

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Tempest. We have, for our sins, received a brotherly communication from Professor Arnold Rogow, the editor-in-chief of *Comparative Politics*, hotly disputing certain of the figures in a recent editorial comment (December 1973) concerning the deplorable lack in the *APSR* of articles on China. These figures seem to show—and were so interpreted—that articles on China appear very seldom in any of the main political science journals. Our brother Rogow does not dispute these figures, or indeed anything else bearing on the point of the editorial comment. He does complain, however, that articles purportedly on Latin America appearing in *Comparative Politics* were undercounted, and that the proper number is 7, not 4. For South and Southeast Asia their figures are 11 and ours 4. And for Canada their figures are 3 and ours 0. (For “underdeveloped areas” they had 8 and we counted 10.) Professor Rogow further points out, “The *New York Times* regularly has a column of ‘corrections’ even if the statement corrected is rather insignificant. I recall a case when a *Times* story referred to someone as the ‘brother’ of a deceased person. In a subsequent edition the statement was corrected to read ‘brother-in-law.’ Is the *APSR* less responsible than the *New York Times*?”

Heaven forbid. We are happy, therefore, to print his correction, and we trust our brother-in-law Rogow will rest content.

Unwritten Rules. It has not yet ceased to amaze us to see the extent to which the *Review* is read cabalistically, rather than straightforwardly, by political scientists. People frequently try to figure out how the *Review* does its business by inference rather than by inquiry. For instance, given our backlog, it is easy enough to discern why we would rather print short articles than long ones. Nevertheless, if a long article makes the grade, and more than a few have over the last couple of years, we go ahead and print it. The fact that we do this should be plain enough to any readers of the *Review*.

Yet for some reason people occasionally tell us that they assume the *Review* has some sort of page limit on manuscripts regardless of quality. In recent weeks we have had to assure two different authors of moderately lengthy manuscripts that this was not so, and that we would not reject a manuscript out of hand for reasons of length alone.

Likewise, we do not discourage the submission of different manuscripts either by authors who have recently been published by the *Review* or by

those recently rejected. Fortunately, somebody asked us about that one. We take the same view as seems to have been taken by the editor of *Annalen der Physik*, who in the year 1905 was pestered by manuscripts from a twenty-six year old Swiss civil servant named Albert Einstein no less than four times. The published articles that resulted¹ did not particularly advance the career of the editor who accepted them, but three of them turned out to be significant landmarks in the study of modern physics.

Nobody knew ahead of time where and in what ways 20th century physics would develop. Owing to the institutional structure of the time, a forecaster could be confident only that if it was going to develop at all, it would have to do so through the medium of scholarly exchange, and predominantly through the journals.

Although the idea of an embryonic Einstein lurking in our midst is nice to contemplate, it is unnecessary for there actually to be one for us to pursue the *Annalen der Physik* policy of encouraging scholars who have two things to say to say them both. Consequently, every new manuscript, from whatever source, is treated separately, and except in the rare case where a preliminary screening discloses its inappropriateness for the *Review*, it is assigned referees, and proceeds through our editorial process, just like every other new manuscript. Nobody gets a free ride—and as a matter of fact nobody has asked for one. Nobody is turned away without consideration on the merits. That is what we are here for.

On Correcting the Record. Speaking as an author, the three worst things an editor of a scholarly journal ever did to me were: (1) Solicit a book review, which was duly supplied, and then reject the review on the stated grounds that it evaluated the book differently from published reviews the editor had seen. Instead, this editor asked permission to condense the review into a few sentences and run it as an anonymous book note. Permission was refused, whereupon the editor did it anyway. (2) Accept a review-essay for pub-

¹As readers will observe from their titles, these articles were not even written in acceptable English: “Über einen die Erzeugung und Verwandlung des Lichtes betreffenden heuristischen Gesichtspunkt,” *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Vol. 17 (1905), pp. 132–148; “Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen,” *ibid.*, pp. 549–560; “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper,” *ibid.*, pp. 891–921; “Ist die Trägheit eines Körpers von seinem Energieinhalt abhängig?,” *ibid.*, Vol. 18 (1905), pp. 639–641.

lication and then edit it into partial unintelligibility without informing me, and printing the resulting mess under my name. (3) Summarily refuse to print a letter offering a correction of an article that had flagrantly misquoted my work. This happened to be about a subject on which the editor himself had in his writings adopted the position of the article I was endeavoring to correct.

These three editors have a special place in my own personal hall of fame. No one who, after experiences of this sort, himself becomes an editor, can help wondering how many halls of fame he inhabits. This may assist in explaining why we conscientiously strive to minimize at least these three classes of mistakes at the *APSR*. We do not knowingly print material contrary to the expressed wishes of authors. We give authors ample opportunity to monitor all the editorial work we perform. And we bend over backward to accommodate most persons who claim to have been misrepresented by material printed in the *APSR*. There is a risk involved in this last policy, and we do try to discriminate between what appear to us to be reasonable complaints and people merely seizing an occasion for self-advertisement, a problem that crops up with some frequency in the book reviews. Any unfavorable review is likely to be perceived by the author of the book in question as unfair. Yet not all authors of panned books write in. Of those that do, how many have a legitimate claim on our scarce space and our readers' valuable time? Opinions are bound to differ on this point. Some readers have shared with us the view that most of the complainants in our letter columns are merely serving themselves and not the cause of scholarship. Yet if we were to turn a deaf ear to all such complaints, some serious misrepresentations, we are convinced, would go uncorrected. Every reader will have to decide for himself how successfully we walk this particular thin line.

Errata. In Brian D. Silver's "Social Mobilization and the Russification of Soviet Nationalities," a line of type has been transposed: the third line on page 65 (March 1974) is missing, and turns up intact as line 23. The original sentence should read: "But two long-term trends working together favor Russification: not only are natives becoming more urbanized, and thereby more available for Russification, but the probability that the urban resident will be Russified also appears to be growing."

In Gregory Henderson's review of *Korean Development: The Interplay of Politics and Economics* (March 1974), a line of type on page 298 has been transposed; what should be the 9th line is set as line 2. The relevant section should read:

"Although the Park government has, in effect, ceased even such attempts as it once made to be genuinely popular and although repression renders the degree of support or opposition alike immeasurable, this economic concentration and its fruits surely continue to give the government whatever degree of genuine stability it has; and, for the moment, this degree appears still to suffice. The story of how this took place, told with some clarity by two men who observed its details, is of great value.

In Ted Robert Gurr's review essay, "The Neo-Alexandrians: A Review Essay on Data Handbooks in Political Science" (March 1974), the sentence at the end of page 243 and at the beginning of page 244 should read "The compilers respond by resorting to cross-checking against multiple sources, double coding, and sometimes defensive codicils. A third common feature of the handbooks is their 'institutionalized' origin."

In Table 3 (page 1217) of "Party and Incumbency in Postwar Senate Elections" by Warren Kostroski in the December 1973 issue, the column totals for the Senate should read 195, 171, and 87.7. The textual reference just above the table should also be changed accordingly.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

- 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"
- 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 Uni-

- versity, "Party Identification and the Floating Vote: Some Dynamics"
- Dennis L. Dresang, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "Ethnic Politics, Representative Bureaucracy, and Development Administration: The Zambian Case"
- Claude S. Fischer, University of California, Berkeley, "The City and Political Psychology"
- Richard Funston, San Diego State University, "The Supreme Court and Critical Elections"
- G. David Garson, Tufts University, "On the Origins of Interest Group Theory: A Critique of a Process"
- Mark Gavre, University of California, Los Angeles, "Hobbes and His Audience: The Dynamics of Theorizing"
- 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"
- Ted Robert Gurr, Northwestern University, "Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800-1971"
- Richard Child Hill, Michigan State University, "Separate and Unequal: Governmental Inequality in the Metropolis"
- 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 Iowa, 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"
- Walter Korpi, University of Stockholm, "Conflict, Power and Relative Deprivation"
- J. A. Laponce, University of British Columbia, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Spatial Archetypes and Political Perceptions"
- Peter M. Leslie, Queen's University, "Interest Groups and Political Integration: The 1972 EEC Decisions in Norway and Denmark"
- Alan Marsh, Social Science Research Council, "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"
- 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"
- Stanton Peele, Harvard University and Stanley J. Morse, Pontificia Universidade Catolica de Sao Paulo, "Ethnic Voting and Political Change in South Africa"
- N. Patrick Peritore, University of Missouri, Columbia, "Some Problems in Alfred Schutz's Phenomenological Methodology"
- David E. Price, Duke University, "Community Control: Critical Democratic Theory in the Progressive Period"
- 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"
- Joseph A. Schlesinger, Michigan State University, "The Primary Goals of Political Parties: A Clarification of Positive Theory"
- Brian D. Silver, Florida State University, "Levels of Sociocultural Development Among Soviet Nationalities: A Partial Test of the Equalization Hypothesis"
- J. S. Sorzaon, 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"
- C. Neal Tate, North Texas State University, "Individual and Contextual Variables in British Voting Behavior: An Exploratory Note"
- Kent L. Tedin, College of William and Mary, "The Influence of Parents on the Political Attitudes of New Voters"
- Edward R. Tufte, 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"
- Clement E. Vose, Wesleyan University, "Political

- Dictionaries: A Bibliographical Essay”
- 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”
- Herbert Weisberg, University of Michigan, “Models of Statistical Relationship”
- Mary B. Welfling, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, “Models, Measurement and Sources of Error: Civil Conflict in Black Africa”
- Louis P. Westfield, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, “Majority Party Leadership and the Committee System in the House of Representatives”