

2012 APSA Awards

Recognizing excellence in the profession is one of the most important activities of APSA. The following awards were announced in August 2012.

CAREER AWARDS

Frank J. Goodnow Award for Distinguished Service

The Frank J. Goodnow Award, created by the APSA Council in 1996, honors the contributions of individuals to the development of the political science profession and the building of the American Political Science Association. APSA's first president, Frank J. Goodnow, exemplified the public service and volunteerism that this award recognizes. Goodnow was the first of many who voluntarily contributed an extraordinary amount of time, energy, and attention to building our dynamic and learned profession.

Award Committee: Diana C. Mutz, University of Pennsylvania (Chair); Kerry L. Haynie, Duke University; Lawrence R. Jacobs, University of Minnesota

Recipient: **John H. Aldrich**, Duke University

Citation: John H. Aldrich's service to the discipline, as well as to the broader social science community, has been and continues to be both extensive and exemplary. His position as a distinguished scholar and contributor to the discipline already have been recognized in having been elected President of the Midwest Political Science Association and the Southern Political Science Association, as well as serving on the Executive Councils of the Midwest Political Science Association, the Southern Political Science Association and the American Political Science Association, among other positions.

In addition, Professor Aldrich has provided many concrete benefits and goods to the broader political science community through his involvement in the development of major large-scale data sets that are of prime importance to the

discipline. Most importantly, he served as Chair of the Board of Advisors of the American National Election Study and has served on the Board since 2003. In addition to the ANES, Professor Aldrich has been a member of the Planning Committee of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems data set. He was also instrumental in the development and funding of the Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models Summer Institute. As with most successful programs, their origins are often lost with the passage of time. However, his many substantial contributions to all of these endeavors are so extensive that they have not been forgotten.

John H. Aldrich recently chaired the APSA Taskforce on Interdisciplinarity for the American Political Science Association. The report from the taskforce, asking how, why, and to what extent the modern institution of higher learning is best understood as this rich mixture of disciplinary and interdisciplinary structures, has been turned into a book manuscript. This was a major commitment of time and a tremendous service to the discipline, as well as an important scholarly contribution.

In addition, his role as a mentor and dissertation chair or co-chair is fondly remembered by dozens of political scientists across the discipline. Professor Aldrich has produced at least 32 young scholars to date, leading to the nomination by his students, and subsequent selection by a university committee to receive the Graduate School Dean's Award for Excellence in Mentoring and Scholarship from Duke University.

John H. Aldrich's service and contributions have made an enduring impact on American political science, on the APSA, and on social science more broadly. His voice was always one of reason and he consistently gave generously of his time and talent to these many endeavors. It is with deep appreciation for his dedication to scholarship, research, the Association,

and the profession that we present to Professor Aldrich the Frank J. Goodnow Award for Distinguished Service.

John Gaus Award and Lectureship

The John Gaus Award and Lectureship is given to honor the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration. The recipient delivers the Gaus Lecture at the Annual Meeting.

Award Committee: Sharon H. Mast-racci, University of Illinois, Chicago (Chair); Daniel P. Carpenter, Harvard University; Lael R. Keiser, University of Missouri, Columbia

Recipient: **Beryl A. Radin**, Georgetown University

Title: "Reclaiming Our Past: Linking Theory and Practice"

Citation: The American Political Science Association (APSA) is proud to confer the 2012 John Gaus award upon Professor Beryl Radin to honor her "lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration."

Professor Radin, of the Georgetown Public Policy Institute at Georgetown University, has profoundly and substantially influenced the study and practice of public administration and policy in the United States and internationally. She has made extraordinary contributions in several areas, most notably federalism, intergovernmental relations, and comparative public administration.

Professor Radin has written and co-written 10 books, and more than 100 articles, book chapters, and monographs. Her commentary has been sought and published in dozens of outlets, including the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *Government Executive*, *PA Times* and the *New York Times*. She has advised hundreds of students throughout the course of her remarkable career, which includes

academic appointments at American University, the University of Baltimore, the University of Southern California, and the University of Texas at Austin. Her international reputation as an accomplished scholar is betrayed by the number of academic appointments she has received to premier universities from Copenhagen to Canberra; Sydney to Shanghai, New Delhi, and Hong Kong. Indeed, in his decision, one Gaus Award committee member underscored her contributions to both the international and domestic dimensions of public administration.

Professor Radin recently received the H. George Frederickson Award by the Public Management Research Association (PMRA) in recognition of her lifetime achievements in and lifelong contributions to public management. She was instrumental to the creation of the PMRA and was elected to its first Board of Directors. In 2008, she served as a Super Delegate to the Minnowbrook III conference, and is a past President of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management. She has long served APSA, perhaps most notably on the Centennial Center Board in 2008, but also chairing the Public Administration section, and serving on award committees in several other sections. She has edited and co-edited some of the most prestigious journals of public administration, including the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, and has served on innumerable editorial boards. Her impact extends beyond the academy to administration in practice, having served as a consultant to national and international organizations and agencies, including the World Bank, the National Academies, NASA, IRS, EPA, and several cabinet-level agencies in the United States and Australia.

In her new book, entitled *Federal Management Reform in a World of Contradictions*, Professor Radin interrogates the somewhat underwhelming track record of many efforts at government reform, and is particularly critical of the tendency of reformers to gravitate toward “one-size-fits-all” approaches. One nominator of Professor Radin for the Gaus Award praises this book for “challeng[ing] the way in which academics as well as practitioners have tackled the problems associated with public management reform.”

Given her global impact on scholarship, partnerships with government

agencies, and lifelong support for generations of students, few corners of public administration and political science are untouched by her influence.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award

The Hubert H. Humphrey Award is given in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Award Committee: Melissa Nobles, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Chair); James L. Gibson, Washington University, St. Louis; Jacob S. Hacker, Yale University

Recipient: Louis Fisher, The Constitution Project (retired)

Citation: We are pleased to award APSA’s Hubert H. Humphrey Award for “notable public service by a political scientist” to Louis Fisher, Scholar in Residence at the Constitution Project.

Dr. Fisher has long been regarded as the nation’s preeminent expert on all facets of separation of powers. In his lifelong quest to understand the challenges of constitutional self-government, Fisher’s encyclopedic knowledge of budgeting, national security, and many other vital issues of the day educated two generations of colleagues, collaborators, students, Capitol Hill staffers, and members of Congress.

Before joining the Constitution Project, Fisher worked for four decades at the Library of Congress as Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers (Congressional Research Service, from 1970 to 2006) and Specialist in Constitutional Law (the Law Library, from 2006 to 2010). During his service with CRS he was research director of the House Iran-Contra Committee in 1987, writing major sections of the final report.

His books include *President and Congress* (1972), *Presidential Spending Power* (1975), *The Constitution Between Friends* (1978), *The Politics of Shared Power* (4th ed. 1998), *Constitutional Conflicts Between Congress and the President* (5th ed. 2007), *Constitutional Dialogues* (1988), *American Constitutional Law* (with Katy J. Harriger, 9th ed. 2011), *Presidential War Power* (2d ed. 2004), *Political Dynamics of Constitutional Law* (with Neal Devins, 4th ed. 2006), *Congressional Abdication on War and Spending* (2000), *Religious Liberty in America: Political Safeguards* (2002), *Nazi Saboteurs on Trial: A Military Tribunal & American Law* (2003; 2d ed. 2005), *The Politics of Executive Privilege* (2004), *The Democratic Constitution* (with

Neal Devins, 2004), *Military Tribunals and Presidential Power: American Revolution to the War on Terrorism* (2005), *In the Name of National Security: Unchecked Presidential Power and the Reynolds Case* (2006), *The Constitution and 9/11: Recurring Threats to America’s Freedoms* (2008), *The Supreme Court and Congress: Rival Interpretations* (2009), *On Appreciating Congress: The People’s Branch* (2010), and *Defending Congress and the Constitution* (2011). His textbook in constitutional law is available in two paperbacks: *Constitutional Structures: Separation of Powers and Federalism* and *Constitutional Rights: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties*. He has twice won the Louis Brownlow Book Award (for *Presidential Spending Power* and *Constitutional Dialogues*). The encyclopedia he co-edited was awarded the Dartmouth Medal. In 1995 he received the Aaron B. Wildavsky Award “For Lifetime Scholarly Achievement in Public Budgeting” from the Association for Budgeting and Financial Management. In 2006 he received the Neustadt Book Award for *Military Tribunals and Presidential Power*.

Dr. Fisher has been invited to testify before Congress about 50 times on such issues as war powers, state secrets privilege, NSA surveillance, executive spending discretion, Congress and the Constitution, and presidential impoundment powers. He is in demand around the world as a lecturer and consultant on constitutional development.

The nominating committee salutes Dr. Fisher’s extraordinary career of scholarship and public service. He is a true public intellectual. It is hard to imagine another scholar in this country who has done more over the years to illuminate the Framers’ vision of separation of powers than Louis Fisher.

Carey McWilliams Award

The Carey McWilliams Award honors a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

Award Committee: Sarah Binder, George Washington University (Chair); Marion R. Just, Wellesley College; Regina G. Lawrence, University of Texas, Austin

Recipient: Dana Priest, *The Washington Post*

Citation: Carey McWilliams was an investigative reporter who wrote about such subjects as the oppression of farm labor, the internment of Japanese-

Americans during World War 2, the McCarthy witch hunts, and the Bay of Pigs. His work revealed failures of government or activity that governments had tried to hide. In that spirit, the APSA's Carey McWilliams Award goes to "a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics."

This year we have chosen a journalist who, like Carey McWilliams, uncovered uncomfortable truths that the government tried to keep hidden. Dana Priest is an investigative reporter for the *Washington Post* who most prominently reported on the egregious health care at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center of wounded servicemen and women from the war in Iraq. Her stories caused a major scandal that resulted in the firing of top Army brass, reforms to military health care, and the eventual closing of the hospital. Another of Priest's reports focused on the "black sites" where detainees of the war on terrorism are being held outside the United States. Most recently, Priest provided intensive analysis of the vast network of secret agencies carrying on the war on terrorism and collaborated on the PBS *Frontline* special, "Top Secret." These investigative reports collectively aid our understanding of the inherent costs and threats of the way the government has prosecuted the war on terrorism. Dana Priest's reporting, like Carey McWilliams', may not be popular in governmental quarters, but it is essential reading for students of government, political scientists, and the broader public.

Distinguished Teaching Award

The Distinguished Teaching Award honors outstanding contributions to undergraduate and graduate teaching of political science at two- and four-year institutions.

Award Committee: Kay Schlozman, Boston College (Chair); Juan Carlos Huerta, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi; Anita J. Isaacs, Haverford College

Recipient: **Denise L. Scheberle**, University of Colorado-Denver

Citation: Last year the American Political Science Association established an annual award to recognize distinguished teaching. It is a great pleasure to confer the 2012 Distinguished Teaching Award, the first such award, to Denise Scheberle of the University of Wisconsin - Green Bay.

The nominations for this award were uniformly extremely impressive, demonstrating both that there are many excellent teachers of political science and that there are multiple ways to embody teaching excellence. While the committee might have wrangled over which construction of "distinguished teaching" should prevail in making the inaugural award, we were not forced to choose any particular understanding. No matter which way we might have construed distinguished teaching, Denise Scheberle's record measures up.

With respect to the basic metrics of teaching success, Prof. Scheberle shines. Whether freshman or graduate students, the students in her public policy and environmental affairs courses testify over and over to the impact she has had on their lives and, according to her dean, award her stratospheric teaching evaluations. Beyond her unambiguous success in the classroom as conventionally defined, she has branched out by encouraging technological innovations, embracing on-line teaching, and participating in her university's adult degree program for non-traditional learners. Furthermore, she has created innovative hands-on learning projects such as the Steps to Make a Difference Walk, a service-learning project that raised over \$50,000 for nonprofit organizations.

Complementing her prodigious efforts to advance her own teaching are her contributions to improving others' teaching—not simply through her generosity as an informal mentor but through her work in bringing about both an annual teaching conference at UW-Green Bay and the Teaching and Learning Center on campus. In addition, she was instrumental in the development of the Teaching Scholars program for first- and second-year faculty, a program that includes not only peer review of the teaching of new faculty but also faculty research projects focused on teaching. She then took this program another step by extending it to include measures to encourage tenured faculty to reengage with their teaching.

With such a record, is it any wonder that she has received the Founders Association Award for Excellence in Teaching from the University of Wisconsin - Green Bay; the University of Wisconsin Regents Teaching Excellence Award, which is the highest teaching award in the University of Wisconsin system; and the Founders

Association Award for Excellence in Community Outreach Teaching from the University of Wisconsin - Green Bay? We are pleased to add the 2012 Distinguished Teaching Award to this list.

BOOK AWARDS

Ralph J. Bunche Award

The Ralph J. Bunche Award is given for the best scholarly work in political science published in the previous calendar year that explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Melissa J. Marschall, Rice University (Chair); Matt A. Barreto, University of Washington; Pei-te Lien, University of California, Santa Barbara

Recipients: **Charlton D. McIlwain**, New York University; **Stephen Maynard Caliendo**, North Central College

Title: *Race Appeal: How Candidates Invoke Race in U.S. Political Campaigns*, Temple University Press

Citation: In *Race Appeal* McIlwain and Caliendo examine the use and influence of race-based appeals by black and white candidates in American elections. The authors employ an impressive array of data and methods, including the Kanter Political Commercial Archives, content analysis, experiments, newspaper ads and case studies to analyze not only how candidates use language and visual imagery to construct race-based appeals, but also how these appeals affect both black and white voters. In addition to finding that whites and blacks continue to respond very differently to race-based messages and the candidates who use them, the authors present evidence throughout the book demonstrating persistent racial animosity and resentment throughout the American political system. Despite these pessimistic findings, the authors offer a way forward. Referencing research on latent racial attitudes (e.g., implicit associations), which finds subconscious predispositions about people of color to be widespread, the authors argue that meaningful progress on race relations and racial equality can be made if Americans eschew their defensiveness about their own racial biases and prejudices and focus on addressing the systemic roots of racial injustice. *Race Appeal* is not only a groundbreaking work that represents the most extensive and thorough treatment of race-based appeals in American political campaigns to date, but also an outstanding example of multi-disciplinary work that integrates research

and theory across the fields of communication and political science.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award

The Gladys M. Kammerer Award is given for the best political science publication in the previous calendar year in the field of US national policy.

Award Committee: Thad Kousser, University of California, San Diego (Chair); Sunshine Hillygus, Duke University; Reuel R. Rogers, Northwestern University

Recipient: **Sean D. Ehrlich**, Florida State University

Title: *Access Points*, Oxford University Press

Citation: *Access Points: An Institutional Theory of Policy Bias and Complexity* is driven by a theoretical insight that rings clear as a bell: Lobbyists become more active and influential, making policy more complex and often biased, when the structure of government opens up more points of access. Sean D. Ehrlich's important new book lays out this original idea in plain language, backed by formal reasoning. He argues that one key feature of governing institutions—the number of relevant and independent policymakers who are susceptible to special interest influence—shapes many aspects of both lobbyist behavior and the content of policies.

Ehrlich then demonstrates the explanatory power of this idea through an impressive series of empirical tests that reach across political systems as well as policy spheres. Access point theory helps us understand why US tariff rates shifted over time as the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 delegated decision-making power to the executive branch, and why America's many access points generally empower interest groups and bias policy. This contribution to the study of American national policy is significantly buttressed, though, with cross-national investigations showing that institutional design predicts policy outcomes in trade, the environment, banking, and tax codes across the globe.

Ehrlich guides readers through this wide range of sophisticated tests in well-crafted prose, and concludes by deftly showing how his theory interacts with yet adds to veto player and selectorate theories. With a parsimonious idea that has broad explanatory power, *Access Points* is poised to contribute the American politics, comparative institutions, and policy-making literatures.

Victoria Schuck Award

The Victoria Schuck Award is for the best book published in the previous calendar year on women and politics.

Award Committee: Kristen Williams, Clark University (Chair); Marian Sawer, Australian National University; Anna Marie Smith, Cornell University

Recipient: **S. Laurel Weldon**, Purdue University

Title: *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*, University of Michigan Press

Citation: In *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*, S. Laurel Weldon makes a powerful argument regarding the role of social movements as avenues for democratic representation. Drawing on the literature on social movements, women's substantive representation, intersectionality, and comparative state feminism, Weldon argues that social movements provide an important means for disadvantaged and excluded groups to participate and influence policies. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, as well as cross-national and subnational comparative perspectives, she examines a variety of policy areas, including violence against women in general and violence against women of color, family policy (parental/maternity leave policy), and antidiscrimination policy. She shows, for example, that the separate organizing of women's groups (e.g. black women's caucuses; women of color) was a strength of the movement, rather than a limitation or loss of force—countering the argument that diversification of a movement can lead to its weakening. She finds that “women's organizations, taken together, do a better job of representing the diversity of women—both descriptively and substantively—than do formally representative organizations such as legislatures and political parties” (p. 5).

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award

The Woodrow Wilson Award is given for the best book published in the U.S. during the previous calendar year on government, politics, or international affairs (supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation).

Award Committee: Margit Tavits, Washington University (Chair); Robert S. Erikson, Columbia University; Leslie Paul Thiele, University of Florida

Recipients: **Erica Chenoweth**, University of Denver; **Maria J. Stephan**, U.S. State Department

Title: *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*, Columbia University Press

Citation: *Why Civil Resistance Works* is the first scholarly work to provide a rigorous demonstration that nonviolent movements are more effective than violent ones in defeating authoritarian regimes and establishing durable democracies. The authors statistically test their claim using an original dataset that includes all known major nonviolent and violent resistance campaigns from 1900–2006. They supplement their quantitative analyses with rich, detailed and systematic narratives, persuasively challenging the belief that violence is necessary to achieve political goals. The book is an outstanding work of political science that illuminates one of the most important questions: how to promote social and political change in authoritarian regimes. Given the aspirations of many nations to replace repressive regimes with stable democracies, it is especially commendable that the authors have presented their work in a manner accessible to a wide audience. *Why Civil Resistance Works* is a very timely achievement.

PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

Heinz I. Eulau Award (*American Political Science Review*)

The Heinz I. Eulau Award is given for the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during the previous calendar year (supported by Cambridge University Press).

Award Committee: David J. Samuels, University of Minnesota (Chair); Ernesto F. Calvo, University of Maryland; Branislav L. Slantchev, University of California, San Diego

Recipients: **Lars-Erik Cederman**, ETH Zurich; **Nils B. Weidmann**, Peace Research Institute Oslo; **Kristian Skrede Gleditsch**, University of Essex

Title: “Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War: A Global Comparison” *American Political Science Review* 105(3).

Citation: This paper reconsiders the question of whether various types of inequalities between cultural groups contribute to the onset of civil war. Up to this point conventional wisdom suggested that economic “grievances” do

not matter. Yet the authors suggest that research had yet to consider a potential connection between economic and socio-cultural exclusion. The authors argue that economic inequalities can be transformed into grievances through a process of group comparison, which is driven by activation of collective emotions. More importantly, they find that such grievances can trigger violent collective action. This paper makes a key contribution to an important debate at the juncture of political economy, comparative politics, and international relations. Fearon and Laitin's conclusion that "grievances" do not matter much for civil war has had great influence; Cederman et al draw inspiration from that argument, but offer a welcome revisionist retort. This piece will be widely-cited, and should inspire a great deal of additional work exploring a critically-important issue facing the world today.

Heinz I. Eulau Award (*Perspectives on Politics*)

The Heinz I. Eulau Award is given for the best article published in *Perspectives on Politics* during the previous calendar year (supported by Cambridge University Press).

Award Committee: David J. Samuels, University of Minnesota (Chair); Leslie E. Anderson, University of Florida; Robert E. Goodin, Australian National University

Recipients: **Robert O. Keohane**, Princeton University; **David G. Victor**, University of California, San Diego

Title: "The Regime Complex for Climate Change" *Perspectives on Politics* Vol. 9/No. 1.

Citation: At the heart of this innovative article is a conceptual innovation in the realm of international institutional design. When we look at the global system for managing climate change, what we see is not a strong, integrated regulatory system but rather a "regime complex."

That is a set of loosely coupled elements, concocted at different times for different purposes, which nonetheless manage to work in broadly mutually reinforcing ways. While not ideal in several ways, a regime "complex" has the advantage of flexibility and adaptability over a more tightly integrated international system. A further advantage that states can participate in some parts of it even if they cannot, for one reason or another, join in other parts. This article lays out the logic of such arrangements, illustrating copi-

ously from the case of climate change, and offers fruitful food for thought for students of changes in international relations.

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: Michael F. Thies, University of California, Los Angeles (Chair); Orit Kedar, Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Amie Kreppel, University of Florida

Recipient: **Noam Lupu**, Juan March Institute

Title: "Party Brands in Crisis: Partisanship, Brand Dilutions and the Breakdown of Political Parties in Latin America" (Princeton University)

Citation: In "Party Brands in Crisis," Noam Lupu asks why political parties that have been competitive for power for decades sometimes collapse into irrelevance overnight. Poor performance in office is not sufficient—parties that oversee economic crises can remain important political forces because voters maintain brand loyalty. But sometimes a party desperate for short-term economic performance gains will "dilute its brand" by abandoning longstanding policy positions and converging with traditional opponents. This confuses voters and weakens their attachments to the party, and makes the party much more susceptible to short-term performance evaluations. If the gamble pays off—the dissonant policy move saves the economy—either its loyalists forgive it, or else the party picks up new supporters. But if the gamble fails, the party will have betrayed its core voters for nothing. Now it is seen as both ineffective and unprincipled, and it is likely doomed.

The committee members were impressed with the elegant research design, the novel theoretical model, with its nice interplay between the short-term interests of incumbent leaders and the longer-term interests of prospective future leaders, and the carefully executed empirical work. A clever survey experiment demonstrates that voters' party attachments weaken when they see evidence of party convergence, and comparative case studies of Argentina and Venezuela show that major parties survive brand dilution or poor performance, but not both. Lupu's theory could generalize to any democratic setting, and with a little adaptation of the

notion of a "brand," perhaps to authoritarian settings as well.

William Anderson Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of state and local government, federalism or intergovernmental relations.

Award Committee: Joseph F. Zimmerman, SUNY, University at Albany (Chair); John Kincaid, Lafayette College; J. Eric Oliver, University of Chicago

Recipient: **Paul Brian Nolette**, Marquette University

Title: "Advancing National Policy in the Courts: The Use of Multistate Litigation by State Attorneys General" (Boston College)

Citation: The Anderson Award Committee (John Kincaid, Eric Oliver, and Joseph F. Zimmerman) selected Paul Nolette as the 2012 winner of the Award. He received his Ph.D. from Boston College. His dissertation committee members were R. Shep Melnick, Chairman, Marc Landy, and Michael Greve. Nolette currently is an assistant professor political science at Marquette University.

Professor Nolette's 2011 dissertation, entitled "Advancing National Policy in the Courts: The Use of Multistate Litigation by State Attorneys General," makes a major contribution to the literature on state attorneys general by combining quantitative analysis and numerous case studies. This type of litigation differs significantly from other litigation forms, pressures federal regulatory agencies to initiate action, and helps to establish national policies. Nolette's case studies involving the Clean Air Act and pharmaceutical regulation are particularly important. In sum, the dissertation clearly reveals the important roles played by state attorneys general in the federal system.

Edward S. Corwin Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public law.

Award Committee: Melinda Gann Hall, Michigan State University (Chair); Jeffrey A. Segal, Stony Brook University; Georg Vanberg, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Recipient: **Lauren McCarthy**, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Title: "Trafficking (In)justice: Law Enforcement's Response to Human Trafficking in Russia" (University of Wisconsin, Madison)

Citation: Lauren McCarthy's dissertation, "Trafficking (In)justice: Law Enforcement's Response to Human Trafficking in Russia," tells a fascinating story about the prosecution of human traffickers in Russia and in doing so dispels common misperceptions of the criminal justice system. Through extensive ethnographic fieldwork, including interviews that posed a potential risk to her life, McCarthy demonstrates that law enforcement officials—from police officers to prosecutors—respond systematically to the incentives for reward and promotion they confront. Ironically, these incentives discourage officials from enforcing laws against human trafficking and instead encourage prosecution of human traffickers under alternative statutes that require lower standards of proof and thus are easier to enforce. In short, Russia prosecutes human traffickers but not human trafficking. Normatively, sexual trafficking is an enormous problem not just in Russia but in much of the world, including the United States. Anything that gives us a better handle on how to fight this scourge is extraordinarily valuable. This study also has significant implications for understanding the manner in which global concerns for the protection of human rights can be enforced. Overall, this study contributes valuable insights to a number of subfields of political science and serves as an excellent example of how political science scholarship can be used to address compelling normative concerns and pressing practical problems in politics.

Harold D. Lasswell Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of policy studies (supported by the Policy Studies Organization).

Award Committee: Paul J. Quirk, University of British Columbia (Chair); B. Dan Wood, Texas A&M University

Recipient: **Christopher G. Faricy**, Washington State University

Title: "The Politics of Public Versus Private Social Welfare" (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)

Citation: The Harold D. Lasswell Award is given annually for the best dissertation of the preceding year in the field of public policy. The members of the selection committee—B. Dan Wood and Paul J. Quirk (chair)—are pleased to announce that Christopher G. Faricy is winner of the 2012 Award, for his dissertation entitled "The Politics of Public

Versus Private Social Welfare." Professor Faricy, who is assistant professor at Washington State University, wrote the dissertation at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, under the direction of Virginia Gray.

In this outstanding dissertation, whose research is already appearing in leading journals, Professor Faricy builds on the observation by Jacob Hacker that the United States has both public and private systems of social benefits and services—all supported by public policy and funded, directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by taxpayers. The public systems are funded largely by direct appropriations; the private systems are heavily subsidized by tax expenditures. And the two systems have considerably different effects for the respective roles of governmental and market institutions and ultimately for the distribution of income and the material circumstances of low-income people. Faricy makes three distinct and major contributions. First, he presents a carefully constructed, exceptionally valuable data set, showing the development of the public and private systems of social benefits, and their relative size, from 1967–2006—taking into account dozens of tax provisions, measures of private expenditures, and budget items. Second, he develops a theory of the partisan and ideological politics of the two systems and tests it in the context of congressional policymaking. Finally, he uses detailed data on the incidence of the benefits to determine the effects of the two forms of social policy by income group. The findings underline the long-term (not only recent) importance of party in American politics: To the extent that Democrats control the government, they implement direct public spending, and this spending disproportionately benefits lower-income citizens. Republicans, in contrast, implement indirect expenditures; and the resulting growth of private social spending disproportionately benefits middle- and upper-income citizens. The dissertation is an advance in the analysis of tax and expenditure data and a major contribution to our understanding of social policy, party politics, and economic inequality in the United States.

Helen Dwight Reid Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of international relations, law and politics.

Award Committee: Barbara F. Walter, University of California, San Diego (Chair); Nathan M. Jensen, Washington University, St. Louis; Anne E. Sartori, Northwestern University

Recipient: **Margaret E. Peters**, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Title: "Open Trade, Closed Borders: Immigration Policy in the Era of Globalization" (Stanford University)

Citation: In a rich and fascinating study of immigration, Margaret Peters attempts to explain why immigration policy has varied in 19 different states over the last 200+ years. She argues that states' policy about immigration is strongly affected by two factors heretofore largely ignored by scholars: international trade and capital movement. Not only are trade and capital openness critical determinants of immigration policy, but they should be viewed as policy substitutes. Opening trade forces firms to become more productive, move overseas, or close their doors—all actions that reduce their desire for open immigration. Opening capital reinforces this effect by increasing the probability that firms move overseas in response to trade openness. Both actions result in less pressure on policymakers to push for more open immigration. The dissertation then tests this theory using three new datasets, one on the immigration policy of 19 states since the late 1700s, one on the voting behavior of US Senators since 1865, and one on immigration treaties since 1945. The results reveal a robust relationship between trade and immigration that is made stronger when capital policy is considered. Peters has produced an extraordinarily well-written and systematic study of immigration policy that incorporates a novel theory, rich new data and careful analysis. It will shape the way we think about immigration policy for years to come.

E.E. Schattschneider Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of American government.

Award Committee: Wendy J. Schiller, Brown University (Chair); Ted Brader, University of Michigan; Eric Schickler, University of California, Berkeley

Recipient: **James M. Curry**, University of Utah

Title: "Information Control: Leadership Power in the U.S. House of Representatives" (University of Maryland, College Park)

Citation: We are pleased to present the 2012 E.E. Schattschneider award to Dr. James M. Curry. Dr. Curry has produced a creative and persuasive dissertation that explains the role of information in congressional policymaking with an emphasis on the asymmetry between party leaders and rank and file members of the House of Representatives. Curry lays out a clear theory about the power that information affords party leaders, from the content of bills, to the sequencing of issues, to the construction of the legislative agenda. Using both qualitative and quantitative empirical evidence, including interview data, he constructs original measures of congressional activity to test the theory. Curry finds that party leaders selectively release and withhold information about legislation to rank and file members who are thereby forced to accept leadership decisions without a large degree of information or input. The result is an observed increase in party unity and polarization, but a decrease in actual representation by individual members. In this dissertation, James Curry makes an outstanding contribution to our understanding of American politics because he adds to our theoretical understanding about the underpinnings of party power, and also illustrates the normative tradeoffs between responsible party government and participation in the legislative process.

Leo Strauss Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Stephen Macedo, Princeton University (Chair); Stephen T. Leonard, University of North Carolina,

Chapel Hill; Annabelle Lever, University of Geneva

Recipient: Alison McQueen, Stanford University

Title: "Political Realism in Apocalyptic Times" (Cornell University)

Citation: Alison E.J. McQueen has crafted a rigorously argued, imaginatively conceptualized, and gracefully written dissertation that is sure to make a mark on our understanding of political realism. Crossing the boundaries of political theory and international relations, McQueen brings together three canonical "realists"—Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Hans Morgenthau—all of whom, she argues, struggled with the challenges of engaging an "apocalyptic imaginary." Beginning with originating sources in the books of Daniel and Revelation, McQueen shows how apocalyptic concerns inform the realist project of exposing power while also offering the radical hope of overcoming political conflict. Situating Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Morgenthau in contexts rife with apocalyptic images, symbols, and narratives, McQueen lets us see these works anew. Machiavelli's excited—and near apocalyptic—exhortation in the final chapter of *The Prince* bridges the "Savonarolan moment" in Florentine politics and the tragic sensibilities underwriting his republican commitments. Hobbes' defense of autocratic absolutism is an attempt to answer "apocalypse with apocalypse," and realize the radical hope for "enduring earthly peace." Hans Morgenthau's realism unfolds amidst the apocalyptic imagery of postwar liberal internationalism; McQueen traces his movement away from the tragic sensibility he shared with the

mature Machiavelli, in favor of the more Hobbesian project of constructing a world state as an enduring bulwark against the threat of nuclear annihilation.

The selection committee applauds McQueen, and the many other excellent works nominated for this year's Leo Strauss Award.

Leonard D. White Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public administration (supported by the University of Chicago).

Award Committee: Jerrell D. Cogburn, North Carolina State University (Chair); Sally Coleman Selden, Lynchburg College; Vicky Wilkins, University of Georgia

Recipient: Quinn W. Mulroy, Syracuse University

Title: "Public Regulation through Private Litigation: The Regulatory Power of Private Lawsuits and the American Bureaucracy" (Columbia University)

Citation: Conventional social scientific accounts of American regulatory agencies typically suggest that a lack of formal command-and-control power constrains agencies' effectiveness in enforcing regulatory goals. In contrast, Mulroy's dissertation looks beyond formal administrative powers to reveal agencies' conscious and coordinated strategies for developing and maintaining alternative regulatory enforcement mechanisms. Through a series of meticulously crafted case studies and development of original quantitative measures of agency behavior and enforcement, Mulroy demonstrates how and when regulatory agencies utilize private litigation enforcement as an informal yet effective pathway for achieving their regulatory aims. ■