EDITORIAL COMMENT

Relax. By the time this issue of the Review is mailed to readers, and they can read this comment, the Review office will have already received galley proofs for our next issue and distributed copies to authors for corrections, and manuscripts for the issue following that one will have been mostly edited and sent off to the printer. We will also be fairly certain of the contents of the two issues beyond that. Operating, as we do, with such formidable time lags makes it difficult for us to move quickly even when we want to. Because our authors are scattered all over the map, we have to schedule slow turn-around times for galley proofs. A speeded-up high quality job from a printer would greatly increase our printing bill—and so we have decided to try for high quality rather than top speed.

We know this annoys some people. Consider the author of a scholarly book. This person wants to see it reviewed sometime soon after publication. Instead he waits. And waits. Why? A review arriving today is usually scheduled for the next issue—but the next issue for us in the editorial office is not the one you are holding in your hand or even the one after that, but rather the one that will come out six months from now. And there are often vicissitudes before a publishable review arrives on our doorstep. First we must receive the book. Then we must find a reviewer—which means asking possibly reviewers one at a time until somebody says yes. Then we must pause to give the reviewer a chance to read the book, and write his review, and get it typed up, and send it to us. Then we must read his review, and edit it, and possibly send it back to the reviewer to see if our editorial job is satisfactory. Then we must get the review back. And then we schedule it for that "next" issue, six months hence.

Why are we telling readers all this? It is because the modern world is too hectic. Too many political scientists have lost touch with the stately rhythms of nature, and of that child of nature, The American Political Science Review.

Idiots. Irate author writes in and wants to know what recourse he has when the managing editor picks idiots to referee his manuscript and they don't like it and on their advice the managing editor turns the manuscript down. Our view is that this is a real problem. We hereby state categorically that we make every effort to find referees who are not only not idiots but if possible themselves scholars of standing in the field to whom a manuscript is addressed. If Homer occasionally nodded without the stimulus of a prospective APSR manuscript, we must be ready to concede that even highly qualified readers may sometimes fail to see the merits in a meritorious piece of work. Or we may have
made a mistake in sending it out or in reading the comments as they come back to us. Thus sometimes a well-timed and well-reasoned gripe will win a rehearing for a manuscript, if an author is willing to invest some more patience with us. There is, however, a small but irreducible number of manuscripts for which the following statements are all true: the referees have said they don’t like it, the managing editor is persuaded by the referees, and the author thinks the referees and the managing editor are simply wrong.

One author has suggested that such cases go to arbitration, but this strikes us as a very unwieldy process, since at a minimum there would be the problems of picking arbitrators satisfactory to author and editor alike, and of agreeing on criteria that would inform their judgment, and of making sure these criteria were followed.

Happily, there is a better way. It is provided by the existence of other political science journals of high repute, each managed by its own board of editors. An author who finds his work unappreciated here may try elsewhere and indeed may succeed. If his faith in his work is justified and it is printed elsewhere and subsequently acclaimed, it is of course the Review that suffers rather than the profession at large or the author.

Another check on ineptitude or idiosyncrasy in these precincts is of course the custom we have latterly adopted of periodically changing the management. We believe this is a wise policy. Like some of our readers and disappointed prospective authors, around here we are keeping one eye on the calendar.
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