

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Help wanted. As it must to all editors, ex-editorship will overtake the current inhabitants of the *Review's* masthead with the issue of June 1977. Five issues before then, if the size of our current backlog holds, a new managing editor elect must be in place and ready to evaluate manuscripts for the June 1977 issue, and those following. That means by the end of 1975 the Council must hear the advice of the President, and select a new managing editor in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the Association. A search committee has been appointed by President Austin Ranney, to advise him as he ponders the possibilities. This committee consists of six members. Two sit as ex-officio members: the current managing editor and the President-elect of the Association. In addition, three members are drawn from the Council and one other member from the editorial board of the *Review*.

Since members of the Association having an opinion about the future management of the *Review* should feel free to communicate with any or all of the members of this committee, we will list herewith their names and addresses:

1. Austin Ranney, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 202 Junipero Serra Boulevard, Stanford, California (on leave from the University of Wisconsin);
2. James MacGregor Burns, Department of Political Science, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts;
3. Martin Diamond, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (on leave from Northern Illinois University);
4. Dale Rogers Marshall, Department of Political Science, University of California, Davis, California;
5. John E. Turner, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota;
6. Stephen V. Stephens, Department of Political Science, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. In addition the managing editor can be reached at the usual place.

What qualifications for the job should we be bearing in mind as we go about our search? The last editor of the *Review* once stated within earshot that the private standard against which he measured potential candidates for the managing editor's job was John L. Lewis's famous description of John Nance Garner: "a poker-playing, whiskey-drinking, evil old man." It seemed to my illustrious predecessor that only persons approximating to these qualities would have the necessary consciousness of their own limitations and consequently the requisite compassion to dis-

charge wisely responsibilities that affect the course of so many careers and the shape of intellectual discourse in our discipline. At the same time these nicely chosen epithets convey a certain joyfulness of spirit, a sustaining capacity to have a little fun in the most unpromising of circumstances.

All things considered, it is a wonder that the last managing editor ended up with a non-gambling teetotaler nearly fifteen years his junior for a successor. Perhaps this shows his flexibility, perhaps his capacity to be undeterred by superficialities. The tacit criteria he foreshadowed, in any event, if not the overt ones, are not bad guidelines.

What they suggest, among other things, is that certain human qualities come first, and that a number of other considerations will be of little or no help in screening candidates. For example, all purely demographic characteristics of political scientists—characteristics which commonly weigh heavily in determining job eligibility throughout most societies—are utterly irrelevant to the selection of a managing editor: sex, age, race, religion, height, weight. It is well known, for example, that tall people are far more likely to be selected for executive positions in most American enterprises, and fat people far less likely. On at least one of these counts, previous APSA search committees can claim very clear consciences.

Certain other characteristics of possible candidates are bound to count for something. It is important in order to tap the most competent advice available that managing editors have reasonably good access to informal networks of communication within the discipline. This would suggest at first blush that the Association would be better served if the managing editor were to come from a large department than a small one. Plenty of large departments, on the other hand, are collections of lonely prima donnas, and some small ones provide nearly ideal conditions of collegial access, so it is important to state this criterion as a property of an individual rather than of his environment. What the search committee should be looking for are candidates who make an effort, and who succeed, in informing themselves about currents of thought in political science.

Field of specialty within the discipline should count only a little. There is certainly no one mainstream in political science, so the notion of selecting a "mainstream" political scientist, while no doubt more appropriate for the central journal of the profession than the deliberate selection of an

intellectual maverick, is in fact a will-o-the-wisp. The methodological, theoretical, and substantive range of present-day political science is very great. The metaphor of an intellectual center surrounded by a periphery has limited usefulness when "mainstream" voting behavior specialists rarely if ever cite "mainstream" international relations theorists in their work and vice-versa. Either specialty might perfectly well be the area of major interest for the next managing editor.

Since scholars are notorious for their erratic work habits, it is well to state one criterion that should matter a great deal. All serious candidates for the managing editorship must be capable of regular routines and especially must be prompt about answering their mail. This indispensable quality undoubtedly knocks off some otherwise attractive candidates, but it is a clear *sine qua non* for actually doing the job.

It is not quite self-evident that the managing editor should be a scholar of some accomplishment. In principle, of course, and in practice as well, being a skilled and tasteful appreciator of other peoples' scholarship does not entail also being a scholar. The reason managing editors must meet a test of scholarship is to confer legitimacy upon their letters of rejection. A letter of rejection from editors who have not personally subjected their work to the same rigorous scrutiny that the *Review* routinely accords its submissions, is a document of questionable persuasiveness.

At the same time, competence within one of the vineyards of our discipline is certainly not enough. Successful managing editors must also have a well-developed curiosity about what is going on in other parts of the discipline, a sense of where the emerging interests are, a sensitivity to cliques and schools of thought, and something more hospitable than tolerance toward work in modes and traditions different from their own.

If such a paragon exists, no doubt the search committee will want to hear of it. And readers are invited to send their suggestions along.

On Being Calm. In a recent journal article, a political scientist disparages the appearance in the *Review* of the 1930s of "calm analyses" of fascism. The implication is clearly that there is something morally defective in scholars who confront evil in a nonhysterical, even an analytical, fashion. Is it possible that the composure of scholars sent to premature destruction people whose lives would have been spared by scholarly hysteria? We doubt it. The moral example of emotionally distraught men of knowledge is not the strongest material out of which to build policy of any sort, and it seems to us the record is now thick with examples of all kinds—and on all sides—that bear this proposition out. Moreover people are sure to ask on what grounds a scholar's lack

of calm should be weighed more heavily than the urgent promptings of the conscience of a construction worker, or a housewife.

What entitles scholars to be listened to, it seems to us, is not the intensity of our convictions, but the quality of our arguments. When these are grounded upon an honest marshalling of evidence, upon a fair-minded canvass of alternatives, a capacious understanding of social and political contexts, they have a chance at larger influence. In part, the capacity of political scientists to play a role in making a better world is dependent upon our capacity to render assurance to those whom we address that our work is warranted by a climate of free and open inquiry, tested by the rigorous canons of rational discourse, and arises in short from an atmosphere of what for a better word one might call "calm."

We believe that the preservation of this atmosphere is an imperative duty that rests (in part) upon the management of the *Review*. The pursuit of this obligation does not entail suppressing conflicts of opinion, but rather ventilating them. It does mean making a strenuous effort to keep discourse civil, focused, and substantive. We believe that although we are far from perfection, the *Review* does show the effects of the diligent pursuit of this goal, at a time when, no less than the '30s, the calm voices of political scientists are needed in public discourse.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

- Paul R. Abramson, Michigan State University, "Generational Change and the Decline of Party Identification"
- Christopher H. Achen, Yale University, "Political Belief Systems in Mass Publics: The Problem of Inconsistent Opinion Survey Responses"
- 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"
- Francisco Arcelus and Allan H. Meltzer, Carnegie-Mellon University, "The Effect of Aggregate Economic Variables on Congressional Elections"
- John A. Armstrong, University of Wisconsin, "Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas"
- Robert L. Ayres, University of California, Berkeley, "Development Policy and the Possibility of a 'Liveable' Future for Latin America"
- Jonathan D. Casper, Stanford University, "The Supreme Court and National Policy Making"
- Roger Cobb, Brown University, Jennie-Keith Ross, Swarthmore College, and Marc Howard Ross, Bryn Mawr College, "Agenda Building as a Comparative Political Process"
- 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”
 Fred R. Dallmayr, Purdue University, “Beyond Dogma and Despair: Toward a Critical Theory of Politics”
 Geoffrey Debnam, University of Otago, “Non-decisions and Power: The Two Faces of Bachrach and Baratz”
 John P. Diggins, University of California, Irvine, “Four Theories in Search of a Reality: James Burnham, Soviet Communism, and the Cold War”
 Douglas Dobson, Northern Illinois University, and Douglas St. Angelo, Florida State University, “Party Identification and the Floating Vote: Some Dynamics”
 George Edwards, Tulane University, “Presidential Influence in the House: Presidential Prestige as a Source of Presidential Power”
 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”
 Norman Frohlich, University of Texas, “The Instability of Minimum Winning Coalitions”
 Richard Funston, San Diego State University, “The Supreme Court and Critical Elections”
 Benjamin Ginsberg, Cornell University, “Elections and Public Policy”
 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”
 Fred M. Hayward, University of Wisconsin, “A Reassessment of Conventional Wisdom About the Informed Public: National Political Information in Ghana”
 David K. Hildebrand, University of Pennsylvania, James D. Laing and Howard Rosenthal, Carnegie-Mellon University, “Prediction Analysis in Political Research”
 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”
 David Koehler, American University, “Vote Trading and the Voting Paradox: A Proof of Logical Equivalence”
 Patrick J. McGowan, University of Southern California, and Robert M. Rood, University of South Carolina, “Alliance Behavior in Balance of Power Systems: Applying a Poisson Model to 19th-Century Europe”
 Kenneth John Meier, Syracuse University, “Representative Bureaucracy: An Empirical Analysis”
 Arthur H. Miller, Warren E. Miller, Alden S. Raine, and Thad A. Brown, University of Michigan, “A Majority Party in Disarray: Policy Polarization in the 1972 Election”
 Fritz Nova, Villanova University, “Political Innovation of the West German Federal Constitutional Court: The State Discussion on Judicial Review”
 Guillermo Owen, Rice University, “Evaluation of a Presidential Election Game”
 Douglas Rae, Yale University, “The Limits of Consensual Decision”
 Michael J. Robinson, The Catholic University of America, “Public Affairs Television and the Growth of Political Malaise: The Case of *The Selling of the Pentagon*”
 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”
 Gerald S. Strom, University of Illinois, Chicago, “On the Apparent Paradox of Participation”
 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”
 J. Weinberger, Michigan State University, “Hobbes’s Doctrine of Method”
 Mary B. Welfing, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, “Models, Measurement and Sources of Error: Civil Conflict in Black Africa”