

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

**In this Corner.** In the course of preparing his contribution to this issue, Professor Philip Converse has had some hard words to say about the general idea of the scholarly symposium, regretting that too often these turn into a schoolyard scrap, which ends up merely bruising participants and entertaining—but not enlightening—onlookers. This is certainly one way to look at the matter, but perhaps it is not the only way. There are such things, for example, as civilized conversations, or honest differences of viewpoint, or correctable errors. The juxtaposition of different scholarly treatments of a single theme might easily stimulate this sort of description as well.

The publication of a scholarly article or book is, after all, as the term suggests, a public act. It is intended for use in the community of scholars; it is, the author must hope, a contribution. It is sometimes the case that the ideas we send out into the world in this way are misunderstood, or found fault with, or are used in some unanticipated way. When this happens, we may without impropriety abandon them to their fate, and get on with our new interests.

Or, alternatively, we may accept continuing responsibility for our earlier work, and conceivably thereby add a little more to the general understanding of the ideas that work addresses. In our view, a willingness to enter into a discussion of this kind is an act of responsibility, and of sober citizenship in the scholarly com-

munity. Of course such an act can be turned into an ego trip, or be so misconstrued by perennial sophomores, but our opinion is that these are chances worth taking in the interests of genuine interchange among serious students.

Thus we applaud Professor Converse's willingness to put his misgivings aside in order to address his colleagues in this format on a matter of some scholarly significance.

**New Math.** Where does the APSR stand on the issue of mathematics in political science? Nowhere. If political scientists find it helpful to use numbers, or algebraic symbols, or mathematical operations in doing their work, the chances are that articles reflecting these tastes will appear in the *Review*. Insofar as political scientists go off on other tracks, and make their statements without mathematics, we assume we will reflect that too.

Many observers have noticed, however, that as time has gone on over the last few years literacy in mathematics has been more and more necessary for readers to travel comfortably from one cover of the *Review* through to the other. It is now possible to supplement this purely literary sentiment with hard empirical facts. What follows is a portion of a memorandum prepared by Professor William Riker of the University of Rochester:

"[Political Science] has indeed been somewhat mathematicized in the last decade. In Table I

**Table 1. Distribution of Papers in American Political Science Review by Categories Concerning the Use of Numbers and Mathematics**

	Kind of Paper in Percents (rounded)					Total	N
	Verbally Interpreted Numbers	Numerical		Non-Numerical			
		Statistical Interpretation	Mathematical				
1964	29%	9%	3%	59%	100%	35	
1965	28%	20%	0	52%	100%	40	
1966	32%	25%	7%	36%	100%	44	
1967	23%	24%	2%	51%	100%	55	
1968	38%	32%	15%	15%	100%	40	
1969	10%	45%	12%	33%	100%	51	
1970	13%	52%	10%	25%	100%	52	
1971	13%	38%	21%	28%	100%	56	
1972	12%	36%	13%	39%	100%	52	
1973 (2 issues)	—	50%	17%	33%	100%	24	
<b>Total</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>449</b>	
<b>N</b>	<b>(88)</b>	<b>(150)</b>	<b>(45)</b>	<b>(166)</b>	<b>(449)</b>		

is reported a categorization of papers in the *American Political Science Review*, the most prestigious journal in the field, over this period. There are three categories of papers using some kind of numerical evidence:

1. Numerical. Here the raw numbers are subjected to mostly verbal interpretation, perhaps with the use of the most elementary kind of statistics such as means and percentages.

2. Statistical. Here the numbers are interpreted by some kind of statistical device more complicated than, say, means.

3. Mathematical. Here there is some sort of deductive development of applied mathematics.

Finally there is a fourth category of all papers not using numerical or mathematical methods. This includes everything from the loosest kind of history writing to the tightest kind of philosophizing.

As is apparent from this table, there has been a notable shift from using literarily interpreted numerical evidence to the use of statistical methods. In 1964 about thirty per cent of the papers used numerical evidence and about ten per cent used statistical evidence. In 1972 these proportions were about reversed. Furthermore, the proportion of non-numerical articles had fallen from about sixty per cent in 1964 to about thirty per cent in the years around 1972. One can genuinely speak of the conversion of at least the best journal in the field from being numerically naive to being somewhat sophisticated in formal methods."

There is always the possibility that letting information like this get around will be bad for business, that somebody will identify too strongly with one or another entry on Professor Riker's table, and go away unjustifiably happy or sad. On the other hand one way to live up to our obligation to go about our work without fear or favor is to pass information like this along when we can, and hope for the best.

Nothing in the table should be interpreted as constituting a determination on our part to print or to suppress any kind of article. If the figures show the APSR has gotten more mathematical over the years, this ought to be interpreted as telling us what's on political scientists' minds these days.

**On Deadlines.** Occasionally readers tell us that the *Review* does not reach them in the same month as the date indicated on the cover. Many scholarly journals from time to time suffer from this difficulty, but in recent years the *Review* has on the whole made its deadlines and arrived promptly at the doorsteps of political scientists all over the world. Maintaining this record takes

no small effort. It entails the coordinated activity of our manuscript editor, proofreader, and book review editorial assistant here in this office, plus the cooperation of our far-flung authors and book reviewers, who must attend to their galley proofs on schedule. The whole thing is supervised by the assistant to the managing editor, Betsey Cobb, in association with our friends at the George Banta Company. Last December, so it seems, Banta made the supreme sacrifice, and got our December issue out almost on schedule. It was the middle of January, however, before we received a Christmas card from the Banta Company. Greater love hath no printer, we think.

### Articles Accepted for Future Publication

- Neal Andrews, Wayne State University, "Integration and Community in Communist Theory"
- Paul Allen Beck, University of Pittsburgh, "Environment and Party: The Impact of Political and Demographic County Characteristics on Party Behavior"
- Samuel H. Beer, Harvard University, "Tradition and Nationality: A Review Essay"
- Robert A. Bernstein and William W. Anthony, Texas A&M University, "The ABM Issue in the State, 1968-1970: The Importance of Ideology"
- Gordon S. Black, University of Rochester, "Conflict in the Community: A Theory of the Effects of Community Size"
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, University of Rochester, "Need for Achievement and Competitiveness and Determinants of Party Success in Elections and Coalitions"
- Walter Dean Burnham, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "Theory and Voting Research: Some Reflections on Converse's 'Change in the American Electorate'"
- Edward G. Carmines, State University of New York, Buffalo, "The Mediating Influence of State Legislatures on the Interparty Competition-Welfare Expenditures Linkage"
- Richard Allen Chapman, University of Montana, "*Leviathan* Writ Small: Thomas Hobbes on the Family"
- John P. Clark, III, City College, Loyola University, "On Anarchism in an Unreal World: Kramnick's Views of Godwin and the Anarchists"
- Claude S. Colantoni, Terrence J. Levesque and Peter C. Ordeshook, Carnegie-Mellon University, "Campaign Resource Allocations Under the Electoral College"

- Wayne A. Cornelius, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "Urbanization and Political Demand Making: Political Participation Among the Migrant Poor in Latin American Cities"
- Douglas Dobson, Northern Illinois University and Douglas St. Angelo, Florida State University, "Party Identification and the Floating Vote: Some Dynamics"
- Lawrence C. Dodd, University of Texas, "Party Coalitions in Multiparty Parliaments: A Game-Theoretic Analysis"
- Dennis L. Dresang, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "Ethnic Politics, Representative Bureaucracy, and Development Administration: The Zambian Case"
- Claude S. Fischer, University of California, Berkeley, "The City and Political Psychology"
- G. David Garson, Tufts University, "On the Origins of Interest Group Theory: A Critique of a Process"
- Mark Gavre, University of California, Los Angeles, "Hobbes and His Audience: The Dynamics of Theorizing"
- Sheldon Goldman, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, "Voting Behavior on the U.S. Courts of Appeals Revisited"
- Ted Robert Gurr, Northwestern University, "Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800-1971"
- Larry B. Hill, University of Oklahoma, "Institutionalization, the Ombudsman, and Bureaucracy"
- Richard Child Hill, Michigan State University, "Separate and Unequal: Governmental Inequality in the Metropolis"
- Kenneth Jowitt, University of California, Berkeley, "An Organizational Approach to the Study of Political Culture in Marxist-Leninist Systems"
- Jae-On Kim, University of Iowa, John R. Petrocik, University of Chicago and Stephen N. Enokson, University of Iowa, "Voter Turnout Among the American States: Systemic and Individualistic Components"
- David Koehler, "Vote-Trading and the Voting Paradox: A Proof of Equivalence"
- Walter Korpi, University of Stockholm, "Conflict, Power and Relative Deprivation"
- J. A. Laponce, University of British Columbia, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Spatial Archetypes and Political Perceptions"
- Peter M. Leslie, Queen's University, "Interest Groups and Political Integration: The 1972 EEC Decisions in Norway and Denmark"
- Jesse F. Marquette, University of Akron, "Social Change and Political Mobilization in the United States: 1870-1960"
- Alan Marsh, Social Science Research Council, "The 'Silent Revolution,' Value Priorities, and the Quality of Life in Britain"
- Arthur H. Miller, Ohio State University, "Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1864-1970"
- Thomas C. Nowak and Kay A. Snyder, Michigan State University, "Clientelist Politics in the Philippines: Integration or Instability?"
- Stanton Peele, Harvard University and Stanley J. Morse, Pontificia Universidade Catolica de Sao Paulo, "Ethnic Voting and Political Change in South Africa"
- N. Patrick Peritore, University of Missouri, "Some Problems in Alfred Schutz's Phenomenological Methodology"
- David E. Price, Duke University, "Community Control: Critical Democratic Theory in the Progressive Period"
- Adam Przeworski, University of Chicago, "Institutionalization of Voting Patterns or Is Mobilization the Source of Decay?"
- Douglas Rae, Yale University, "The Limits of Consensual Decision"
- Joseph A. Schlesinger, Michigan State University, "The Primary Goals of Political Parties: A Clarification of Positive Theory"
- Brian D. Silver, Florida State University, "Levels of Sociocultural Development Among Soviet Nationalities: A Partial Test of the Equalization Hypothesis"
- Peter G. Stillman, Vassar College, "Hegel's Critique of Liberal Rights"
- C. Neal Tate, North Texas State University, "Individual and Contextual Variables in British Voting Behavior: An Exploratory Note"
- Kent L. Tedin, College of William and Mary, "The Influence of Parents on the Political Attitudes of New Voters"
- John Wanat, University of Kentucky, "Bases of Budgetary Incrementalism"
- Meredith W. Watts, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, "B. F. Skinner and the Language of Technological Control"
- Herbert Weisberg, University of Michigan, "Models of Statistical Relationship"
- Louis P. Westfield, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, "Majority Party Leadership and the Committee System in the House of Representatives"