

NON-EDITORIAL

What with Richard M. Dorson, Jan Harold Brunvand and Avery Comarow stirring up various controversies elsewhere in this issue, the FORUM editors have decided to dispense with one of their usual courageous and forthright editorials. We have, however, been able to re frain from saying nothing at all. We are delighted to note that these three writers have seen fit to submit their comments to the FORUM. The FORUM was established partly with the end in view that it might serve as the place to publish short communications (of varying formality) upon the state of the field, or the public image of the field, or current research trends and projects, or upon virtually any other subject lending itself to a brief statement. The three notes appearing in this issue certainly fit this open-ended description, and we hope they are an indication of a growing trend. We certainly invite rejoinders, vicious or friendly attacks, or other comments on anything which appears in these pages. No one speaks of generating "dialogue" these days (except for some chaps, obviously out of tune with fashions in terminology, who have started a journal called The Dialogist at King's College in Wilkes-Barre). But perhaps we can generate some conversations in print.

Secondly, we might mumble some brief apologies of an editorio-typographical nature. We DO regret typographical errors. Especially the fairly horrendous one we made while pointing out somebody else's typo (II, 4, p. 107, l. 28). Well, we told ourselves, it's funnier that way. And the glaring basic grammar error in a review by our very own review editor (II, 5, p. 132, l. 33) shocked even him. He wants us to point it out, however, reasoning that now somebody might read the d--n thing. Despite the fact that our last issue was the most carefully perused ever (3, yes 3, whole proofreaders), our dunning of poor Russell Kirk was less than flawless (p. 117, read "journals" for "upheavals," l. 37, "go" for "to," l. 46): We apologize also for misusing Albert Friedman, whose middle initial, whatever it may be, is not L. The cryptic remark "A third way" (II, 4, p. 92) is just that; it appeared mysteriously. We don't know where it came from. Honest. It doesn't "mean something." At least not to us.

Then there is the question of our style for footnotes, headnotes, academic affiliations and the like. It has been completely inconsistent. This will not improve.

Finally, someone asked us the other day why we print on only one side of the page. In the words that the man with the lightbulb tattooed on his head spoke to Emily Tipp, the Tip-Top Lady Bread (thereby, incidentally, encapsulating the essence of moral philosophy): "It seemed like a good idea at duh time."