

Draft Minutes: October 13, 1998 APSA Council Meeting

American Political Science Association Annual Meeting September 2, 1998 Marriott Copley Place Boston, Massachusetts

Present:

Council Members: M. Kent Jennings, Matthew Holden Jr., Martha Ackelsberg, Jane Bayes, Timothy Cook, Gary W. Cox, Ada W. Finifter, Rudolfo O. de la Garza, Kathie Stromile Golden, Charles Hadley, Jennifer Hochschild, John E. Jackson, Michael Laver, David Laitin, Kristen Monroe, Pippa Norris, Robert Putnam, Catherine E. Rudder, Virginia Sapiro, Beth Simmons, Joseph Stewart Jr., Toni-Michelle Travis, Joan C. Tronto, and Michael Wallerstein.

Council Nominees Attending: Michael Dawson, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Luis Fraga, Robert O. Keohane, Cynthia McClintock, Nancy McGlen, Kay L. Schlozman, Howard Silver, Paul Sniderman, and James Stimson.

Guests: Neal Beck, Pendleton Herring, Ronald Peters, and Matthew Pullen.

APSA Staff: Jeffrey Biggs, Robert J-P. Hauck, Sheilah Mann, Rovilla McHenry, Maurice Woodard, and Jun Yin.

1. President Jennings welcomed the members of the Council to the Boston meeting, and following introductions, the Council minutes of April 25, 1998 were approved after a point of clarification and an amendment requested by Rudolfo O. de la Garza.

A. Rudy de la Garza questioned whether it had been decided at the last Council meeting to increase the number of Latino/a fellows in the minority fellows program from one to three. Though that decision was not made, Executive Director Catherine Rudder and Staff Associate Maurice Woodard clarified for the record that there are at present two Latino/a fellows. In addition, the Council minutes of April 25 were amended to reflect that de la Garza had raised the matter of increasing the number of Latino/a fellows.

2. Report of the President:

A. President Jennings elected to handle the action items of the previous day's Administrative Committee as they came up on the Council's agenda.

B. The Council concurred with the Administrative Committee's decision to ask the Publications Committee to consider whether or not to levy any permissions fees at all for noncommercial classroom use of APSA journal articles. Neal Beck, a visitor to the Council, urged that the Council take action immediately rather than delaying the decision by referring it to the Publications Committee. APSA Treasurer Timothy Cook observed that given the financial consequences of any decision, it was only prudent to have the Committee responsible for closely examining the issue carry out its function.

C. In reviewing his activities during his term as APSA president, Kent Jennings expressed appreciation for the high level of "civic virtue" shared by members of the profession. He also thanked the staff for its support, recognized the challenges new technologies raised for the organization, and singled out for special recognition the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute.

D. Funding of Political Science by NSF:

1] The Administrative Committee recommended the creation of an ad hoc committee to evaluate the discipline's relationship with the National Science Foundation. The Committee would have two areas of responsibility. The first involves telling NSF about the excellent work being done in political science so that the NSF's Political Science Program would receive more than nominal budget increases. The second is to analyze the relationship between NSF and APSA and make recommendations to the Council. After general discussion about the sources of possible remedies, the Council approved the recommendation, and urged that the Association's lobbying activities continue in tandem with the Committee's broader objectives.

2] The Council then considered a statement on confidentiality of sources and freedom to do research on democratic institutions drafted by Ethics Committee Chair Matthew Moen, Charles Johnson, and Russell Newman, approved by the Association's Ethics Committee, and recommended adoption by the Administrative Committee with minor changes. After considerable discussion, the following edited statement was approved by the Council and was to be distributed at the Hyde Park Session

on The Politics of Government Funded Research and the press conference tentatively scheduled by Maisel and Stone:

*A Statement of the
American Political Science Association
"FREEDOM AND INTEGRITY
OF RESEARCH:
THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF
SCHOLARS AND FUNDING SOURCES
IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY"*

Preface

Political scientists have ongoing concerns about the relationship between research and funding, especially in the area of confidentiality of sources. Scholars must be able to conduct research in our democratic society, free from pressure to disclose properly confidential information.

In 1967, the American Political Science Association created a Committee on Professional Standards and Responsibilities, which issued a report providing guidelines for professional conduct by political scientists. One element of that report warned scholars of possible complications if they accepted funding from sources lacking a commitment to dispassionate scholarship; the burden was placed primarily upon the scholar rather than the funding source. Yet, those who fund research—particularly public institutions and agencies—also have professional obligations. They need to recognize the vital contribution that political scientists make by studying democratic institutions, and they should not impede legitimate scholarly inquiry.

Reaffirming Current Guidelines

The *Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* provides a clear and forceful statement about a researcher's obligation to maintain confidentiality of sources, balanced with restraint in making claims of confidentiality and with disclosure of nonconfidential sources (Section A.6). These principles endure and deserve reiteration.

The *Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* also notes that "financial sponsors of research should avoid actions that would call into question the integrity of American academic institutions as centers of independent teaching and research" (Section A.1.3); it mentions that "the grantor shall not impose any restriction on or require any clearance of research methods, procedures, or content" (Section A.1.5). These provisions are worth restating to remind all funding sources that they should refrain from interfering with legitimate scholarly inquiry, even if a research product is unsettling to its sponsors. Scholars and funding sources alike must recognize and defend these principles of research, particularly given the substantial reliance of the academy on external sources of funding.

The American Political Science Associa-

tion reaffirms its enduring commitment to confidentiality of sources and to uncompromised and independent scholarly inquiry.

New Language

Beyond reaffirmation of important principles already in place, the following revisions to the *Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* are hereby adopted by the APSA Council. These revisions will be distributed throughout the political science community, and, with the assistance of the Consortium of Social Science Associations, to the broader community of social and behavioral scientists.

A.1.8. Members of public institutions or agencies should not interfere with disinterested scholarly investigation of their actions, processes, or functions. Public institutions should recognize the value of scholarship and acknowledge that interference with bona fide scholarship is contrary to the core values on which our democratic institutions are predicated.

A.1.9. Governmental and nongovernmental officials and agencies that fund scholarly research, should understand that scholars have a professional obligation to protect the identity of confidential sources of information or data that is developed in the course of researching institutions, agencies, or persons. Funding entities should help scholars fulfill their obligations, not impede them.

Discussion continued concerning how the statement might be disseminated more broadly. De la Garza moved, and Robert Putnam seconded, a motion calling upon the APSA president, president elect or executive director to write a strongly worded press release or letter to the editor that called attention to the principles the Council had reaffirmed, and that took to task public officials who had attempted to interfere with Maisel and Stone's 1997 Candidate Emergence Study. Jennings and President-Elect Matthew Holden demurred in favor of disseminating the Council guidelines and emphasizing the legitimate claim of the discipline to the study of American political institutions. The de la Garza/Putnam motion failed.

Discussion continued regarding the dissemination of the Council's guidelines. Putnam moved that it be the sense of the Council that the principles in the statement "Freedom and Integrity of Research" are important and that they were violated in the Maisel/Stone case. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Michael Laver stressed that APSA should make every effort to promulgate the newly adopted "Freedom and Integrity of Research" guidelines throughout the policy community. The Council unanimously supported the Laver motion. Jennings thanked Moen and the members of the Ethics Committee for their leadership and responsiveness to the Council.

E. Jennings asked and received Council approval of his appointments to the Ad Hoc Committee on Information Technology: Pippa Norris, chair, William Ball, Janet Box-Steffensmeier, and Stephen Weatherford.

F. Council members were invited to several special events at the 1998 Meeting including the Honors Reception, the Awards Ceremony and Presidential Address, the Business Meeting, the Centennial Campaign Kick-off Reception, and the Reception of the Committee on the Status of Blacks in the Profession honoring John Hope Franklin and Steven Finkel, co-director of the Bunche Institute at the University of Virginia.

3. Outside Reviews in the Hiring and Promotion Process

President Jennings asked that Kay Scholzman and Matt Moen, the respective immediate past and present chairs of the Ethics Committee present to the Council the revised language of Section G of the Ethics Guide, the section dealing with external reviews for tenure and promotion. Thanking APSA Staff Associate Jun Yin for her assistance in compiling the data collected from two sample surveys of senior faculty and department chairs, Scholzman summarized the changes and pointed out that the Committee chose to say nothing on the subject of compensation for reviews in light of a lack of consensus within the profession and among committee members. The Council unanimously approved the Committee's revised statement and urged that it be distributed to department chairs [new language appears in italics and deleted language is crossed out]:

Section G: Promotion and Tenure

32.0 External reviews are governed by a triad of rights and obligations: those of the department conducting the review; those of the candidate under review; and those of the external reviewer. All three parties share certain values; these include a commitment to fairness, dispatch, and mutual respect. But obligations and rights are not the same for all parties; each may give these values differing weight, even conflicting interpretations.

Guidelines, necessarily, must concern general principles. Guidelines for external review are not intended to be and should not be read as a uniform code to be applied to all universities and colleges alike. Academic departments differ, for example, in educational mission, institutional resources, access to external reviewers and size as well as in the administrative and legal constraints under which they operate. The proper procedure for one department or institution may not be the same for others.

Rights of the Candidate

32.1 Where external reviews are used in tenure and promotion decisions and if they

are used in reappointment decisions, *faculty members under review have a right to external reviews that are expert, disinterested, and timely.*

Obligations of the Department

32.2 Departments and universities have an obligation to *select reviewers who have appropriate professional competence, and who would provide a fair assessment of the candidate.*

32.3 *Departments and universities are encouraged to ask candidates being reviewed to suggest names of external reviewers who know their work well, and to give the candidates under review an opportunity to call to the departments and universities' attention potential reviewers that the candidate believes should be excluded on the grounds of personal bias.*

32.4 Solicitation of outside letters of recommendation for promotion and tenure should always be phrased as an invitation which recipients are free to reject. No presumption should be expressed that there is an obligation to perform service, but rather that it is a professional courtesy of assistance to the department making the request. Refusal to perform this service should not be regarded as a negative statement about the candidate.

32.5 *Departments and universities should exercise restraint in soliciting external reviews because it imposes an obligation upon other scholars. Ordinarily, no more than six reviews should be solicited for promotion and/or tenure cases or senior appointments. No reviews should be solicited for decisions that do not warrant them (for example, in entry-level and adjunct appointments, renewals of junior appointments, and special increments at the senior level).*

32.6 The department conducting an external review, ~~given its overall responsibility to assure an informed and timely evaluation~~ is ordinarily obliged: [i] to provide external reviewers a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita and the principal materials on which the assessment is to be based; [ii] to ensure external reviewers sufficient time for a competent and conscientious assessment, as a rule not less than six (6) weeks ~~one month~~; [iii] to protect confidentiality to the extent legally possible; [iv] to state whether the assessment is a confidential one, and if it is not, the terms of departure from confidentiality; [v] to explain to external reviewers the relative importance of external reviews to the overall review process; and [vi] to inform the external reviewers of the final decision without elaborating on the reasons for the decision.

Obligations of the External Reviewer

32.7 *Once they assume responsibility for serving as a reviewer, external reviewers are ordinarily obliged: to make an assessment that is candid and fair, based solely on professionally relevant criteria and first-hand knowledge; [ii] to disclose to the department or institution conducting an external review any personal relationship with the candidate being evaluated; and [iii] to honor any deadline to which they have agreed.*

~~32.3. External reviewers perform a valuable professional service in assisting other departments and universities to assess candidates for tenure and promotion. It is not inappropriate for departments to offer an honorarium to external reviewers in the case of candidates for promotion and tenure who are~~

not members of the reviewer's university. Institutions should inform the reviewer whether or not they will pay a fee and what that fee is when the initial contact is made with the reviewer.

4. Report of the Executive Director:

A. Catherine Rudder expressed her appreciation for the work of President Jennings, Council members, and Program Chair Gina Sapiro over the course of the year.

B. Rudder reported that the Administrative Committee recommended that APSA not contract with CHOICE to provide book reviews to members at this time. The \$10,000 fee to provide members access to the CHOICE book reviews was considered by the Committee to be unjustified, especially given the difficulties users had in accessing CHOICE and the brevity of the reviews. Rudder also reported that the test of *PSNOnline* was inconclusive. Individual subscribers were using the service, but departments were not submitting listings electronically, increasing, rather than decreasing, the administrative burden of producing the paper and electronic versions of the job listings. *PSNOnline* will not be continued for departments but will remain available to individual subscribers.

C. The Council approved a formal liaison relationship with areas studies groups for Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, and the Middle East, in addition the ongoing relationship with Slavic Studies. The liaison will call for the area studies groups to designate joint members as the links between themselves and APSA. The designees will keep the organizations informed of activities related to their respective interests and help develop special panels and programs at Annual Meetings and other venues.

D. Rudder reported on the formal adoption of PROceedings, the online archive of Annual Meeting panel papers as a result of a \$311,000 grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. As of the time of the Council Meeting, over 500 papers had been submitted electronically. She observed that Project Director William Ball was urging that paper givers be required to submit papers electronically as well as provide 50 copies to the panel paper room. A discussion followed in which several Council members expressed concern over ending the panel paper room too abruptly. Rudder responded that the Mellon funding provided for a three-year test period and that the Annual Meeting Committee was going to consider Ball's request at a meeting later in the week. [Subsequently, the Annual Meeting Committee agreed to require that paper givers submit an electronic copy to PROceedings

as well as copies to the panel paper room.]

E. Rudder sought and received Council approval for participating in the AAAS Science on the Mall program if APSA can mount a cooperative interactive presentation with other social science organizations, one area of joint interest being the Geographic Information System. Pippa Norris suggested scanning interactive presentations at the Annual Meeting for possible presenters for APSA.

F. The Council also approved APSA's participation in the American Psychological Association's Decade of Behavior (2000–10) and noted the appointment of Paula McClain of the University of Virginia to the national advisory board.

G. Rudder informed the Council of the major computer system reconfiguration taking place at national headquarters.

H. The Council also approved spending \$2,000 to file an appeal in the Association's continuing effort to gain a property tax exemption as a nonprofit, educational association, a designation already enjoyed by several organizations comparable to APSA, including the American Council on Education. Though a full scale appeal could cost as much as \$50,000, Rudder pointed out that if APSA won, the judgment would include a rebate of four to five years of back payments on the order of \$80,000 per annum as well as relief from future taxes.

5. Officer and Council Nominations Approved

The Council unanimously approved the committee appointments of President-Elect Matthew Holden Jr. and permitted any changes or additions as necessary.

6. 1998 Annual Meeting Report

Program Chair Virginia Sapiro and APSA Deputy Director Robert Hauck reported on the 1998 Annual Meeting. The meeting, the first held in Boston, consisted of over 750 panels and roundtables and 250 business meetings and receptions, making the program the largest in the Association's history. There were several indications that participation in and attendance at the meeting would set new records. Sapiro prepared a detailed chronicle of the program chair's responsibilities during the year and passed it on to the 1999 Program Chairs Alberta Sbragia and John Garcia. Ada Finifter urged APSA to refund pre-registration fees to those prevented from attending by the Northwest Airlines strike.

7. 1999 Annual Meeting Report

President-Elect Matthew Holden reported that the 1999 Program Chairs,

Alberta Sbragia and John Garcia, had selected division chairs and were developing the 1999 program around the theme "Political Science and the World of Politics and Policy: Contributions and Impact." The deadline for submission of paper and panel proposals is November 16, 1998.

8. Report of the APSR Editor

APSR Editor Ada Finifter presented her annual report to the Council. Of special interest was the relationship between print journals and papers appearing on the Internet in one capacity or another. Finifter reported that the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 17, 1998) had written a story on electronic publishing and the policies of a number of academic print journals with respect to allowing submission of articles previously posted on the internet. Some editors are considering such articles already published and therefore ineligible for submission. The Political Methodology section's electronic paper archive was featured prominently in this story and Finifter was also interviewed for it. The article reported different policies in existence at different journals and that this had resulted in some confusion in the scholarly community about the status of articles posted on the internet. To avoid such confusion among those who wish to submit to *APSR*, Finifter has written a statement about electronic publishing and submission to the *APSR* in the "Editor's Notes" of the current (September 1998) issue of the *Review*, discussing this issue in general and explaining current *APSR* policy. The guideline used by the *APSR*, said Finifter, was to equate publishing with peer review. If a paper was posted electronically but had not been subject to peer review, it could be considered by the *APSR*. Articles appearing in peer-reviewed electronic journals would not be considered by the print journal. Finifter also pointed out that the transfer of copyright required for publication in *APSR* could be compromised if electronic postings of articles were copyrighted by someone other than the author. Cook suggested that the Publications Committee consider the issues raised by Finifter.

A. Pippa Norris asked that future reports of submissions and acceptances track the countries of origin of the authors so as to better monitor participation by international scholars in the journal.

B. David Laitin said submissions of articles on Gay and Lesbian Politics, African American Politics, and specific countries should be tracked so that the Editor's Report could include this information. Finifter agreed to do this, emphasizing, however, that it is not clear

what conclusions one would be able to draw from such data in that the numbers of submitted articles in such specific categories would be very small, and that *APSR* reviews of articles in all subject areas are fair and conducted by scholars expert in the respective fields.

9. Report of the Editor, *PS: Political Science & Politics*:

Hauck called the Council's attention to design changes in *PS* and the migration of time-sensitive materials from *PS* to *PSOnline*, a new service on the Association's web site. Early indications are that *PSOnline* is already being well used by members.

10. Report of the APSA Treasurer:

A. Timothy Cook confirmed that the financial condition of the Association remains strong, as he reported in April. There is an \$86,000 surplus for FY 98. Nonetheless, there are some concerns for the future as sources of revenue show slower growth or decline, among them membership (especially institutional membership) and advertising and sales revenues (although advertising is up in *PS*). These changes may lead to an increased reliance on revenue from the Annual Meeting. In terms of investments and its endowment, APSA has done well. The Trust and Development Fund and the Congressional fellowship Program Endowment have soared. Since 1982, the T&D Fund has earned 17.9% compared with an 18.7% S&P return. For FY98, both T&D and CFP endowments have earned approximately 27% returns. The independent audit for FY 98, attesting to the APSA's sound financial condition and management, was distributed to Council members.

Cook presented the FY 99 budget and pointed out that it is essentially the same as the preliminary version the Council approved at the April 25 meeting, adjusted for some decline in revenue. While the FY 99 budget anticipates a \$45,390 deficit, there will be no debt since the Association had set aside \$50,000 to cover the loss of rental revenue for half of the year. A lease is being prepared and new tenants are expected to be in the building and paying rent by January 1, 1999. A motion to approve the budget was made, seconded, and approved.

Further discussion of the Association's finances followed. Jennifer Hochschild asked about placing APSA membership data online. Rudder noted that list sales generate revenues and that offering many free goods may undercut membership incentives. The newly appointed Ad Hoc Committee on Technology will consider how to attract new members with

electronic services along with the consequences of offering online materials free of charge. Putnam observed that all professional associations are experiencing declines in their market share and will provide more information electronically. He also noted that the increase in electronic communication and the decrease in membership are occurring at the same time as the increase in participation in the Annual Meeting. Consequently, APSA should consider increasing Annual Meeting fees and drawing more revenue from the Annual Meeting. Laitin suggested that the *APSR* have submission fees for nonmembers.

Laitin also asked about the status of a proposal to require departments/institutions to be members of the Departmental Services Program in order to submit nominations for dissertation awards. Rudder responded that the Departmental Services Committee decided that it did not have jurisdiction over the awards and that the Endowments Committee will now consider the proposal. The Departmental Services Committee will, however, be asked to respond to a proposal that departments pay a fee for authors who submit their papers electronically to PROceedings.

B. The Council was presented with new guidelines for reimbursing travels costs for APSA committees and governance. The guidelines state that reimbursement for travel costs will be no more than the amount which would have been incurred had reservations been made at least three weeks prior to the date of departure. The purpose of the guideline is to be reasonable and responsible with respect to Association expenditures. The Council approved the rule unanimously.

11. Report of the Committee on Departmental Services:

Ronald Peters, committee chair, summarized the actions taken by the Committee in response to the Council's recommendation for reducing the frequency of APSA surveys. He pointed to the Committee's decisions regarding the publication of directories and highlighted its decisions to provide new information about careers and professional opportunities. He asked the Council to approve the Departmental Services Committee's plan for funding the production of a video on careers and the (undergraduate) study of political science. The production company specializes in career videos for academic fields and the Committee members thought well of the video produced for the American Psychological Association.

Beth Simmons observed that this an excellent project because it will result in

a product developed with the technical expertise of an experienced company that will reach a specific and large target audience. As such, it is a good use of Association resources. The Council unanimously approved the plan to produce the career video.

12. Report on the Centennial Campaign:

Hauck summarized the achievements of the pre-public stage of the Centennial Campaign. Though the Campaign would be officially launched later in the week, it had already raised substantial sums. As of August 25, 1998, the Campaign had raised \$1.8 million, or 59%, of its \$3 million goal from all sources. Approximately \$1.1 million had already been raised from internal transfers from previous budget surpluses and income from the Trust and Development Fund. By late August, 57% of the anticipated \$2 million to be raised by this means was in hand. The Campaign had also raised over \$600,000, or 63%, of the \$1 million to be raised from APSA members and friends.

Hauck praised the generosity of APSA members and pointed out the restricted endowment campaigns under the umbrella of the Centennial Campaign were attracting many contributors to the Campaign.

13. Report on Minority Programs:

A. Rudder reported on the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute and on the participation of Ralph Bunche students in the Annual Meeting. Kent Jennings praised the enthusiasm and interest of the students he met at this summer's institute.

B. Woodard reported on the selection and academic placement of minority fellows for 1998-99.

C. Jun Yin reported that the Minority Identification Program is going well and has drawn considerable departmental participation.

14. Report on International Programs:

A. Hauck reported on the ninth year of the scholarly exchange between the APSA and the Japanese Political Science Association at their respective meetings. The Japanese Political Science Association observes its 50th anniversary at its October 1998 Annual Meeting. In recognition of this anniversary, the Council approved a resolution signifying its appreciation of the benefits of this exchange and congratulating the Japanese Political Science Association on the occasion of its anniversary.

B. Hauck presented the Council with the proposal that APSA host the IPSA World Congress in 2003 as a meeting to be held jointly with the Association's

Annual Meeting marking the Centennial of the APSA's founding in 1903. The proposal is designed to realistically use APSA resources. The IPSA Executive Committee was meeting in Boston and considering the proposal.

C. Yin reported that cooperative activities with the Political Studies Association of the United Kingdom are proceeding, and including listing British programs in the new edition of the *Graduate Faculty and Programs, 1998–2000*, a scholarly exchanges, and jointly sponsoring Annual Meeting sessions.

D. Yin reported on the progress of the web-based project to facilitate a job exchange between American and European academics. The project is a

partnership between the Association and the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR). Catherine Rudder thanked Michael Laver for proposing the initiative.

E. Yin reported on projects to donate Association journals to needy institutions in countries with weak currencies. Ada Finifter suggested including some institutions in Latin America.

15. Report on Education Projects:

APSA Director of Education Sheila Mann reviewed ongoing education projects, including the preparation of new collections of course syllabi, a fourth year for the International Civic Education Exchange, and the discussion list and section on the APSA web site of

the Task Force on Civic Education for the Next Century. APSA is awaiting word about funding for a project on "preparing future faculty" coordinated by the Council of Graduate Schools and the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

16. No new business was introduced.

17. President Holden Recognizes Jennings

President-Elect Matthew Holden presented President M. Kent Jennings with a print of Hogarth's "The Politician" and a Certificate of Appreciation for his service as the Association's president. Jennings expressed his gratitude and adjourned the meeting.

APSA Awards Presented at 1998 Annual Meeting

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1996 or 1997 in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: T.J. Pempel, University of Washington, chair; Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University; and Susan Stokes, University of Chicago

Recipient: Beatriz Magaloni, Harvard University

Dissertation: "The Dynamics of Dominant Party Decline: The Mexican Transition to Multipartyism"

Dissertation Chairs: John Aldrich, Duke University and Robert H. Bates, Harvard University

Recipient: James Mahoney, Brown University

Dissertation: "Radical, Reformist, and Aborted Liberalism: Origins of National Regimes in Central America"

Dissertation Chairs: David Collier and Ruth Berins Collier, University of California, Berkeley

Citation: James Mahoney's dissertation provides a historically sweeping analysis of the diverse regime types that

have emerged in five Central America countries over the past 150 years. His argument resonates methodologically with other broad structuralist treatments of the changing relationships among competing economic sectors and social classes, work that began with Barrington Moore's classic study of three decades ago. Unlike Moore and most others, however, Mahoney focuses quite deliberately on the "small countries" of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, and, sensitive to the ways in which such small states are inevitably constrained by broader political and economic forces, he remains particularly attuned to the ongoing linkages between domestic relationships and external influences.

Mahoney argues that three different types of authoritarian liberalism emerged in Central America during the late 19th century. At this time these regimes acquired their primary shapes, principally as the outgrowth of the socio-economic alliances that were forged when liberals in each country sought to utilize state power in differential ways to promote commercial agriculture and to incorporate their national economies into the world system. Radical liberalism prevailed in Guatemala and El Salvador; reformist liberalism dominated in Costa Rica, and aborted liberalism was the outcome in Honduras and Nicaragua. These initial regime formulations, Mahoney argues, have left a persistent legacy for all five countries though much of the Twentieth Century, as a consequence of what he labels an "integrative path dependent process."

Mahoney's work provides a sensitive

and nuanced treatment of the interplay between structures and contingencies over a broad historical period. Its country cases are rich in detail. The work challenges many existing analyses of Central American development demonstrating in a convincing way the importance of political leadership and policy choice; the linkages between internal political processes and external economic and political events; and the relative autonomy of state actors vis a vis oligarchic interests. In all of these ways, it provides an extremely valuable contribution to the field of comparative politics.

Citation: Beatriz Magaloni's thesis offers a methodologically sophisticated analysis of both the longevity of dominant party rule in Mexico and the more recent transition to meaningful multiparty competition. Central to both processes, she demonstrates, were the electoral processes and mass behavior as opposed to elite level strategies. Magaloni shows how long-term PRI resiliency grew out of three things: voter uncertainty and asymmetries of information; long term rational attachments to the ruling party by older voters; and the inability of the opposition parties to coordinate support from their voters. In this way, she provides a compelling and triangulating explanation for the puzzle of how authoritarian parties can win reasonably free elections. At the same time, she shows how, as all three of these variables changed, the fortunes of the contending political parties and the broader shape of the Mexican regime were reshaped as well.

Focusing particularly on the interplay between economic performance and political reform, Magaloni analyzes how Mexican political parties were differentially organized along these two dimensions and how the debt crisis and the market-oriented reforms that followed reshaped these organizational patterns in fundamental ways, thereby reconfiguring the dynamics of party competition and in this way allowing for far more democratic political outcomes.

The thesis combines sophisticated and insightful theorizing, advanced methods of data analysis, and creative and original substance. The Mexican case is used to provide broader comparative insights into problems linked to the decline in one party dominance generally and democratization most broadly. Her thesis thus has powerful implications and broad applicability as the problems of democratic contestation gain momentum in Eastern Europe, Africa, and Southeast Asia.

William Anderson Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1996 or 1997 in the field of state and local politics, federalism, or intergovernmental relations.

Award Committee: John Kincaid, Lafayette College, chair; Frances Stokes Berry, Florida State University; and David Nice, Washington State University

Recipient: Kirk Emerson, University of Arizona

Dissertation: "The Emergence of State Property Rights Legislation: A Comparative State Policy Analysis"

Dissertation Chairs: Charles Wise and Rosemary O'Leary, Indiana University

Citation: Emerson's Ph.D. dissertation on "The Emergence of State Property Rights Legislation: A Comparative State Policy Analysis" is a meticulous, well-crafted, and thorough analysis of an emerging field of state law. It is well grounded in the relevant literature, well written, and thoughtful.

Since 1991, half of the U.S. states have enacted statutes protecting private property from certain regulatory actions by government. Emerson places this new legislation in the context of environmental policymaking; carefully explores the interplay of economic, political, and institutional dynamics in shaping state decision-making; and explores the extent to which this legislative activity represents a major shift in public policy

toward natural resource, environmental, and land-use regulation.

Essentially, Emerson finds that lower levels of commitment to environmental protection and higher proportions of "neo-legislators" are associated with the enactment of such property rights statutes. The adoption of strong property rights laws is also affected by organized interests representing resource-based industries and by Republican-dominated legislatures. Across the country, the enactment of such legislation broadens differences among the states in their regulation and management of land and environmental resources.

Emerson's dissertation was nominated by the Department of Political Science at Indiana University, Bloomington. The doctoral committee co-chairs were Professors Charles Wise and Rosemary O'Leary; the additional committee members were Professors Norman Furniss and Russell Hanson. Dr. Emerson is now Assistant Research Professor of Environmental Policy at the Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, The University of Arizona, Tucson.

Edward S. Corwin Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1996 or 1997 in the field of public law.

Award Committee: Jeffrey A. Segal, SUNY-Stony Brook, chair; Susan Olson, University of Utah; and Mark Silverstein, Boston University

Recipient: Christopher Zorn, Emory University

Dissertation: "U.S. Government Litigation Strategies in the Federal Appellate Courts"

Dissertation Chair: Gregory Caldeira, Ohio State University

Citation: This dissertation is an examination of the decision by the Department of Justice and the Solicitor General to appeal adverse decisions of the U.S. Courts of Appeals. The dissertation is substantively important, theoretically thoughtful, and methodologically rigorous.

The "United States" is the most frequent and important litigant in the federal judiciary. It is a party to more than a third of all filings in the federal district courts and about forty percent of all cases decided by the Supreme Court. The average litigant has about a five percent chance of getting his or her case accepted by the Supreme Court; the solicitor general has nearly a two-thirds

chance. And of those accepted, the United States will eventually win about 60%. Thus, before the Supreme Court can decide which cases to hear, the Solicitor General must decide which cases to appeal.

Despite the importance of this question, and an avalanche of studies examining the Solicitor General's success on the merits, there exists no systematic examination of which cases the Solicitor General appeals. Moreover, the lack of information on the selection of cases to appeal makes it impossible to ascertain accurately the factors that influence the SG's success on the merits.

Zorn helps answer these questions with a rich mix of personal interviews, descriptive statistics, and statistical models. Theoretically, Zorn considers the institutional design that gives the Department of Justice and the Solicitor General final say over virtually all agency requests to review unfavorable lower court decisions. Because the Solicitor General's office is not tied to the specific decisions or policies under attack, it can ignore the narrow costs of the decision and focus instead on the broader importance of the case and the likelihood of success.

Among the highlights of the dissertation is the methodological rigor with which Zorn seeks to answer his questions: a bivariate probit estimator to gauge the impact of Department of Justice recommendations on Solicitor General decisions; ordered probit analysis of the decision to appeal en banc or to the Supreme Court; and a multinomial logit examination of the same process. Zorn carefully lays out the theoretical benefits of these approaches over more traditional estimation procedures.

Among his results, Zorn finds that invalidation of a federal law was more important to the Justice Department than to the Solicitor General, but that cases involving intercourt conflict were more important to the SG. And in a finding that will cause scholars to update their views, Zorn found that the ideology of the lower court decision consistently had no impact on the decision to appeal. Finally, the estimation strategies demonstrate that the decision to appeal is a *process* that must be considered *en toto*, rather than a series of discrete events that can be considered separately.

The committee would also like to recognize the dissertation by David Alistair Yalof, University of Connecticut as an Honorable Mention. Yalof's thesis, "Choosing Supreme Court Nominees: Selection Politics From Truman to Reagan" is a highly readable, well researched, examination of the factors affecting Presidential selection of Supreme Court nominees. Yalof interviews many of the participants in the process and

makes exceptional use of the various Presidential libraries. Among the most interesting findings, Yalof discovers that the Reagan White House apparently had good information before Anthony Kennedy was appointed to the Court that the appeals court judge supported *Roe v. Wade*. He also finds convincing evidence that Brennan was Eisenhower's first choice and not a backup, as has often been asserted. This dissertation will become a major university press book and will be on the shelves of all students of the nominations process. J. Woodford Howard and Joel Grossman served as dissertation chairs.

Harold D. Lasswell Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1996 or 1997 in the field of policy studies.

Award Committee: David L. Weimer, chair, University of Rochester; Susan E. Clarke, University of Colorado; Russell Hardin, New York University

Recipient: Daniel P. Carpenter, Princeton University

Dissertation: "Corporate Identity and Administrative Capacity in Executive Departments, 1862-1932"

Dissertation Chair: John F. Padgett, University of Chicago

Citation: It is with pleasure that the committee presents the Harold D. Lasswell Award to Daniel P. Carpenter in recognition of his fine dissertation, which stood out as exceptional among a very strong field of contenders.

An important question for political scientists in a number of fields is the role of bureaucratic culture in framing and furthering the missions and external political relationships of public agencies. Carpenter seeks to answer this question, as well as identify the strategies, including the choice of an appropriate metaphor, that can be used to establish a corporate identity as a means of achieving a favorable bureaucratic culture. He does so within the broad context of an ongoing debate among political historians over the development of state capacity in the United States.

Carpenter presents an exceptionally rich exploration of the development of corporate identities in the Department of Agriculture and the Post Office Department. Drawing on primary and secondary historical sources, he traces the development of corporate identities in the Department of Agriculture (university) and the Railway Mail

Service (army and then machine) that enabled their employees to see their organizations as cohesive despite their functional and geographic differentiation. Carpenter derives hypotheses about the attachment of different types of employees in bureaus of the Department of Agriculture that follow from his assessment of corporate identity. His statistical tests of these hypotheses are based on data extracted from the personnel files of USDA employees around the turn of the century.

In making use of a variety of historical sources and data to answer a general question of contemporary interest, Carpenter provides an exemplary demonstration of the integration of historical approaches into political science and policy studies.

Helen Dwight Reid Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1996 or 1997 in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

Award Committee: Joseph M. Grieco, Duke University, chair; James D. Morrow, Stanford University; Janice Gross Stein, University of Toronto

Recipient: Michael John Hiscox, Harvard University

Dissertation: "The Trade War at Home: Factor Mobility, International Trade, and Political Coalitions in Democracies"

Dissertation Chair: James E. Alt, Harvard University

Citation: After reviewing fourteen very fine dissertations, the committee is extremely pleased to announce its selection of Michael John Hiscox as the 1998 winner of the Helen Dwight Reid Award for best dissertation in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

The core thesis developed by Hiscox in "The Trade War at Home" is that differences in the ease with which factors of production can be shifted by their owners across industries can produce differences in the incentives of those owners to press for their preferred trade policies through mass-based parties as opposed to narrow industry-based organizations, which in turn affects both the character of national trade politics and the content of national trade policies. He argues that when inter-industry factor mobility is high, then factor owners will be more likely to have convergent class-based trade interests, and this will be reflected in political action by those

factor owners to construct and maintain class-based political parties and to pursue overall trade policies consistent with their general class interests. The result, Hiscox suggests, is a type of national politics that produces relatively coherent trade politics either in favor or opposed to trade liberalization. In contrast, when inter-industry factor mobility is low, then factor owners will be more likely to define their economic interests in terms of the international competitiveness of their particular industries. This in turn will yield a more industry-based form of political organization and action by those factor owners, and this more complex organization of political interests and more heterogeneous distribution of policy preferences will produce a less coherent overall national trade policy.

Hiscox uses a formal model of international trade to determine how differences in factor mobility affect incomes of labor and capital. He then uses his analysis of such trade-induced changes in income to derive preferences over trade policy for parties, producer groups, and labor unions in political competition. He demonstrates the plausibility of his analytical argument through both intensive qualitative and statistical analyses. His basic finding is that in the period since 1815, and especially in recent decades, trade politics and policies in the United States and other advanced industrial democracies have become less coherent as inter-industry factor mobility has generally decreased.

The committee finds, in sum, that Hiscox's dissertation is a model of original, innovative theorizing about the relationship between important economic and domestic political-institutional variables in the field of international political economy; that in its theorizing it brings to bear very effectively cutting-edge scholarship in political science and economics; and that in generating and testing its empirical hypotheses the dissertation makes highly effective use of formal modeling and both quantitative and qualitative methods.

E.E. Schattschneider Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed or accepted in 1997 or 1998 in the field of American government and politics.

Award Committee: Thomas Patterson, Harvard University, Chair; Katherine Tate, University of California, Irvine; and Dennis Chong, Northwestern University

Recipient: Frances E. Lee, Case Western Reserve University

Dissertation: "The Enduring Consequences of the Great Compromise: Senate Apportionment and Congressional Policymaking."

Dissertation Chair: Bruce Oppenheimer, Vanderbilt University

Citation: The representative institutions of the United States include the Senate, which is anything but representative in its apportionment. Each state regardless of population has the same number of senators. Wyoming, which has fewer people than the average House district, has the same number of senators as California, which has a population larger than most nations of Europe. There are twenty-one states with a combined population that is less than California's yet they have forty-two U.S. senators compared to California's two.

This institutional arrangement, of course, was a product of the Great Compromise at the Philadelphia Convention of 1787. The Senate for the large states was the price of Union. And it is virtually an unchangeable characteristic of our political system. Article V says, "No state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The permanence of the Senate is perhaps a reason by its apportionment has rarely been a subject of political debate. Less easy to explain, as Frances E. Lee notes, is the lack of interest that political scientists have shown in the question. Until her superb dissertation, we knew almost nothing about the effect of Senate apportionment on public policy. Many small things about Congress have been studied nearly to the point of exhaustion. A large fact about Congress—two hundred years of legislation that has been a product of a House apportioned among the states according to population and a Senate apportioned equally—has gone virtually unstudied.

The brilliance of Frances Lee's dissertation goes beyond her recognition of a major institutional feature of our constitutional system that is worthy of study. Through the application of a path-dependent framework, she finds "that federal distributive programs tend to be constructed so that a majority of states benefit, even though a majority of congressional districts do not." She demonstrates that the tendency can be accounted for by the coalition-building process in the Senate.

She also demonstrates that equal Senate apportionment works to the advantage of small states in the distribution of domestic spending. Over represented states receive higher per capita outlays, even when need is controlled. On a per capita basis, the biggest winners in the

distribution of federal funds are the smallest states. In terms of actual dollars, their senators are the least costly additions to a potentially winning Senate coalition. As a result, they get a financial windfall.

Frances Lee's dissertation is methodologically rigorous, analytically elegant, and theoretically important. It is a compelling study and a worthy recipient of the E.E. Schattschneider Award.

Leo Strauss Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1996 or 1997 in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Mary G. Dietz, University of Minnesota, Chair; Alan Houston, University of California, San Diego; and Marion Smiley, University of Wisconsin

Recipient: Sung Ho Kim, Ohio University

Dissertation: "Of 'Sect Man': The Modern Self and Civil Society in Max Weber's Political Thought"

Dissertation Chair: Susanne Hoerber Rudolph, University of Chicago

Citation: The 1998 Leo Strauss Award Committee is pleased to announce that Sung Ho Kim is the recipient of the prize for the best dissertation in the field of political philosophy. The committee agreed that Mr. Kim's dissertation, *Of 'Sect Man': The Modern Self and Civil Society in Max Weber's Political Thought* deserved the Leo Strauss Award for its discerning and original interpretive reconstruction of Max Weber's political thought. In clear and polished prose, Kim presents a historically contextualized and intertextual reading that illuminates the theme of the modern self across a range of Weber's works, and deftly identifies a "novel mode of sociability" that, in Weber's thinking, demands the pluralistic organization of civil society. The interpretation issuing from this project does not deny Weber's value conviction in individualism, but rather relocates it within an equally resolute concern for societal pluralism and associational life, a concern heretofore relatively unnoticed and utterly unexplored in Weber studies. Thus, even as the thesis skillfully mobilizes (the now considerable) secondary literature on Weber's political thought, it presses beyond it by way of a critical reabsorption of Weber's texts that produces a fresh and nuanced perspective.

Specifically, Kim's elaboration of

"sect man" casts light on what has been an area of darkness—the place where Weber's unique ontology of the self and his modern politics of voluntary associational life intersect and interact. The thesis begins with a delicate reconstruction of, in Kim's words, "Weber's genealogical account of the modern self." In tracing the development of this individualized and Protestant type of self that Weber called *Berufsmensch*, Kim shows how Weber's Protestant ethic thesis issues in a "newly empowered" concept of the individual that is clearly distinguishable from both the Enlightenment view of man and Victorian liberal characterology, because it can only be grasped within the peculiar historical context of modernity's rationalization processes and the asceticism that embodies the disenchantment of the modern world. Thus the empowered self to which Weber aspires is paradoxically predicated upon modernity's complete disempowerment of human beings. Nevertheless, Kim argues, Weber imagines a self at once "subjectified and objectified," capable of willful transformation, and charged with a belief in absolute values. In this vision (wherein Kim also observes the traces of a Kantian self-legislating self), the genuine possibility for an autonomous freedom resides.

Yet the account of the Weberian self that Kim offers is neither fixed at the level of ontology, nor focused on a sociological theory of an atomized realm of individual societal rights. To the contrary, the originality of this interpretation of Weber's ethical project lies in its identification of certain "strategies" upon which Weber relies to secularize the *Berufsmensch*, and thereby re-empower the modern self. Primarily, Weber's empowerment strategy demands the pluralistic organization of the public sphere and the vitalization of associational life—in short, the invigoration of charisma in a secular form in modern society. This insight of Kim's initiates a remarkable variety of comparative sociological and political themes and concerns, including a thought-provoking assessment of Weber's little-known observations of the Puritan sectlike associations in America which he deemed a "horizonwidening" experience, and sharply differentiated from the "bowling clubs and political parties" of Germany, whose modes of sociability and organizational culture he did not find conducive to the creation of good citizens. Kim's illumination of Weber's analysis of sectlike society also develops, on a conceptual level, the picture of a social group that is neither invested with primordiality, nor defined by ascriptive characteristics, nor encumbered by what Weber called "vegetable-like geniality," but rather infused (in truly Weberian

fashion) by a constant emphasis on persistent achievement, lifelong diligence in one's "calling," collective, purposeful activity and the methodical conduct of life. "It seems clear," Kim concludes, "that what Weber tries to outline here amounts to a form of social organization which can sustain integration in a differentiated, individualistic and democratic society."

In the powerful penultimate chapter of the dissertation, Kim situates his civil-societal, associationalist Weber in the context of Wilhelmine politics in order to reassess Weber's ardent nationalism, as well as his critique of corporatism, and his diagnosis of the political degeneracy and the administrative inertia of the German nation. In this lucid discussion, Kim arrives an exemplary hermeneutical moment that casts Weber's thinking in the face of the harsh reality of politics as "an eternal struggle," and in the light of a "guarded hope" for a postwar, reformed Germany that will culminate in a democratically constituted state composed of associational groups that will pulsate (if unavoidably in "pianissimo") with the activities of individuals as citizens.

Kim persuasively establishes that, in Weber's political thought, neither the modern self nor sectlike society is really comprehensible without the other; hence his dissertation is essential reading for those who would understand either. We therefore commend this pathbreaking study to scholars of Max Weber and theorists of modernity alike, and in equal measure.

Leonard D. White Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1997 or 1998 in the field of public administration.

Award Committee: David Lowery, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, chair, Susan Hansen, University of Pittsburgh, and Matthew Cahn, California State University at Northridge.

Recipient: Craig Warren Thomas, University of California, Berkeley

Dissertation: "Bureaucratic Landscapes: Interagency Cooperation and the Preservation of Biodiversity"

Dissertation Chair: Todd R. La Porte, University of California, Berkeley

Citation: The Leonard D. White Award this year goes to Craig Warren Thomas for his dissertation "Bureaucratic Landscapes: Interagency Cooperation and the Preservation of

Biodiversity." The topic of governmental fragmentation is a perennial concern to political scientists, with bureaucratic fragmentation a particular subspecies of special interest to public administration scholars. But the concept of fragmentation is of concern to many other disciplines. Indeed, in the last decade ecological fragmentation has been one of the key concepts driving both population biology theory and public policy on the preservation of biodiversity. Dr. Thomas deftly considers the implications of changing notions of ecological fragmentation for modes of interaction among the fragmented state and national agencies charged with managing the environment. In doing so, he highlights how changing scientific ideas both upset long standing interagency agreements and then create the policy uncertainty underlying conflict among bureaus with competing and overlapping interests.

Dr. Thomas explores these issues with a series of case studies of interagency interactions in California during the 1990s. Employing analyses of line managers, professionals, and rural field staff, he demonstrates that each level has its own resources and interests which lead to quite different responses to the advent of interagency conflict and opportunities for interagency cooperation. Given these differences, Dr. Thomas argues that the deck is stacked against interagency cooperation within the bureaucratic system as constituted in the United States. This may have both negative and positive consequences for public policy. However, Dr. Thomas strongly argues that public policies arising from changing ideas about minimizing ecological fragmentation as a means of preserving biological diversity have not fared well in a world of intense bureaucratic fragmentation. Minimizing the impact of ecological fragmentation may well require a level of interagency cooperation that is not readily realized by our current arrangement of competing and overlapping bureaucratic structures.

The key strength of Dr. Thomas work lies in its attention to the role of substantive policy ideas in shaping and then reshaping interaction among public agencies. Ideas do matter. But their expression is very much conditioned by the discretionary behaviors of public employees at all levels of the bureaucracy and across levels of government. This theoretical strength is fully balanced by a series of intensive case studies illuminating the perspectives of all the actors needed to make interagency cooperation a reality. Taken together, these strengths make this an important work on the nexus of science, public policy, and bureaucratic politics, a work that merits the attention of political scientists as well as others in a number of disciplines.

PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

Franklin L. Burdette/ Pi Sigma Alpha Award (\$500)

For the best paper presented at the 1997 Annual Meeting.

Award Committee: John M. Orbell, University of Oregon, chair; Jan E. Leighley, Texas A&M University; and Kevin O'Brien, University of California, Berkeley

Recipient: Karen Orren, University of California, Los Angeles

Paper: "Machine Constitutionalism: The Court, the Republican Party and the Eleventh Amendment in the Gilded Age"

Citation: The papers nominated for this award were hugely diverse in paradigmatic terms, in theoretical issues addressed, in styles of argument and in empirical approaches and methodologies—not surprisingly, since they were nominated by the diverse divisions of a very diverse profession. Finding "the best" paper required that we find a common basis for comparing them. We chose to sort papers by (1) the theoretical significance of their conclusions; (2) the soundness of the basis from which those conclusions were drawn; and (3) the clarity and force with which the argument was made. We believed that those three criteria were sufficiently broad to let us make meaningful and fair comparisons even among the diversity with which we were confronted.

Inventing those criteria was, however, the easy part. A first pass was conducted independently by the three Committee members and produced a set of ten papers that at least one member believed was a serious contender in those terms. These ten were then all read and re-read by each committee member during an extended period of backward and forward discussion that, at times, threatened to produce a classic cycle of preferences—and no consensual winner. By becoming ever more demanding in terms of our three criteria, however, we were eventually able to reduce the set to two, and then, after still more extensive discussion, to a single winner.

"Beyond Ordinary Logit: Taking Time Seriously in Binary Time-Series-Cross-Section Models" by Nathaniel Beck, Jonathan N. Katz and Richard Tucker, nominated by the Political Methodology Division, not only made a

strong critique of the manner in which time-series-cross-section data have been analyzed, but showed how a powerful and simple alternative that they have developed produces a significant new slant on the much discussed relationship between economic interdependence, democracy and peace. The paper is, we believe, a fine example of how methodological critique and innovation can have major theoretical implications. It deserves, and will surely get, wide currency in the profession and beyond.

The winner, however, is Karen Orren's "Machine Constitutionalism: The Court, the Republican Party and the Eleventh Amendment in the Gilded Age," nominated by the Politics and History Division. It is quite masterful along all three dimensions of comparison. From the case of the Eleventh Amendment during the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Century—*itself*, as she readily acknowledges, "a relatively obscure constitutional topic"—Orren builds to argue the innovative and general proposition that "American political development consists in a shifting balance of rights between those held by virtue of office and those held by virtue of citizenship . . . [that] American political development displays a movement over time from officers' rights to citizens' rights." As she shows, this reduces the classic distinction between the "powers" of office holder and the "rights" of citizens to a "single distribution of enforceable claims." The paper is gracefully written and argued, powerfully deploying historical evidence toward Orren's analytical ends. The conceptual and theoretical distinctions it makes, demonstrated to be useful in illuminating one particular set of events, are likely to stimulate a re-examination of all American political development since Philadelphia.

Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)

For the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during 1997.

Award Committee: Morris Fiorina, Stanford University, chair; Valerie Bunce, Cornell University; and Robert Powell, University of California, Berkeley

Recipients: Piotr Swistak, University of Maryland, and Jonathan Bendor, Stanford University

Paper: "The Evolutionary Stability of Cooperation"

Recipients: Christopher Anderson, SUNY-Binghamton, and Christine Guillory

Paper: "Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy"

Citation: Service on the Eulau Award Committee requires a close reading of an entire volume of the *American Political Science Review*. This duty powerfully brings home the great heterogeneity of our discipline. Reflecting this diversity, the committee's short list was rather long, and in the end, we decided to single out not one, but two—quite different—articles for recognition.

The first article to be recognized is "Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy," by Christopher Anderson and Christine Guillory. Most fundamentally, this article is an admirable empirical examination of important issues in democratic theory. It is truly comparative in its approach, and the power of its analysis rests on two illuminating empirical syntheses—the integration of institutional and behavioral variables and the merging of individual and aggregate data.

Much recent work has focused on bargaining among elites as the genesis of institutional arrangements. Although this work has done much to advance our understanding of democratic systems, Anderson-Guillory strike out in other directions. They treat institutional structure as a cause not an effect, and they focus on citizens rather than elites, looking at how variations in institutional structure affect public attitudes. They draw important linkages between types of democracy and citizen evaluations of democracy, linkages that are central to debates in democratic theory as well as comparative studies of recent democratization.

The second recipient of the Eulau Award is "The Evolutionary Stability of Cooperation", by Jonathan Bendor and Piotr Swistak. This is a more narrowly-focused paper, and its contribution lies in its rigorous formal argument rather than empirical analysis. But the general question "can actors cooperate when a central authority is either absent or unable to enforce agreements?" is critically important in international relations theory, collective action and common resource analyses, and the study of political and institutional development.

Two decades ago the seminal work of Robert Axelrod focused attention on reciprocity as a means of sustaining cooperation. Drawing on recent work in evolutionary game theory, Bendor and Swistak advance and deepen our understanding of the relation between cooperation and reciprocity. If cooperation

emerges in an evolutionary setting, then in some sense cooperating must be a better or fitter strategy than not cooperating. But in precisely what sense is cooperation better? By offering a more precise answer Bendor and Swistak suggest empirical conditions where cooperation is more likely to emerge.

BOOK AWARDS

Ralph Bunche Award (\$500)

For the best scholarly work in political science, published in 1997, which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Michael C. Dawson, University of Chicago, chair; Cynthia Enloe, Clark University; and David Sears, University of California, Los Angeles

Recipient: Rogers M. Smith, Yale University

Book: *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (Yale University Press)

Citation: In 1941 Ralph Bunche made the following argument:

The entire constitutional history of the nation has reflected this compromise in the quixotic tendency to sanctify its democratic creeds while stubbornly retaining its racial bigotries. Paradoxical as it may seem in the light of the historical record, however, the fact remains that the Constitution did lay the basis for the most broad ideological pattern of individual human equality, human liberty, and human rights that the modern world has known.

—Bunche, 1995 [1941], p. 93.

Throughout his long career as radical, scholar, intelligence agency analyst, and diplomat, Bunche wrestled with the paradox of a liberal democracy that represented in his opinion the most democratic set of institutions and norms ever devised, yet which also had an equally established set of illiberal, violent, impulses, supported by both the grassroots and elites, which served to exclude large segments of American residents from the benefits of citizenship within the polity. In his massive historical study of the evolution of citizenship laws, group inclusion and exclusion, and American political thought, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions in U.S. History*, Rogers M. Smith has tackled the central themes that Bunche argued were at the heart of the paradox known as American democracy.

Civic Ideals is impressive along a number of dimensions. Smith attempts to explain the long history of American exclusion of groups such as blacks, women, residents of Chinese descent, and Native Americans from the polity during a number of historical periods through an analyses of the evolution of American citizenship laws. He argues that we have become too focused on the idea of a single American liberal tradition and need instead to realize that there are multiple civic traditions that have not only competed with liberal and republican traditions, but indeed during many periods, these illiberal, bigoted, but often popular traditions have dominated liberal impulses in the nation's politics. Smith further argues that political elites have often found that illiberal and chauvinist political rhetorics were often more useful for the very necessary task of nation-building than liberal discourses. Smith supports this provocative argument with an impressive amount of empirical research that traces citizenship debates, legislative action, and relevant court cases across American history. One of the merits of Smith's treatment of political conflicts over American citizenship is his effort to include the different but critical themes of race, ethnicity and gender. His explicit inclusion of a number of racial groups, as well as women and African Americans is important for showing the complex contours of the political exclusions that are as central, Smith argues, to American political traditions as are the norms of liberal democracy. In the concluding section of this work Smith argues for a reappraisal of the political tasks necessary for building a liberal nation on democratic grounds. As with the arguments found throughout the book, Smith's conclusions will certainly provoke much debate over the next several years as scholars engage both his empirical findings and normative concerns.

The question of political conflict over the meaning and scope of American citizenship remains a central political question for our times. Smith's book addresses a topic at the very center of both contemporary and historical study of American politics and American political thought. In a year of an extremely strong field, the committee agreed that there were a number of works whose excellence deserved recognition, the 1998 Bunche Prize Committee is delighted to award the Bunche Prize for the best scholarly work in political science which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism to Rogers M. Smith for his outstanding portrayal of the tortured relationship between liberal democratic principles, illiberal and exclusionary political traditions

and practices, and the history American citizenship law in *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award (\$1,000)

For the best political science publication in 1997 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Award Committee: Thomas J. Anton, Brown University, chair; Bryan D. Jones, University of Washington; and Elaine B. Sharp, University of Kansas

Recipients: Paul M. Sniderman, Stanford University, and Edward G. Carmines, Indiana University

Book: *Reaching Beyond Race* (Harvard University Press)

Citation: In this remarkable book, Paul M. Sniderman and Edward G. Carmines offer fresh insights into American attitudes toward race that challenge much conventional thinking about racial politics and policies. Building on these insights the authors develop a persuasive argument for a new coalition, based on widely-shared moral convictions, to address the mounting problems of America's disadvantaged. At once a work of exceptional technical sophistication, passionate advocacy and writing elegance, *Reaching Beyond Race* is a book that will help all Americans, not just social scientists, think more clearly about our most enduring social problem.

Using data from a number of national surveys conducted over the past decade, Sniderman and Carmines examine the controversy over affirmative action programs in employment and higher education. Not surprisingly, the authors find that whites overwhelmingly oppose preferences for blacks in employment and quotas for blacks in college admissions. Indeed, even whites liberals are strongly opposed to preferences and quotas, a discovery that leads the authors to conclude that racial prejudice, "... far from dominating and orchestrating the opposition to affirmative action, makes only a slight contribution to it." (p. 22) Driving home their point that racism is not the primary source of opposition to affirmative action programs, Sniderman and Carmines show that, while whites are opposed to preferences and quotas, they are *not* opposed to efforts to reach out to blacks and other minorities to ensure that they receive fair consideration. On the contrary, "... a clear majority of whites believe that an extra effort *should* be made to ensure blacks are judged on their merits, and not on the color of their skin." (p. 145. Italics in

original) This, along with the equally impressive discovery of substantial growth in good will toward blacks, leads the authors to a carefully reasoned but nonetheless passionate argument for a return to "color-blind politics" based on values that blacks and whites share in common.

In less skillful hands, an argument based on the presumption of common values among blacks and whites might seem either naïve or utopian, given the recent popularity of the notion that blacks and whites live in "two nations," with widely divergent social and political perspectives. In their masterly analysis, however, Sniderman and Carmines confront the "two nations" perspective head on, showing that black and white Americans give remarkably similar reasons why blacks continue to be worse off than whites. More importantly, blacks are as supportive of the ethic of self-reliance and individual responsibility as are whites, leading the authors to comment that, "For better and for worse, and to an extent which deserves to be appreciated again, black Americans and white Americans share the same culture." (p. 138) It is precisely this shared culture that provides the foundation for their discovery that support for programs that assist poor blacks increases dramatically when expressed in universalistic rather than ethnic terms. "The strongest arguments in behalf of programs to deal with issues of race," they write, "need not be confined to considerations of race. Indeed, the most effective way to increase the coalition in support of policies that directly improve the lives of the worst-off blacks is to reach beyond race itself and appeal to moral common ground—to principles that apply regardless of race." (p. 125)

As challenging as these ideas are, it is equally important to note that the authors develop them through extraordinary innovative and powerful analytic techniques. Race is clearly a sensitive topic, and it is always difficult to know whether respondents to survey questions are speaking honestly or simply saying what they think they should say. For the past decade, however, Sniderman and Carmines have been developing a new methodological approach that allows them to illuminate "real" attitudes that have previously been hidden. "The key to this approach," they write, "is to embed complex, genuinely randomized experiments in public opinion interviews and carry them out in a way that is invisible to the person being interviewed." (p. 12) Relying on computer-assisted interviews, Sniderman and Carmines thus offer a series of truly ingenious "experiments," in which analyses of matched samples, alike in every respect save one, allow them to clearly identify

the impact of the variable being examined. From the "Two Meanings Experiment" at the beginning to the "No Special Favors" experiment at the end, these beautifully written exercises move progressively through the deepest complexities of racial attitudes, leaving the reader with a new appreciation of the ability of excellent research to illuminate significant social and political issues.

Books that utilize sophisticated research techniques are common, perhaps too common, as are books that address significant political issues or books that offer powerful advocacy for some political position. This book, however, is a rarity: it is a model of innovative research technique, attached to an important issue, in pursuit of a morally-driven solution to what may be our most unyielding social problem. Anyone who believes that moral values necessarily undermine objectivity needs to read it, and anyone who is still persuaded that advanced research technologies are unlikely to be relevant is in even more need of this work. Above all, Americans need to read this work and absorb what it teaches us about our own racial attitudes. Its lessons are powerful, its messages are clear and beautifully delivered, and its contributions to our national conversation about race could not have come at a more appropriate time.

Victoria Schuck Award (\$500)

For the best book published in 1997 on women and politics.

Award Committee: Lee Ann Banaszak, Pennsylvania State University, chair; Sue Thomas, Georgetown University; and Wilma Rule, University of Nevada, Reno

Recipient: Uma Narayan, Vassar College

Book: *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism* (Routledge)

Citation: Uma Narayan's book *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism* examines the intersection of nation, identity and culture focusing specifically on the connection between Third World feminists and their critics within Third World nations as well as Western feminists and Western nations. Narayan's analysis of the political construction of culture is a strong analytic tool with widespread significance and application not only in the field of women and politics but also in the areas of comparative politics, political culture, and minority politics. It is

for its unique insights which provide significant contributions to multiple areas of political science that the committee selected *Dislocating Cultures* for the 1998 Victoria Schuck award.

Narayan begins her book by taking on the critique leveled against Third World feminists that their feminism is a result of "Westernization." She argues persuasively that the practices against women (e.g. the Indian practice of sati) glorified by Third World nationalists as a cultural tradition are themselves constructions of the interaction with and political struggle against Western colonialism. What is currently accepted as Third World culture is a construction that selectively chose some traditions and abandoned others for Western ways; that disregarded religious, regional, and class differences in culture; and that ignored that Third World traditions were not static but mutable and developing. Thus, those Indians who venerate sati (widow-burning) as an Indian tradition (and Western feminists who unquestioningly accept this position) ignore that it had virtually died out by the end of the nineteenth century, that it was only practiced in certain regions and among certain castes, and that the traditions relating to women and the private sphere are more rigorously adhered to than others.

Narayan also examines the interaction of Third World feminists and the West. First, using Western discussions of sati as an example, she notes that Western discussion of feminist issues in the Third World tend to assume that the mistreatment of women stems from an artificial construct labeled "Traditions/Religions/Culture" and ignore other explanations for women's status, such as the importance of economic gain and state practices and policies. Thus, Western feminists are guilty of often simplifying the problems faced by women in the Third World as "death by culture." In a chapter comparing discussions of dowry murders in India to death by domestic violence in the United States, Narayan shows how nationalist contexts and feminist activism helps determine how these issues are framed. She discusses, for example, how the lack of any information on death by domestic violence in the United States as well as the mistaken tendency to blame culture as a cause of dowry murders makes it hard for U.S. feminists to see the similarity of the two issues.

Finally, Narayan argues that part of the reason for Western simplifications and misunderstandings is the way that issues cross national borders. When issues cross borders, individuals in all countries tend to look at such issues as a phenomenon of the "Other." The third major theme of the book explores how the West deals with other cultures both

within the academic setting (and the current trend towards multiculturalism) and in general. She argues that in exploring cultures, we tend to adapt them to fit our own culture and tradition, emphasize cultural traditions, and avoid engaging in true discussion.

Narayan provides important insights for feminists and for scholars of women's movements and comparative women and politics. In discussing the construction of cultures and identity, she demonstrates that Third World feminists must continually challenge the definitions of culture and identity. However, she argues that this advice is equally applicable to feminists everywhere since within the United States such definitions often exclude women of color. She also provides a concrete model for how feminists (and others) should forge true multiculturalism. Her arguments are equally important to scholars of women's movements since they illustrate the role of political struggle in the creation of culture. In particular, Narayan documents the influence which both the women's movement and the state play in the definition of culture.

Finally, *Dislocating Cultures* also has much to offer political scientists seeking to understand political culture and Third World politics. By documenting the political struggles involved in the construction of culture, Narayan provides some new explanations for character of political culture—a factor which is often used as an independent variable by political scientists. Her observation that the construction of culture is not just an internal struggle but takes place in an international context suggests that political culture cannot be understood simply by exploring the traditions, religions, and history of individual countries. Similarly, her discussion has important implications for comparative politics. She provides a new perspective of the relationship between Western colonizers and the Third World countries. Even as she supports literatures which document the negative influence colonizers had on Third World countries, she also finds that the activities of nationalists often reinforced some of these negative effects. She also demonstrates the dynamic and strategic nature of Third World culture, which is less an independent force in the politics of these countries than it is a construction by the political forces within these countries.

In closing, the 1998 Victoria Schuck Award committee wishes to cite four books as Honorable Mentions. These are books which we believe will also make major contributions to the discipline of women and politics. They are (in alphabetical order) Elizabeth Busiere (*Dis*)Entitling the Poor: The Warren Court, Welfare Rights, and the American

Political Tradition (Penn State Press); Cathy Cohen, Kathleen B. Jones, and Joan C. Tronto (Editors) *Women Transforming Politics: An Alternative Reader* (New York University Press); Mary Lyndon Shanley and Uma Narayan (Editors) *Reconstructing Political Theory: Feminist Perspectives* (Penn State Press); and Iris Marion Young *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy and Policy* (Princeton University Press).

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$5,000)

For the best book published in the United States during 1997 on government, politics, or international affairs.

Award Committee: Larry M. Bartels, Princeton University, chair; Kristen Renwick Monroe, University of California, Irvine; and Jack L. Snyder, Columbia University

Recipient: Gary W. Cox, University of California, San Diego

Book: *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems* (Cambridge University Press)

Citation: *Making Votes Count* is an intellectual *tour de force* combining the best features of traditional comparative studies and contemporary formal analysis. Given the amount and variety of political science scholarship in the past half-century devoted to the operation and effects of electoral systems, one would hardly expect a new book on this topic to provide pathbreaking insights and evidence; but Gary Cox's new book does just that. Along the way, it validates, modifies, or generalizes much of what came before, providing a beautiful example of cumulative social science in action.

Making Votes Count provides a comprehensive synthesis of previous scholarship on electoral laws, candidate entry, and strategic voting stemming from the seminal contribution of Maurice Duverger. It also summarizes and extends much of the theoretical and empirical work on electoral systems that Cox himself has published in scholarly articles over a period of several years. Cox characterizes the number of viable parties under alternative electoral rules, clarifying and generalizing "Duverger's Law." His empirical analysis distinguishes unusually clearly between the specific effects of electoral laws and the more general effects of political culture on party systems—a notable weak point in most

previous studies of electoral systems. He also examines how the preferences and expectations of political actors may lead to failures of coordination, with major parties or factional groupings breaking apart or failing to coalesce in the first place.

One of Cox's most important achievements is to find conceptual unity in the apparently distinct problems faced by voters, politicians, and architects of electoral systems. His game-theoretic focus on "strategic coordination" highlights the fact that strategic voting by citizens and strategic entry by parties or candidates are simply two aspects of the single, fundamental problem of "making votes count." Since electoral laws define the rules of the game in which these actors are situated, strategic analysis must incorporate a firm grasp of institutional arrangements and their implications—and successful institutional engineering must incorporate a firm grasp of how voters and politicians are likely to behave under alternative electoral arrangements.

Cox provides powerful analyses of the theoretical properties of alternative electoral arrangements, and equally powerful empirical analyses of their effects in practice. He presents complex theoretical arguments with admirable clarity, keeping the sophisticated formal analysis underlying those arguments firmly in the background. And he draws empirical examples from an impressive variety of political systems, including Japan, Britain, Colombia, and Germany. An appendix provides systematic data on electoral institutions in 77 democracies, a sampling from a more extensive data set contained in the Lijphart Election Archive, a website initiated and maintained by Cox at the University of California, San Diego.

Reading a wide range of the best political science produced in a single year was, for us, a stimulating educational experience. Having been struck once again by the diversity and richness of our discipline, we are delighted to honor a book that is itself impressively diverse and rich. *Making Votes Count* exemplifies much of what is right with contemporary political science.

CAREER AWARDS

John Gaus Award (\$1,500)

The John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer Award Honors the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more gener-

ally, recognizes and encourages scholarship in public administration.

Award Committee: Lois Recascino Wise, Indiana University, chair; James P. Pfiffner, George Mason University; and Nicole Mayor de Montricher, CNRS/Paris

Recipient: Louis C. Gawthrop, University of Baltimore

Citation: Louis C. Gawthrop's professional career is marked by an exemplary contribution of intellectually challenging scholarship in the finest tradition of political science and public administration. Throughout his career he has participated in activities to enhance the status of the field and promote rigorous scholarship in public administration. The John Gaus award honors these contributions. In the late 1960s and early 1970s Professor Gawthrop published three well-received works in succession that established him as a leader in the field of public administration research.

His writings on the role of bureaucracy in democracy are staples in the field influencing a generation of scholars and students of public administration. For example, *Bureaucratic Behavior in the Executive Branch: An Analysis of Organizational Change*, published in 1969, offered the field an analytical framework for understanding how, why and under what circumstances public organizations succeed or fail in implementing change. He captured the dynamics of bureaucratic behavior by highlighting the similarities and differences between public and private organizations in the way they manage decision making, internal tension, and respond to changes in their internal and external environments. His edited book, *The Administrative Process in Democratic Theory*, published in 1970, provided a framework for thinking about how well suited government bureaucracies are to the task of responding to the preferences and needs of a democratic society. Gawthrop provided extensive interpretive analysis of the broad range of leading scholarly writing presented in the volume. *Administrative Politics and Social*

Change, published in 1971, developed and refined his analysis of the way administrative theory reconciles the twin concerns of efficiency and social equity. As Robert Durant noted, Gawthrop "... formulated and put forward ways that these competing values might be reconciled in the maelstrom of social unrest that characterized the era." Professor Gawthrop's book, *Public Sector Management, Systems and Ethics*, published in 1984, combines his long standing interest in ethics and values with

management systems in a way that was described by reviewers as "unique and brilliant." He puts forward the argument that by integrating general systems theory and an ethical perspective, public organizations can be redesigned to respond to the increasing complexity that characterizes their external environments. In presenting and analyzing a range of organizational designs, he brings the reader to the realization that existing systems must be rethought and redesigned to meet the demands for innovation and invention that characterize contemporary public management. It is a classic work in organizational theory. These themes are developed in numerous journal articles and essays. His new work, *Public Service and Democracy: Ethical Imperatives for the 21st Century*, argues for recognition of the ethical-moral values that pervade democracy and develops the linkage between these value systems and contemporary demands for public management reform. "The value vision of democracy," Gawthrop states, "must serve as the lifeblood of the entrepreneurial spirit. . . ." George Fredrickson calls the work a signal contribution to our understanding of the moral foundations of administration in democratic government." And Donald Kettl describes it as ". . . a work with an unparalleled richness" and "A great achievement."

A prime example of Professor Gawthrop's efforts to promote scholarship in the field of public administration is seen in his stewardship of the *Public Administration Review*. During his tenure as editor in chief from 1977 to 1984, he endeavored to enhance the quality of the journal by emphasizing the peer review process and publishing methodologically diverse but rigorous manuscripts. Under his leadership the journal provided a forum for work from a range of subjects and perspectives that met high standards of research. He produced the journal's first cumulative index of research articles as well as a six volume series of classic research in public administration, which are invaluable to both scholars and students. Gawthrop used *PAR*'s "Professional Stream" and "Manager's Forum" in creative ways to respond to the perennial tension between academics and practitioners in public administration. At the same time, he sought to attract comparative and international readers to the *Public Administration Review* and expand the relevance of the journal beyond the North American experience to countries where public administration was still a fledging field.

His efforts to bridge the gap between scholars of public administration in the US with colleagues abroad were capped by being named visiting Distinguished Tinbergen Professor at Erasmus Univer-

sity in 1993. It is noteworthy that his career is punctuated by numerous visiting professorships and fellowships that reflect the way he has managed his career to prioritize scholarship and the pursuit of knowledge. As a scholar he has probed the challenging and important questions at the core of public administration. Louis Gawthrop is indeed a person whose scholarship and service have made outstanding contributions to the field of public administration and whose career serves as an example for others.

Ithiel de Sola Pool Award (\$1,500)

Presented triennially to a scholar selected to explore the implications of research on issues of politics in a global society.

Award Committee: Marion R. Just, Wellesley College, chair; Jarol Manheim, George Washington University; and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Recipient: W. Lance Bennett, University of Washington

Citation: Ithiel de Sola Pool made prodigious contributions to the field of political science. He pursued a wide range of topics with scientific rigor, spurred by curiosity and girded with courage. His work in politics, political behavior and political communication are classics, continually, and often, startlingly relevant today. Ithiel Pool was fascinated with technology both in its applications to social life and to social research. He was one of the innovators of the methods of content analysis and worked tirelessly to develop a computer program that would analyze both numbers and words. The program was eventually launched as Data-Text and was the first widely used statistical computer package in social science.

Lance Bennett shares many qualities with Ithiel Pool. He too began his studies with political theory, moved on to political behavior, and specialized in political communication. He too has been an innovator in the methods of content analysis. Like Ithiel Pool, Lance Bennett has been a fearless scholar, unafraid of tackling tough subjects or cherished icons. His work is dedicated to understanding and reinvigorating contemporary democracy.

Bennett received his Ph.D. with distinction from Yale in 1974. That year he received the E.E. Schattschneider Award of the American Political Science Association for the best dissertation in American politics. He then returned to the West Coast and to join the faculty of the

Department of Political Science at the University of Washington, where he has remained ever since. He has served as chair of the Department and holds adjunct appointments in the Departments of Speech Communication and the School of Communications. Lance Bennett recently completed a term as chair of the Political Communication Section of the American Political Science Association.

Bennett is a prolific scholar. In the past twenty years he has written more than forty articles and book chapters and eight books, including two widely used texts on public opinion and American politics. His research spans the fields of American politics, law, comparative politics, and foreign policy. Bennett's writing is marked by a simplicity, elegance and a point of view which makes it appealing both to specialist scholars and undergraduates.

One of Bennett's early and enduring concerns is how the culture shapes political understanding. His first book, *The Political Mind and the Political Environment* is fittingly subtitled, *An Investigation of Public Opinion and Political Consciousness*. That book was followed by a co-authored work with Martha Feldman: *Reconstructing Reality in the Courtroom: Justice and Judgment in American Culture*. Most recently, Bennett returned to this theme in a comparative study with Erik Asard on *Democracy and the Marketplace of Ideas: Communication and Government in Sweden and the United States*.

Centered in the academic tradition of political rhetoric, Bennett led a team of scholars in studying political communication around the time of the Gulf War. He and Jarol Manheim won the McGannon Communication Policy Award for Social and Ethical Relevance for one part of that study: "Taking the Public by Storm: Information, Cuing and the Democratic Process in the Gulf Conflict."

While much of Bennett's work is draws on broad patterns of language and symbolism, he was also an innovator in the field of electronic content analysis. His first use of the technique resulted in a study about environmental pollution: "News Icons and the Mainstreaming of Social Change." He developed the concept of news icons in a subsequent article "Media Agency and the Use of Icons in the Agenda Setting Process."

Bennett's work has always been a little ahead of the curve. He was one of the first to challenge the press in the post-Watergate era in his book *News: The Politics of Illusion*. In that study Bennett's rhetorical analysis of news shows why the values that shape journalism make news such an unsatisfying a tool of civic education. The book is in its

third edition, each more powerful and, sadly, more convincing than the last. His concluding recommendations call on citizens not only to be skeptical, but to take responsibility for their understanding.

His book on *The Governing Crisis: Media, Money, and Marketing in American Elections* was equally prescient when first published in 1992. In it, Bennett draws together arguments from rhetoric, practical politics, and political behavior to explain citizens increasing alienation from the political process. He argues that in the post-modern election, special interest money in politics "undermines the emergence of what can be called 'governing ideas.'" . . . "Thus," he says "the political culture has been robbed of its creative communicative potential by the imposition of packaged messages that inspire little interest, faith, or involvement from the people." Yet it is characteristic of Bennett's work, that his insights into political failure always lead to optimistic proposals for reform, arising from his deep faith in the democratic ideal.

Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

Presented each year to honor a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

Award Committee: Benjamin Ginsberg, John Hopkins University, chair; Ann Crigler, University of Southern California; and Cliff Zukin, Rutgers University

Recipient: Richard Reeves, University of Southern California

This year's choice for the Carey McWilliams award has been a major figure in American journalism for the past three decades. Reeves is a former chief political correspondent for the New York Times, a frequent contributor to the New Yorker, and a former editor of both New York magazine and Esquire. Reeves has also taught at a number of universities, and is presently a faculty member at the University of Southern California's Annenberg School. Reeves's news documentaries have won virtually every major television award. His ABC "Close-Up" production, "Lights, Camera, Politics," was awarded an Emmy. His "Frontline" production, "Struggle for Birmingham," received a Columbia-DuPont Award for best network documentary. His film "Red Star Over Khyber," won a George Foster Peabody award. Reeves is, perhaps, best known to political scientists for several excellent books. Reeves' work has focused on the

presidency, examining the relationship between the 'institution and its occupants. His books include *A Ford, Not a Lincoln* (1975), *The Reagan Detour* (1985), and most recently *Running in Place: How Bill Clinton Disappointed America*. Taken together, Reeves' books, news articles and documentary films exemplify the sort of journalism that the McWilliams prize was established to honor. Reeves' work combines the political sensibility of a first-rate scholar with the investigative and communications skills of an outstanding journalist. We are proud to add his name to the list of McWilliams award recipients.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500)

Presented each year in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Award Committee: Milton C. Cummings, Jr., John Hopkins University, chair; Jerrold M. Post, George Washington University; and William A. Diaz, University of Minnesota

Recipient: Rep. Lee Herbert Hamilton (D-IN), United States Congress

In a long, full, and distinguished career, Congressman Lee Herbert Hamilton has exhibited the sustained commitment to public service which the career of Hubert H. Humphrey exemplified.

An honors graduate at DePauw University in his home state of Indiana, Congressman Hamilton then studied at Goethe University in Frankfurt, Germany, and at the University of Indiana's School of Law, where he received the J.D. degree in 1956. Eight years later, Congressman Hamilton, a Democrat, was first elected to the House of Representatives, in 1964. He has since been reelected by his constituents in southeastern Indiana to sixteen more consecutive terms in Congress, rising to his position in 1997 as the sixth ranking member of the House of Representatives.

In his first term in the House, in 1965, Congressman Hamilton joined a large class of newly elected Democratic House Members who passed the far-reaching legislative program of the Johnson Administration, including Medicare. Ten years later, the Congressman joined another new class of reform-minded legislators who brought about significant changes in the working rules of the House. Still later in 1992, Congressman Hamilton, who has always taken a perceptive and forward-looking interest in the internal workings of the House, served as co-chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Initially, a majority of Congressman Hamilton's colleagues in the House resisted his far-sighted proposals for change; but eventually, many of the reform proposals of that committee also were adopted. In addition, the Congressman served as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in 1989-1990.

It is, however, for his leadership in the field of foreign relations that Representative Hamilton will most fully be remembered. As a major political figure in the Democratic House in the decade before the 1994 election, Congressman Hamilton was chairman of the Intelligence Committee in 1985-1987, House chairman of the Iran-Contra Committee in 1987-1988, and chairman of the Committee on International Relations in 1993-1995. He was a leader among

American foreign policy experts in identifying weapons proliferation as a major world problem; and he gained a reputation as a thoughtful legislator who focused attention on the long-range, fundamental problems of international relations, as well as the short-term crises of foreign policy making. He once listed among his major foreign policy goals "the fight against hunger, disease, and rapid population growth." During his final ten years of service in the House, few observers were surprised when Representative Hamilton was seriously considered by two Democratic presidential nominees as a potential vice-presidential running mate.

During the early years of his own career, Representative Hamilton was a congressional colleague of Senator Humphrey for a total of seven years. In the years that followed that professional association, Congressman Hamilton's own career has flowered into a record of distinguished public service of which Senator Humphrey himself would be proud. It is with both pleasure and pride that the American Political Science Association confers upon Lee Herbert Hamilton the Hubert H. Humphrey Award for 1998.

APSA Publications List

*Available from Customer Services Department, University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106; phone, (800) 521-0600.

PERIODICALS

American Political Science Review. The leading quarterly journal for scholarly articles and book reviews in political science. Subscription cost is included in APSA membership. Back issues: \$25 per copy.

PS: Political Science and Politics. A quarterly journal of Association news and political analysis. *PS* is the single best source for information on professional opportunities. Subscription cost is included in APSA membership. Back issues: \$10 per copy (\$15 for June issue which includes a preliminary Annual Meeting program); \$40 per volume.

The Political Science Teacher. Stimulating quarterly magazine on education, curriculum, and teaching. Fall 1990 was the last separate issue of *The Teacher*. **Beginning in with the March 1991 issue, *The Teacher* has been incorporated into *PS*.**

DIRECTORIES

APSA Directory of Members, 1997–99 (1997). A triennial listing of the names, addresses, current positions, institutional affiliations, highest degrees, and fields of specialization of APSA individual members. Specialized indexes make it easy to locate political scientists by minority status, geographic location, and research interest. \$50, APSA members; \$75, non-members.

Graduate Faculty and Programs in Political Science, 1998–2000 (1998). A listing of over 300 Ph.D. and M.A. programs in political science in the United States and Canada. Each program description includes information about available specializations, tuition and financial aid, admissions data, enrollment statistics, degree requirements, degrees awarded, and lists of faculty along with each faculty member's name, highest degree, fields of specialization, and current position. \$24, APSA student members; \$35, regular members; \$60, nonmembers.

Directory of Undergraduate Political Science Faculty, 1996–98 (1996). A triennial listing of undergraduate, degree-granting departments of political science in the United States. Each department description includes addresses and phone numbers, and the names and specializations of member faculty. \$25, APSA members; \$40, nonmembers.

APSA Directory of Women of Color in Political Science (1997). A first-time, comprehensive listing of women of color in political science, which gives names, addresses, phone numbers, highest degrees, and fields of specialization. \$6.

APSA Directory of Political Science Departmental Chairpersons, 1997–98 (1997). Annual listing of the names and addresses of chairpersons of undergraduate political science degree-granting departments at four-year institutions. \$20, APSA members; \$25, nonmembers.

INDEXES

Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, 1906–68. \$6.50*.

Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, 1969–95. Keyword index to all articles published in *APSR* between 1969 and 1995. \$25.

Cumulative Index to the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting. Keyword index to all papers included in the proceedings of the APSA Annual Meeting between 1904 and 1912 and 1956 and 1970. \$18.50*.

SYLLABI COLLECTION

The Political Science Course Syllabi Collection. The Course Syllabi Project compiles syllabi for reference and adaptation by departments, faculty, and teaching assistants designing courses. \$12 each.

Introduction to International Relations (1991), edited by Linda Brady

American Government and Politics

(1991), edited by Marjorie R. Hersey
Introduction to Political Theory (1992),

edited by Peter G. Stillman
Introduction to Political Science (1992),

edited by John C. Wahlke
Comparative Politics (1998), edited by

Frank L. Wilson
Public Law (1992), edited by Leif H.

Carter
Methodology (1992), edited by John R.

Freeman and W. Phillips Shively
Public Administration (1992), edited by

Naomi Lynn
Political Behavior (1992), edited by

Nancy H. Zingale
Women and Politics (1996), edited by

Sally J. Kennedy
Capstone Course/Senior Seminar (1992),

edited by Ronald Kahn
Public Policy (1998), edited by

Thomas A. Birkland

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

SETUPS: American Politics (Supplementary Empirical Teaching Units in Political Science). Computer-related instructional materials designed to help students gain an appreciation of specific substantive topics while simultaneously learning general analytic methods.

Presidential Popularity in America (1982), by Stephen Frantzich. Contact APSA for price information.

American Voting Behavior in Presidential Elections 1972 to 1992 (1995), by Charles Prysby and Carmine Scavo.

\$10 (paper); 20% discount on orders of 25 or more copies.

Voting Behavior: The 1988 Election (1989), by Charles L. Prysby and Car-

mine Scavo. \$8; 20% discount on orders of 25 or more copies.

Voting Behavior: The 1992 Election (1993), by Charles Prysby and Carmine Scavo. \$8.75 (paper); 20% discount on orders of 25 or more copies.

Voting Behavior: The 1996 Election (1997), by Charles Prysby and Carmine Scavo. \$11.50, ICPSR members; \$14.50, non-ICPSR members.

Financing Congressional Campaigns (1988), by Clyde Wilcox. \$8; 20% discount on orders of 25 or more copies.

Women and American Politics: A Series of Instructional Units (1988). These monographs, designed for use in undergraduate courses, can be used individually to augment textbooks, or collectively to provide the basis for a course on women and politics. \$6.50 each, discounts available on large orders.

Women and American Politics in the United States, by Mary Lyndon Shelly with an "Introduction" and "Epilogue" by Shelby Lewis. This unit introduces readers to the relationship between the philosophy of feminism and American politics. It contains a history of women's political activities and of feminist ideology in the U.S., along with a series of documents that serve as the primary sources for the reconstruction of that history. Currently out of print, contact APSA for reprint permission.

Women, Political Action, and Political Participation, by Virginia Sapiro. This work focuses on women's opportunities for activism, communication and influence, as well as how women have united in effective organizations devoted to political action and electoral participation. Out of print, contact APSA for reprint permission.

Women's Movements: Organizing Change, by Joyce Gelb and Ethel Klein. This monograph gives an in-depth look at women's social movements aimed at affecting social change. Special focus is given to how such groups build and maintain the resources, organizational structures, leadership groups, and devoted constituencies they need to achieve their goals.

Women in the Judicial Process, by Beverly B. Cook, Leslie F. Goldstein, Karen O'Connor, and Susette M. Talarico. In this monograph, the authors look at women's experiences in the judicial system. The authors intend their work to give students an appreciation for how the American judicial system works and how women have fared when confronting that system.

Women and Power in American Politics, by Milda K. Hedblom. This unit discusses the changes that justify a separate study of women and politics and the special study of women as power

holders. It goes on to analyze how opportunities and power are regularly and differentially distributed among women and considers the evidence that for some political purposes women may become a distinct economic and political interest group.

Lessons on the Constitution: Supplements to High School Courses in American History, Government, and Civics, by John Patrick and Richard C. Remy, with Paul Finkelman serving as consulting historical editor. Published jointly by Project '87 and the Social Science Education Consortium. \$18.95 (with discounts available for large orders) from SSEC Publications, 855 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302.

Ideas of the Founders on Constitutional Government: Resources for Teachers of History and Government (1991), developed by John Patrick. Published jointly by Project '87 and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, the collection contains nine essays based on historical documents that explore the constitutional thought of the Founders. Each essay is accompanied by teaching plans for teachers and exercises for students. \$12 each; 10% discount on orders of 10 to 20 copies; 20% discount on orders of 20 or more copies.

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

Personnel Services Newsletter. A monthly listing of positions for political scientists. APSA members only; \$35 in the U.S., \$60 outside the U.S.

Careers and the Study of Political Science: A Guide for Undergraduates (5th ed., 1994). Discusses how the knowledge and skills political science majors acquire can benefit them as they pursue careers in law, government, business, journalism, and teaching. \$3.50 each (plus \$1 p&h); discounts available for large orders.

Storming Washington: An Intern's Guide to National Government (4th ed., 1994), by Stephen Frantzich. A handy students' guide for finding, planning, and enjoying internships in Washington, DC. \$6 each (plus \$1 p&h); discounts available for large orders.

Political Science: An Ideal Liberal Arts Major. A brief description of the benefits students derive from majoring in political science. This brochure also contains information on career opportunities for political science majors. Single copy free; \$15, 25 copies; \$25, 50 copies; \$40, 100 copies; \$150, 500 copies; \$250, 1000 copies.

Earning a Ph.D. in Political Science (1994). Advice useful for those considering advanced study in political science. Single copy free; \$20 first 25 copies and \$10 for every additional block of 25 copies.

ANNUAL MEETING PUBLICATIONS

Annual Meeting Program. Final program for the previous year's annual meeting, includes registration forms for the following year's meeting. \$15.

APSA Annual Meeting Papers. Hard copies of papers presented at the Annual Meetings. \$15 each*.

APSA Annual Meeting Proceedings. Microfilm reels of all papers presented at Annual Meetings and collected by APSA, grouped by year. Contact UMI* for price information for reels for 1904-13 and 1956-76; \$179.20, 1977-82*; \$158.50, 1983*; \$166.20, 1984*; \$174.60, 1985*.

RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL GUIDES

Political Science: The State of the Discipline II (1992), edited by Ada W. Finifter. A collection of research essays in all major fields of the discipline prepared by the world's leading political scientists. The collection is an attempt to capture the current content of the discipline and provide a touchstone for expanding its boundaries. \$30, APSA members; \$45, nonmembers.

The Style Manual for Political Science (1984). Prepared by the editor of *APSR* working in consultation with the editors of 25 other political science journals, this guide to manuscript preparation has become the standard for discipline. \$2, APSA members; \$4, nonmembers. Add

\$1 p&h for all orders of single copies; discounts available for large orders.

Getting Published in Political Science Journals: A Guide for Authors, Editors, and Librarians (4th ed., 1997), edited by Fenton Martin and Robert Goehlert. A listing of over 100 journals in political science. Each listing identifies the journal's field(s) of specialization, requirements for submitting manuscripts, procedures for reviewing manuscripts, and rates of manuscript submission and acceptance. \$18, APSA members; \$35, nonmembers.

A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science (2nd ed., 1991). A handbook of principles guiding the professional conduct of political scientists. \$4, APSA members; \$6, nonmembers. Add \$1 p&h for all orders of single copies; discounts available for large orders.

Guide to Federal Funding for Social Scientists (1990). A multidisciplinary directory of over 200 federal programs that offer research support in the form of grants, fellowships, and contracts. Program listings include contact information, budgets, application procedures, and deadlines. \$10.

MISCELLANEOUS

APSA Survey of Political Science Departments (1997). Annual report of the results of a survey conducted on all four-year institutions offering degrees in political science. Data presented include faculty salaries, enrollment trends, and persistence rates. \$20.

Simple Simulations II (1980), edited by Charles Walcott. A collection of 24 instructional games and simulations spanning all major areas of political science. \$3 (plus \$1 p&h).

MAILING LISTS

APSA Membership mailing lists and labels. Contact APSA for ordering and pricing information.

APSA Political Science Department Chairpersons mailing labels. Contact APSA for ordering and pricing information.

PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

(Orders must be prepaid)

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____ APT. _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

Please list publication titles: _____ \$ Price

Total Merchandise _____

U.S. bankdraft on U.S. Bank only. Add postage & handling _____

No foreign funds accepted.

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE _____

APSA accepts Mastercard or Visa. Mastercard / Visa (circle one)

Card No. _____ Expiration Date _____

Signature _____ Daytime Phone () _____

Mail order form to:
Member Services/APSA
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1206
(202) 483-2512

SHIPPING AND HANDLING: (Unless otherwise indicated in list)*

Up to \$30.00.....	\$ 4.00
\$30.00 to \$100.00.....	\$ 6.00
\$100 to \$200.00.....	\$10.00
Over \$200.00.....	\$15.00

*Contact the APSA for rates for expedited shipping (number above). Foreign and Canadian orders will be sent surface mail unless otherwise requested. Rates for overseas air mail triple.

PS Index to Quarterly Features

PS publishes lists and reports as follows:

List	Issue	List	Issue
AAUP and CAUT Censure Lists	September	APSA Publications List	Quarterly
Annual Meeting Preliminary Program	June	APSA Rules for the Annual Business Meeting and Association Elections	June
APSA Awards and Recipients, Cumulative List (every 3 years beginning 1984)	December	APSA Treasurer's Report	December
APSA Committees	March	APSR Managing Editor's Report	December
APSA Constitution & Bylaws (every two years beginning 1986)	June	Organized Sections Update	December
APSA Executive Director's Report	September	PS Index of Authored Articles	March

Check *PSonline* for current lists of political science associations in the U.S. and abroad.

PS welcomes items for its professional sections. Submissions should be made in the PS format, whenever possible.