee, take a dim view of multiple submissions.

An even more straightforward rationale underlies the APSA policy concerning the reprinting of articles. Our position for years has been that persons wanting to reprint an article must seek and

receive the permission of the scholar who did the work, before the Association, as copyright holder, will grant its permission to reprint. The technicalities of copyright law may or may not support the Association's scrupulousness on this issue; nevertheless to us it seems manifestly reasonable that authors retain control over the reprinting of their work, and the Association acts accordingly. In this, we consider that we are following a well-understood, if unwritten rule of the profession, and cannot imagine, in any case, that a political scientist seeking to reprint the work of a colleague would dream of neglecting to ask the author's permission.

Readers will also be gratified to learn that we oppose plagiarism (as well as piracy) and think well of springtime. But enough of controversy.

On Scholarly Infallibility. We see by the papers that Washington columnist Joseph Kraft says political science is in big trouble. He doesn't know the half of it, we thought, until we read a little farther and discovered he didn't know the other half of it, either. His argument goes this way: because the state of our knowledge about voting behavior is unsettled, and because the nature of voter commitment to political parties in America is changing, political science has "lost its way."

Many political scientists will testify that they weren't heading in that direction anyhow, that some folks in Our Nation's Capital must have a mighty narrow idea of what political science is. What puzzles us even more is this cultivated and well-informed layman's peculiar conception of the calling of the scholar. And if Joseph Kraft has such a misconception, heaven knows how many others do as well.

It is our duty, it seems to us, less to celebrate past victories over ignorance than continually to confront what we don't know, to grapple with the anomalous, the imperfectly understood. The existence of perplexity in a scholar is, we believe, an unmistakable sign of life (maybe the only sign of life) and in a discipline, likewise.

This leaves open—as it had better—the question of our competence, individually or collectively, to focus our inquiries, to organize our assaults upon our ignorance with skill and sensitivity. On this score people are entitled to have their doubts. But not on the question Mr. Kraft raises. Scholars are not oracles. Our commitment is to inquiry, not to final solutions, and it is amazing that a Washington pundit would want us crowding his territory.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

Christopher H. Achen, Yale University, "Political Belief Systems in Mass Publics: The Problem of Inconsistent Opinion Survey Responses"

- Francisco Arcelus and Allan H. Meltzer, Carnegie-Mellon University, "The Effect of Aggregate Economic Variables on Congressional Elections"
- C. Arnold Anderson, University of Chicago, "Conceptual Framework for Political Socialization in Developing Societies"
- Neal Andrews, Wayne State University, "Integration and Community in Communist Theory"
- Robert L. Ayres, University of California, Berkeley, "Development Policy and the Possibility of A 'Liveable' Future for Latin America"
- Richard Allen Chapman, University of Montana, "*Leviathan* Writ Small: Thomas Hobbes on the Family"
- John P. Clark, III, City College, Loyola University, "On Anarchism in an Unreal World: Kramnick's View of Godwin and the Anarchists"
- Claude S. Colantoni, Terrence J. Levesque and Peter C. Ordeshook, Carnegie-Mellon University, "Campaign Resource Allocations Under The Electoral College"
- David Collier, Indiana University, and Richard E. Messick, Office of U.S. Senate, "Functional Prerequisites Versus Diffusion: Testing Alternative Explanations of Social Security Adoption"
- Andrew T. Cowart, University of Iowa, Tore Hansen and Karl-Erik Brofoss, University of Oslo, "Budgetary Strategies and Success at Multiple Decision Levels in the Norwegian Urban Setting"
- Geoffrey Debnam, University of Otago, "Non-decisions and Power: The Two Faces of Bachrach and Baratz"
- Douglas Dobson, Northern Illinois University and Douglas St. Angelo, Florida State University, "Party Identification and the Floating Vote: Some Dynamics"
- Claude S. Fischer, University of California, Berkeley, "The City and Political Psychology"
- Robert C. Fried, University of California, Los Angeles, "Party and Policy in West German Cities"
- Richard Funston, San Diego State University, "The Supreme Court and Critical Elections"
- Sheldon Goldman, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, "Voting Behavior on the U.S. Courts of Appeals Revisited"
- Fred I. Greenstein, Princeton University, "The Benevolent Leader Revisited: Children's Images of Political Leaders in Three Democracies"
- Fred W. Grupp, Jr., University of Connecticut and Allan R. Richards, Louisiana State University, "Variations in Elite Perceptions of American States as Referents for Public Policy Making"
- Susan Blackall Hansen, University of Illinois, Urbana, "Participation, Political Structure, and Concurrence"
- K. J. Holsti, University of British Columbia, "Underdevelopment and the 'Gap' Theory of International Conflict"
- Robert T. Holt and John E. Turner, University of Minnesota, "Crises and Sequences in Collective Theory Development"
- M. Kent Jennings, University of Michigan and Richard G. Niemi, University of Rochester, "Continuity and Change in Political Orientations: A Longitudinal Study of Two Generations"
- Jae-on Kim, University of Chicago, John R. Petrocik, University of Chicago and Stephen N. Enokson, University of Iowa, "Voter Turnout Among the American States: Systemic and Individualistic Components"
- David Koehler, American University, "Vote Trading and the Voting Paradox: A Proof of Logical Equivalence"
- J. A. Laponce, University of British Columbia, "Spatial Archetypes and Political Perceptions"
- David G. Lawrence, Fordham University, "Procedural Norms and Tolerance: A Reassessment"
- Peter M. Leslie, Queen's University, "Interest Groups and Political Integration: The 1972 EEC Decisions in Norway and Denmark"
- Patrick J. McGowan, Syracuse University and Robert M. Rood, University of South Carolina, "Alliance Behavior in Balance of Power Systems: Applying a Poisson Model to 19th-Century Europe"
- Alan Marsh, University of Michigan, "The 'Silent Revolution,' Value Priorities, and the Quality of Life in Britain"
- Joseph A. Massey, Dartmouth College, "The Missing Leader: Japanese Youths' View of Political Authority"
- Kenneth John Meier, Syracuse University, "Representative Bureaucracy: An Empirical Analysis"
- Fritz Nova, Villanova University, "Political Innovation of the West German Federal Constitutional Court: The State of Discussion on Judicial Review"
- N. Patrick Peritore, University of Missouri, Columbia, "Some Problems in Alfred Schutz's Phenomenological Methodology"
- Adam Przeworski, University of Chicago, "Institutionalization of Voting Patterns or Is Mobilization the Source of Decay?"
- Douglas Rae, Yale University, "The Limits of Consensual Decision"
- Austin Sarat, Yale Law School, and Joel B. Grossman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "Courts and Conflict Resolution: Problems in the Mobilization of Adjudication"
- Joseph A. Schlesinger, Michigan State University, "The Primary Goals of Political Parties: A Clarification of Positive Theory"

- Paul R. Schulman, University of Tennessee, "Non-Incremental Policy Making: Notes Toward an Alternate Paradigm"
- J. S. Sorzano, Georgetown University, "David Easton and the Invisible Hand"
- Peter G. Stillman, Vassar College, "The Limits of Behaviorism: A Critique of B. F. Skinner's Social and Political Thought"
- Gerald S. Strom, University of Illinois, Chicago, "On the Apparent Paradox of Participation"
- Edward R. Tuftes, Princeton University, "Determinants of the Outcome of Midterm Congressional Elections"
- Eric M. Uslaner and J. Ronnie Davis, University of Florida, "The Paradox of Vote Trading: Effects of Decision Rules and Voting Strategies on Externalities"
- Meredith W. Watts, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, "B. F. Skinner and the Language of Technological Control"
- J. Weinberger, Michigan State University, "Hobbes's Doctrine of Method"
- Mary B. Welfling, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, "Models, Measurement and Sources of Error: Civil Conflict in Black Africa"