EDITORIAL COMMENT

Why Editorial Comment? The purpose of this space is to share with readers of the Review information that may from time to time be available to the managing editor about Review policies and activities. This space will not be used to comment on other Association activity. Like all other members of the Association (he is sure), the managing editor of this Review looks forward to having his say in P.S. whenever he feels the Association at large has need of his guidance.

New Format. It is not obligatory that the format of the Review change with each new managing editor. Indeed, it is not even traditional. In spite of this, the appearance of the Review has occasionally changed. Notable landmarks in the evolving design of the Review include: the change in the color of the cover from brown to its present gorgeous two-toned hue in the issue of March, 1952, by managing editor Taylor Cole; the change to double columns in June, 1960, in Harvey Mansfield’s editorship, made necessary by considerations of space and expense, and managing editor Austin Ranney’s new cover, which first made its appearance in March, 1966.

This is the second issue in a new format, which includes a new type face and style (New Times Roman monotype), new paper (Winnebago eggshell) somewhat whiter and more opaque than the previous stock, a new cover, and a new table of contents, which gives abstracts for all articles and lists all books reviewed. The Review’s new format was worked out in consultation with Mr. Barnard Norris of the periodicals division of the University of California Press, and Mr. John Robson of the George Banta Company, the Review’s printer. Since articles in the Review are in general sent in by authors rather than solicited by the managing editor, the format constitutes the major part of what a managing editor can contribute toward the intelligibility of the Review.

New Editorial Board. This is the first issue to be published by new management. The retiring editorial board labored for five years under the distinguished leadership of Austin Ranney. In that time, the Review grew greatly in circulation, and, reflecting Professor Ranney’s own capacious and hospitable mind, readily opened its pages to new approaches to the writing of political science. The new board will be very happy to do as well as the old and begs the indulgence of readers while we struggle to measure up.

The new editorial board is more than twice the size of the old, and for the first time includes scholars from abroad. Political Science as a learned discipline has always reached across national boundaries. While the Review is a publication of the American Association devoted to the study of political science, its contents are aimed at the general enlightenment of students of politics throughout the world. The foreign scholars presently serving on the editorial board are all, similarly, through their own writing benefactors of American political science. I think all the rest of us on the Editorial Board share the view that it is a distinct honor to be serving with them.

ERRATA

In “Dimensions of Candidate Evaluation” by Herbert F. Weisberg and Jerrold G. Rusk in the December 1970 issue, the list of candidates and “card #5” appearing above Figure 1 are not a part of Figure 1; they should have been placed instead at the end of the Appendix.

In C. W. Cassinelli’s review of Rahul, Government and Politics of Tibet in the December 1970 issue, on page 1332, column 2, line 26, strike the words “political figure” to read “... Lama was a minor and the...”

In the review of Breckenridge’s The Right to Privacy in the March 1971 issue (p. 208) the reviewer’s name mistakenly appeared as Louis B. Moreland; the name should read Lois B. Moreland.

Articles Accepted for Future Publication

Lawrence W. Beer, University of Colorado, “Freedom of Information and the Evidentiary Use of Film in Japan: Law and Socio-politics in an East Asian Democracy”

Gordon S. Black, University of Rochester, “A Theory of Political Ambition: Career Choices and the Role of Structural Incentives”

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

B. Michael Frolic, York University, “Decision-Making in Soviet Cities”


Jerry Hollenhorst and Gary Ault, Southern Illinois University, “An Alternative Answer To: Who Pays For Defense?”

J. Woodford Howard, Jr., The Johns Hopkins University, “Judicial Biography and the Behavioral Persuasion”
Ronald Inglehart, University of Michigan, “The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Six Countries”
Gerald W. Johnson, Auburn University, “Political Correlates of Voter Participation: A Deviant Case Analysis”
Evron M. Kirkpatrick, American Political Science Association, “‘Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System’: Political Science, Policy Science, or Pseudo-Science?”
Allan Kornberg, Duke University, and Robert Frasure, The University of the South, “Policy Differences in British Parliamentary Parties”
Robert J. Lieber, University of California, Davis, “Interest Groups and Foreign Policy: British Entry Into Europe”
Arend Lijphart, University of Leiden, “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method”
Lawrence S. Mayer, Ohio State University, “A Note on ‘An Axiomatic Model of Voting Bodies’”
Richard M. Merelman, University of Wisconsin, “The Development of Policy Thinking in Adolescence”
Robert D. Putnam, University of Michigan, “Studying Elite Political Culture: The Case of ‘Ideology’”
Donald VanDeVeer, North Carolina State University of the University of North Carolina, “Oppenheim’s Defense of Non-cognitivism”
D. M. White, Monash University, “Power and Intention”
Raymond E. Wolfinger, Stanford University, “‘Nondecisions’ and the Study of Local Politics”

The sixty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Association will be held September 7–11, 1971, at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.