
Reply

TO THE EDITOR:

We agree with Lawrence that alternative techniques are useful when theoretically appropriate. Lawrence recognizes the primary conceptual point we make—the definition of tolerance requires that the person holds objectionable the group in question so that tolerance consists of setting aside that negative inclination. In game theory terms, tolerance presumes a cost, that of enduring an objectionable group. We do not claim our measure is superior to Lawrence’s measure, only that it is more appropriate to our conceptual definition of tolerance.

We also included in our study investigation of responses to the second most disliked group, as well as some of the traditional Stouffer and Mc-

Closky items. A full discussion of these findings is reported in Sullivan, Piereson and Marcus (forthcoming, 1982). Lawrence’s (1976) work was very important to our own work and his measures remain a useful way to investigate mass reactions to groups and issues. Each investigator ought to choose that measure most appropriate to the theoretical task.
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Editorial Note

This issue is my last as managing editor. It has been a rewarding experience. We managed 17 issues of the journal in Pittsburgh—from December, 1977, through December, 1981. I had the support of an outstanding staff and Editorial Board, and an APSA Headquarters sensitive to our every need. The book reviews were superbly managed by Paul Allen Beck and Holbert N. Carroll, each with their own fine advisory boards. As is noted in my final report printed in PS (Fall, 1981), thousands of members have been involved in the work of the journal—as authors, readers, and reviewers. I thank you all.

The following articles have tentatively been scheduled to appear in the March, 1982, issue:

Elaine Sharp, University of Kansas, “Citizen-Initiated Contacting and Social Status: Determining the Relationship and Accounting for It”

Barbara Romzek, University of Kansas, and J. Stephen Hendricks, University of Texas, Austin, “Organizational Involvement and Representative Bureaucracy: Can We Have It Both Ways?”

Youssef Cohen, University of Michigan, “‘The Benevolent Leviathan’: A Study of the Political Consciousness of Urban Workers in a Context of Extreme Working-Class Dependence on the State”

Paul Allen Beck, Florida State University, and M. Kent Jennings, University of Michigan, “Pathways to Participation”

Nathaniel Beck, University of California, San Diego, “Parties, Administrations and American Macroeconomic Outcomes”


Charles S. Lindblom, Yale University, presidential address, “Another State of Mind”

J. Peter Euben, University of California, Santa Cruz, “Justice and the Oresteia”