

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Editorial Interns. If we can judge by the volume of response received in this office, the most beloved feature of the *REVIEW* by far is the masthead. The managing editor will confess to a certain fondness for the current masthead himself, since he designed it, and put all those names there, new faces and golden oldies alike. A number of people have inquired about the unfamiliar title "Editorial Intern." "What do editorial interns do?" they want to know; "Why are there so many of them?" And "What do they cost?"

They don't cost the Association anything. They are advanced graduate students in political science—very gifted students, by the way, some of whom are themselves published scholars. They donate their time to the *REVIEW* in order to perform menial, but in our view essential editorial tasks.

Readers of *REVIEW* front-matter (second only to the masthead in intrinsic interest) are aware that the *REVIEW* receives the bulk of its manuscripts unsolicited, and that it sends them out anonymously to referees. When the referees' comments come back, the whole file, manuscript, comments, correspondence, lands on the managing editor's desk for a decision. Approximately one in ten times, the decision is to publish.

This, roughly, is the procedure that has been handed down from managing editor to managing editor. Once an article has been accepted for publication, however, current management has begun to diverge from previous practice by assigning manuscripts to a professional manuscript editor, who offers editorial advice to authors, in behalf of the *REVIEW*'s beleaguered readers. The manuscript editor also supervises the editorial interns, one of whom takes each article and checks every quote and footnote for accuracy. We cannot and do not guarantee, by the way, that once an article has gone through this mill it emerges perfected. In a scholarly journal, the author, not the editor, is the guarantor of the adequacy of work. We provide the forum and try to exercise some quality control, but in the end, the authors stand behind the contents. The work of the interns, as of the manuscript editor, aids the reader essentially by assisting the author—although in an extreme case that one expects never to arise, one can imagine the managing editor stepping in and making compliance with editorial suggestions a condition of publication.

The work of editorial interns is, in short, unpaid drudgery. Why do they do it? In part be-

cause as concerned near-professionals, they want the *REVIEW* to be a good journal, and they want to be proud of it. In part because they value the opportunity of learning from the inside out how articles are put together and gotten ready for publication. In part because they enjoy the experience of meeting together in a no-credit seminar, as we do once a month, and discussing upcoming *REVIEW* articles. In part, one supposes, because they hope others will value them more highly for having made this contribution. The experience is more or less equivalent to that gained by law students who by their efforts contribute so much to the distinction of the law journals of this country. Those of us who have seen the *REVIEW*'s editorial interns at work believe that their contribution adds greatly to the quality of our enterprise.

High Finance. The price of back copies of the *REVIEW* is now \$7.50. This reflects a judgment in the national office, not contradicted by anyone, that the cost of back issues ought to bear some relationship to the cost of membership in the Association, since otherwise, one assumes, libraries, other holders of institutional memberships, and conceivably individuals may be tempted to buy back issues at cut prices rather than keep their memberships current.

This also gives us a convenient way of calculating part of the contribution of the *REVIEW* to the income of the Association. If a single back issue costs \$7.50, then it is not outrageous to assume that thirty out of the thirty-five dollars the Association charges to institutional members (in return for which they get four issues each of both the *REVIEW* and *P.S.*) ought to be allocated to the credit of the *REVIEW*. The Association currently has 3,536 institutional members, and that figure multiplied by \$30 gives an income contribution of \$106,080. Advertisements in the *REVIEW* brought in another \$53,056.70 last year. The sale of back issues brought in \$10,834.87. The *REVIEW* office has not been able to ascertain what our income was from the sale of publication rights.

How much ought we to allocate from the dues of ordinary members to the credit of the *APSR*? Here reasonable men disagree, since it is assumed that members of the Association have an interest not only in the *REVIEW*, but also in the running of the national office, in election mailings, in the meetings of the Council and other committees of the Association, in the employment service, in *P.S.*, and in *ad hoc*

conferences called by the President of the Association, all of which cost money. (This is not an exhaustive list.)

Instead of making an arbitrary allocation, which is sure to meet with disagreement in some quarter, it is easier simply to report that individual memberships in the Association currently number 14,274. Readers may decide for themselves the proper allocation of ordinary dues income to four issues of the REVIEW, and multiply accordingly. This figure, added to the others, will give the contribution of the REVIEW to the annual income of the Association.

On the outgo side of the ledger, by far the largest expense is the bill for printing and mailing, now climbing into the neighborhood of \$30,000 an issue, on the average. Management costs, including stipends for the managing editor, book review editor and editorial associates, secretarial and clerical costs both in the REVIEW office and in the national office, postage, phone bills and so on, now run to around \$50,000 annually. It is not for us to decide whether readers are getting their money's worth from all this—or from the other activities of the Association, for that matter. We continue to hope so. We can observe, however, that the REVIEW does seem to be paying its way financially. This is no measure, we are sure, of the affection the REVIEW inspires in the hearts of its readers, but in a crass world, we must take our satisfactions where we find them.

Errata. In D. Spafford, "A Note on the 'Equilibrium Division of the Vote,'" this *Review*, 65 (March, 1971):

Line 7, right-hand column of p. 181, the equation should read: $\lambda = \beta_1 - 1$.

Equation (5), p. 181, should read: $x^* = \beta_0 / (1 - \beta_1)$, $\beta_1 \neq 1$.

In equation (A.6), p. 183, the condition should read: $E(\epsilon_t) = 0$.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

Robert Axelrod, University of California, Berkeley, "Where the Votes Come From: An Analysis of Electoral Coalitions From 1952-1968"

Lawrence W. Beer, University of Colorado, "Freedom of Information and the Evidentiary Use of Film in Japan: Law and Sociopolitics in an East Asian Democracy"

Gordon S. Black, University of Rochester, "A Theory of Political Ambition: Career

Choices and the Role of Structural Incentives"

Richard W. Boyd, Wesleyan University, "Popular Control of Public Policy: A Normal Vote Analysis of the 1968 Election"

Thomas W. Casstevens, Oakland University, "The Committee Function"

Robert S. Erikson, Florida State University, "The Electoral Impact of Congressional Roll Call Voting"

B. Michael Frolić, York University, "Decision-Making in Soviet Cities"

Howard Hamilton, Kent State University, "The Municipal Voter: Voting and Non-voting in City Elections"

Ronald Inglehart, University of Michigan, "The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Six Countries"

Arnold Kanter, The Brookings Institution, "Congress and the Defense Budget: 1960-1970"

Evron M. Kirkpatrick, American Political Science Association, "'Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System': Political Science, Policy Science, or Pseudo-Science?"

Isaac Kramnick, Yale University, "The Politics of Political Philosophy, A Case Study: Godwin's Anarchism and Radical England"

Rene Lemarchand, University of Florida, "Political Clientelism and Ethnicity in Tropical Africa: Competing Solidarities in Nation-Building"

Robert J. Lieber, University of California, Davis, "Interest Groups and Foreign Policy: British Entry Into Europe"

Richard M. Merelman, University of Wisconsin, "The Development of Policy Thinking in Adolescence"

Eugene F. Miller, University of Georgia, "Positivism, Historicism, and Political Inquiry"

Willard A. Mullins, Carleton University, "On the Concept of Ideology in Political Science"

John M. Orbell and Toru Uno, University of Oregon, "A Theory of Neighborhood Problem-Solving: Political Action vs. Resident Mobility"

Peter C. Ordeshook, Carnegie-Mellon University, "Pareto Optimality in Electoral Competition"

Gerald M. Pomper, Rutgers University, "From Confusion to Clarity: Issues and American Voters, 1956-1968"

Jeffrey L. Pressman, Dartmouth College, "Preconditions of Mayoral Leadership"

George F. Quester, Cornell University, "Some Conceptual Problems on Nuclear Proliferation"

David Sankoff, University of Montreal, and
Koula Mellos, University of Ottawa, "The
Swing Ratio and Game Theory"

James Scott, University of Wisconsin, "Patron-
Client Politics and Political Change in South-
east Asia"

Kenneth A. Shepsle, Washington University,
"The Strategy of Ambiguity: Uncertainty and
Electoral Competition"

Donald VanDeVeer, North Carolina State Uni-

versity of the University of North Carolina,
"Oppenheim's Defense of Non-cognitivism"

Peter Willetts, Makerere University College,
"Cluster-Bloc Analysis and Statistical Infer-
ence"

James Q. Wilson and Edward C. Banfield, Har-
vard University, "Political Ethos Revisited"

Raymond E. Wolfinger, Stanford University,
"'Nondecisions' and the Study of Local Poli-
tics"