

2001 Call For Papers

The 97th Annual Meeting
will convene August 30-September 2
in San Francisco, CA at the
Hilton San Francisco and Towers,
Renaissance Parc 55,
and Hotel Nikko

Program Chairs: Edward Mansfield and Richard Sisson, Ohio State University

**The deadline is
Wednesday,**

November 15, 2000

visit <http://www.apsanet.org>

Questions? Contact

APSA at 202-483-2512

or meeting@apsanet.org

2001 Call For Papers

2001 Program Call For Papers

Program Chairs:

Edward Mansfield, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, 2140 Derby Hall, 154 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210; p: 614-292-9498; f: 614-292-1146; mansfield@polisci.sbs.ohio-state.edu

Richard Sisson, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, 2140 Derby Hall, 154 North Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210; p: 614-292-9658; f: 614-292-1146; sisson@polisci.sbs.ohio-state.edu

Political science has been an interdisciplinary endeavor since its inception a century ago, and it continues to be. It then was and is now eclectic in adopting and employing perspectives and tools for inquiring into its distinctive focus and domain in the study of human behavior — the terms and conditions for the governance of political jurisdictions, the considerations of fairness in the search for accommodation among individual preferences and collective goods, and the management of engagement among sovereign jurisdictions. Political science now as then finds tension between its commitment to objective inquiry and a science of verifiable propositions and its concern with the relevance of scholarly research to the world of political action and public decision.

As the first annual meeting of the new century and as the centenary of the discipline approaches, it is fitting that at the 2001 Annual Meeting we take stock of notable scientific and theoretical achievements in the discipline. We also encourage consideration of the impact of political science research and thought on other disciplines, and of the contributions that research and thought has made to the quality of public life. The 2001 Annual Meeting should stimulate and consider agendas that prove productive in defining a new phase and in pursuing new domains of inquiry.

✳ denotes an APSA Organized Section

Division 1: Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches

Susan Shell, Boston College

The Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches Division has traditionally included ancient, medieval, modern, and contemporary theory. In addition, it has encouraged a general attitude of wishing to learn from the past, if only through a better understanding of past errors. Papers are solicited from any of these fields, with special emphasis on both the enduring questions of political philosophy and new approaches and concerns. "Historical approaches" will be understood in its broadest sense, and without prejudice as to particular theoretical orientation. Although there is no special theme for the 2001 meeting, authors may wish to address issues they consider especially germane, given present political circumstances. Such issues might include the apparent waning of the nation state, the implications of postmodernism for political life, the strengths and weaknesses of liberal democracy in the new millennium, and the character or meaning of justice in the current world. These subjects are intended only as suggestions, and do not preclude other topics and concerns. Special consideration will be given to projects that enter with critical sympathy into works of political theorists, past and present, or otherwise attempt seriously to engage their thinking. Every effort will be made to place accepted papers on panels in a manner that allows the issues they raise to be productively debated and discussed

✳ Division 2: Foundations of Political Theory *J. Peter Euben, University of California, Santa Cruz*

The division encourages panel proposals where representatives of different "schools" or approaches to political theory talk to each other rather than to themselves. The hope is to make panels less parochial and self-congratulatory and more lively. More specifically, we are interested in panels that reflect back on books written before 1975, which continue to exercise significant influence on contemporary theoretical debates or, in the opinion of people with different theoretical sensibilities, should have such influence. Finally, we invite panel proposals where political theorists talk about contemporary politics, especially when the range of theoretical reference is not just contemporary.

Division 3: Normative Political Theory *Ian Shapiro, Yale University*

Proposals for papers on all topics will be considered. However, preference will be given to those that develop constructive arguments rather than merely engage in critical commentary on the work of others, draw in creative ways on the empirical precincts of political science, or show, by argument or example, how normative political theory can contribute to, or help shape, research agendas for political scientists.

Division 4: Formal Political Theory *Randall Calvert, Washington University*

Although political scientists use mathematical and symbolic methods to advance their understanding in many substantive fields, their efforts to specify and clarify patterns in political life present technical as well as substantive problems. The Formal Political Theory Division, as always, offers opportunities for scholars to exchange questions and answers to problems of modeling, and to share new modeling approaches across the boundaries of substantive fields. The division provides a forum for modeling based on rational actors (game theory, social choice theory, decision theory, spatial modeling) and for formal work on dynamic systems, agent-based simulation models, evolutionary models, and information theory. Moreover, laboratory testing of such models in a general setting has always been an important part of the work done by formal political theorists, and the division is the traditional home for presentation of such experimental studies.

In addition to studies focusing on formal modeling techniques and their evaluation, innovative substantive analyses often find a home in the formal theory division. Recently, formal and normative theorists have begun several promising conversations on social identity, deliberation, and other topics of surprisingly mutual interest. The division invites proposals for papers, or entire panels, and hopes to offer presentations on all such topics.

Division 4: Formal Political Theory *Randall Calvert, Washington University*

Political psychology views politics as one of many domains of human behavior and uses the science of individual and social behavior, namely psychology, to inform our political analysis. In turn, the study of

politics enriches, extends, and modifies theories of human behavior that have been developed and tested in other domains. The Political Psychology Division welcomes proposals that relate political phenomena to basic principles of human personality, motivation, cognition, emotion, and social life. Many of the better known research domains in political science speak to important questions about human psychology, including political communication, public opinion, international conflict and cooperation, leader decision making, small group and bureaucratic function, and voting. We welcome submissions from scholars working in these areas as well as from those who usually think of themselves as political psychologists.

★ **Division 5: Political Psychology**
Thomas Nelson, Ohio State University

Modern political economy is a broad interdisciplinary subfield that cuts both a substantive and a methodological track across the four traditional subfields of political science—domestic, comparative, and international politics, and political philosophy and across several subfields of micro, macro, and international economics. In its methodological guise, political economy (*syn*: rational choice, formal theory) explores the application of microeconomic theories of decision making to political arenas such as voting, legislative processes, international relations, etc., and not exclusively to matters of economic politics. In substantive guise, political economy studies the multifarious roles of politics in economic policy making and outcomes and, vice versa, the roles of economic policies and outcomes in the conduct of politics, again not exclusively through application of microeconomic decision-making theory. Moreover, in either guise, originating from either discipline, and across all subfields, political economy firmly embraces both a theoretical and an empirical agenda. As many recent advances demonstrate, this *interdisciplinarity, substantive breadth, methodological diversity, and strong commitment to simultaneous theoretical and empirical development* is the intellectual strength of this emerging subfield. For example, insights gleaned from the formal study of legislative processes in the U.S. have recently fueled theoretical advances in the comparative study of legislative institutions, and, conversely, many of those insights have begun to receive more fruitful empirical exploration and theoretical advancement in comparative contexts. Similarly, recent advances in comparative and international (substantive) political economy have theoretically and empirically clarified the mutual conditionality of the effects of domestic and international institutions on economic policies and outcomes. Likewise, increasingly theoretically-informed empirical work, including experimental work, and increasingly empirically-motivated theoretical work have facilitated an exciting process of intellectual cross-fertilization. Seeking to continue these laudable trends, the division seeks paper proposals addressing any aspect of this definition of modern political economy, and especially those that bridge disciplinary or subfield boundaries and/or that further narrow the gaps between the equally important abstract generality of formal political-economic theory and the substantive concreteness of empirical applications.

★ **Division 7: Politics and History**
Jeffrey Tulis, University of Texas
Ruth O'Brien, John Jay College of Criminal Justice

The Politics and History Division has drawn its participants from those who have found the traditional subfields of the discipline too confining. Any study that examines change, is written from a historical perspective, or simply uses historical material in its execution is appropriate for this section. We welcome proposals for papers and panels on the full range of topics that stand at the juncture of politics and history. We also encourage submissions from the full array of epistemological and methodological positions within political science.

In recent years, this division has become home to the study of American political development and to studies of institutional change and we continue to encourage those kinds of endeavors. We will make special effort this year to broaden our reach in two respects: We seek papers that look beyond America to other polities and, in addition, to institutional change, we are interested in work that examines political culture, myth, symbol, ideational development, or the political vulgarization of thought. We also seek papers from theorists who write on the political significance of contested concepts such as time, memory, revolution, or history itself. Finally, we encourage submissions that use history to better understand large scale movements such as the future of the state system, the fate of democratic reform, or the logic of regime change.

Panel proposals that offer a mix of very well-known scholars with newer members of the profession will be advantaged. We also encourage efforts to experiment with new formats that better engage the audience. For example, some panels might be discussant driven—with critics summarizing and criticizing the papers at the outset and paper givers spending more time in argument or response. One or two panels may offer a single paper of exceptional interest surrounded by a large number of discussants. Finally, we welcome proposals for roundtables and book-author-meets-critic sessions.

★ **Division 6: Political Economy**
Robert Franzese, University of Michigan

I am particularly interested in getting a good “mix” of proposals that deal with methodological innovations in the statistical analysis of political data as well as innovative applications and extensions of extant quantitative methods for political data. Although any proposal addressing issues in political methodology will obviously be considered, I am particularly interested in papers and panels that deal with methods for panel data and/or cross-sectional time-series data, including papers dealing with fixed and random effects models, duration models, and the problems inherent in panel designs; estimation theory, including papers dealing with Bayesian theory and MCMC methods as well applications, extensions, and exposition of the theory of generalized linear models (GLM); issues in measurement, including papers dealing with innovations in measurement models and accounting for missing data; and innovative applications and extensions of experimental designs in political analysis.

I also strongly encourage any proposal that deals with quantitative political methodology, even if the proposal does not obviously fit into the four listed categories (for example, papers on time-series analysis and/or on random utility models). Further, I strongly encourage all authors to link the statistical theory discussed within their papers to applied political science problems.

★ **Division 8: Political Methodology**
Bradford Jones, SUNY, Stony Brook

Those who aim to advance teaching and learning in political science continue to face several challenges. One major challenge is to instruct an ever-more disengaged generation of university students in the art of politics while at the same time furthering education in the scientific study of politics. A second is to expand the range of teaching methods and instructional venues so as to continue to attract a diverse pool of gifted and motivated students to our discipline.

This division welcomes proposals for papers, roundtables, panels, and interactive sessions that discuss and evaluate such tools as computer technology in the classroom, including use of the Internet; simulations; internships and practical learning experiences; collaborative research;

travel programs; and honors seminars and mentoring.

We encourage contributions that explore and evaluate how we teach students to write and do research in our discipline, how we train them to observe the ethical standards of our profession, and how we prepare students, and graduate students in particular, to be better teachers.

★ **Division 10: Undergraduate Education**
Lynne E. Ford, College of Charleston

It is no secret that fewer of the students in our classes are intrinsically interested in politics and even fewer still are interested in the scientific study of politics. What are we to do? To grudgingly borrow some questions from the increasingly consumer-oriented enterprise of higher education: How might we “market” politics and political science to today’s students? How can our “product” be improved to meet the needs of today’s students? What are the major challenges we face in presenting the discipline of political science to students? What will these new challenges require of our discipline, of our departments and institutions, and of us and our colleagues?

In considering these questions, I invite full panel and individual paper proposals within and across three broad areas: our students, our major curriculum, and the connections between undergraduate political science education and “real-world” politics. For example, authors might address the following sets of questions: What do we know about today’s students? How do we learn about them? What kinds of innovations in teaching and modifications to the curriculum might be employed to attract new students to the major? How do we modify our pedagogy and message to reach nonmajors in our classes? What have we learned through assessment of curricular outcomes? I am particularly interested in receiving proposals for papers or panels which present and evaluate new approaches to the standard courses in the curriculum—the introductory courses, the methods courses, and capstone seminars. Has technology enlivened the classroom and better connected students to the real world? What role do simulations, models, and service learning opportunities play in undergraduate political science? How might the growth of distance education impact our discipline, departments, students, and work lives? In addition to these and any other questions you find compelling, papers and panels might address successful faculty development initiatives undertaken to improve teaching, curriculum, or faculty’s ease with technology.

★ **Division 11: Comparative Politics**
Barbara Geddes, University of California, Los Angeles

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness . . .” So begins *A Tale of Two Cities*, Charles Dickens’ novel set during the French Revolution. We also are living during a period of great changes in the world and compelling challenges to received wisdoms. At precisely the moment when transitions to authoritarianism had, in Albert Hirschman’s words, “been fully explained by a variety of converging approaches and [were] therefore understood in [their] majestic inevitability and perhaps even permanence,” democratization swept through much of the world. In a second equally unexpected development, many governments began to abandon their decades-long commitment to state-led development strategies in favor of greater market orientation. Meanwhile, in Western Europe, the cradle of the nation-state, states were voluntarily giving up national control over policy. On top of everything else, the Soviet empire collapsed. Though comparativists have greeted most of these events with delight, they did not predict them and, even today, could more persuasively explain why they should not have happened than why they did.

This ferment in the world has shaped the research agenda in the

comparative field. Proposals for research in two areas will be especially welcome for the 2001 APSA meeting: research aimed at explaining the great changes that have recently occurred and research that seeks to build an understanding of contemporary politics and political economy in new democracies, new states, and new transnational unions. Proposals should include a brief discussion of research strategy and evidence along with a clear statement of the research question and a summary of the argument tentatively proposed. Proposals for novel variations on the standard panel format will get serious attention.

**Division 12 Comparative Politics of
Developing Countries**
Pradeep Chhibber, University of Michigan

The comparative politics of developing areas no longer has the preeminence it had in the 1950s and 1960s. It is for this reason that we encourage paper and panel proposals that offer tests of broad theoretical propositions or self-consciously engage in developing arguments that would lead to a modification of existing theories. For some time now, research in developing areas has remained preoccupied either with the testing of individual concepts or with an examination of new political events and patterns. This, in conjunction with the availability of new data, techniques, and approaches, has provided scholars with a rich database from which to launch a reexamination of key concepts in comparative politics. To regain the vitality of the subfield, it is important that proposals be inclusive and encompass a large conceptual arena rather than focus on particular empirical events.

Proposals that consider why there should be a distinct politics of developing areas are also welcome. Papers could seek to ascertain ways in which the politics of developing areas are distinct and therefore should be the subject of independent systematic theoretical formulation. Discussions of why particular theories should apply equivalently across different levels of development are especially welcome.

The papers proposed should be innovative and methodologically self-conscious. Most important of all, the evidence could come from a variety of places, including archives, abstract models, case studies, interpretive accounts, oral histories, or quantitative research.

**Division 13: Politics of Communist and
Former Communist Countries**
Kevin O’Brien, Ohio State University

A dozen years after the disintegration of the Soviet bloc, some say that the problems faced by post-communist countries are little different than those faced by other nations, rich or poor. Indeed, one of the largest challenges for leaders from Beijing to Warsaw to Havana is how to generate equitable and corruption-free development in an increasingly integrated world economy. Does this mean it is best to view formerly communist countries as garden-variety developing countries? Or is there still much to be gained by exploring the relevance of the Leninist legacy?

More broadly, is it time to abandon the “transition mentality” and to recognize that, in many post-communist states, the transition is over? And, in situations where the transition is clearly not over, what is the relationship between political and economic reform? Have some reforms run their course and does the main impetus for change lie in the localities or among popular forces?

More broadly yet, how do post-communist transformations differ or resemble transformations elsewhere? Scholars have been studying the

“great transformation” for over a decade now and may be in a good position to determine where recent developments fit in with broader understandings of regime change.

Proposals for complete panels are especially welcome, as are efforts to stimulate discussion (e.g., the discussant presents the papers, then the authors and audience members respond). Panels that address common themes but employ diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives are strongly encouraged.

Division 14: Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies

John D. Huber, Columbia University

Papers on all aspects of politics in advanced industrialized countries are welcome and will be considered. The proposed research can be cross-national, examine a single country, or be explicitly theoretical, without a specific geographic application. Research on supranational organizations, such as the European Union, is also welcome. I am particularly interested in receiving proposals for panels that examine a common substantive theme, and that approach this theme with papers from different methodological perspectives. Individual paper proposals are also welcome, of course, especially for research that carefully develops new theory, or that bring new data or methods to bear on existing controversies in the literature. Finally, on many questions about democratic politics, it no longer makes sense to segregate the study of advanced democracies from other systems. I am therefore eager to receive proposals that straddle the traditional divide between studies of democratic processes in advanced industrial democracies and in developing parts of the world.

*** Division 15: Politics and Society in Western Europe**

Jonah Levy, University of California, Berkeley

Western Europe has long stood for a distinctive approach to political, social, and economic life. In recent years, however, many of the core components of European identity have been challenged by a combination of internal and external developments. Europe's varieties of capitalism have struggled in an increasingly integrated, innovation-driven global economy; Europe's generous welfare states have been blamed for creating social exclusion, rather than social cohesion; Europe's elite-oriented cultural production seems unable to resist the American, low-brow juggernaut; Europe's ostensibly tolerant, liberal political cultures have failed to embrace the continent's sizable immigrant communities; Europe's commitment to integration has stripped powers from nation-states without providing an effective system of governance in Brussels; and Europe's citizen armies have proven incapable of responding to the localized conflicts of the post-Cold War era, even within Europe itself.

Many argue that, in response to these developments, Europe must shed (and is shedding) its distinctive features, becoming more like other parts of the globe and embracing U.S. hegemony. Others contend that Europe can find distinctly European ways to confront today's challenges. Essential components of European specificity are being adapted and reconfigured, rather than jettisoned. Overlaying this empirical debate is a methodological one, with proponents of a more formalistic, deductive approach to political science maintaining that the erosion of European specificity renders European “area studies” superfluous, while defenders counter that such broad-gauge theorizing obscures critical differences between Europe and other parts of the world and ignores the important theoretical contributions made by many scholars of Western Europe.

Although open to paper and panel proposals on any aspect of research on Western Europe, the division will give priority to proposals that

address the issue of European specificity. Is Europe becoming less distinctive or distinctive in new ways? What are the political processes and actors that shape the process of European adjustment? Also welcome are papers that address the implications of current transformations for Western Europe as a subfield of political science. What are the most promising designs for advancing social science knowledge through the study of Europe? Finally, the selection process will be heavily tilted in favor of coherent panel proposals, as opposed to individual submissions.

Division 16: International Political Economy

Judith Goldstein, Stanford University

Broadly construed, the papers and panels in this division should examine the interplay between power and wealth in both international and domestic politics. The examination of power and wealth can take many empirical and theoretical forms and I thus seek an eclectic array of submissions. Although I encourage submissions on the more traditional international public economy topics such as trade and monetary politics, research on, for example, human rights issues, labor, and globalization, are also encouraged. In particular, I would like papers and/or panels that study the domestic foundations of international economic policies, whether from a rationalist or constructivist perspective and that look at how involvement in the international system, either through markets or international organization, influences politics at home.

Division 17: International Collaboration

James Fearon, Stanford University

Interest in international collaboration grows from the sense that there is not enough of it. More could make states, people, and the planet better off than they are now. But scholars of international relations (IR) have spent curiously little time documenting the extent and nature of the welfare losses due to insufficient, inept, or malign international collaboration in specific areas. Instead, they have focused on the question of whether meaningful international collaboration is possible at all, with realists being pessimistic and their critics more optimistic. It seems unlikely that more examples of states successfully collaborating or failing to collaborate could ever prove the optimists or the pessimists right.

Perhaps the debate could be more productive if we gain a better sense of just what are the welfare and distributional consequences of international collaboration in different areas. What significant international problems have been more or less solved by international collaboration and how? What problems remain or are new, what are their welfare consequences, and what international or domestic factors impede solutions? Are there cases where international collaboration has led to significant welfare losses or inequities, and what should be done about these?

As international and regional organizations have grown in number and, arguably, power, questions also arise about international collaboration on the appropriate governance of international institutions. Economic globalization and a much-changed international security environment have brought increased activity and public scrutiny to the United Nations, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization. Nongovernmental organizations play an increasing and complex role in particular issue areas, at times monitoring and cajoling states and international organizations, at times monitoring for them. These developments directly concern the welfare consequences of international collaboration, and would be ripe for analysis by IR scholars in panels assembled for this division.

Paper, panel, and roundtable proposals addressing such questions are

encouraged, although proposals for work on any and all aspects of international collaboration are welcome. Paper proposals that contain a clearly posed theoretical and/or empirical question will be favored.

Division 18: International Security
Elizabeth Kier, University of Washington

The end of the Cold War transformed the landscape of international security. We continue to study traditional security issues such as interstate war, nuclear deterrence, and alliance formation, but the new century brings with it a new urgency. We must also focus on topics such as peacekeeping, environmental security, and ethnic conflict as well as breaking down the barrier between what is considered domestic and international. The disintegration of empires, the rise of globalization, and the spread of war from internal to international (as in the Balkans or Rwanda), or from international to internal (as in Dagistan), challenge political science's division between comparative politics and international relations. The militarization of domestic police forces, the extension of domestic roles for the traditional armed services, and the proliferation of mercenary forces all call for new approaches to our understanding of the domestic and international use of force. This list is not exhaustive. Proposals that concern any aspect of international security are welcome. We are especially interested in panels that cut across methodological and theoretical approaches or span subfields in political science. Proposals that include advanced graduate students and involve imaginative formats are also welcome. Of particular interest are ideas concerning roundtable topics, "state of the discipline" panels, or retrospectives on prominent scholars' work.

*** Division 19: International Security and Arms Control**

We welcome panel and paper proposals that advance theoretical or conceptual understanding of globalization and an expanding twenty-first century security agenda—core themes guiding this year's program development for the organized section's November 2000 meeting in Denver. In addition to arms control, conflict management, the use of force, alliances, and other defense-related issues, the expanding global agenda that challenges policymakers of states, international and nongovernmental organizations now includes security aspects of an increasingly globalized economy, the environment, national and ethnic strife, human rights and humanitarian intervention, transnational crime, and terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction as well as threats to worldwide communications and associated infrastructures. Also welcome are papers on the UN, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, EU, and other regional security efforts in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa. The timing of the meeting is right for an early assessment of the new U.S. administration's foreign and national security policies and the question of national missile defense. We also encourage presentation of theoretical work related to security, inviting debate among structural and other realist, liberal and neoliberal pluralist, social constructivist, feminist, critical theorist, postmodernist, and other understandings of global, regional, and national security.

*** Division 20: Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy/
Foreign Policy Analysis**
Steven W. Hook, Kent State University

The Foreign Policy Division welcomes submissions of paper and panel proposals related to the formulation and conduct of foreign policy. The division has broadened its scope and changed its name to include a

more comprehensive range of topics in this area. Specific foci of analyses are subdivided into two categories.

First, in terms of policy formulation, we invite proposals that involve governmental processes and politics, and the impact of nonstate actors such as public opinion, the news media, interest groups, multinational corporations, and international governmental organizations. These proposals should be concerned primarily with the sources of foreign policy at the individual, domestic, societal, and international levels. Their impact on the decision-making process is of particular interest.

Second, in terms of the conduct of foreign policy, we invite proposals concerned with the implementation and outcomes of foreign policy in a variety of issue areas, including international security, foreign economic policy, environmental policy, and human rights and democratization. Papers and panels that systematically explain and/or evaluate policy behavior are of particular interest.

In both categories, we seek proposals that advance substantive understanding of foreign policy. In addition, papers, panels, and poster-based studies should address and seek to refine contending theories of foreign policy formulation and conduct. Meta-analytic research that focuses on methodological and epistemological concerns is also of interest. Proposals may involve single-state studies, present cross-national evidence, or address general issues and dilemmas related to the formulation and conduct of foreign policy. Methodological and theoretical orientation is open, reflecting the division's objective to become an inclusive home to foreign policy analysts with a wide variety of backgrounds, interests, and approaches to this area of study.

*** Division 21: Conflict Processes**
Kelly Kadera, University of Iowa

The Conflict Processes Division invites proposals that focus on the conditions, consequences, and mechanisms of politically motivated conflict, as well as on its potential solutions. Of particular interest are proposals that are theoretically and/or empirically rigorous and that strive to build generalizable contributions to our understanding of conflict. Topics that move toward generalization would address underlying themes that are uncovered and linked across various types and aspects of conflict. Some examples include similarities in the causes of ethnic and interstate conflict; dynamics governing both nonviolent protest and overt military hostility; parallel characteristics across various geographic regions, from Northern Ireland to South Africa; fundamental causes present across disparate time periods, such as the Napoleonic era and the post-Cold War era; theories connecting the initiation, evolution, and resolution of conflict; how to link causal mechanism at different levels of analysis, such as the individual and systemic levels; and patterns of behavior evident at different levels of analysis.

It is preferable for roundtable and panel proposals to concentrate on one particular method of generalization, or on how knowledge of one specific type of conflict (e.g., wars, militarized disputes, riots, protests) can improve through generalization techniques. Roundtable proposals on innovative techniques for teaching conflict courses are also encouraged.

*** Division 22: Legislative Studies**
William T. Bianco, Penn State University

Legislative studies panels at APSA meetings are characterized by a diversity of question and method, and I intend to replicate this approach for the 2001 meeting. I welcome proposals for papers and panels on the usual topics of campaigning, campaign finance, voter behavior, representation, legislative organizations, institutions,

strategizing, and relations with other branches of government.

In addition to these perennials, I am particularly interested in paper proposals that emphasize comparative or historical studies of the legislative process; empirical tests of well-specified theories (rational choice and otherwise), especially analyses that make critical tests of competing theories; and analyses that link macro phenomena (e.g., trust in Congress) to micro mechanisms (e.g., voter information, goals, and calculations).

I would also like to organize roundtables on using new quantitative data sources (e.g., NOMINATE scores) for empirical analyses of both the American Congress and other legislatures, and a "tricks of the trade" discussion of fieldwork.

*** Division 23: Presidency Research**
Jeffrey E. Cohen, Fordham University

Research on the presidency is marked by theoretical and methodological pluralism, a trait that I wish to encourage in this call for papers. Accordingly, I will be open to all approaches that have marked the subfield, from the historical, constitutional-legal, organizational, psychological, behavioral, and quantitative, to the newly emerging formal/rational choice approach, as well as the topics that have occupied so much of the attention of presidential scholars, such as the development of the office, relations with Congress, the properties and dynamics of public opinion toward the president, presidential decision and policy making. But rather than retread the old, I would like to give preference to papers and/or panels that offer new theoretical approaches, new methodologies, and/or new data to these venerable topics. Also, with the 2000 presidential election just behind us as we convene in 2001, papers and panels that deal with the election, primaries, campaign finance and reform, as well as the transition from the old administration to the new, are invited. However, I also wish to encourage under-titled topics that potentially have much to offer to our understanding of the presidency and executives more generally. The emergence of new democracies around the world has created a variety of presidential and nonpresidential executive forms, and offers us the opportunity not only to understand the processes of democratization, but also the role of executives in that process, as well as a way to compare different executive systems and the impact of those executive forms on executive behavior. Papers that focus on these new presidencies will be greatly encouraged, as will papers that make comparisons with subnational executives in the U. S., like governors and mayors, an approach often talked about but little utilized.

*** Division 24: Public Administration**
Charles R. Wise, Indiana University

Recognizing the richness and diversity of the field of public administration, proposals for papers and panels from the entire range of significant and enduring topics of the field are encouraged. Topics that invite reflection on where the field has been over the last century, that consider the role of key concepts in its evolution, and that discuss where it is going are of particular interest.

The enduring role of power points to key relationships in the administrative role in government, including those between policymakers, implementers, and citizens. Issues of responsiveness and accountability are continuing concerns as elected officials and citizens demand more systematic proof of the outcomes of public service activities. The concept of choice is particularly salient as market models for public service institutions compete with other alternatives in the search for public service arrangements that are more responsive, effective, and efficient. The analysis of alternative public service arrangements and forms of organization to facilitate them involve issues of service quality

but also issues of equity and legality. The focus on the state reminds us of the evolution of the administrative state and what is expected of it. Reinventing government initiatives demands analysis of the purposes and methods of administering the public's business in diverse fields. Discerning the effects of new forms of government organization on both efficiency and democratic effectiveness is a critical area of study. Finally, key external actors among interest groups, legislatures, and the courts are exerting new pressures on administrative organizations.

As always, this listing is intended to be suggestive and not exhaustive. I encourage proposals from the full range of public administration topics, so that our sessions represent the diversity of interests and approaches extant in the field.

*** Division 25: Public Policy**
Elaine Sharp, University of Kansas

The field of public policy includes a rich array of inquiries concerning the character of governmental decision-making processes, outcomes, and impacts, as well as the interface between government's authoritative choices and the programmatic activities of nongovernmental organizations. Hence, there should be numerous opportunities for policy scholars to contribute to a program with a thematic emphasis on power, choice, and the state.

I encourage proposals for papers and panels, across the spectrum of policy studies. This includes, but is not limited to proposals testing theories about the impact of institutional arrangements, economic contexts, public demands, and other factors on policy outcomes; proposals assessing either particular policies, policy designs, or policy-making arrangements; proposals focusing on the current status of and future prospects for policy evaluation; and proposals assessing the implementation issues involved in the public policy realm.

Proposals featuring multiple methods of analysis, offering new methodologies for policy study, or advancing the theoretical underpinnings of the public policy field are especially encouraged. Similarly, proposals that feature comparative analyses across substantive policy areas (e.g., health care, welfare, environment, education, law enforcement) are encouraged. However, this is not intended to limit the diversity of proposals. Proposals involving any aspect of, or approach to, the study of public policy are welcomed and all efforts will be made to ensure that the division's offerings genuinely reflect the richness of the field.

*** Division 26: Law and Courts**
Paul Wahlbeck, George Washington University

Forty-five years ago, Jack Peltason wrote that although judges are in the political process, judicial scholars felt it was necessary to justify studying judges like other politicians. That day, of course, is now past. Not only do we use courts as a venue for testing broadly applied theories of decision making, but studies of judicial process illuminate behavior that interests students of legislative behavior, the presidency, interest groups, public opinion, state politics, and comparative politics (to name a few). Indeed, political scientists increasingly recognize that the courts are uniquely situated to provide a testing ground for a wide range of theoretical and empirical questions. Consequently, judicial scholars regularly contribute not only to our collective understanding of law and courts, but also to the discipline's understanding of a vast range of political phenomena.

To highlight our many ongoing contributions to the discipline, I am particularly interested in receiving proposals that employ innovative empirical analysis, unique data sources, or original theoretical approaches. Proposals can address either questions that have not

been posed previously in the study of law and courts or questions that perennially interest judicial scholars, like court decision making or *judicial selection*. For instance, judicial scholars applying neo-institutional theory have been interested in the effects of institutional rules and norms on court decisions. In recent years, we have studied this by relying on relatively recent Supreme Court decisions. Alternative means for testing these theories abound, and include the use of historical data to examine the effect of institutional change on court behavior and the comparative study of court behavior to determine the effect of various institutions. At the same time, judicial scholars have not devoted much attention to the development of institutions on courts. Yet, such studies would make a valuable contribution to the broader understanding of political development.

Since the value of contributions is not dictated by a particular approach or method, I welcome proposals that reflect the diverse interests, both theoretical and substantive, found in our subfield.

Division 27: Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence
Nancy Maveety, Tulane University

Just as the judicial process wing of the public law subfield endeavors to highlight its many ongoing contributions to empirical analysis within the discipline, so the constitutional studies wing of our subfield should seek to connect its research objectives to related work in political philosophy, political development, and comparative legal studies. But the scholars within our subfield should also be concerned with the interrelation between judicial process and constitutional research. The advent of new institutionalism as a theoretical approach animating judicial scholarship offers one possibility for a substantive and methodological bridge between the two wings of the public law subfield. Moreover, our subfield's recently renewed interest in comparative court studies invites cooperative exchange among those who identify a nexus between judicial decisions and decision making, institutional contexts, and normative rules, but who do so from a variety of theoretical and analytical perspectives.

I have no intention of using this call for papers to force an ecumenicalism on a subfield that has seen fit to constitute itself as two separate APSA sections. Nor am I attempting to subvert traditional jurisprudential and qualitative case study analysis, and their place in both current constitutional law scholarship and in the subfield's development and genesis of research questions. Rather, I am hoping that this division's panels will coordinate with the topics of those of Law and Courts and other related divisions, as well as appeal to our colleagues working in law faculties. Thus, I wish to echo the sentiment of my fellow division chair: A broad range of judicial scholars are interested in the effect of institutional rules and norms on court decisions, and utilize a wide range of data to investigate this—from recent Supreme Court decisions to historical evidence to aspects of comparative legal culture. As with the call for papers from Law and Courts, then, this call welcomes proposals that reflect the diverse theoretical approaches and substantive interests found in the public law subfield. I am adding an additional statement of inclusiveness: This call welcomes proposals that reflect the concerns of scholars in legal ethnography and legal hermeneutics, and those whose interests span the political science-law divide.

Proposals for integrated panels are welcome, as are those to be jointly sponsored by related divisions.

*** Division 28: Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations**
Beryl Radin, University at Albany, SUNY

In an election year, especially with a governor running for office, federalism and intergovernmental relations questions rise to the surface. Issues that had often been discussed as mere academic questions take on a more pointed meaning in a charged, political environment. And despite the rhetoric to the contrary, intergovernmental relationships have become more variegated and complex during the eight years of the Clinton administration.

It is my hope that the proposals in the area of federalism and intergovernmental relations will include papers and panels that attempt to take stock of the Clinton years, focusing not only on relationships between the federal government and states but also on state-local relationships. I would like to encourage people to revisit the models of federalism that have been developed over the past several decades and present some new ways of explaining the behaviors that have emerged. These models might be tested by focusing on some specific intergovernmental policy areas (e.g., Medicaid, environment).

In addition, it is my hope that the panels in this area will include attention to comparative and international experiences, drawing on the work that has already been done in this area. Scholarship on the effects of globalization and technological change on federalism and intergovernmental relations is developing. Other topics that are of interest include new developments in judicial decision making, fiscal and regulatory federalism, and the interplay between this topic and state politics as well as legislative politics. Papers dealing with intergovernmental issues flowing from partnerships, including nonpublic as well as public sector actors are also encouraged.

*** Division 29: State Politics and Policy**
Michael Mintrom, Michigan State University

Political scientists are showing increasing interest in subnational politics, and for good reason. Here we find much governmental activism and innovation with respect to cultural and economic development, resource management, regulation, and income redistribution. Individuals and groups often attempt to change the national political agenda by first defining problems and seeking policy responses at the state level.

For scholars in this subfield, a myriad of possibilities exist for making exciting theoretical and methodological contributions, for questioning conventional wisdom, and for identifying emerging issues in government management, democratic practice, inequality and justice, and the interplay between politics and policy. I strongly encourage submissions from graduate students and younger researchers, as well as from established scholars. I am especially keen to hear from those whose examinations of state politics and policy serve to challenge and extend the discipline's boundaries.

Paper proposals should outline the topic of inquiry, its political relevance, and the form of analysis to be used. In reviewing proposals, I will give equal weight to the substantive appeal of the issues being addressed and to the strength of the research design. I welcome proposals for papers making original use of theory, archival research, comparative case studies, and other qualitative and quantitative approaches to examine politically interesting similarities and differences across individuals, organizations, or states. I am also interested in receiving proposals for papers that are discipline-oriented, that critically scrutinize past efforts to understand particular aspects of state politics and policy, and that present innovative techniques for studying political

phenomena.

Roundtable proposals (which might be devoted to highly topical issues, practical research problems, or celebrating a prominent scholar's oeuvre) should explain the significance of the topic and provide a list of prospective participants. When proposals for whole panels are being assembled, serious effort must be made to achieve intellectual diversity and balance with respect to the experience and broad interests of participants and their chosen research approaches.

*** Division 30: Urban Politics**
Timothy Krebs, University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Far more so than in the recent past, local political issues have the attention of national politicians and institutions. Urban sprawl and police-community relations, for example, are, or at least have been, featured in two high-profile political campaigns and have received a great deal of national media exposure. Other debates, such as those involving gun control and morality politics, have important local dimensions to them. While this attention is a good thing for the subfield in the short term, the broader implications of urban politics need to be explored if we are to have a lasting effect on political science more generally.

While there is much work to be done in core areas of interest to urban scholars, as the urban division organizer for the 2001 meeting, I will give priority to research that addresses questions that have received less attention in the literature. Proposals dealing with local institutions and decision making, federal devolution of power, urban campaigns and elections, voting behavior, public opinion and media effects, the role of public entrepreneurs, interest groups, and representation are strongly encouraged. Because the demographics of urban areas represent the future of the country (i.e., "minority majority"), research dealing with racial and ethnic politics will be enthusiastically received. Urban scholars are also uniquely poised to take advantage of research in the area of social capital and its effect on political life in the U.S.

I welcome ideas that address topics and that use research methodologies of interest to those both inside and outside of the field. I encourage proposals that seek to take advantage of the great variety of contexts within which local politics occur. Case studies, perhaps the chief means of investigating urban politics, should take care to be theoretically relevant and empirically grounded.

*** Division 31: Women and Politics**
Jane Bayes, California State University, Northridge

Research proposals are encouraged from the wide range of topics and methodological perspectives constituting the study of women and politics. Papers and panels, for example, could feature issues in political theory, social movements and activist politics, electoral politics and women's political leadership, constitutional law and jurisprudence, the development and implementation of public policies, international relations, processes of globalization and democratization, multiculturalism and identity politics, economic foundations of politics, and methodological considerations. Whatever the research focus, however, emphasis should be placed upon how the study of gender in relation to politics and political systems reaffirms or challenges prevailing assumptions. A critical stance, therefore, is welcomed, as a way to integrate as well as to advance scholarship on women and politics.

Proposals for papers, panels or roundtables that cross intellectual boundaries and that present analytical challenges are particularly appropriate. Proposals should include a brief discussion of the theoretical approach informing the research, the type of analysis

undertaken, the substantive area or areas addressed, and the significance of the study for the field of women and politics.

*** Division 32: Race, Ethnicity and Politics**
M. Njeri Jackson, Virginia Commonwealth University

The Race, Ethnicity and Politics Division invites papers, panels, and roundtables that consider the role of the state in constructing or limiting racial and ethnic classifications (i.e., use of census data and redistricting in the U.S.); comparative cross-national and cross-cultural research on race and ethnicity, and political history involving challenges to full political participation of racially or ethnically classified groups. We also invite presentations on affirmative action, political mobilization and participation, public policy, political theory, electoral politics, and other traditional areas of the study of politics that also address matters of race and ethnicity. What do trends in racially and ethnically motivated violence suggest? What has been the impact of recent legal decisions on the status of racially identified groups? How are demographic changes impacting relations between racial and ethnic groups? How do other factors (especially gender) influence the political, social, and economic conditions of racial and ethnic groups? What are the challenges to and possibilities for ending racial and ethnic discrimination? How have groups mobilized to impact political agendas? What will be the impact of a new presidential regime or congressional or local elections on racial and ethnic cleavages? This division recognizes that race and ethnicity are social categories that are infused with significance by the practice of racism and discrimination. We are particularly interested in work that addresses the phenomenon of persistent and widespread discrimination despite the dismantling of legal and state-sponsored forms of discrimination, or research that seeks to explain ongoing discrimination in social contexts that profess a commitment to justice, equality, and antiracism.

Papers and panels should focus on racial and ethnic groups in the U.S.; however, we welcome cross-national comparisons with the U.S. We welcome diverse perspectives and the participation of scholars from a broad range of subfields.

*** Division 33: Religion and Politics**
Anthony Gill, University of Washington

For most of the twentieth century, the study of religion was dominated by secularization theory, which predicted the ultimate demise of spiritual belief and organization. Affected by this notion, many political scientists considered religion to be of trivial importance. In recent years, this perspective has come under scrutiny as both religious belief and institutions continue to show remarkable resilience in our modern world. Not surprisingly, there has been a growing interest in the field of religion and politics, combined with a corresponding increase in the quantity and quality of research in this area. Membership in the religion and politics section of APSA has seen steady growth. Despite these positive trends, there is a perception among many that religion remains a marginalized topic in political science (though some may disagree with this assessment). To address this concern, scholars are encouraged to submit paper and panel proposals that speak to the following questions: What does the study of religion tell us about political and social behavior more generally? How can religious belief, affiliation, and organization be integrated into more complete explanations of political phenomenon? These questions can be addressed directly or indirectly. In the process, proposals can encompass a wide variety of empirical themes and methodological approaches. Examining how both ideational (theological) and institutional (denominational) factors interact in politics offers a fertile area for investigation. Papers are not required, however, to focus on these questions. All proposals related to the theme of religion and politics will be considered on their own merits.

Nonetheless, it is hoped that the above questions will spur lively intellectual debate among panelists about the critical role religion plays in political science.

★ **Division 34: Representation and Electoral Systems**
Andre Blais, University of Montreal

We welcome papers and panels that cover the broad range of issues relating to representation and electoral systems in both the U.S. and other countries. We are interested in studies that assess the political consequences of various electoral systems as well as in analyses of the factors that explain the choice of electoral rules.

Research in the field has focused on the contrast between electoral formulas such as proportional representation and plurality, and we expect some sessions to deal with that crucial theme. We would like to receive proposals for papers and panels that look at other dimensions of electoral rules, especially the regulation of money and communication in election campaigns. We would also like to receive proposals for papers and panels that examine the issues of representation and electoral systems outside the traditional realm of national politics, especially in local politics and within groups and associations.

Finally, we would welcome papers and panels that explore the implications of instruments of direct democracy such as referendums for the functioning of representative institutions.

★ **Division 35: Political Organizations and Parties**
Anne Costain, University of Colorado, Boulder

I encourage proposals for panels, papers, and roundtables that explore similarities and differences between the roles, structures, objectives, and organization of political parties, interest groups, and social movement organizations. Is each of these political actors sufficiently distinctive to justify studying it in isolation? Or, might comparative or cross-time studies be more fruitful? Should more work be done to examine the overlaps, intersections, and transition processes of these interest organizations (e.g., shifts from an environmental movement to a Green Party)?

Have public perceptions of parties and other organizations changed in recent decades? Has their respective power and influence altered? Do they possess different strategic advantages in advancing policies? Is each able to adopt the tactics of the others in pursuing change?

The electoral importance of political parties has long been a touchstone used to distinguish parties from other types of interest organizations. Democratic theorists such as E.E. Schattschneider have argued that party linkages to building governing majorities, by placing politicians in public office, establishes them as morally superior to other types of political organization. At the start of the new millennium is it worth exploring whether the widely recognized and long-lasting ties between interests such as the religious right, the environmental movement, right to life, labor unions, the women's movement, and the tobacco industry are well-enough known to the public that this is now a part of the "brand-name" appeal of specific parties?

Scholars studying social movements have explored the roles movements play in shaping individual identities in post-industrial society. Might this perspective be valuable in analyzing the current meaning of party identification? Finally, social movement studies of political opportunity structures suggest that organizational differences may be at least partly strategic. Does this shed light on the electoral fortunes of parties?

Although these topics/questions cover a broad spectrum, there are

undoubtedly many more hypotheses related to the nature of political organizations and parties, which deserve exploration. Please feel welcome to make proposals of all types encompassing the wide range of perspectives and methodologies.

★ **Division 36: Elections and Voting Behavior**
Stuart Elaine MacDonald, University of North Carolina

Elections are the hallmark of democracy, and the new millennium has seen a surge of electoral activity around the globe. Our division welcomes papers and panels focusing on elections and voting, broadly conceived, in both established and emerging democracies.

The division's panels are designed to be eclectic. They are appropriate for any work that pertains to campaigns, voting behavior, or the determinants or consequences of elections. We welcome a diversity of approaches, including survey, aggregate, formal theoretic, experimental, small group, and simulation studies. Similarly, we are open to comparative analyses bridging several countries or subunits within a country, or work focused on a single national or subnational unit.

The 2001 Meeting should provide a forum for research on the 2000 U.S. national elections, both presidential and congressional, as well as projects that take advantage of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. Noting these two topic areas, however, should not be taken to signal a preference for survey-based research, simply the obvious match of the 2001 panels with the availability of these new materials.

Most of all, this is an open show, and interesting proposals on any topic related to elections or voting behavior will be carefully considered.

★ **Division 37: Public Opinion and Participation**
Darren Davis, Michigan State University

A great deal of what we know about politics is informed by public opinion research. This division welcomes proposals for both papers and panels in the area of public opinion and political behavior. It is important to consider how new concepts and theories, such as social capital, surface that bear directly on individual-level evidence from surveys and how systematic and rigorous examinations of the validity of measures of such concepts usually follow at a slow pace. Proposals assessing whether and how recent research on political attitudes has altered our understanding of broad theoretical concepts are therefore welcome.

Recent advances in public opinion research have refocused attention on reliability and the context-dependence of political attitudes. Papers are encouraged that give insight into new ways of conceptualizing and measuring aspects of social identity, political tolerance, partisanship, ideology, racial attitudes, and political trust—as well as their cross-national comparability and equivalence. Context also refers to the influence that certain types of instrumentation and survey artifacts have on substantive conclusions.

Finally, our understanding of public opinion relies very heavily on reliable and valid measurement and a rigorous methodology. I especially welcome papers that concentrate on methodological innovations and that address how measurement influences substantive conclusions. Additionally, papers calling for new theoretical models and methodological approaches to studying public opinion are also solicited. Papers dealing with how new methods or new databases could help scholars better understand the development and stability of political attitudes are also welcome.

*** Division 38: Political Communication**
Lynda Lee Kaid, University of Oklahoma

Political communication is concerned with how the political system is shaped by the flow of communication messages. For the 2001 meeting, there will be particular interest in how the flow of communication through the media and through personal communication channels affected the first major election cycle of the new millennium in 2000. Political communication scholars are invited to submit proposals that focus on the impact of media and other channels of communication on the formation of political opinions and on voting behaviors in the presidential elections, in races for offices below the national level, and in international settings. Particularly welcome will be research that concentrates on the role that traditional media and new technologies (such as the Internet) play in civic participation and engagement. For instance, how successful were new technologies in enhancing voter participation and turnout?

The political communication division will consider a wide variety of topics and a diverse range of methodological approaches to explore the relationship between communication processes and the political system. Topics will include news coverage of the political system, political advertising, political debates, communication and public policy, and the impact of gender, cultural, and socioeconomic variables. Research that addresses communication and politics beyond the electoral process is also welcome.

Proposals should emphasize the significance of the proposed topic, the context of prior research, the methodological approach, and the anticipated scope and contribution of the research outcomes.

*** Division 39: Science, Technology and Environmental Politics**
Richard P. Hiskes, University of Connecticut

It is difficult to identify an area either in politics or political science unaffected by the influences of science, technology, and the environment. So the issues within the purview of science technology and environmental politics (STEP) panels range broadly indeed, reaching to the edges of the profession.

STEP panels are known for their heightened theoretical sophistication in areas such as policy modeling, the impact of science and technology on political institutions, the intersection of normative democratic theory and environmental activism, patterns of science and environmental regulation, the changing nature of science as an intellectual and economic activity, and the role of legal and public opinion in environmental and science policy. I welcome panels, papers, and poster sessions in all these areas.

Panels are particularly welcome that continue the recent trend in cross-listing with other divisions. The nature of our substantive interest lends itself to such cross-fertilization, and I would like especially to reach out more than we have to comparative politics, international relations, and normative theory scholars. Panels that pursue broad topics such as globalization; international tensions and cooperation in science, technology, and environmentalism; the redefinition of federalism and state/federal environmental partnerships; democratization and environmentalism; the impact of new technologies; and the nexus of economics/science/politics are especially welcome.

*** Division 40: Information Technology and Politics**
Chip Hauss, George Mason University

Political science has by no means escaped the information technology revolution. The newly renamed Information Technology and Politics Division anticipates panels in which scholars along with practitioners will focus on how information technology (IT) is reshaping political life and how IT affects the way we do research and teach as political scientists.

Over the last few years, we have been shifting our focus at the annual meeting away from an emphasis on teaching and have reached a balance of about half teaching and half scholarship, devoting more of our sessions to the ways IT is changing political life—especially in regard to privacy policy, activism on the web, electronic democracy—and how IT is being used as a tool in our research on substantive.

For all these areas, we are also interested in papers and panels that focus on the use and impact of IT outside the United States, in general, and in the third world, in particular.

*** Division 41: Politics and Literature**
Denise Schaeffer, College of the Holy Cross

The study of literature offers political scientists a particularly stimulating mode of inquiry into political institutions and principles, and into the ways of life that sustain them and are, in turn, shaped by them. Indeed, the creation of this division is itself a sign of the complex and changing landscape of the study of politics. The division therefore encourages the submission of papers proposals that highlight the way in which literature—broadly understood to include diverse literary genres as well as film—offers unique insights into the nature of political life and the study of politics. Papers analyzing literary works that contemplate the character of modern power, and the dilemmas of modernity, are especially encouraged.

The following are examples of the kinds of questions that might be explored: What can literature teach us about the dynamics of human relationships, human choices, and social change? How do literary works illuminate the relationship between public and private, the individual and the community, freedom and responsibility? How might an enhanced understanding of the extra-political dimensions of life further our understanding of politics? This list is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. We welcome proposals that address these themes, but papers need not be restricted to this agenda. We also encourage proposals for thematically cohesive panels.

*** Division 42: New Political Science**
Michael Forman, University of Washington, Tacoma

The New Political Science Division is committed to a critical and activist approach within the profession. In keeping with these commitments, we encourage the submission of scholarship that stresses questions of human rights, labor rights, social rights, and justice for women and minorities in the United States and around the world. We are especially interested in entries in the following areas: the recent activism focused on transnational capitalism, changing understandings of the modern state, and the relationship between intellectual work and political action.

Although the long-term impact of the protests surrounding recent meetings of major international organizations is still uncertain, it is clear

that these protests highlight new alliances and new interpretations. They may even signal a new politics of national and international labor organizations, human rights activists, environmentalists, small agriculturalists from Europe and the developing world, and others. In many ways, actual developments may have surpassed existing social movement theory to raise a number of questions. For example, how can we account for the participation of “official labor” in progressive politics for the first time in half a century? Given their actions during the Cold War, can U.S. labor organizations acquire credibility before the eyes of historically progressive groups (e.g., Latin American popular movements)? Does the language of human rights provide an adequate medium for conceptualizing old grievances and expressing new ones? Does this language permit theorizing an internationalist politics? Does it permit theorizing a feminist politics?

Submissions might also focus on one of the central objects of political investigation: the state. For example, given the phenomena usually dubbed “globalization,” can we continue to understand the state as a more or less autonomous subject, even in the international arena? Do developments associated with globalization limit democracy? Do they provide new avenues for activism? Has anything really changed? Is the predominance of the “third way” among European labor and social democratic parties a response to these changes? Do the categories of modern political theory retain their validity in view of the emergence of new transnational forces? of the “new economy”? of new forms of cultural interaction?

Submissions may also reflect upon the activity we are all engaged in—thinking about politics. They may examine the relationships between intellectuals, political action, and political actors. For example, what types of engagement are appropriate? What types are the logical conclusion of intellectual inquiry? Is there a contradiction between a scholarly standpoint and moral or political commitments? Are truth and responsibility inherently connected?

Submissions may come from any field, and they may draw upon a wide variety of engaged perspectives including critical theory, environmentalism, feminism, historical approaches, Marxism, political economy, etc. Contributions from junior colleagues and others submitting to *New Political Science* for the first time are especially encouraged.

★ Division 43: Ecological and Transformational Politics

The recent protests against corporate-led globalization recalls the roots of the Ecological and Transformational Politics Division (ETP) in the political movements and counterculture of the 1960s. Keeping that spirit alive, while growing and changing with the times, ETP fosters political science research and theorizing that is inspired by and gives guidance to social action—action for transformation to a just society, a sustainable economy/technology, and a culture that nurtures aesthetic, emotional, and spiritual values for all people. ETP fosters transformative approaches to methods of research and theory. ETP also recognizes the link between the personal and the political and fosters scholarly inquiry into this linkage.

The division welcomes proposals for papers, panels, posters, roundtables, and interactive sessions that address theoretically or empirically the ecological and sociopolitical impact of globalization and envision transformational alternatives to the dominant neo-liberal corporate-led strategies—including environmental problems such as global climate change, depletion of natural resources, diminishing biodiversity, pollution, social movement building, and democratizing decision making in the global economy—and explore grassroots ecological, sustainable, and transformational efforts at constructive social change, such as: micro-credit, worker ownership and management of businesses, organic farming and urban agriculture, ecosystem restoration, neighborhood organizing and community development, environmental justice, mediation and conflict resolution, local currency

systems, and many others.

ETP welcomes proposals concerned with new modes of thinking about the nature of power, choice, and the state, as well as ways to transform such understanding into action; that develop themes, concepts, symbols, and archetypes of transformation: that discuss democratization, empowerment, community, collaboration, coalition, spirituality, recognition, holism, quantum paradigm, simple living, appropriate technology, nonviolence, and so on; and consider methodologies that liberate persons to see things as they are and to live authentically in response to the truths they discover.

ETP also welcomes proposals about achieving a diverse society in which difference is valued and welcomed and serves to enrich life, in which conflict is an occasion for creative democratic resolution and reconciliation, not an embittering experience that destroys community; focusing on the processes, patterns of interaction, and emergent properties of whole systems, rather than discrete events and units of analysis; and offering teaching and research strategies that foster ecological literacy, environmentally responsible citizenship, and an affinity for the living world.

★ Division 44 Interdisciplinary Approaches to International History and Politics *Hendrik Spruyt, Arizona State University*

This section welcomes paper, panel, and roundtable proposals that promote the study of international history and politics, and advance interdisciplinary conversations between international relations theorists, comparativists, foreign policy analysts, and historians.

We thus seek to transcend the artificial barriers that separate comparative politics and international relations, as well as security and political economy studies. Accordingly, proposals will be judged by their focus and intellectual coherence, rather than by their faithfulness to academic boundaries.

While welcoming a broad array of substantive interests, we particularly wish to receive proposals that illuminate significant contemporary issues with historical study. Proposals for methodological discussions are welcome, but will preferably be grounded in the interplay of history and political science theory building.

A French historian once remarked how historians tended to be of two types: truffle hunters and parachutists. The former searches for the poignant detail to illuminate or challenge established wisdom, the latter for the broad theoretical picture to clarify the complexity of the historical record. In that vein, we encourage proposals that either illuminate or challenge prevailing theoretical approaches by examination of historical materials, or that develop new theoretical orientations to organize and understand complex phenomena.

The division seeks to represent, and welcomes proposals from scholars at all stages of their careers.

Deadline: Wednesday, November 15, 2000

2001 Call for Papers Guidelines for Participation

When submitting panel and individual paper proposals, keep in mind the five participation rules developed by the APSA Council.

1. Participation Limitation

In the Fall of 1987, in order to provide opportunities in the Annual Meeting by the greatest number of people, the APSA Council limited participation in the Program. As a result, presenters are limited to TWO PARTICIPATIONS on sessions organized by the APSA Program Committee, Organized Sections, and Related Group panels. **An appearance on the Annual Meeting Program takes the form of paper or roundtable presenter, chair, or discussant. A third participation is allowed only if you are serving as a chair for one of the panels on which you are appearing. Poster presentations are exempt from the two participation rule.**

2. Preregistration

The APSA Council requires all program participants to preregister by **April 13, 2001**. Participants who do not preregister by April 13 **will not** be listed in the *Preliminary Program*.

3. Exempt Participants

Prospective participants may request of a division chair or panel organizer an exemption from the preregistration requirement if they are: **A) not a political scientist; B) appearing on only one panel; and C) not an exempt participant in 2000**. An exempt participant receives a badge for admission to all Annual Meeting activities but will not receive an Annual Meeting Program or the reduced hotel rate.

4. Paper Delivery

As paper presenters you have three important obligations: A) to ensure that the members of your panel, especially discussants, receive your paper in time to read it carefully prior to the meeting; B) to submit 50 copies of the paper to the panel paper room at the hotel by the first day of the Annual Meeting; and C) to submit your paper to PROceedings, APSA's online collection of Annual Meeting papers.

5. Panel Schedule

Panels are scheduled in fourteen (14) time slots beginning at 8:45 a.m. on Thursday and concluding at 12:30 p.m. on Sunday. **Participants are expected to be available for any of the fourteen time slots**. If your schedule is limited by a teaching or travel constraint, inform the division chair or panel organizer upon your acceptance as a participant, or by April 13, 2001.

Deadline: Wednesday, November 15, 2000

2001 Proposal Submission Process

APSA successfully re-designed the proposal submission process for the 2000 Annual Meeting to ensure that all proposals were acknowledged immediately upon receipt and tracked by an ID number. Because the system is web-based, all submitters must have an email address to submit a proposal. Notification of acceptance and rejection will be done electronically in February. Please pay special attention to the submission instructions below.

	Electronic Submission (available September 11 at APSA website)
Deadline	November 15, midnight EST
Address/Method	http://www.apsanet.org
Requirements	Email address and internet access*
Confirmation of Receipt	1. Unique ID number assigned for each proposal 2. Email confirmation with ID number within 24 hours
Notification of Acceptance	Email on February 15, 2001

Submission Requirements (established by the APSA Committee on the Annual Meeting)

- You may submit **up to two** papers or **two** organized panel proposals. Additional proposals from the same author or organizer will not be accepted.
- You may submit each proposal to **no more than two** Divisions.
- All paper proposals will be considered for poster presentation.
- All submissions must be received electronically by **Wednesday, November 15, 2000**.

Confirmation of Proposal Receipt at APSA

- All electronic proposal submissions will receive a unique ID number and email confirmation within 24 hours. *Please print the confirmation page and ID number for future reference.*
- Please contact the APSA office at meeting@apsanet.org if you do not receive an email confirmation of your submission within 24 hours.

Acceptance Notification

On February 15, 2001 you will receive an acceptance or rejection email from the division chair for each proposal you submitted. If accepted for a panel or poster presentation, the email will indicate the division for which you are accepted. (**Note:** Only first authors and panel organizers will receive an email – see forms on website for further clarification.)

If your proposal is not immediately accepted for a panel or poster, you may be contacted at a later date to serve as a chair or discussant. You will receive additional detailed information regarding your panel or poster session from the division chair.

* **Note:** If you do not have access to a computer or an email account, please contact APSA at 202-483-2512.