

Notes from the Editors

In this issue are included several articles that directly relate to the U.S. elections, a timely issue given the contests in November. In particular, several articles directly relate to how representatives present themselves, the nature of the “culture war” in American politics, and the continuing issues of race and voting in the United States. Further, we present articles that ask other important questions such as: Do peacekeepers really make a difference in promoting an end to fighting? How does foreign military presence produce norm changes within a country? Do political entrepreneurs mobilize ethnic and religious cleavages in different ways to attain their political goals? Can humankind form a deliberative, global-scale polity? Taken together, these articles demonstrate that original research in political science can—and frequently does—speak to the important problems confronting the nation and the world.

In This Issue

In the lead article to this issue, a central and fundamentally important question is addressed: How do we best conceptualize what representatives actually do? This is a key concern of democratic theory, and a number of different models have been proposed. In **“Shape-shifting Representation,”** Michael Saward proposes a new way of understanding the phenomenon. Representation doesn’t follow any one model, but is instead characterized by “shape-shifting.” The roles that representatives play shift from one time period to another, and from one theater to another. Sometimes representatives control shape-shifting to achieve their ends; sometimes new roles are thrust upon them. Moreover, Saward argues, shifting does not occur haphazardly. Rather, there are patterns that it exhibits. Saward’s argument promises to open a new and fruitful avenue for the theory of democracy and representation.

In **“Beyond Keeping Peace: United Nations Effectiveness in the Midst of Fighting,”** Lisa Hultman, Jacob Kathman, and Megan Shannon show that although UN peacekeeping missions may not always stop fighting completely, they do reduce the severity of ongoing civil wars. The authors argue that the capacity (or size) and constitution (or the type of personnel) of each mission account for its ability to reduce violence in ongoing conflicts. They employ new data composed of monthly observations of the actual number and type of troops deployed, rather than the officially mandated number. They find that larger numbers of armed military troops are associated with fewer battle deaths. Hultman, Kathman, and Shannon’s study implies that, if properly composed, a UN peacekeeping mission can indeed play a role in reducing civil conflict.

Along with a significant methodological contribution, William G. Jacoby provides major substantive food for thought in his article entitled, **“Is There a**

Culture War? Conflicting Value Structures in American Public Opinion.” He develops and tests a geometric model of American political culture composed of individual’s rank-ordered value choices using data obtained from the 2006 Cooperative Congressional Election Study. By examining the religious and political foundations of variability in value choices, and assessing the sources and magnitude of value conflict, the results of the empirical analysis seemingly contradict any argument that there is a consensus on fundamental principles within the mass public. Americans’ value choices are shown to be highly heterogeneous, with many conflicting preferences that tend to vary along social and partisan lines. Thus, the study provides strong evidence for the culture wars hypothesis.

Alexis de Tocqueville’s diagnoses of the problems with modern democratic culture are well known. In **“Tocqueville on the Modern Moral Situation: Democracy and the Decline of Devotion,”** Dana Jalbert Stauffer argues that these diagnoses have a somewhat different, and deeper, root than we have thought. Such conspicuous Tocquevillian themes as “individualism” and “materialism” have captured most of our attention, but Stauffer argues that the social state of equality, the deepest of Tocquevillian causes, leads to a decline of *devotion*. The result is a culture with no notion of a higher or nobler vocation, of the type that traditionally underpinned, and elevated, society. This phenomenon, Stauffer argues, underlies phenomena such as individualism, and leads to the more familiar problems Tocqueville identifies with modern democracy. Grasping the fundamental nature of the lack of devotion leads to a new perspective on key parts of Tocqueville’s analysis.

In **“Selling Out?: The Politics of Navigating Conflicts between Racial Group Interest and Self-Interest,”** Ismail K. White, Chryl N. Laird, and Troy D. Allen provide both a new take on and an improved test of the commonly accepted “linked fate” explanation for African American political solidarity. They argue that crystallized and intense in-group norms, as well as processes of racialized social pressure, are central to understanding why black Americans act on racial group interests in exchange for satisfying individual self-interests. They test their model using a series of behavioral experiments that vary both the personal incentives for defecting from, and the amount and kind of peer monitoring of, political behavior well-defined by in-group norms. They find that in the absence of social monitoring, defection is not uncommon, but that racialized social pressure—monitoring signals from other blacks—has a unique ability to rein in defection.

John F. McCauley in **“The Political Mobilization of Ethnic and Religious Identities in Africa”** makes a real contribution to our understanding of how policy entrepreneurs mobilize ethnic and religious cleavages in getting political support. As many scholars have noted, ethnicity as an identity is often mobilized at certain

times but not at others. What McCauley asks is, When do elites mobilize based on religion and when do they mobilize based on ethnicity? Although much of the literature has said that group size matters (the bigger the group the more you mobilize on that line of cleavage), the author argues that the answer lies instead in the distinct individual-level priorities that manifest under different identity conditions—in other words, elites use different strategies depending not on the size of the group, but on the policy end. He shows this by empirically using data from a framing experiment in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. By randomly assigning participants to either a religious or an ethno-linguistic context, he shows that group members primed to ethnicity prioritize club goods, the access to which is a function of where they live. Identical individuals primed to religion prioritize inter-group divisions and international ties.

“Foreign Military Presence and the Changing Practice of Sovereignty: A Pragmatist Explanation of Norm Change,” by Sebastian Schmidt, proposes a new way of understanding the evolution of norms in international relations. He argues that the evolution of new informal norms in an under-institutionalized arena like international affairs is best understood by adopting a pragmatist perspective. The evolution of norms is shaped by the residue of previous practice, but also by the pressures of new and unprecedented developments. The responses to these developments are not predictable, but are governed by the same element of groping creativity that according to pragmatism governs the evolution of norms in many areas of life. After laying out the pragmatist model, Schmidt illustrates and confirms it with a case study, the development during the Cold War of “sovereign basing,” whereby the military forces of one sovereign nation are based in another. This development, Schmidt argues, was a pragmatic response to the postwar security situation and the declining legitimacy of colonialism, which had previously been the vehicle for global power projection. The pragmatist approach promises to deepen our understanding of the complex dynamics of international relations.

Is there any reasonable prospect of humankind forming a deliberative, global-scale polity? Does Islamic philosophy, with its universalist perspective, offer hope for such a polity? Alexander I. Orwin, in **“Can Humankind Deliberate on a Global Scale? Alfarabi and the Politics of the Inhabited World,”** examines this question in the writings of perhaps the most profound of the medieval Islamic philosophers. Alfarabi appears to take different positions on this key issue in different works, which has left interpreters at an impasse. By carefully tracing Alfarabi's use of key terms across several of his works, Orwin provides a new interpretation that makes sense of Alfarabi's apparently inconsistent usage. He finds that, despite the universalism-in-principle of both Islam and philosophy, Alfarabi finds obstacles to a true universal polity in the irreducible diversity of mankind. Orwin's article concludes with a discussion of the importance of Alfarabi's perspective for global politics today.

For decades, scholars have operationalized political knowledge in different ways and with limited attention

to the variation in the types of knowledge questions. In **“The Question(s) of Political Knowledge,”** Jason Barabas, Jennifer Jerit, William Pollock, and Carlisle Rainey propose a framework for theorizing about how question characteristics influence observed levels of knowledge. They argue that there are two theoretically relevant dimensions when it comes to understanding the variation in knowledge: first, how recently the fact came into being (a “temporal dimension”); and second, whether the question has to do with public policy concerns or the institutions and people/players of government (the “topical dimension”). The resulting typology yields four types of knowledge questions. In an analysis of more than 300 knowledge items from late in the first decade of the 2000s, they convincingly demonstrate that several classic findings regarding the antecedents of knowledge are conditional upon the type of question being asked.

The surge of interest in the thought of Hannah Arendt has enriched our perspective on many aspects of political life. When it comes to the economic, however, Arendt has always been thought to offer little more than a dismissive warning of the de-politicizing, de-humanizing effects of the market. In **“Fit to Enter the World”: Hannah Arendt on Politics, Economics, and the Welfare State,”** Steven Klein produces a new interpretation of this side of Arendt's thought. While Arendt clearly decries certain encroachments of market relations on the rich fabric of communal political life, Klein argues that her critique does not extend to modern economic life per se. To the contrary, economic life, or the communal contestation of economic policy, can be a part of a rich communal life, in effect bringing economics back into the political fold. Klein makes the case that welfare politics is one arena where an Arendtian perspective can deepen our understanding of the intersection of politics and economics.

Finally Lorenzo De Sio and Till Weber in **“Issue Yield: A Model of Party Strategy in Multidimensional Space”** introduce a new, multidimensional model of party strategy in which parties compete by emphasizing policy issues. They argue that the choice regarding which issues to emphasize in a party's strategy is a function, simultaneously, of two goals: mobilizing the party's core voters and broadening the support base. Using multilevel regressions employing both mass surveys and party manifesto scores, they find that issue yield is a primary explanatory variable for the adoption of different party strategies.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (APSR) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the APSR reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question

of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the *APSR* consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your case, you should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of your submission's review at the *APSR*—regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the “Specific Procedures” section that follows.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and—in the event the article is accepted for publication—to permit other scholars to replicate your results and to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. With surveys, for example, provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).¹ For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on. In any case involving human subjects, the editors may require certification of appropriate institutional review and/or conformity with generally accepted norms.²

The strength of evidence necessary for publication of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. The journal's coeditors—following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the im-

portance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

In addition, authors of quantitative or experimental articles are expected to address the issue of data availability. You must normally indicate both where (online) you will deposit the information that is necessary to reproduce the numerical results and when that information will be posted (such as “on publication” or “by [definite date]”). You should be prepared, when posting, to provide not only the data used in the analysis but also the syntax files, specialized software, and any other information necessary to reproduce the numerical results in the manuscript. Where an exception is claimed, you should clearly explain why the data or other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot be shared, or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

Similarly, authors of qualitative, observational, or textual articles, or of articles that combine such methods with quantitative analysis, should indicate their sources fully and clearly enough to permit ready verification by other scholars—including precise page references to any published material cited and clear specification (e.g., file number) of any archival sources. Wherever possible, use of interactive citations is encouraged. Where field or observational research is involved, anonymity of participants will always be respected; but the texts of interviews, group discussions, observers' notes, etc., should be made available on the same basis (and subject to the same exceptions) as with quantitative data.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*.³ In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome wide significance—taking into account all sources of multiple testing (e.g. phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

Articles should be self-contained; you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—the first time it is mentioned in the text—and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures.

¹ See <http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp>

² One widely accepted guide to such norms is given by the American Anthropological Association's Code of Ethics, particularly, Section III. <http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf>

³ *Behavior Genetics* 42 (2012): 1–2, DOI 10.1007/s10519–011-9504-zvi

Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, standard summary statistics (n, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided, and the reason for their inclusion discussed. However, tables and figures should also be comprehensible without reference to the text (e.g., in any figures, axes should be clearly labeled). Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

You may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear. If you advise readers that additional information is available on request, you should submit equally anonymous copies of that information with your manuscript as “supplemental materials.” If this additional information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* will be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section, using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed. The author(s) of the previously published article will be invited to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer-reviewed. While the *Review* does publish forums these are published very rarely. We do not publish rejoinders to these.

The *APSR* accepts only electronic submissions (at www.editorialmanager.com/aprsr). The website provides detailed information about how to submit, what formatting is required, and what type of digital files may be uploaded. Please direct any questions regarding new submissions to the journal’s editorial offices at aprsr@unt.edu.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations. Do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our website. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case (e.g., [Table 3 about here]). If your submission is accepted

for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal’s print specifications (e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) and review recent issues of the *APSR*.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/aprsr> and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit (at www.editorialmanager.com/aprsr), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also “oppose” potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files.
 - a) An “anonymous” digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal websites or at institutions with which any of the co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.
 - b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors,

in the order their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.

4. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication, and which may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.
6. Charges apply for all color figures that appear in the print version of the journal. At the time of submission, contributors should clearly state whether their figures should appear in color in the online version only, or whether they should appear in color online and in the print version. There is no charge for including color figures in the online version of the *Journal* but it must be clear that color is needed to enhance the meaning of the figure, rather than simply being for esthetic purposes. If you request color figures in the printed version, you will be contacted by CCC-Rightslink who are acting on our behalf to collect Author Charges. Please follow their instructions in order to avoid any delay in the publication of your article.

Further questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940-891-6803) or by sending an e-mail to: apsr@unt.edu

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE APSR

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually "moving wall"), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume

1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available online through JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/>). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* through the APSA website (www.apsanet.org) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datastar (Datastar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association's address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512 (voice), and (202) 483-2657 (fax). E-mail: apsa@apsanet.org. Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*

E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for non receipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Director of Member Services

E-mail: membership@apsanet.org

Reprint permissions:

E-mail: Rights@cambridge.org

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,

Cambridge University Press

E-mail: journals_advertising@cambridge.org

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING APSR, PERSPECTIVES, AND PS ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a

specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional websites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci; America, History and Life 1954-*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; EconLit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (www.umi.com). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969-95, is available through the APSA.