

## APSA Awards Presented at 2002 Annual Meeting

### DISSERTATION AWARDS

#### Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$750)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in the field of comparative politics.

*Award Committee:* Jennifer Widner, University of Michigan, chair; Steven R. Reed, Chuo University; and Oliver Woshinsky, University of Southern Maine.

*Recipient:* **Evan S. Lieberman**, Princeton University

*Dissertation:* "Payment for Privilege? Race and Space in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa"

*Dissertation Chairs:* Robert Price and Ruth Berins Collier, University of California, Berkeley

*Citation:* The Gabriel Almond Prize committee received several excellent dissertations and it deliberated long and hard. Evan Scott Lieberman, this year's winner, asks why some governments are able to develop more effective tax systems than others. Revenue collection is one of the core consequences a state must be able to carry out to survive. How it conducts this activity has important consequences for economic growth and equity. The dissertation opens with a large-N analysis of the influence of several factors on the character of tax regimes, an analysis that points to variance unexplained by purely economic variables or by international factors. To help decipher this puzzle, Lieberman conducts a careful study of variations in tax policy and administration between Brazil and South Africa, two moderate-income, late-industrializing countries, both with racial divisions and sharp inequality. Whether members of upper income brackets share a common identity shapes outcomes, Lieberman theorizes. Division produces lower rates and less efficient administration. Lieberman's brand of historical institutionalism, at work in the case studies, is more self-conscious and systematic than we usually see, and he has blended it with statistical analysis of aggregate data. The committee applauded the choice of question, the deft handling of multiple methods of investigation, and the cogent presentation.

#### William Anderson Award (\$750)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in

the general field of federalism or intergovernmental relations, or state and local politics.

*Award Committee:* Amy Bridges, University of California, San Diego, chair; Yvette M. Alex-Assensoh, Indiana University; and Denise Scheberle, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

*Recipient:* **David Stuligross**, Colgate University

*Dissertation:* "A Piece of Land to Call One's Own"

*Dissertation Chair:* Jyotirindra Das Gupta, University of California, Berkeley

*Citation:* David Patrick Stuligross has been chosen to receive the Anderson Award for the best dissertation about state politics. The dissertation is entitled "A Piece of Land to Call One's Own: Multicultural Federalism and Institutional Innovation in India," and it has many virtues.

Stuligross joins sophisticated understandings of several literatures – about social movements, institutional architecture and incentives, history of the subcontinent -- and the richness of "thick description" made possible by extensive fieldwork and conscientious listening. Stuligross constructively amends theories of social movements, the social and political uses of "culture", and federalism. Stuligross offers the most prized contribution of a social scientist, "a simple, elegant hypothesis of great explanatory value" to explain the creation of new states. The thesis is also written with grace and clarity.

Stuligross seeks to solve the puzzle of the creation of new states in India's federal government. Linguistic homogeneity has been the primary criterion for the creation of new states. Linguistic homogeneity had the advantages of limiting the number of states that could be formed, as well as providing an intuitively satisfying rationale for their creation. Over time, however, regions within existing states have become disaffected because they lack both resources for economic development and autonomy to sustain their socially distinct cultures.

State governments have been deaf to complaints because most often they are governed by plurality coalitions. State politicians have successfully won elections over long periods by relying on the slimmest of reliable pluralities. The vulnerable underbelly of that strategy is, of course, the opportunity provided to other politicians by the existence of disaffected and marginalized constituents. National parties have seized this opportu-

nity, co-opting regional activists "for their own strategic purposes" by promising new states to disaffected regional communities.

Political scientists in every sub-field will find this essay good reading for its exemplary logic, graceful prose, and close understanding of politics in India.

#### Edward S. Corwin Award (\$750)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in the field of public law.

*Award Committee:* Lee Epstein, Washington University, chair; Malcolm Feeley, University of California, Berkeley; and Keith Whittington, Princeton University.

*Recipient:* **Nancy Scherer**, University of Miami

*Dissertation:* "Making a Point: The Politicization of Lower Federal Court Appointments in the Modern Political Era"

*Dissertation Chair:* Gerald N. Rosenberg, University of Chicago

*Citation:* A, if not the, goal of most dissertations is to make a significant contribution to academic discourse. It is the rare thesis that, in addition, houses implications and serious implications at that for public policy. Nancy Scherer's falls into that unusual but certainly welcome category.

For starters, Professor Scherer tackles a question that has increasingly occupied the attention of scholars and political actors alike: Why have presidential appointments to the federal courts become so politicized? This matter intrigues academics for any number of reasons—not the least of which is a long-standing belief that the growing politicization affects the types of men and women who are selected to serve on our Nation's federal bench and, in turn, the choices they, as judges, make. We could say the same of political actors, as well as add their concern about the impact of politics on the ability of the courts to function effectively. In 1997, the Chief Justice of the United States expressed his view that whatever the size of the federal judiciary, the President should nominate candidates with reasonable promptness, and the Senate should act within a reasonable time to confirm or reject them. Some current nominees have been waiting a considerable time for a Senate Judiciary Committee vote or a final floor vote. Four years later, he felt compelled to reiterate his concern: [In 1997], President Clinton, a Democrat, made the nominations, and the Senate, controlled by the Republicans, was

responsible for the confirmation process. Now the political situation is exactly the reverse, but the same situation obtains: the Senate confirmed only 28 judges during 2001. The Senate ought to act with reasonable promptness and to vote each nominee up or down.

The problem Scherer confronts in addressing Rehnquist's specific concern, along with broader issues pertaining the appointment process, is that not one but multiple answers exist to her research question. To some analysts, the blame for the growing politicization lies with modern-day Presidents who attempt to use their power of nomination to implement their political or affirmative-action agendas; to others, the culprit is divided government which makes consensus between the White House and the Senate seemingly difficult to achieve.

Systematic analyses that are large and small in scope, that rely on quantitative and qualitative data, and that draw on primary and secondary sources lead Scherer to conclude that neither of these traditional answers is entirely satisfactory; that, rather, to understand the politicization now so evident, we ought be far more sensitive to the importance of electoral benefits. These benefits, however, do not come from the most obvious source—the electorate; they instead, according to Scherer, accrue when Senators focus on important groups within their political parties: the liberal black wing for Democrats and the conservative faction for Republicans.

The implications of this conclusion both for the future study of the federal judiciary as well as for on-going policy debates are too numerous to list here but a few suffice to make the point. One emanates from Scherer's clear and well-supported finding that significant ideological differences exist not just between Democratic and Republican-appointed judicial cohorts (as specialists have long argued) but also among judges of the same party. What this, in turn, suggests is that authors who continue to rely on the party of the appointing president as a measure of judicial policy preferences proceed at their own peril. Another finding that will, at the very least, come as a surprise to all those concerned with the politicization of judicial selection is that placing the blame with divided government is a mistake. As Scherer convincingly shows, Senates and Presidents of different parties do not result in the appointment of more "moderate" judges. The White House—in light of the Senate's limited resources to do battle with the President over each and every of the hundreds of appointments he must make—apparently feels no need to compromise its goals.

We could go on but more examples would only serve to underscore our unanimous sentiment: Professor Scherer

has not just written a dissertation of substantial merit; she also has produced a thesis that will have a substantial impact on the way policy and scholarly communities think about the politics of judicial selection, not to mention about the effect of politics on the choices judges make. Among the many outstanding dissertations we reviewed this year, Scherer's stood out as a truly distinctive and distinguished piece of work.

### **Harold D. Lasswell Award (\$750)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in the field of policy studies.

*Award Committee:* Cathie Jo Martin, Boston University, chair; Kent Weaver, The Brookings Institution; Daniel Wirls, University of California, Santa Cruz.

*Recipient:* **David H. Bradley**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

*Dissertation:* *The Political Economy of Employment Performance: Testing the Deregulation Thesis*

*Dissertation Chair:* John D Stephens, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

*Citation:* The committee is delighted to present the Harold D. Lasswell Award to David H. Bradley in recognition of his superb dissertation, that stood out as exceptional among an impressive field of contenders.

Bradley's dissertation seeks the truth about a highly-influential economic paradigm, the deregulation thesis. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development issued a deregulation manifesto in its 1994 OECD Jobs Study, that called upon countries with a high degree of labor market coordination to relax stringent job protections, to curb social spending, to permit greater wage dispersion and, thereby, to promote growth in low-wage jobs. The American employment model was envied and emulated: plagued with structural unemployment and a growing problem with social exclusion, many European countries began flirting with neo-liberal solutions. Stealing a line from Richard Nixon, even social democrats might have proclaimed, "We are all deregulators now."

Of course deregulation has enjoyed its share of detractors, yet surprisingly little solid empirical research has been conducted to evaluate the neo-liberal claims. Bradley sets out to correct this gross oversight with a novel use of pooled time-series regression analysis. Evaluating the determinants of employment, he demonstrates that many of the deregulation prescriptions have, in fact, had a positive impact on employment levels. By unpacking the taxing and spending state, Bradley offers intriguing and complicated findings, that might disappoint the

ideologue but that are certain to delight the policy analyst. For example, Bradley finds that while payroll taxes constrain job growth, the total tax burden has a positive impact on employment. In like fashion, although high unemployment benefits of a long duration impede employment, short-term generosity spurs job creation. The centralization of wage bargaining and spending on active labor market policies are also associated with higher levels of job growth. Bradley couples this sophisticated quantitative analysis of the determinants of employment with a fascinating qualitative case study of deregulation in the United Kingdom. He argues that the neo-liberal accomplishments of the Thatcher regime fell far short of satisfying expectations; indeed, even British employers felt that the reforms did little to stimulate employment growth.

Bradley's dissertation deserves widespread recognition both for its critically important ambitions and for its methodological inventiveness. With an elegant and comprehensive research design this fascinating study reveals disquieting flaws in the most influential recipe for job growth of the late Twentieth-Century. Bradley offers undeniable support that multiple paths or "varieties of capitalism" can produce rising rates of employment. This dissertation demands to be read by policy analysts, comparative political economists, welfare state scholars and, indeed, by anyone interested in the fate of advanced industrial societies.

Although no runner-up category exists, the Committee also wishes to acknowledge the excellent dissertations of Andrea Louise Campbell (from the University of California at Berkeley) and Jennifer Erkulwater (from Boston College).

### **Helen Dwight Reid Award (\$750)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

*Award Committee:* Jacek Kugler, Claremont Graduate University, chair; Michael Mastanduno, Dartmouth College; and Martha Crenshaw, Wesleyan University.

*Recipient:* **Tanisha Fazal**, Columbia University

*Dissertation:* "Born to Lose and Doomed to Survive: State Death and Survival in the International System"

*Dissertation Chairs:* Stephen D. Krasner and Scott D. Sagan, Stanford University

*Citation:* Tanisha Fazal innovative work on the death of and survival of states in world politics opens a new and exiting area of inquiry. While we know that states are not permanent entities, this is exactly

the way states have been treated by the majority of theorists. It is also clear however that permanent major changes in the distribution of capabilities across in the international system can only take place because nations die and are absorbed forcefully or voluntarily by other states.

This work centered on forceful absorptions is persuasive both because of the novel topic and the appropriate techniques utilized to explore the quarry. Hazard analysis and case studies are effectively combined to assess the prospects for state survival. Because of this careful analysis a large number of persuasive and well-established propositions are challenged. For example, Fazal's analysis rejects the persuasive argument that nations where nationalism prevails and populations can be mobilized to increase the costs of conquest are more likely to survive. Moreover, the analysis also challenges the claim that states that behave consistently with realist norms are likely to survive longer than states that violate such norms.

The most fundamental and interesting finding explored in some detail with the case studies of Poland and the Dominican Republic is that buffer states are least likely to survive. While legal norms established after 1945 ensure a modicum of safety, a buffer location remains the strongest predictor of national death. The existence of this norm is associated to the United States dominance over the international system. An important question left for further study is whether the anticipated decline of the United States and the rise of Asian challenges from China and India may alter the tenuous security established in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

We welcome this young talented scholar to the community of academics concerned with peace and stability in world politics.

### **E.E. Schattschneider Award (\$750)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in the field of American government and politics.

*Award Committee:* Frank R. Baumgartner, Pennsylvania State University, chair; Karen Hult, Virginia Tech; and Fredrick Harris, University of Rochester.

*Recipient:* **Deborah Gould**, University of Chicago

*Dissertation:* "Sex, Death, and the Politics of Anger: Emotions and Reason in ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS"

*Dissertation Chair:* William H. Sewell Jr., University of Chicago

*Citation:* The E.E. Schattschneider Award recognizes the best dissertation in the field of American Politics. This year

the committee consisted of Profs. Karen Hult of Virginia Tech and Fredrick Harris of the University of Rochester. I am Frank Baumgartner, of Penn State University, and I had the pleasure of serving as chair of the committee this year. Let me say a few things about the state of the field of American politics. It is in great shape around the graduate departments of the nation. The committee reviewed a total of 16 nominations, totaling approximately 24 inches of shelf space (or 50 pounds) of excellent work in all areas of American politics. Each of the nominated dissertations was "in the ballpark" for the award; indeed the committee had a very difficult time in deciding on its short list and in making the final selections. I would like to thank Professors Hult and Harris for their work in making these selections; we each are much better informed about the state of American politics research now than we were six months ago. I would also like to thank the dozens of professors who served on the committees of those nominated. Each thesis deserves recognition.

Two dissertations stood out as particularly insightful, important, and well researched, in our unanimous opinion, though of course we can make only one award. We would like to single out the work of Prof. Michele Swers, whose dissertation was submitted by Harvard University, for an honorable mention. This dissertation, entitled "From the Year of the Woman to the Republican Ascendancy: Evaluating the Policy Impact of Women in Congress," is an impressive work in many ways. It addresses a fundamental issue: whether the election of women to Congress has any substantive effect on legislative outcomes. It treats the issue very seriously, with extensive treatment of each stage of the legislative process. And it does so with a variety of appropriate and rigorous statistical techniques. Prof. Swers, and her committee consisting of Theda Skocpol (Chair), Sidney Verba, and John Aldrich, should be proud of this work; we can look forward to seeing much of it in print in the near future I am quite certain.

The winner of the Schattschneider Award this year is Prof. Deborah Bejosa Gould, for her dissertation entitled "Sex, Death, and the Politics of Anger: Emotions and Reason in ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS," submitted by the University of Chicago. It is especially fitting that Gould's dissertation receive the Schattschneider Award. Though much of Schattschneider's work had to do with parties, some of his most lasting work has to do with conflict expansion and the generation of political controversies. He correctly pointed to the scope of the conflict as a major determinant of the outcomes of policy disputes, and his work has been at the core of scores of future research projects, including my own.

Schattschneider pointed to conflict expansion as an important political variable, but he did not focus on the mechanisms by which conflicts are expanded or contracted. In her dissertation, Deborah Gould traces how the ACT-UP mobilized its constituency through the purposive use of anger and by carefully focusing on strong emotional responses, successfully mobilizing a community that could easily have remained quiescent, silent, and marginalized. The work simultaneously describes the particular difficulties in mobilizing the lesbian and gay community, especially in the use of confrontational tactics of political demonstration and anger. Gould relates this history to various theories of social movements, clearly pointing to the particular importance of emotions and anger in mobilizing those who might otherwise be silent. The work provides both substantive and theoretical findings that we are sure to hear more of in the future. Congratulations to Professor Gould and to her committee, consisting of William Sewell (chair), Leora Auslander, George Chauncey, and Michael Dawson.

### **Leo Strauss Award (\$750)**

For the best dissertation completed and accepted during 2000 or 2001 in the field of political philosophy.

*Award Committee:* Timothy V. Kaufman-Osborn, Whitman College, chair; Kirstie McClure, University of California, Los Angeles; and Bruce Payne, Duke University

*Recipient:* **Andreas Kalyvas**, University of Michigan

*Dissertation:* "The Politics of the Extraordinary: Max Weber, Carl Schmitt, Hannah Arendt"

*Dissertation Chair:* Jean Cohen, Columbia University

*Citation:* The 2001-02 Leo Strauss Award Committee is pleased to name Andreas Kalyvas for receipt of the award for the best dissertation in political philosophy completed and accepted in the years 2000 and 2001. His dissertation is entitled "The Politics of the Extraordinary: Max Weber, Carl Schmitt, Hannah Arendt."

The originality of Kalyvas's dissertation lies in its response to a significant lacuna in modern democratic political theory, especially in its conceptualization of what he calls the "extraordinary." In large part, liberal political theory seeks to confine the extraordinary to the founding of a constitutional order within which all politics is then construed as so much legal reform. That construction, Kalyvas argues, effectively domesticates the radical impulses of democracy and results in a form of normal politics characterized by civic privatism, the dominance of profes-

sional elites, and, in time, the generation of a legitimation deficit. Classical Marxism responded to liberalism's domestication of the political through an appeal to revolutionary transformation of the present order. That appeal, however, as Kalyvas notes, has now largely been discredited.

In an effort to articulate an alternative way to think about the relationship between democratic politics and the extraordinary, Kalyvas offers sophisticated readings of Max Weber's concept of charisma, Carl Schmitt's account of sovereignty, and Hannah Arendt's notion of action. Specifically, he asks of these authors whether it might be possible to move beyond a simplistic reform/revolution dichotomy by locating the extraordinary within the domain of everyday democratic practice. This recovery of the extraordinary, he argues, suggests how the ideal of collective autonomy might be re-installed at the heart of democratic politics, thereby countering the legitimation deficit to which contemporary constitutional orders are so often prone. The net result is an argument that suggests creative new ways of thinking about how the spirit of public freedom might be kept alive, but without necessitating a millenarian rupture from the present.

### **Leonard D. White Award (\$750)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2000 or 2001 in the field of public administration.

*Award Committee:* Roy T. Meyers, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, chair; Daniel Carpenter, Harvard University; and Barbara J. Nelson, University of California, Los Angeles.

*Recipient:* **Gregory Huber**, Yale University

*Dissertation:* "Interests & Influence: Explaining Patterns of Enforcement in Government Regulation of Occupational Safety"

*Dissertation Chair:* R. Douglas Arnold, Princeton University

*Citation:* Huber analyzes the patterns of enforcement for occupational safety regulations, an area that has been featured in the well-known theories of Congressional dominance and interest group capture of agencies. The dissertation convincingly shows the limitations of studies using these theories, either correcting them or placing them in better relief. It does so by investigating the detailed processes of regulatory implementation by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and by similar agencies in the states. Huber shows that standard operating procedures matter a great deal in the geographic allocation of enforcement resources and the outcomes of individual inspections.

Bureaucrats appear to lack sufficient discretion and desire to favor one interest over another during enforcement; instead, observed variation in enforcement is due to differences in how workers and businesses behave in the workplace. In some contrast, OSHA's delegation of authority to states occasionally allows lower enforcement stringency.

Huber makes exemplary use of numerous data sources, many of which are new. An example is the construction of a hypothetical expectation of regulatory behavior drawn from workplace safety data, which allows analysis of how this baseline might be disturbed by political factors. The text is very well-written, and the statistical presentations are both sophisticated and transparent. The analytical approaches of this dissertation promise to have useful applications with other agencies and topics.

### **PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS**

#### **Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)**

For the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during 2001.

*Award Committee:* Robert Luskin, University of Texas, Austin, chair; Charles Boix, University of Chicago; and Melissa S. Williams, University of Toronto.

*Recipient:* **Lars-Erik Cederman**, Harvard University

*Paper:* "Back to Kant: Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace as a Macrohistorical Learning Process," March 2001 *American Political Science Review*.

*Citation:* The Heinz Eulau Award Committee for 2002 is pleased to honor Lars-Erik Cederman's "Back to Kant: Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace as a Macrohistorical Learning Process," an important contribution to our understanding of the relationship between regime type and the probability of military conflict. Writing at the intersection of political philosophy and empirical political science, Cederman elucidates, models, tests, and both confirms and qualifies Kant's contention that (only) democracies gradually settle into peaceful relations with one another.

Part of Cederman's contribution is exegetic. In particular, he highlights the neglected role of learning in Kant's analysis. He also points out that what he terms "dialectics" (occasional dips in some dyads' learning curves) were anticipated by Kant as part of the learning process.

More methodologically, Cederman warns against taking single or scattered cases of democracies at war or autocracies at peace as belying causal relationship, a fallacy into which historically-minded scholars have been known to fall. Even

the best specified models contain random error, and, as Cederman argues, some of what appears in simple bivariate light to be error may actually conform to a more multivariate, contingent, dynamic, or nonlinear specification. That, his own more sophisticated analysis suggests, is the case for the democratic peace.

Empirically, Cederman's estimations of a series of Kant-inspired models imply that while the incidence of military conflict has generally declined over the past century-and-three-quarters, the decline has been steepest for democracies. The story his analyses tell is a weaker version of Kant's. All regimes, not just democracies, gradually learn the costs of military solutions, although democracies do learn faster and more thoroughly.

### **BOOK AWARDS**

#### **Ralph Bunche Award (\$750)**

For the best scholarly work in political science, published in 2001, which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Award Committee:* Luis Ricardo Fraga, Stanford University, chair; Marion Orr, Brown University; and Richard M. Valelly, Swarthmore College.

*Recipient:* **Michael Dawson**, Harvard University

*Book:* **Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies** (University of Chicago Press)

*Citation:* Michael C. Dawson's, **Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies** is the most systematic and analytical study to date of the historical origins and contemporary contours of African American political thought. His Herculean effort that critically examines the foundational writings of Black Nationalism, Black Marxism, Black Liberalism, Black Conservatism, and Black Feminism, allows us to appreciate the unique historical context within which each of these interpreted realities of African American life, and the related visions for what an improved life could be, ultimately bring us to a deeper understanding of the American polity itself. Just as significantly, Dawson's application of this history to understand the current structure of African American political thought is path breaking. Dawson allows us to see that it is critical for us to understand history, but that history is not deterministic. He finds that contemporary African American political thought is most defined by Black nationalism, disillusioned liberalism, and radical egalitarianism. He also finds that it is Black nationalism that seems to be the most consistent vision in this community throughout American

history, and although its precise form has evolved over time, its influence is clear, persistent, and most supported through the institutions underlying a black counterpublic. Perhaps most importantly, he uses these findings to challenge both African Americans and white Americans to engage in within and across group debate as to what the American Dream might truly be for all Americans. The scope of Dawson's inquiry is magnificently expansive, his analysis is systematically precise, and his conclusions are provocatively honest. All who seek to understand the ways in which race has always been a fundamental dimension defining American politics must read this important book.

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

For the best political science publication in 2001 in the field of U.S. national policy.

*Award Committee:* David T. Canon, University of Wisconsin, Madison, chair; Suzanne Mettler, Syracuse University; and James Ceaser, University of Virginia.

*Recipient:* **Daniel Carpenter**, Harvard University

*Book:* *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy* (Princeton University Press)

*Citation:* Political commentators and politicians are fond of criticizing a "runaway bureaucracy" in which unelected "faceless bureaucrats" impose their will on the public or create sub-optimal outcomes through the inefficiencies they impose on the free market. Rational choice theorists describe the principal/agent problem that characterizes the relationship between the elected institutions and the bureaucracy, which creates a complex dynamic of oversight, shirking, and compliance in the process of policy implementation. Students of public administration have long-noted the political side of bureaucratic agencies as they attempt to develop loyal constituencies for their policy outputs.

Daniel Carpenter challenges much of this conventional wisdom, while weaving aspects of it into a new theory of bureaucratic autonomy. *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy* examines policy innovation during the Progressive era to determine why the Post Office Department and the Department of Agriculture were able to impose their views on the elected institutions while the Interior Department did not enjoy such autonomy. The successful agencies were able to build reputations and create constituencies for their favored policies, which provided autonomy from interference by politicians. This book raises important questions concerning democratic theory and state development. Carpenter employs archival research, statistical analysis, and

counterfactual reasoning to build his compelling case.

### **Victoria Schuck Award (\$750)**

For the best book published in 2001 on women and politics.

*Award Committee:* Georgia Duerst-Lahti, Beloit College, chair; Pippa Norris, Harvard University; and Mary F. Katzenstein, Cornell University.

*Recipients:* **Sidney Verba**, Harvard University; **Kay Lehman Schlozman**, Boston College; and **Nancy E. Burns**, University of Michigan

*Book:* *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation* (Harvard University Press)

*Recipient:* **Joshua S. Goldstein**, American University

*Book:* *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa* (Cambridge University Press)

*Citation:* For years to come, two remarkable books published in 2001 will serve as resources on gender politics, but they also contribute well beyond this field. Both *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality and Political Participation* by Nancy Burns, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Sidney Verba and *War and Gender* by Joshua S. Goldstein, draw upon far reaching empirical sources to answer questions central to political science. Both also conceptualize a framework of considerable scope, carefully develop meaningful hypotheses, and complete nuanced and meticulous analysis that is conveyed in lucid prose. Path-breaking books, the judges unanimously agreed that these studies will be models for scholarship in the field and the inspiration for many graduate students for years to come.

Burns, Schlozman and Verba shed fresh light on some of the perennial questions at the heart of understanding gender politics. After almost a century of the franchise, why do American women continue to be less active than men in the political arena? Though the gender disparity in voluntary political activities is not enormous, its persistence and consistency remains puzzling. Any gender gap among our grandparents' generations could be explained by their formative political socialization. But today, we need to turn to other factors that might be limiting women's voices in commonplace activities such as working on community problems, contacting public officials, and joining political parties. The answer, the authors suggest, lies in gender differences in the lives of women and men in non-political institutions, such as schools, the workplace and churches. The book represents the cumulative efforts of the team that has been seeking to understand these issues over successive studies, in some cases for more than four decades.

Similarly, in the formidable scholarly work, *War and Gender*, Joshua S. Goldstein takes up the fundamentally important question of why it is almost invariably men who fight wars in the face of otherwise highly variegated political, social, and cultural contexts. In a systematic treatment of an encyclopedic quantity of evidence, Goldstein mines the fields of biology, psychology, anthropology, history, sociology, and political science. His answers point to the importance of "small, innate biological gender differences" together with the "cultural molding of tough, brave men, who feminize their enemies to encode domination." His conclusions about the mutuality of gender difference and war will lay the empirical foundation for research and teaching on gender, war, and international politics for decades to come.

### **Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$5,000)**

For the best book published in 2001 on government, politics, or international affairs.

*Award Committee:* James Caporaso, University of Washington, chair; Stephen Ansolabehere, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Mark E. Warren, Georgetown University.

*Recipient:* **Tali Mendelberg**, Princeton University

*Book:* *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality* (Princeton University Press)

*Citation:* The Committee nominates Tali Mendelberg, *The Race Card*, for the best book in political science for 2001. This book is about one of the most important issues in political science (and politics), namely race. Mendelberg's focus is on how race is communicated in the political arena, particularly political campaigns. The main thesis is that racial messages and stereotypes are most effective when implicit, provided that the dominant social norm is one of racial equality. When racial stereotyping is explicit, agents backed with the norm of equality will quickly counter racially motivated efforts. When they are implicit, the norms are not directly challenged, yet latent racial feelings are likely to be mobilized.

The force of the book lies in the skill with which Mendelberg elaborates the theoretical argument and the rigor, balance, and agility with which she puts together and interprets the evidence. The book is a prime example of the use of multiple methods, combining historical analysis, case studies, cognitive psychology, and experiments with statistical analysis. In the end, her case is utterly convincing.

We expect *The Race Card* to be read, and used, by people in American politics, race and ethnic studies, political communi-

cation, social psychology, and comparative politics. The central message of the book travels well and there is no reason the impact of the book should be restricted to race in American politics. Mendelberg spares no effort to cast the conceptual and theoretical net widely, even as she preserves a research focus on her topic. The Committee enthusiastically recommends *The Race Card* as the winner of the Woodrow Wilson Award for best book during 2001.

## CAREER AWARDS

### John Gaus Award (\$1,500)

To honor the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration. The recipient delivers the Gaus Lecture at the annual meeting.

*Award Committee:* Greg Lewis, Georgia State University, Chair; Sidney M. Milkis, University of Virginia; Steven Kelman, Harvard University; Shep Melnick, Boston College

*Recipient:* Hugh Hecl, George Mason University

*Citation:* The American Political Science Association confers the 2002 John Gaus Award on Hugh Hecl in recognition of a "lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration." The Clarence J. Robinson Professor at George Mason University and former Professor of Government at Harvard University has published widely in the areas of public administration, public policy, comparative politics and policy, and American politics. He has been deeply interested in public administration, but his writings examine issues of governance in a broad philosophical, historical, comparative, and institutional context. Amid the culture wars, institutional confrontations, and militant factionalism of the past 30 years, Hecl reveals in fascinating detail how administration has remained the central problem of modern America -- how American society has "politicized itself" and at same time "depoliticized government leadership."

His classic work, *A Government of Strangers*, won the National Academy of Public Administration's Louis Brownlow Book Award for the best book published on public administration. It is a thorough and thoughtful investigation of relations between political executives and career civil servants that is must-reading for anyone studying this important topic. His essay on "issue networks" has had a lasting impact on the discipline. His brief essay "One Executive Branch or Many?"

provides perhaps the best review written on relations between the Reagan Administration and the permanent bureaucracy.

In addition, he has written a path-breaking comparative work on social welfare policy, many essays on the politics of poverty programs, and some remarkably good essays on the public philosophy. His book *Modern Social Politics* received the Woodrow Wilson award from the American Political Science Association for the best book published in the United States during 1974 on government, politics, or international affairs. In 1976 his co-authored *Comparative Public Policy* received the Gladys Kammerer Award for the best book on national policy. In 1997 his article "The Sixties' False Dawn: Awakenings, Movements and Postmodern Policy-making," in *The Journal of Policy History*, won the award for best article in 1996 in the Politics and History Section of the American Political Science Association.

Professor Hecl is an elected member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and of the National Academy of Public Administration. He was a recipient of a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1985-86. In 2001 he was appointed to the new 12-member Academic Advisors Council serving the Librarian of Congress.

### James Madison Award (\$2,000)

Presented once every three years to a living American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science.

*Award Committee:* R. Douglas Arnold, Princeton University, chair; Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University; and Ian Shapiro, Yale University.

*Recipient:* David R. Mayhew, Yale University

*Citation:* Slowly and carefully, David Mayhew has established himself as one of the most perceptive and creative scholars studying American politics. He regularly discovers patterns in political behavior that no one noticed before. He regularly creates explanations for those patterns that are sweeping in scope and that draw on a deep knowledge of American history. He repeatedly writes elegant books that are a joy to read. His work has set the agendas for hundreds of scholars working on Congress, political parties, elections, and political development.

An early work, "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing Marginals," (*Polity*, spring 1974) supports these points. The conventional wisdom was that congressional elections were largely partisan contests. Voters knew so little about the candidates that the best they could do was to vote based on party identification or on the economic perfor-

mance of the incumbent party. Mayhew noticed that incumbents of both parties were winning reelection by larger margins — a finding that was inconsistent with previous explanations — and developed five hypotheses to explain incumbents' growing advantages. His work sparked an explosion of interest in congressional elections. The literature on congressional elections, once a backwater, is now one of the most distinguished literatures in American politics.

The same year *Congress: The Electoral Connection* revolutionized the study of Congress as an institution. Before 1974, economics-style theorizing had yet to appear in any major work on Congress; soon after 1974, it became the dominant approach. Absent this elegant book, rational choice theory would no doubt have made an impact on the study of legislatures, but it would probably have done so slowly, as it has done in the study of bureaucracies, interest groups, regulatory agencies, and the presidency. What Mayhew did was to make a case against other forms of theorizing and to show the power of rational choice theory for understanding the organization of Congress and the behavior of individual legislators.

*Divided We Govern* (1991) changed the way we think about political parties and the separation of powers in the American system. Mayhew not only demolished the conventional wisdom about political parties — that unified government was necessarily more productive than divided government — he examined a variety of alternative explanations for the patterns that he found. His ideas have sparked a lively literature about the causes of legislative productivity.

*America's Congress: Actions in the Public Sphere, James Madison Through Newt Gingrich* (2000) shows a new side to Mayhew's creativity. Here he shows how much influence real individuals have had on congressional actions — not the single-minded seekers of reelection featured in his *Electoral Connection* book, nor the stylized, anonymous, faceless individuals that populate formal theories of political institutions, but real, living and breathing politicians who are motivated by something besides reelection. Mayhew not only shows that they matter, but works to devise and test explanations for variations in the supply of these entrepreneurial politicians. The new message is simple: Single-minded seeking of reelection explains lots of the broad patterns in legislative studies, but there is much that requires theorizing from alternative assumptions about human behavior.

Mayhew has also written other important books. *Party Loyalty among Congressmen: The Difference between Democrats and Republicans, 1947-1962*

(1966) examines the differences in the coalitional structures of Democrats and Republicans in Congress. *Placing Parties in American Politics: Organization, Electoral Settings, and Government Activity in the Twentieth Century* (1986) is the definitive study of party organizations in the fifty states. *American Electoral Realignments: A Critique of the Genre* (2002) criticizes the entire notion of realignments and introduces lots of new hypotheses about the role of parties in policy making.

It is hard to think of anyone since V.O. Key who has had as great an impact on the study of political parties and political institutions as Key's most famous student, David Mayhew. Both scholars share a remarkably rare combination of theoretical ambition, careful scholarship, substantive breadth, deep expertise, and elegant writing.

### **Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)**

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

*Award Committee:* Linda L. Fowler, Dartmouth College, Chair; E. J. Dionne, The Brookings Institution; Stephen Macedo, Princeton University.

*Recipient:* **Linda Greenhouse**, *The New York Times*

*Recipient:* **Janet Hook**, *The Los Angeles Times*

*Citation:* The intense media focus on the Presidency, all the more obvious, if inevitable, since the events of September 11, often creates the impression that nothing of importance happens outside the environs of the White House. Those journalists who cover the Congress and the Supreme Court know better; and their reporting is a steady reminder that the federal government operates as a system of coequal branches sharing power.

Covering the unglamorous Congress or the enigmatic Court not only bucks current trends in journalism, but also is hard work. The two institutions use intricate procedures, wrestle with technical policy issues and often deliver ambiguous outcomes. In addition, their eventual decisions can be perplexing because of too many informants in the case of the Congress and too few in the case of the Court. Covering both institutions requires a capacity to treat seriously reasons, arguments, and deliberations, and not only bargaining and results. The beat reporters who cover these branches, therefore, must be masters of the rules of the game, keen observers of the participants and their motivations, and experts at uncovering the hidden stories and putting them in a larger context.

Linda Greenhouse and Janet Hook have covered the Court and the Congress, respectively, for many years. Noted for their professionalism and understanding of the institutions they write about, they have been a steady source of good ideas and good quotes to the scholarly community. Perhaps the most fitting testimony to their insight and reliability is the frequency with which political scientists cite their work.

A reporter at *The New York Times* since 1968, Greenhouse covered local and state politics before becoming the *Times* Supreme Court correspondent in 1978. Since then, she has developed the flair for making complex legal concepts intelligible to the public that earned her a Pulitzer Prize in 1998. Her reporting is noteworthy for the clarity with which she explains the difficult issues that come before the Justices and the implications of their decisions. In helping readers to make sense of a political institution that is at once exceptionally secretive (with respect to deliberations among the Justices) and extremely public (with respect to public justification of its decisions and dissents), Greenhouse displays sensitivity to the roles of politics and personality on the Court, without neglecting the importance of principled conviction in shaping judicial agendas.

A writer for *Congressional Quarterly* and now congressional correspondent for *The Los Angeles Times*, Janet Hook has few peers in her knowledge of Capitol Hill. Her coverage of day-to-day events, known for its accuracy and timeliness, sparkles with insight. Hook's work consistently reflects a deep knowledge of the institutions and a lively but notably noncynical sense of the strengths and foibles of those who make them run. Her longer features consistently highlight trends before they are widely noticed and, perhaps more importantly, pay close attention to how developments in Congress reflect and sometimes accelerate changes in politics and in the society politics serves. And she brings to her work both institutional memory and a knowledge of history.

Rejecting the temptation to treat politics as either a "horserace" or a scam, both journalists recognize the vital role of political institutions for a healthy democracy. Congress and the Court should not be the forgotten branches of government. Thanks to Greenhouse and Hook, they are not.

### **Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500)**

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

*Award Committee:* Bruce E. Cain, University of California Berkeley, Chair; Sarah Binder, George Washington

University; Greg Markus, University of Michigan.

*Recipient:* **Parris N. Glendening**, Governor, the State of Maryland

*Citation:* The Hubert Humphrey Award recognizes notable public service by a political scientist. This year's award recognizes an outstanding leader in state and local government. Parris Glendening is just completing a successful two terms as Governor of Maryland. His innovations in the areas of education and smart growth have been a model for other states to follow. Among his many awards, *Governing Magazine* named Governor Glendening Public Official of the Year in 2000.

Prior to becoming Maryland's 59<sup>th</sup> Governor, Dr. Parris Glendening served on the Hyattsville City Council in 1973. Elected to the Prince George's County Council in 1974, he twice served as County Council Chair before being elected County Executive for three consecutive terms from 1982-1994. Under Parris Glendening's leadership, Prince George's County was selected as an All-American County by the National Civic League, and he was personally named "Most Valuable County Official" in the nation by City and State Magazine.

In addition to his public service, Governor Glendening has had a distinguished career as a political scientist. After receiving his PhD in political science and urban administration from Florida State University in 1967, Parris Glendening took a position at the University of Maryland, where he taught political science for 27 years. In 1984, he co-authored *Pragmatic Federalism: An Intergovernmental View of American Government*, a textbook used in over 400 colleges and universities.

Parris Glendening has demonstrated by his achievements that academic knowledge added to political skill can be a formidable combination. Governor Glendening has been able to identify solutions ahead of his peers and to have the skill to implement them. He was ahead of the political curve in identifying education as a priority, increasing school funding, undertaking ambitious plans for modernizing classrooms and improving access to higher education. In the area of the environment, his Smart Growth-Anti Sprawl Initiative has become a model for other states that are trying to preserve open space, protect natural resources, invigorate urban areas and prevent suburban sprawl.

While national and international leaders normally steal the headlines, state and local leaders usually make the decisions that affect the lives of citizens most concretely. This year's Hubert H. Humphrey award recognizes the many achievements of a truly outstanding political scientist and leader in this all too frequently overlooked level of government.