

Communications

To the Editor:

This letter is being sent you to record a vigorous protest about the mail ballot that was recently sent us for voting on officers of the Association. The only part that distressed me was the insufficient choice provided the voter when he voted on members of the council. It happens that I am a vigorous opponent of the Caucus for a New Political Science, and yet I found myself in the position of being forced to vote not only for those that the Association's nominating committee had endorsed but also, if I cast an eighth vote, it had of necessity to be for another member of the Caucus. In other words, there should in the future be a provision so that every voter could have a sufficient number of candidates before him on the ballot that he might make a choice congenial to his way of thinking.

Theodore B. Fleming, Jr.
Wayne State University

To the Editor:

In recent years the problem of "multiple submissions" has emerged as a nagging issue for some editors of political science journals. The March 1969 conference of journal editors, sponsored by the APSA's Committee on Journals, emphasized the obligation of the authors to inform the appropriate editors of multiple submissions (see *P.S.*, Summer 1969, for text of the conference's report). In response to the conference's request, the APSA's Committee on Professional Ethics set forth an advisory opinion on March 29, 1969, strongly supporting this position (also in Summer, 1969 *P.S.*).

The point of this letter is that recent developments have rightly stressed the obligation of the authors but they have failed to pay sufficient attention to the reciprocal obligations of the editors. This was driven home to me just recently when a manuscript of mine was returned by one of the profession's leading journals after a period of *exactly nine months* from the date of submission. This of course is by no means an uncommon experience.

I do not, for my own peace of mind, engage in the practice of multiple submissions. But it would seem fair for another individual to conclude that he might see his article in print (or at least accepted) in nine months' time were he to submit it to three or four journals rather than just one.

The authors, to repeat, have an obligation to the editors, but do the editors have any obligation to the authors? If so, one way of operationalizing such obligation might be to set an outer limit of, say,

three months for a decision on any given manuscript. This should be perfectly feasible provided each editor impresses upon his referees *their* obligation to meet their deadlines and return any manuscripts within a reasonable time period.

Mostafa Rejal
Miami University (Ohio)

To the Editor:

I have been a member of this association for fifteen years, and up until now I have held my tongue. I can no longer do so. I think the spectacle of grown men throwing accusations at one another in the pages of the association journal and/or by letter is not only ludicrous and idiotic, but embarrassing to other members. I don't know what all the fuss is about between Herzberg and Prothro, but I do know Lipsitz, and I say to one and all: "Leave Lewie Alone!"

Caroline A. Dinegar
University of Virginia

To the Editor:

We have duly noted a letter from a professor at the University of North Carolina to the effect that Professor Donald G. Herzberg in his letter to Association members "intended to be fair [but] failed to realize the implications of his remarks."

Those of us who have known Professor Herzberg for many years were shocked and alarmed by this allegation. We have always known Professor Herzberg to be not only fair but very intelligent. Put otherwise, we found it difficult to believe that Professor Herzberg would not "realize the implications of his remarks," particularly after buying, and presumably licking, \$780 of six cent postage stamps to disseminate his views.

For this reason, the Executive Committee of the Conference for Democratic Politics studied Professor Herzberg's letter with great care in order to determine whether or not Professor Herzberg had indeed lost his senses and was guilty of a form of character assassination. More precisely, is Professor Herzberg guilty of employing a "last minute smear tactic associated with the dirtiest level of ward politics" in a "denunciatory letter" designed to unduly or unfairly influence members of the APSA?

We can summate our findings in the following manner:

(a) True or false: "Professors Kariel and Lipsitz . . . are members of the Executive Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science."? We found this

statement to be true. It is also true that they (Kariel and Lipsitz) "are pledged to 'stand on the Caucus platform' and serve as 'spokesmen for the concerns and views of the Caucus'."

(b) True or false: "No representatives were chosen for other sub-groups."? CDP can bear witness to this fact.

(c) True or false: Out of some 14,000 individual members of the Association is it reasonable that two of the eight members nominated to the Council should be avowed members of the Caucus, given the fact that Caucus members number about 3% of our total membership? No comment.

(d) True or false: ". . . the Caucus orientation is already represented on the Council of the A.P.S.A.?" Unfortunately, this statement is true.

(e) True or false: "It seems clear that the Nominating Committee did not *intend* to nominate them (that is, Kariel and Lipsitz) as representatives of a sub-group." We would say *false*. But, in so saying, we do not mean to impugn the integrity of Professor Herzberg. Indeed, we believe he was most generous and fair in putting this matter the way he did.

Our feeling is that the members of the Nominating Committee *did* intend to place more adherents of the Caucus on the Council. Either that or they were incredibly naive or stupid. Are we to believe that this committee did not know that Lipsitz and Kariel were members of the Executive Committee of the Caucus? Are we to believe that it is just coincidence that one-fourth of the "official" nominees to the Council happen to be members of the Executive Committee of the Caucus? Are we to believe that the Nominating Committee did not know that the Caucus viewpoint was already represented on the Council? *Mirabile dictu*, we don't!

Our conclusions are these: (1) Professor Herzberg deserves a sincere thanks from all of us who are interested in preserving the integrity of our profession; and (2) something drastic will have to be done with a nominating procedure which is seemingly prone to placate the whims and follies of such a small minority of our profession.

George W. Carey

Georgetown University

Chairman, Conference for Democratic Politics