

moral judgment—and he extends an olive branch with his mention of a “continuum” (I presume between objectivity and subjectivity)—I am happy to accept the compromise. But if lines have to be drawn, I must reaffirm my conviction that such judgments lack the basis in agreement that makes it possible for us to describe empirical judgments as objective,

and thus fall much closer to avowedly subjective judgments of taste. The problem about moral judgments is not merely that they are complex, as Kaplan suggests, but that there are irreducible variations in the criteria used to make them.

DAVID MILLER

University of East Anglia

EDITORIAL NOTE

Paul Allen Beck is leaving the University of Pittsburgh to assume a post at Florida State University. He has served as Book Review Editor since 1976. Professor Beck's service to the Association in this important position is best exemplified by the resolution of commendation passed by the APSA Council:

The APSA Council hereby commends Paul Allen Beck for his superlative service to the Association as Book Review Editor, 1976–1979. Professor Beck's management of this important section of the journal, his judicious selection of books and reviewers, and his advice and counsel in policy matters merit the gratitude of the entire membership.

At one time it was simple enough to manage the book review section from a different location. The sheer volume of work associated with this position now makes it imperative that the book reviews be assigned and coordinated from the journal's main office. I am pleased to announce that Holbert N. Carroll has accepted the appointment of Book Review Editor, effective July 1, 1979. Professor Carroll has served on the faculty of the University of Pittsburgh since 1946, chairing the department, 1960–1968. A person with wide interests in political science, Professor Carroll has written works on Congress and American foreign and defense policy. He served on the APSA Council 1967–1969. The Association will be well served by this acknowledged scholar and administrator.

* * * * *

With the backlog issue resolved, it has been possible to focus on other matters associated with managing the *Review*. One of an editor's

responsibilities is to point to areas which researchers have neglected and to encourage scholars to venture into new directions. Despite the considerable interest shown by political scientists in public policy research during the last decade, relatively few such manuscripts are submitted to the *APSR*. I recently wrote to a number of policy scholars about this situation and several reasons for it were offered: e.g., not all that much quality work is being done, such research is often supported by government grants and published in reports, many other publishing outlets have recently been developed, and the *APSR* is perceived as not being hospitable to policy research. As editor, I can do little about the first three, but find it unfortunate if the last reason applies. And yet I can understand how such an attitude might develop, given the scope and variety of what is called “policy research.” A useful purpose can be served, therefore, by identifying the type of policy-related study seemingly appropriate for the *APSR*. I prepared the following statement (now slightly revised) for a *Policy Network Directory*, to be published by the Policy Studies Organization. It is offered here to provoke thought, not to establish an orthodoxy.

Articles directed to conceptual and theoretical development and refinement would certainly be of interest to our general readership. Comparative analyses of public policies, major issues, political institutions, policy processes, etc., would also be welcome because they provide the empirical basis for theory and conceptual growth. And single-issue studies too, might be of general interest if designed to test propositions drawn from the work of other policy scholars. Strictly substantive policy analysis—i.e., work designed to evaluate the substantive effects of existing programs and/or

recommend programmatic change—is probably best placed in the several journals now inviting such work.

I also sent this statement to a number of policy scholars for their reaction. For the most part their reaction was positive. Several had constructive comments and as a result I made some revisions in the statement. Two responses were particularly contributory and deserve special mention here. Duncan MacRae, Jr., University of North Carolina, noted that: “There is one type of ‘policy analysis’ that does . . . belong clearly in political science and this is the choice among political institutions—constitutions, federalism, party systems, electoral systems, administrative structure, legislative institutions, judicial systems, and the like.” He also observed that while articles dealing with conceptual and theoretical development are relevant, “It might be useful to specify some of the major lines of development. . . .” Here is what he suggests:

1. Criteria for policy analysis [are needed]. This topic overlaps somewhat with political philosophy, especially when choices of regimes or constitutions are involved. But the region of overlap of criteria, between constitutional choice and program choice, seems to me to be among the most interesting areas: how can similar criteria be formulated for these large choices and for choices among specific programs? Can detailed choices among political institutions be assessed in economic or utilitarian terms? Can criteria, dealing with human development or perfection, be expressed in researchable terms?

2. The role of policy analysts in political systems is another large topic that deserves discussion. It can be generalized in one respect to deal with the proper “politics of expertise,” and in another to deal with the evaluation of proposed new institutions, such as “science courts,” to make use of policy-relevant expertise. An increasing variety of such institutions is being proposed and requires systematic analysis.

3. Normative analyses of how problems are formulated might be appropriate. Political scientists have contributed a great deal to the study of how issues *are* redefined; but could we take the further step of analyzing how issues *should* be redefined? At first glance, this seems to be mere assertion of the writer’s political preferences; but if redefinition could derive from general philosophical systems, take a long view, or contribute to policy analysis, conceivably it could be a contribution to the *APSR*. I suspect that this sort of discussion has occurred more often in “great debates” on foreign policy or international relations than in domestic policy; but I wonder whether this restriction is necessary.

4. Can comparative policy studies be placed in a context of explicit evaluation of alternative choices currently facing a single polity? I have found “comparative public policy” to be a very frustrating field on the whole because of its *lack* of direct contribution to policy evaluation and choice. Explicit attention to policy choices, rather than to non-manipulatable variables alone, might help to remedy this.

5. Careful analyses of “political feasibility” are still needed. I don’t mean mere case studies of feasibility; important as they are, I don’t think the *APSR* should invite them. Rather, I mean analyses of the scientific versus intuitive or personal status of this topic. Not only the scientific status of feasibility assessment, but also its ethical status should be assessed. Should political science be training feasibility experts as “hired guns?”

This is a particularly rich and stimulating, though by no means comprehensive, list of research issues and is reprinted here for illustrative purposes. It encourages the political scientist to move beyond tightly formulated empirical work to consider its significance in the world of policy choice. It asks as well that scholars draw upon their training in philosophy for identifying the nature and consequence of decisions.

Theodore J. Lowi, Cornell University, asks why the criteria in the statement should not also be applied to other research areas. He writes:

I would urge you to take it one step further and to formulate some of the same criteria on a more general basis for every area in which political scientists write articles and submit them for publication in the *APSR* which were perfectly adequate and acceptable from the standpoint of the subdiscipline in question, but which were too specialized and too narrowly focused to be in the *APSR*. If you had applied the criteria suggested in your September 12 memo to those areas, many such articles would have been sent back to the author with strong encouragement to divert them to the more specialized journals. Why, for example, should the *APSR* be more interested in an article on voting behavior in Congress or in the electorate if it is not “directed to conceptual and theoretical development and refinement?” Why should the *APSR* be receptive to an article on any subject if the article does not “provide the empirical basis for theory and conceptual growth?” You are correct in your position toward public policy papers, and you would be precisely equally correct in applying such criteria to all other areas of our discipline.

Whether a single statement is applicable to all subfields is not something I am prepared to

judge at this point. I was moved to develop a statement for public policy for the reasons stated in my opening remarks. It is my belief, however, that the editor must become as knowledgeable as possible about developments in the many subfields of the discipline. Accordingly, it is my intention to correspond with a

representative group of scholars in various fields to determine how they see the *APSR* serving them, as well as what they judge to be important developments in their particular corner of the discipline. In the meantime, I invite members to write to me or members of the editorial board on this important set of issues.

* * * * *

The following articles have tentatively been scheduled to appear in the December, 1979, issue:

Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier, University of California, "Inducements versus Constraints: Disaggregating 'Corporatism' "

Enrique A. Baloyra, University of North Carolina, "Criticism, Cynicism, and Political Evaluation: A Venezuelan Example"

Robert B. Albritton, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, "Social Amelioration through Mass Insurgency? A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis"

Frances Fox Piven, Boston University, and Richard A. Cloward, Columbia University, "Electoral Instability, Civil Disorder, and Relief Rises: A Reply to Albritton"

Dale C. Nelson, Fordham University, "Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status as Sources of Participation: The Case of Ethnic-Political

Culture"

W. Phillips Shively, University of Minnesota, "The Development of Party Identification among Adults: Exploration of a Functional Model"

Gregory B. Markus and Philip E. Converse, University of Michigan, "A Dynamic Simultaneous Equation Model of Electoral Choice"

Benjamin I. Page, University of Chicago, and Calvin C. Jones, National Opinion Research Center, "Reciprocal Effects of Policy Preferences, Party Loyalties and the Vote"

James H. Kuklinski, Indiana University, and John E. Stanga, Wichita State University, "Political Participation and Government Responsiveness: The Behavior of California Superior Courts"

Fred Thompson, Economic Council of Canada, "American Legislative Decision Making and the Size Principle"

* * * * *

Erratum

The key was inadvertently omitted from Figure 3 of Arthur H. Miller, Edie N. Golden-

berg, and Lutz Erbring, "Type-Set Politics: Impact of Newspapers on Public Confidence," Vol. 73 (March, 1979), p. 77. The figure, with key, is reprinted on p. 845.