

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

**Rejection.** The worst chore that falls to the managing editor of this *Review* is rejecting manuscripts for publication. We are only too painfully aware that scholarly careers depend upon the ability of scholars to get their thoughts into print, and that intellectual discourse cannot be shaped except by what readers are given an opportunity to see. We have commented before on our relief that there are other journals to which authors can turn with their manuscripts rejected here. At the very least, this provides an appeal from inevitable mistakes. Mistakes, however, either of omission or commission, sooner or later mount up and fall into a pattern, and define the limitations of a managing editor in the exercise of his stewardship. A fortunate editor is one who discerns this pattern before most of his readers do, and who forthwith musters up the good grace to pass the job along to fresh hands.

In the meantime, of course, he busies himself shaping the scholarly conversation of his colleagues, and willy nilly messing about with their careers. One observer of this process in his own discipline is a distinguished historian of early modern England, Professor J. H. Hexter. In the preface to his *Reappraisals in History* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963) Hexter says:

The rejection of their early efforts sometimes unduly discourages young historians. They may perhaps be raised from unwarranted despair by the contents of this book and by its publication. Three of the essays in it were rejected by scholarly journals in good standing . . . All of the rejections came when the author was over forty. A letter of rejection is not a divine decree; it is neither an immutable nor an eternal judgment, but the decision of one or two fallible men, subject to reversal by other men equally fallible. So let young historians take heart; and in this matter may all historians be young at heart.

**The Uncertain Wages of Virtue.** A political scientist boggled our minds recently by saying, "I know—or at least can figure out—what good it does the *Review* to have editorial interns slaving away checking footnotes and quotations. What I can't figure out is what good it does the editorial interns."

We had to assure our interrogator that service as an editorial intern was purely voluntary. Some graduate students have become editorial interns by asking to join at a time when there was a vacancy. Others have been asked and have declined. Mostly, when stu-

dents have been invited to become interns, they have accepted, and they seldom drop out before leaving the Berkeley graduate program altogether. Starting in the fall of 1973 several Stanford graduate students also elected to join the program.

This constitutes a weak *prima facie* case for the proposition that the interns like to be interns, however dubious the status, and despite the annoyance of the work and the downright rottenness of the pay.

For what it's worth, interns do get something back. We have a seminar, once a month, not for credit, at which we generally go over an article that has been accepted for *Review* publication. Sometimes, the author joins the group for the evening. Sometimes, we invite a political scientist in whom the group has an interest to assign us an article he has written, and we devote a session to discussing that. In this fashion the interns were able to get a preview of Heinz Eulau's Presidential Address, and meet with such diverse and interesting political scientists (among others) as Michael Walzer, Alexander George, Austin Ranney, Ali Mazrui, and Frederick Frey.

These evening meetings are held in the managing editor's living room, and sometimes they can get pretty raucous. This, needless to say, increases the morale of the group. Social scientists have always noted the correlation between noise level and group solidarity, but what they have failed to understand until now is that the one causes the other.

This is one answer to the question what do editorial interns get? Another answer is that once a year we have dinner at the expense of the Association. Any pleasure that interns receive from this act of modest largesse is somewhat mitigated by the fact that they have to listen to a short speech by the managing editor.

Last year, his mind still boggled by the question with which we began this comment, he said:

I've been wondering whether the experience of working side by side together on the *Review* has helped in any way, and whether we can make the experience any better for the people who will be coming along to take your places.

What my thoughts have led me to is this: In my view, going through graduate education is an incredibly challenging experience. It entails the learning of a complex array of skills. It means the mastery of large and difficult bodies of written material. It means focusing your energy and intelli-

gence in such a way as to produce new and original combinations of ideas. It means learning new ways to think and talk about things. It means adopting a new identity.

Amidst all these heavy demands for focused intelligence, for mastery in depth, your work for the *Review*—our monthly seminars on random subjects, your occasional job of footnoting and nit-picking—can only come to you as a distraction.

What I'm hoping is that for at least some of you, some of the time, it has been a life-giving distraction. In order to stay sane, and intellectually healthy, we all of us need peripheral vision as well as focused concentration. We need to let our minds play a little as well as plod a lot.

For those of you who have been able to use the distraction of the *Review* as professional play—and I hope it's most of you—I suggest the possibility that it will help you become better political scientists. By giving you a chance to exercise your judgment, and your wits, and, if I may insert an empirical finding, your voices, free of evaluation by your professors and just for fun, I hope the *Review* has widened your experience a little, and cultivated your taste a little, and improved your minds—just a little.

Every year, tempered—or distempered—by the experience, a few editorial interns leave the nest and go out to seek their fortunes. Former interns are now teaching at Dartmouth, M.I.T., Pittsburgh, Princeton, Illinois, C.U.N.Y., William and Mary, Minnesota, Southern Methodist, and one or two have even made it onto the faculty at the mother church in Berkeley. Not bad.

**Erratum:** In “The Attribution of Variance in Electoral Returns: An Alternative Measurement Technique” by Richard S. Katz in the September 1973 issue, Table 4 was deleted, and Table 5 renumbered in its place. Table 4 should have read as follows:

**Table 4. Correlations Between District National Variance Components and Support of Party Majority on Party Opposition Roll Calls**

	Democrats	Republicans
All Roll Calls	.17	.18
Foreign Policy Roll Calls	.16	.04
Domestic Policy Roll Calls	.20	.17

The table appearing on page 827 is correct, but should have been numbered as Table 5.

#### Articles Accepted for Future Publication

Craig Neal Andrews, Politecon Research and Consulting, Detroit, “Integration and Community in Communist Theory”

William I. Bacchus, Commission on the Or-

ganization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy, “Diplomacy for the '70s: An Afterview and Appraisal”

Paul Allen Beck, University of Pittsburgh, “Environment and Party: The Impact of Political and Demographic County Characteristics on Party Behavior”

Samuel H. Beer, Harvard University, “Tradition and Nationality: A Review Essay”

Robert A. Bernstein and William W. Anthony, Texas A&M University, “The ABM Issue in the Senate, 1968–1970: The Importance of Ideology”

Gordon S. Black, University of Rochester, “Conflict in the Community: A Theory of the Effects of Community Size”

Walter Dean Burnham, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Theory and Voting Research: Some Reflections on Converse's ‘Change in the American Electorate’”

Edward G. Carmines, State University of New York, Buffalo, “The Mediating Influence of State Legislatures on the Interparty Competition-Welfare Expenditures Linkage”

John Chamberlin, University of Michigan, “Provision of Collective Goods as a Function of Group Size”

Richard Allen Chapman, University of Montana, “*Leviathan* Writ Small: Thomas Hobbes on the Family”

Claude S. Colantoni, Terrence J. Levesque and Peter C. Ordeshook, Carnegie-Mellon University, “Campaign Resource Allocations Under the Electoral College”

Wayne A. Cornelius, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Urbanization and Political Demand Making: Political Participation Among the Migrant Poor in Latin American Cities”

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, University of Rochester, “Need for Achievement and Competitiveness as Determinants of Party Success in Elections and Coalitions”

Lawrence C. Dodd, University of Texas, “Party Coalitions in Multiparty Parliaments: A Game-Theoretic Analysis”

Dennis L. Dresang, University of Wisconsin, Madison, “Ethnic Politics, Representative Bureaucracy, and Development Administration: The Zambian Case”

Peter Eisinger, University of Wisconsin, Madison, “Racial Differences in Protest Participation”

David J. Elkins, University of British Columbia, “The Measurement of Party Competition in Multi-Party Systems”

John A. Ferejohn and Morris Fiorina, California Institute of Technology, “The Paradox

- of Not Voting: A Decision Theoretic Analysis"
- Ada Finifter, Michigan State University, "The Friendship Group as a Protective Environment for Political Deviants"
- Peter C. Fishburn, Pennsylvania State University, "Paradoxes of Voting"
- Ronald P. Formisano, Clark University, "Deferral-Participant Politics: U.S. Political Culture, 1789-1840"
- Mark Gavre, University of California, Los Angeles, "Hobbes and His Audience: The Dynamics of Theorizing"
- Ted Robert Gurr, Northwestern University, "Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800-1971"
- Larry B. Hill, University of Oklahoma, "Institutionalization, the Ombudsman, and Bureaucracy"
- Richard Child Hill, Michigan State University, "Separate and Unequal: Governmental Inequality in the Metropolis"
- Kenneth Jowitt, University of California, Berkeley, "An Organizational Approach to the Study of Political Culture in Marxist-Leninist Systems"
- Donald R. Kelley, Monmouth College, "Toward a Model of Soviet Decision Making: A Research Note"
- Stanley Kelley, Jr., Princeton University and Thad W. Mirer, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "The Simple Act of Voting"
- 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"
- Walter Korpi, University of Stockholm, "Conflict, Power and Relative Deprivation"
- Jesse F. Marquette, University of Akron, "Social Change and Political Mobilization in the United States: 1870-1960"
- Arthur H. Miller, Ohio State University, "Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1864-1970"
- Thomas C. Nowak and Kay A. Snyder, Michigan State University, "Clientelist Politics in the Philippines: Integration or Instability?"
- Stanton Peele, Harvard University and Stanley J. Morse, Pontificia Universidade Catolica de Sao Paulo, "Ethnic Voting and Political Change in South Africa"
- John C. Pierce, Washington State University and Douglas D. Rose, Tulane University, "Non Attitudes and American Public Opinion: The Examination of a Thesis"
- David E. Price, Duke University, "Community and Control: Critical Democratic Theory in the Progressive Period"
- Kenneth A. Shepsle, Washington University, "On the Size of Winning Coalitions"
- Brian D. Silver, Florida State University, "Levels of Sociocultural Development Among Soviet Nationalities: A Partial Test of the Equalization Hypothesis"
- Arthur G. Stevens, Jr., University of Virginia, Arthur H. Miller, Ohio State University and Thomas E. Mann, American Political Science Association, "Mobilization of Liberal Strength in the House, 1955-1970: The Democratic Study Group"
- Peter G. Stillman, Vassar College, "Hegel's Critique of Liberal Rights"
- 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"
- Timothy A. Tilton, Indiana University, "The Social Origins of Liberal Democracy: The Swedish Case"
- Glenn Tinder, University of Massachusetts, Boston, "Beyond Tragedy: The Idea of Civility"
- John Wanat, University of Kentucky, "Bases of Budgetary Incrementalism"
- Meredith W. Watts, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, "B. F. Skinner and the Language of Technological Control"
- Herbert Weisberg, University of Michigan, "Models of Statistical Relationship"
- Louis P. Westfield, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, "Majority Party Leadership and the Committee System in the House of Representatives"
- Roger E. Wyman, Rutgers University, "Middle-Class Voters and Progressive Reform: The Conflict of Class and Culture"