

Notes from the Editors

In this issue we start with three articles that focus on women and politics. Although we do not publish special issues (and what appears in each issue really depends on the manuscripts we receive), we are very fortunate to be able to publish together three articles that address different aspects of women and politics. These pieces approach the topic from different epistemological angles, and represent different subfields in the discipline. We are very pleased to be able to highlight, collectively, as our “lead articles” the first three pieces in this issue.

In this issue of the *Review*, as with previous issues, we present articles that ask important questions for both scholars and practitioners, such as: How do women political activists develop? From where does the gender gap in political ambition emerge? What is the source of the gender gap in political ambition? Do quotas as they are currently constructed really work to alleviate the gender gap in politics? What were the real lessons about education (including differing educations for young men and young women) from Rousseau’s *Emile*? What are the effects of terrorism on political attitudes? Are state governments really responsive to the political preferences of voters? Does coopting local elites effectively deal with insurgencies (a topic very much being discussed these days given the recent events regarding the Sunni uprising in Iraq)? And finally, what really causes state repression?

As always, we seek to publish work that speaks to a broad audience of scholars, and on topics that also may have important implications for policy makers and practitioners as well. Further, in keeping with our vision of the *Review* as the leading journal in our discipline, we seek (and will continue to seek) to publish the most innovative work in the field.

In this Issue

Our first three articles constitute the “collective lead” articles for this issue. Thus our cover reflects the historical importance of women activists, the role that gender socialization plays in political behavior, and whether the way in which policy makers have thought about quotas is the most effective way to deal with the gender gap.

In “**When Canvassers Became Activists: Antislavery Petitioning and the Political Mobilization of American Women,**” Daniel Carpenter and Colin D. Moore engage in meticulous and detailed historical research. Employing a data set based on thousands of antislavery petitions that were sent to Congress in the first half of the 19th century, they find that women who engaged in the simple act of walking door to door to collect signatures on antislavery petitions gained political skills and networks that facilitated their later activism for women’s political rights. The women who served as canvassers did so at a time when few avenues for

political activism were open to them. Perhaps for this reason, the act of canvassing became a crucial training ground for these women’s later political activism.

Today, gender differences in political ambition persist, and Richard L. Fox and Jennifer L. Lawless investigate when and why this gap emerges in “**Uncovering the Origins of the Gender Gap in Political Ambition.**” They survey high school and college students, and find that there are gender differences in political ambition among both groups. However, they also find that the gender gap in political ambition widens considerably during the college years. Although they allow that they must be careful in the interpretation of their findings because they do not have panel data, they venture an explanation for the fact that the gender gap in political ambition widens during the college years.

The use of quotas to address the underrepresentation of women in legislatures has become the subject of criticism from people on either end of the ideological spectrum. What would likely happen if the target population for quotas was shifted to men? In “**Quotas for Men: Reframing Gender Quotas as a Means of Improving Representation for All,**” Rainbow Murray provides a provocative answer to this question. In doing so, Murray calls for a normative shift in thinking toward the problem of overrepresentation, arguing that “the quality of representation is negatively affected by having too large a group drawn from too narrow a talent pool.”

In “**The Illustrative Education of Rousseau’s Emile,**” John T. Scott uses the engravings Rousseau commissioned for his educational treatise/novel to uncover some of the hidden secrets of the work. Scott shows that Rousseau, who dictated the content of the graphics in great detail, uses them to deepen the reader’s understanding of the lessons of *Emile*. The engravings all use subjects from ancient mythology, but sometimes alter the mythic story in depicting it. The differences between the original myth and Rousseau’s use of it are instructive in each case. Within *Emile*, Scott shows how Rousseau creates a dynamic relationship between image and text, and between both and the reader. By drawing all these threads together, Scott gives us a deeper appreciation of the genius of Rousseau’s work.

“**The Politics of Precedent in International Law: A Social Network Approach**” examines the element of politics found in appeals to international tribunals and international law. Focusing on trade disputes, Krzysztof J. Pelc finds that while nations often initiate disputes for domestic political reasons, they sometimes do so in order to set precedents. It is often maintained that precedent has no force in international law, but Pelc finds that nations deliberately use disputes to create precedents that they may rely on later. Using an original data set that portrays trade rulings as a network, he illustrates that nations sometimes bring minor cases

in order to pave the way for favorable rulings in later, higher-stakes disputes.

Scott Ashworth and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita ask a provocative question and present a thought-provoking theory in **“Is Voter Competence Good for Voters?: Information, Rationality, and Democratic Performance.”** The authors contend that the literature on voting behavior does not sufficiently take into consideration that voters react to the incentives placed before them by the (anticipated) behavior of politicians. Through a series of formal models, complemented by highly readable arguments that explain their logic, the authors show that knowledge about the candidates and the issues sometimes benefits the voters and at other times does not. In other words, Ashworth and Bueno de Mesquita suggest that whether it is good to be a well-informed voter is contingent upon the strategic interaction between voters and politicians.

In **“Terrorism and Voting: The Effect of Rocket Threat on Voting in Israeli Elections,”** Anna Getmansky and Thomas Zeitzoff investigate the effect of living within the range of rocket fire on voting behavior. They use data from several subsequent Israeli elections during a period in which the rocket range extended to additional areas. This allows the authors to observe the impact on voters who had not previously been exposed to this form of terrorism. They find that right-wing parties gain vote share in areas that are in the rocket range, irrespective of incumbency. The authors conclude that this shift suggests that voters who live under the threat of terrorism (in the form of rocket attacks) are, as a result, more likely to elect candidates who are less willing to make concessions. This, in turn, contributes to the continuation of the conflict.

How responsive and intentional are local governments to the ideological preferences of their citizens? How do various institutional structures that exist in municipal governments help to explain policies enacted? In **“Representation in Municipal Government,”** Chris Tausanovitch and Christopher Warshaw answer these questions using a multilevel regression and poststratification (MRP) model to measure the mean policy conservatism in every U.S. city and town with a population above 20,000 people. They find that the policies enacted by local policy makers usually correspond with the liberal-conservative positions of their citizens and that the institutional structure has little consistent impact.

Jeremy Ferwerda and Nicholas L. Miller in **“Political Devolution and Resistance to Foreign Rule: A Natural Experiment”** address a central question in the literature on foreign occupation and insurgency (a very timely piece particularly in the wake of the occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan and recent events in Iraq): Do foreign occupiers face less resistance when they increase the level of native governing authority? Using a natural experiment (and an original data set collected from a variety of archival sources) when comparing insurgent activities in German Occupied France and Vichy-controlled areas, they provide evidence that granting political authority to the occupied populace

reduces resistance to foreign rule (the evidence is of causal effect, not just correlation). They argue that this is due to cooptation of local political elites (as opposed to dampened nationalism among the natives), and is expected only among the group to whom power is extended. They show that resistance to Germans and to the Vichy government was lower in Vichy areas than in German-controlled areas, and especially in right-wing areas in Vichy (but not in right-wing areas in German-controlled territory). The latter is evidence for what they call the “cooptation mechanism.” This is a very important piece, which demonstrates the benefits of cooptation and not repression (which has important implications for countries where one part of the population feels “occupied” by another).

What are the causes of state repression? Have political scientists been using appropriate models to investigate this? These are the questions asked by Daniel W. Hill, Jr. and Zachary M. Jones, in **“An Empirical Evaluation of Explanations for State Repression.”** They find that the confidence given to some of the most common variables in the current literature is misplaced. Moreover, they allege, current studies are based on data that themselves are tailored to fit an unreliable “standard model” of state repression, making the shortcomings of the model all but invisible to researchers. Relying on cross-validation and random forests techniques, they find that while some of the variables in the standard model perform well, others do not. Meanwhile, they identify some variables that have been largely ignored, that perform quite well. Their work promises to reshape the study of state repression going forward.

In the article **“I wld like u WMP to extend electricity 2 our village’: On Information Technology and Interest Articulation,”** Guy Grossman, Macartan Humphreys, and Gabriella Sacramone-Lutz address how access to information technology lowers the threshold for the poor in communicating with politicians. Contrary to the long-held belief that technology largely benefits the privileged, they find that access to information communication technology (ICT) increases participation in politics by marginalized groups. Using the case of Uganda, the authors demonstrate that by lowering the cost of ICT, access to communication channels increases dramatically for marginalized populations.

Finally, Xiaobo Lü and Pierre F. Landry in **“Show Me the Money: Interjurisdiction Political Competition and Fiscal Extraction in China”** make a very interesting argument regarding competition among local elites in an authoritarian regime, in this case China. They argue that competition in authoritarian regimes between county apparatchiks engenders a specific logic for taxation. Promotion-seeking local officials are incentivized to signal loyalty and competence to their principals through tangible fiscal revenues. The more officials there are the more intense the competition and as a result, higher taxation. However, there is a point at which there are too many officials to be accountable, which leads to lower taxation due to shirking. The authors employ a unique panel data set of all Chinese county-level jurisdictions from 1999 to 2006, and find strong support for their arguments.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

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

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

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

institutional review and/or conformity with generally accepted norms.²

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

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

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

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

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome wide significance—taking into account

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

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

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

- all sources of multiple testing (e.g. phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

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

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—the first time it is mentioned in the text—and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, standard summary statistics (n, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided, and the reason for their inclusion discussed. However, tables and figures should also be comprehensible without reference to the text (e.g., in any figures, axes should be clearly labeled). Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

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

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

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

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text

(including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations. Do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our website. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case (e.g., [Table 3 about here]). If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal’s print specifications (e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) and review recent issues of the *APSR*.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr> and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also “oppose” potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files.
 - a) An “anonymous” digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded

should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal websites or at institutions with which any of the co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.

- b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.
4. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
 5. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication, and which may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.
 6. Charges apply for all color figures that appear in the print version of the journal. At the time of submission, contributors should clearly state whether their figures should appear in color in the online version only, or whether they should appear in color online and in the print version. There is no charge for including color figures in the online version of the *Journal* but it must be clear that color is needed to enhance the meaning of the figure, rather than simply being for esthetic purposes. If you request color figures in the printed version, you will be contacted by CCC-Rightslink who are acting on our behalf to collect Author Charges. Please follow their instructions in order to avoid any delay in the publication of your article.

Further questions

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

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE APSR

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually "moving wall"), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available online through JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/>). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

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

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

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

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

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

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

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

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

E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

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

Director of Member Services

E-mail: membership@apsanet.org

Reprint permissions:

E-mail: Rights@cambridge.org

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,

Cambridge University Press

E-mail: journals.advertising@cambridge.org

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

Class Use

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

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available

through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

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

APSR Authors

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

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

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

INDEXING

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