

Draft Minutes APSA Council Meeting

**American Political Science
Association Annual Meeting
August 30, 2000
Omni Shoreham Hotel
Washington, DC**

Present:

Council Members: Robert O. Keohane, Robert Jervis, Randall Calvert, Ada W. Finifter, Luis Fraga, William Galston, Ira Katznelson, Edmond Keller, Gary King, Atul Kohli, George Marcus, Cynthia McClintock, Eileen McDonagh, Nancy McGlen, Helen Milner, Guillermo O'Donnell, David Rayside, Catherine E. Rudder, Virginia Sapiro, Fritz Scharpf, Christine Sierra, Roberta Sigel, Sven Steinmo, James Stimson, J. Ann Tickner, Howard Silver.

Council Nominees Attending: Richard Brody, Robert Holmes, Sandy Maisel, Doris Marie Provine, Robert Putnam, Mark Schneider, Robert Kaufman, Kathryn Sikkink, Katherine Tate, and Margaret Weir.

Guests: Tony Affigne, Paul Beck, Norman Bradburn, Georgia Duerst-Lahti, Valerie Martinez, Bert Rockman, Ron Rogowski, Kay Schlozman, Lee Sigelman, and Beth Simmons.

[Note: These minutes are intentionally discursive and detailed, as the Council's discussion of the report of the Strategic Planning Committee was the main item of business rather than the usual series of Council actions.]

1. Introductions and Order of Discussion of Agenda Items

President Robert Keohane asked the Council members, guests and APSA staff to introduce themselves. President Keohane pointed out that the Council has to consider several important reports and proposals and that an agreement on how to proceed is needed. He suggested that the Council begin by considering the procedural suggestions from the Administrative Committee, review and approve the minutes of the Administrative Committee and next

take up the appointment of the new APSR editor. The Council could then turn to agenda item #4, the Report of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), beginning with the proposed APSA Mission Statement. The order of SPC recommendations for consideration the morning would be:

10:30 a.m.-11:00 a.m. – Annual Meeting
11:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. – APSR
11:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. – representation and governance

In addition, he pointed out that there are issues in the SPC Report that are covered also by reports before the Council from other committees and the reports with complimentary issues could be considered in conjunction with SPC recommendations. Where there were conflicting recommendations, more time would be needed for discussion. The Council would break for lunch at 12:15p.m. followed by remarks from Norman Bradburn, Assistant Director, Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences, NSF. The Council would reconvene at 2:00 p.m. to continue its discussion of the SPC report and action items on the Agenda: establishing an Electronic Publications Advisory Committee, Report from the Treasurer and proposals regarding graduate student membership, items numbered: 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

2. Approval of the April 29, 2000 Council Minutes

The minutes were corrected by substituting "idea of" for "recommend" on the last line on page 3.

Council Action: George Marcus then moved to approve the Minutes. Eileen McDonough seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

3. Appointment of a New Editor of the APSR

President Keohane referred to his statement on behalf of the appoint-

ment of Lee Sigelman as editor of the *APSR*, accepting the formal recommendation and report from the Search Committee for Editor of the *APSR*. He elaborated on the thorough and deliberative search process and on the strength of the candidates for the editorship. In light of Keohane's own background in IR, he said he was aware of the reservations people might have about another "Americanist," but he said he was convinced Lee would broaden the Review. He commented on the skills and disposition that Lee Sigelman brings to this position. Jim Stimson introduced a motion to appoint Sigelman *APSR* editor.

Council discussion followed. Cynthia McClintock spoke highly of Sigelman's professional, administrative and collegial abilities. Atul Kohli noted that this would be seen as a vote for continuity in editorial leadership by a scholar whose principle field is American politics. Robert Jervis responded that the Search Committee was mindful of this perception as is Sigelman who recognizes the importance of addressing it. Robert Keohane affirmed this intent. Edmund Keller referred Council Members to Keohane's Council statement on the selection. David Rayside observed that having an editor who is aware of the need to create a sense of community may be attractive. Sven Steinmo commented that, as a member of the SPC, he had initially hoped for a change in perspective, but concluded that it is not wise to prejudge, but to encourage the new editor in his efforts to address these concerns. Keohane reported that he visited with Sigelman, prior to recommending his appointment and that Sigelman recognizes the complexity of the issues before the *APSR* and the concerns of APSA members.

Council Action: The Council unanimously approved the motion to appoint Lee Sigelman editor of the *APSR*.

Lee Sigelman joined the Council for a discussion about the future of the *APSR*. He thanked the Search Committee and President Keohane for

their confidence in him and said he was looking forward to becoming the editor. He acknowledged that electronic publishing presents particular challenges. He invited questions from Council members.

Atul Kohli identified himself as a comparativist and editor of *World Politics*. He asked how Sigelman plans to incorporate under-represented areas of IR and comparative politics in the *APSR*. Lee Sigelman responded that, from discussions with his IR colleagues, he is aware of their view of the *APSR* as irrelevant and regards this as unfortunate and one that he wants to change. He also expressed concern about what he perceives as the anger of comparative politics scholars toward the *APSR*. He said that he will appoint associate editors from different subfields to reach out and bring in good submissions to have the *APSR* include the best work in a range of fields and demonstrate greater breadth. Other strategies he would employ would affect the selection of reviewers, the speed of the review process and related matters. He expressed the hope that cumulatively these activities would change the *APSR* and the perceptions about it.

David Rayside asked how these changes would be manifested. Lee Sigelman answered that he will use the "From the Editor" section of the *APSR* imaginatively to explain why the particular articles in each issue are worth a wide readership and to invite comments from readers. He promised also to emphasize excellence and clarity of presentation.

Sven Steinmo complimented Ada Finifter, current *APSR* Editor, for starting a movement for change and urged Lee Sigelman to address the challenges that face the *APSR* and to recognize the singular role the journal plays with respect to the careers of political science scholars of which he seemed well aware. Lee Sigelman concurred and remarked, "You are preaching to the choir." He reinforced his commitment to fostering exchanges across subdisciplinary specializations and improving the quality of writing as well as inclusiveness, while being mindful of the distinctive attributes of articles in different fields.

Fritz Sharpf cautioned that expecting the *APSR* to publish the best work in all fields may be too ambitious. Perhaps the journal should publish articles that are less technical

but where "subfields talk to each other." Lee Sigelman answered that he is sensitive to this objective and its appeal to a broad readership in political science. He said that he is aware that it is important not to publish only cautious and technically competent work.

Robert Keohane thanked Sigelman for his comments which, he said, demonstrated why the Search Committee and he, as *APSA* President, had chosen Sigelman.

Council Action: Robert Keohane moved to thank the Search Committee for its work. The motion was seconded by Stimson and McClintock and passed unanimously

4. Report of the Strategic Planning Committee

Paul Beck, Chair of the SPC introduced the committee's report. He pointed to two broad conclusions in the report: a) in most respects, *APSA* is in fine shape; and b) some changes can make the future of the *APSA* brighter. He thanked the *APSA* staff for responding to the committee's requests for information, *APSA* officers and standing committee chairs, and especially President Keohane who had been so helpful along with the other members of the committee. Robert Keohane said that the SPC report represented remarkable accomplishment—unanimity among a diverse committee. This outcome reflects the leadership of Paul Beck and the willingness of the committee's members to express their views and to compromise. Keohane opened the meeting to discussion of the SPC report.

Mission Statement for APSA

Robert Keohane asked for comments on the need for a mission statement and whether there are errors of omission or commission in the statement.

George Marcus suggested putting "to foster" after teaching and to drop the phrase "deep scholarship." Robert Putnam said that while he is generally skeptical about mission statements, he is stunned that there are no references to the quality, efficiency and justice of political institutions (i.e. there are bulleted declarations regarding the self interests of the profession but little

on the profession's obligations to the public and to the study of politics. This suggests that we/*APSA* have abandoned aspirations to contribute to political institutions locally, nationally, and internationally, he averred.

Robert Jervis said that broad discussion of the mission statement is needed as the process of vetting the SPC Report continues in order to reach closure in the coming year(s). The Administrative Committee and Council provide the forum for continuing discussion on the mission statement.

Annual Meeting

The reports of the Annual Meeting Committee and the SPC differed with respect to rules regarding the number of papers on the program with the SPC recommending a one-paper rule and the Annual Meeting Committee. The Annual Meeting Committee recognized the problem of enabling more people to participate that the SPC rule would address but disagreed with the SPC recommendation for a one-paper rule. Cynthia McClintock, in support of the one-paper rule, noted the uneven rejection rates across program divisions and the especially high rejection rates in certain divisions. Gina Sapiro, speaking as a former Program Chair, member of the Annual Meeting Committee, as well as from personal experience, pointed out that confining participants to one paper would result in many people refusing to participate in panels that focus on the profession or other service panels or to co-author articles with graduate students, as these are secondary priorities to presenting one's own research. She added that it would be unfortunate for *APSA* to eliminate child care since the service is so important to junior faculty, particularly women.

David Rayside pointed out that the Related Groups encourage other people to attend the Annual Meeting and could be put at a great disadvantage with a one-paper rule if people opt to present on the regular program first. Roberta Sigel said that there is merit to the suggestion that graduate students who are on the program be well along in their training. Helen Milner pointed out that the design of the program is very decentralized. The program chair(s) select only a

portion of the division chairs that make decisions about sessions. Ira Katznelson observed that with such a diverse profession, the program chairs could not know about work at the edge of subfields. Moreover, the Annual Meeting structure represents classic incremental institutional development. He recommended looking at substantive rather than procedural issues at some point to see how the program divisions comport with the discipline. George Marcus pointed out that while APSA has a mechanism for forming and consolidating Organized Sections, there is no mechanism for doing so for program divisions. He also suggested that child care be recognized as a legitimate subsidy for Annual Meeting participants.

Ann Tickner raised the question of alternative meeting dates, an issue investigated periodically. Paul Beck noted that past evaluations show that there is no ready alternative date for the members and that a change in dates would cause difficulties and raise prices for hotel contracts.

Ron Rogowski said that the Annual Meeting is characterized by contradictory demands for appearances by senior scholars--which draw large audiences--and graduate students--(which draw small audiences). Tilting too much to the latter will decrease attendees, public attention, registration and revenues. The same contradictions apply to the disparities in demand and attendance across program divisions managed by Organized Sections. Consequently, the SPC recommended the one paper rule but two panel appearances. He endorsed child care but asked if APSA should provide a bigger subsidy than other associations, and suggested not doing so for established scholars. Sandy Maisel agreed that there are trade-offs between offering panels offering opportunities to present papers and round tables attracting larger audiences. It is likely that a good many papers are co-authored with graduate students.

Dick Brody suggested that if an objective of the SPC Report is to encourage graduate student membership, a contradictory message is sent if graduate student participation in the Annual Meeting is discouraged. However, he argued that graduate student panels would be unfortunate. Mark Schneider observed that people are not prepared for organizing poster sessions and that there should be

more and better preparation to encourage participation in these sessions, which other associations use quite successfully. Catherine Tate agreed with Dick Brody's point about graduate student participation. She also suggested that chairs be selected in advance so that they can shape the sessions and improve quality.

Journals

Robert Keohane encouraged broad participation in the discussion of the SPC Report's comments and recommendations about the journals. He also deemed appropriate comments on the Publications Committee proposal for a new journal of political literature.

Sven Steinmo said that this was the most controversial and difficult issue before the SPC. He thanked Paul Beck for conducting the committee's discussion fairly. George Marcus noted that the SPC report is inconsistent insofar as it posed the objectives of speed and prudence in moving to electronic publication.

David Rayside endorsed the suggestion to feature integrative essays in the *APSR* to appeal to a broad audience rather than launching a new journal. Robert Jervis cautioned that many of the pressures on the *APSR* are associated with its importance in tenure and promotion decisions.

Bill Galston said that he strongly favors the Publications Committee recommendation for a literature journal and for implementation of the proposal as quickly as possible. He cited the success of the *Journal of Economic Literature* that is an important reference featuring integrative and synthetic essays. If APSA wants a broader outlet for political science, a literature journal is a venue for practitioners and a public audience. Robert Putnam observed that the American Economic Association has three major journals: the *American Economic Review*, the *Journal of Economic Literature*, and the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. The SPC Report addresses the objectives of the first two journals but offers no analog of the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* that focuses on policy. He asked if there were any discussion in the SPC of the relevance or attractiveness of a journal with special symposia and round tables that *PS* cannot accommodate. Paul Beck answered that the Committee

did discuss such coverage and noted that *PS: Political Science & Politics* has a claim to this area albeit that *PS* covers many areas and might do more in this one.

Robert Keohane said that Robert Putnam's comments raise the issue of whether the APSA has become too inward looking and suggested that this could be a focus during Putnam's presidency. Robert Putnam agreed but persisted that coverage of the type of material featured in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* is immediately relevant. Nancy McGlen reported that the SPC discussed different categories of publications that probably do require three journals, but recognizing the high costs of another paper journal, considered whether electronic publishing should take precedence before another paper journal is launched. She added that the SPC recognized the need to publish papers on policy issues but considered *PS* the venue.

Bert Rockman, Chair of the Publications Committee, summarized his committee's Report. He noted that the report results from the extensive discussions and email exchanges among the Committee's members. The *Journal of Political Literature* being proposed would contain much needed additional book reviews (only 20% of the books submitted are reviewed currently in the *APSR*) and synthetic reviews of the literature as well as coverage of the "perspectives" issues noted by Robert Putnam. The Committee looked closely at the strengths of electronic publishing but concluded that, since there is considerable demand for paper and since paper is still the only secure archival format, a new journal should be published in paper and electronically.

Kay Schlozman responded that the SPC did take all of these objectives into account but dealt with the fiscal realities in making its proposals, as starting a new journal is an expensive proposition. Sven Steinmo affirmed that the SPC confronted all of these issues as well as the question of whether APSA members should be able to choose among journals. All of the options are expensive and there was no consensus. The SPC decided that it was not appropriate to make a specific proposal since a new *APSR* editor was being selected simultaneously. The APSA should be

committed to reviewing all objectives and options for its journals.

Robert Keohane acknowledged that the SPC made some strategic choices. Yet there is a general view that APSA is not providing enough book reviews and review essays, and there is the desire also to inform the polity. Since the APSA's budget situation is good and its endowment is increasing, the possibility exists to augment its journal offerings. Ron Rogowski responded that the SPC agreed about the value of a literature journal and this view is expressed in its report. Committee members were concerned about funding it at the annual cost of at least \$180,000, particularly when revenues from library subscriptions continue to decline. In addition, the SPC preferred to keep review essays in the *APSR*. Ira Katznelson observed that adding pages to the *APSR* might be a cost effective way of achieving the desired objectives. Beth Simmons reiterated the SPC's concern about economic constraints in funding a new paper journal which led to the early proposal for electronic publishing.

The SPC wanted to link all of the desired content electronically to the printed copy and expand the *APSR* as the flagship journal in political science.

Paul Beck agreed that it would be advantageous to broaden journal coverage, both to APSA members and a larger audience. APSA may want to consider investing in publications in hopes of gaining memberships and public attention. Gina Sapiro cautioned about how difficult publications decisions are at this time when electronic communication is changing so rapidly. And, she suggested, there should be concern about placing too much of a burden on the *APSR*: considering the many fields and subfields in the discipline, how many pages would be required if the *APSR* is asked not only to cover all of the research but also to satisfy all of the other objectives? It would be wise to solve these issues without relying on the *APSR* alone.

Gary King said that the Publications Committee and the SPC worked hard and agreed that there should be an outlet for integrative essays and more book reviews. APSA should act on this and determine how to do so now rather than waiting. He observed that no journal ceased publishing on paper when it provided electronic

copy. He suggested that a committee be charged with preparing a plan. Luis Fraga said that the SPC agreed about the importance of creating momentum for growth in membership and attracting a broader readership among teachers and practitioners but was constrained with respect to the mechanism. Roberta Sigel pointed to the appeal of integrative essays and the popularity of the *Journal of Contemporary Psychology*. Robert Keohane supported Gary King's suggestion that APSA take the initiative and budget now for a journal, perhaps by drawing on the Trust & Development Fund.

Representation and Governance

Georgia Duerst-Lahti addressed the Council and pointed to the positive SPC Report references to teaching and the representation of faculty from teaching institutions in Association governance. She would look forward to specific actions to implement these SPC recommendations, and she called for more attention to the recruitment of leaders and to an examination of the opportunity structures for leadership in the APSA. She pointed out that the representation of women varies considerably across Organized Sections and that eight sections have never had a woman president. The presidency of the APSA is of particular concern, and she had hoped that the Council would pass a non-binding resolution that a person of the same gender shall not serve as Association President for more than two consecutive terms. She reported that the WCPS will debate a motion at its Saturday morning breakfast to contest the election of the next president if the nominee is not a woman. She concluded by underscoring the benefits of recruiting women and people of color to the APSA and diversifying the profession. Robert Keohane suggested including this language regarding the objectives for representation for the APSA presidency in the letter sent to members of the Nominating Committee. Since there is energy on this issue, it will get attention. Robert Jervis said that it was the sense of the Administrative Committee that a revised letter to the Nominating Committee would be developed.

Guillermo O'Donnell stated that we should pay more attention to

politics, applied research, and civility. We should also keep in mind that efficiency is important but things like individual ethics cases and the existence of committees to promote the status of under represented groups are more important. He said that APSA should celebrate and foster diversity, as efficiency and cost should not be the sole decision-making criteria. He added that "high barriers" to new initiatives are too conservative and that APSA should lower the barriers to new and creative ideas.

Edmund Keller noted that the Status Committees and Ethics Committee norms on diversity and the support for diversity are valued characteristics of the APSA and should be fostered. The SPC objectives to achieve efficiency should not take precedence. Robert Keohane said that the urgency of the issues of representation in the APSA and in its governance is a reflection of the work of these committees and their constituencies.

Gina Sapiro addressed Georgia Duerst-Lahti's references to representation in the Annual Meeting. She pointed out that insofar as the Organized Sections are responsible for the majority of Annual Meeting sessions, there is less leeway to give consideration to representation in the Annual Meeting Program Committee. The burden of doing so falls to the Program Chair(s). She suggested greater integration of the Organized Sections into the norms of governance of the APSA. Robert Jervis referred to Matthew Holden's questions about the autonomy of the Sections and the difficult tradeoffs between the objectives of decentralization and more integration. There is a need for dialogue with the Organized Sections and attention to this issue in the coming year.

Luis Fraga responded that the SPC carefully considered whether the Status Committees should be merged. The SPC Committee hoped that APSA Presidents would appoint people who are committed and constructive to lead the committees. The SPC also recognized the importance of such leadership positions for the profession. Recommendations 19 on Ethics Committee, 20 on Status Committees and 21 Association memberships in other associations are appropriate for consideration. A renewed commitment to diversity in

the Association and its governance is important. Robert Keohane said that APSA President's should take an active role in the selection of the leadership of the Status Committees and that the evidence of the impressive activity of the Committee on the Status of Latinos/Latinas this year indicates the importance of vigorous leadership. He concluded this discussion by saying that these issues are now before the Council as are all recommendations of the SPC.

Council Action: Robert Keohane introduced a motion to thank the Strategic Planning Committee for its hard work and excellent report. David Rayside and Gary King seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Council Minutes (Afternoon session)

4. Following lunch the Council returned to its discussion of the strategic planning report:

Robert Putnam began by saying that the immediate impetus for strategic planning was finances and declining membership. He added it was always wrong to look at raw membership data; rather we should consider market share. Of the total number of political scientists eligible for membership, how many are APSA members? He suggested that going to the Bureau of Labor Statistics data might help determining whether is the Association's market share is declining.

McGlen responded that the decline in membership was real; Rudder added that "political scientist" is not an employment category in the BLS data.

Rayside said that the accrediting program would consume enormous amounts of staff time; he also pointed out that the planning document doesn't list the under-represented groups and that it should be made clear that the category is inclusive of all under-represented groups including the disabled, and sexual minorities.

George Marcus observed that most of the resources of the Association are focused on meeting the needs of elite, research departments and that more attention has to be paid to teaching. He strongly urged that the

Association use volunteers to develop resource web sites for each of the major introductory courses that would feature existing faculty web sites, syllabi, debates on content and orientation. These invaluable resources would help to serve a broader scope of members and might attract new members. The Council voiced its strong interest in developing this teaching resource.

Keohane reported that the proposal for rostering (prepared by the Education and Professional Development Committee) did not receive the enthusiastic support of the SPC. [The Education and Professional Development Committee is refining its proposal and will resubmit it to the Council for consideration in April 2001.]

Putnam and Marcus pointed to the big tent approach of welcoming academic and non academic members. Marcus noted the unfortunate consequences of the internal conflict within the American Psychological Association between practitioners and academic psychologists.

Jervis stated that it was easy for the Association to say that it welcomed members from non-research institutions or non-academic political scientists; the harder question was whether it was willing to make changes that would make it more attractive to people in other categories.

Fraga argued that the starting point should be to increase the number of APSA members among the faculties on non-Ph.D.-granting departments. He suggested that the first task of a new Membership Committee should be to collect the necessary data on non-Ph.D. faculty to allow for better planning.

5. Report of the Committee on Publications

Keohane observed that several APSA committees were working on the question of the content and direction of APSA publications, and that there appeared to be a consensus within the Council that publishing integrative essays would be desirable. The Administrative Committee suggested that a plan should be developed that addresses (1) the need for a new journal; (2) whether a future journal should be a print or electronic journal; and (3) a business plan for publishing integrative

essays. The Committee proposed that President Bob Jervis appoint committee to look into these and related matters and report to the Council in April 2001.

XXX asked why another publications committee was needed. Keohane responded that the current publications committee would be included but that extra technical expertise was needed to deal with electronic issues facing a new journal.

Guillermo O'Donnell asserted that the Association is behaving in a schizophrenic manner. We want to merge the Status committees and abolish individual ethics cases for cost and efficiency reasons and yet we also want to create a new committee on web publishing. He suggested that if the current Publications Committee does not have the expertise, appoint several new members who do to the existing committee.

Bob Putnam said that there was a consensus on publishing integrative essays, and suggested that 2003 be set as the target date for doing so, leaving for further consideration whether the essays would appear in the *APSR* or a new journal, and whether they would appear in a print or electronic format. Keohane suggested that the Committee's proposal would accept a friendly amendment along the lines stated by Putnam.

Gary King offered the following proposal: That the Council agrees that integrative essays will be published; that a new ad hoc committee will be charged with the responsibility for developing a plan to realize this goal by 2003; and that the ad hoc committee will present a plan at the Council's April 2001 meeting. The proposal was seconded.

Helen Milner questioned whether the Council was still deliberating whether the Association would be moving toward electronic publication of its research and other journals. Keohane responded that the commitment to a future electronic format had been made. Jervis added that the financial questions associated with electronic publishing remained to be worked out.

Bert Rockman added that the Publications Committee was in favor of coming out immediately with a new print journal, the *Journal of Political Science Literature*. George Marcus argued in favor of charging the Publications Committee with the

task of producing the new print journal immediately.

Jim Stimson pointed out that if \$187,000 was the estimated cost of producing a new print journal, there is no slack in the APSA budget to cover the additional expenses, nor is there excess in the draw-down from the APSA endowment. The new journal would mean members would have to pay on average an additional \$14 per member, or approximately \$5 for student members and \$30 for regular members.

Marcus questioned whether the Association was operating like most universities an allowing a prudent draw from its endowment, and that an additional draw of 2.5% would be enough to pay for the new journal. He said that perhaps the bylaws should be changed to accommodate a larger drawdown as is common in universities. Keohane responded that the Association was already drawing down the maximum allowable draw down of 4.5% on its \$4 million endowment.

Rudder added that there are also other claims on future APSA budgets, the most immediate being funding PROceedings. She also observed that given the complexity of the issue, it was unrealistic to promise a final report by April 2001, but that the 2003 goal could be realized and a plan could be delivered to the Council by August 2001.

Sven Steinmo added that if the Association moves to two journals, then it should consider allowing its members to chose between subscribing to the *APSR* and the generalist journal. Further, he stated that members don't seem to like electronic publications and this must be considered in the discussions about a new journal. Additionally, will the additional journal take pressure off the *APSR* to broaden itself? That would not be a positive development, he argued; instead, competition among journals is one way to prevent that development.

Keohane summarized the issues the ad hoc committee would have to consider: (1) paper vs. Electronic format; (2) costs of the chosen format; (3) the role of the *APSR* in publishing integrative essays; (4) member subscription choice. Jervis stated his preference for an ad hoc committee to address these issues rather than the Publications Committee but that the new committee would

include members of the Publications Committee.

Nancy McGlen suggested that the question of increased coverage of teaching and PS must be added to the discussion as well.

Gary King mentioned that commercial publication of journals would alleviate the financial pressures since they would pay start up costs.

Bill Galston echoed Bob Putnam's feelings of urgency for a new journal to be produced by January 2003.

Jervis called the question, and the following motion was passed unanimously:

"The APSA will publish expanded book reviews and more integrative essays no later than January 2003 in a form—electronic and/or print, in an existing or new publication—to be decided. An ad hoc Publications Implementation Committee, appointed by the President and approved by the Council will be established to recommend to the Council plans to carry out this resolution. The committee will report to the Council at its next meeting, April 21, 2001, and will have a completed plan in place for Council approval in time for its August 29, 2001 meeting."

By "integrative essays" the Council has in mind both essays that review the literature in an area and articles that are less specialized than our normal research and span larger parts of the discipline. The latter might also involve the application of political science to questions of public policy.

6. Treasurer's Report-Jim Stimson.

Stimson presented the auditor's report to the Council, and reported that the Association was in sound financial health. Revenues rose by 8% and expenses rose by only 4% making a draw from the Association's Trust and Development Endowment unnecessary.

Council Action: He asked the Council to approve the revised budget which it did unanimously.

Stimson presented a new proposal to offer a one-year free membership to first or second year graduate students in departments that are members of the Department Services Program. The free membership would

help to establish the habit of APSA membership among students. The program's cost would be shared by the Association and the individual departments. The proposal was seconded by Sapiro. Stimson observed that the project was an experiment that could be stopped if it does not succeed in drawing in new members. The proposal was passed unanimously.

Stimson asked the Council to consider a second program that would provide PSNonline to all student members. He was not submitting a proposal as yet because details were yet to be worked out.

Keohane observed that there were three principles guiding current and future APSA programs and services: (1) everyone receiving a benefit has a responsibility to provide something in return; (2) members of the Association have a responsibility to support collective benefits, even if they do not receive an individual benefit; and (3) the Association should continue to innovate and expand services and programs to members.

Keohane said that there was no recommendation from the Administrative Committee on the PSNonline proposal at this time, but the Administrative Committee would report to the Council presently. George Marcus asked that the Council be given a detailed explanation of how the program is currently funded.

7. Presidential Appointments

Bob Jervis' appointments to the standing and awards committees were reviewed by the Council and approved.

8. Annual Meeting Committee Report

Rob Hauck reported that the Annual Meeting Committee had made six recommendations:

It proposed (1) remaining with the existing system for allocating panels, but established a cap of 736 panels as the maximum number of panels to be organized by the program committee; (2) continuing to give Comparative and IR panels--bonus panels to encourage participation; (3) remaining with the two- participation rule with an allowance for an extra appearance as chair at one of your two panels; (4) placing a cap of 50 rather than 75 on the count of

roundtable attendance; (5) not providing A/V equipment beyond overhead projectors due to the disproportionate costs such equipment entails; and (6) asking Related groups to demonstrate that their subject matter is not represented in the regular program, to have at least 50 APSA members among their members, and to maintain a three-year average annual attendance at panels equal to 2/3 of the average annual attendance of panels at the entire meeting (currently 17 attendees). Failure to meet the attendance requirement would mean a one-year suspension from participation in the Annual Meeting. The guidelines were developed to allow for efficient allocation of limited meeting space and not to devalue participation by Related Groups.

Council Action: The Council asked that the Annual Meeting Committee reconsider the two participation rule give the Strategic Planning Committee's suggestion that we go to a one paper rule; and to reevaluate the reduction in the roundtable cap. All other guidelines were approved.

There was substantial discussion about the Related Groups proposal. David Rayside worried that the new rules devalued related group participation. The timing also was said to be a problem. He said that groups do not have much time to gather signatures due to rapid implementation, and suggested a trial period followed by a reevaluation of the policy. Gina Sapiro expressed concern that Related Groups might die but acknowledged the pressure on room space and wondered why some of these groups were not part of pertinent Organized Sections. Christine

Sierra asked if APSA knew how many Related Groups would meet the standards. Rob Hauck answered that so far one related group has withdrawn. Christine then asked if the rules were therefore simply a "bothersome hurdle." Hauck, on behalf of the Annual meeting Committee, iterated that the intent of the rule is not to end Related Groups. The Council asked for a report on the effects of the rule in April.

Keeping poster presentations open longer was also discussed.

Council Action: The Administrative Committee's motion endorsing the Annual Meeting Committee recommendations with the exception of the roundtable cap and a needed exclusion for non-membership-based Related Groups such as the New York Times. Unanimously approved.

9. Agenda for APSA business meeting

The Council approved the Agenda for the annual APSA Business Meeting for 2000.

10. Eligibility for Dissertation Awards

The Endowments Committee proposed new eligibility guidelines for nominations for dissertation awards.

A. Nominations for dissertation awards are to be limited to members of the Association's Departmental Services Program; each member may nominate one candidate for each award.

B. Nominations can come from multiple units within an institution provide they too are DSP members.

C. International departments (upon satisfying the first two requirements) may submit nominations, but the

work of the awards committees will be conducted in English.

Council Action: The Council approved the eligibility guidelines.

11. Council approval of new organized section

Council Action: The Council approved the formation of a new Organized Section on Comparative Democratization.

12. New Business:

A. Sven Steinmo raised the issue of the construction of the Council. He questioned whether a three-year term might not be better and whether the Council might not rotate its spring meeting among all the regional associations.

George Marcus observed that half of the Council is new each year which enables little continuity or familiarity with issues. Keohane responded that if terms were extended to three years, participation in Association governance would be cut by 50% unless the size of the Council were expanded.

B. Atul Kohli suggested that steps be taken toward democratizing the Association's elections; representation should not be allowed to trump elections. Keohane observed that the American Economics Association has competitive elections for its two vice-presidencies but not for the office of president. Cynthia McClintock reported that the Latin American Studies Association relies on competitive elections. Keller added that the present system of slate-making can be effective provided that there is a credible commitment to the importance of diversity in the profession's leadership.

C. Guillermo O'Donnell questioned whether the timing of the Annual Meeting should be reconsidered.

D. Maurice Woodard's retirement from APSA following 25 years of service was warmly acknowledged by the Council.

E. Helen Milner and Ira Katznelson thanked the APSA staff and section chairs for their contributions to the success of the 2000 meeting.

APSA Awards Presented at the 2000 Annual Meeting

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: Joel Kreiger, Wellesley College, chair; Karen Alter, Northwestern University; and Yasheng Huang, Harvard Business School.

Recipient: Anna M.

Grzymala-Busse, Yale University

Dissertation: "Redeeming the Past: The Regeneration of the Communist Successor Parties in East and Central Europe after 1989"

Dissertation Chair: Grzegorz Ekiert, Harvard University

Citation: Anna Grzymala-Busse explains why in some Central Europe countries successor Communist Parties were able to regenerate themselves to become electorally competitive, while successor parties in other Central European countries remained unpopular. The key factor was the willingness of party leaders to immediately streamline and centralize the party organization, while defeating and excluding orthodox opponents within the party.

The thesis is extremely impressive in its scope, the thoroughness and skill of the research conducted, and its capacity to sustain a clear general discussion by masterfully weaving the case explorations into a broader account of the process of party adaptation to democratic politics. The work is theoretically insightful, and has significant prescriptive possibilities. Indeed, *Redeeming the Past: The Regeneration of the Communist Successor Parties in East and Central Europe after 1989*, should be read by any political leader trying to negotiate a significant political transition.

William Anderson Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the general field of federalism or intergovernmental relations, state and local politics.

Award Committee: Clarence Stone, University of Maryland, chair; Ann O'M. Bowman, University of South Carolina; and David B. Walker, University of Connecticut.

Recipient: Pamela W. Winston, Johns Hopkins University

Dissertation: "The Devil in Devolution: Welfare, the Nation, and the States"

Dissertation Chair: Matthew A. Crenson, Johns Hopkins University

Citation: In examining welfare reform, Pamela Winston takes on what may be the most important social policy issue of our time, alteration of the nation's welfare program. Her dissertation, "The Devil in Devolution: Welfare, the Nation and the States," provides a strong dose of political

realism to those who assume that decentralization brings government close to the people. By examining legislative politics in Congress and in three state legislatures, Winston shows that, though there is variation among the states, the voice of the poor diminishes as one moves from the national arena to state arenas. Overall her analysis covers both a vertical dimension (how the states do things differently from the national government) and a horizontal dimension (how states vary). The central finding is that shrinking the sphere of policy making has serious consequences for representation. Smaller is not necessarily better. At the same time, a big state may fail to provide the same scope of representation as states of modest size. The greatest difference, however, is between the national government and the states. The federal government represents more than a force for uniformity; it also affords wider representation.

Winston tackles a big question, builds a strong theoretical foundation, brings together a compelling body of evidence, and presents her findings clearly and crisply. This is scholarship at its best. The committee is pleased to name Pamela Winston the winner of the William Anderson Award for the year 2000.

Edward S. Corwin Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of public law.

Award Committee: Peter Fish, Duke University, chair; Murray Dry, Middlebury College; and Lettie McSpadden, Northern Illinois University.

Recipient: Kenneth I. Kersch, Lehigh University

Dissertation: "Frames of Progress: The Political Imagination of Rights and Liberties in the United States Supreme Court"

Dissertation Chair: Theodore Lowi, Cornell University

Citation: From among more than a dozen dissertations submitted to it, the Committee selected as the best dissertation in the field of public law that authored by Dr. Kenneth Ira Kersch entitled: "Frames of Progress: The Political Imagination of Rights and Liberties in the United States Supreme Court". Written in the tradition of Edward S. Corwin, Kersch's monumental work challenges the conventional narrative of American constitutional development. That narrative hews to the Whig view of a Manichaean contest between the apocalyptic forces of constitutional darkness and the visionary forces of constitutional light. Out of this clash emerges triumphant constitutional progress wherein the disharmonious is harmonized and the incommensurable is reconciled. Kersch advances and alternative and provocative thesis -- that the narrative of constitutional development has not been one marked by linearity, harmony and continuity, but rather by non-linearity and discontinuities. The latter forms an agonistic narrative. Only by so viewing the saga of constitutional development in distinct historical epochs can political choicemaking between and among fundamental and desirable creedal values be revealed. Free of retrospective wisdom and unexamined teleology, his constitutional narrative incisively unveils the tragic choices at the core of American political life.

Kersch builds his learned study on epochal constitutional frames fixed by elite constitutional progressives and conditioned by their changing reformist imperatives. He then assesses the associated tenets of constitutional progressivism as they relate the three social spaces: streets (crime and race); schools (education, family, religion and race); workplace (vocations, enterprise, labor and race). His intensive examination of constitutional choices based on a vast and diverse array of sources that include the works of judges, journalists, fiction writers, philosophers, social scientists and legal academics offer

new insights into political dynamics and constitutional decision-making. Kersch's cross-sectional analysis enables him to present a coherent and creative narrative of American constitutional development with a tragic heart.

Weaving law, politics, history and political thought into a constitutional mosaic, he artfully ferrets out the hidden costs that are masked by the linear narrative of policy choices made by elite decision-makers. Kersch finds that their choices among fundamental values produce unintended consequences that devalue traditional rights and liberties and necessitate a re-imagining of those rights and liberties.

The Committee regards this dissertation as one which makes an important and an original contribution to the study of American constitutionalism. Its refreshing and creative approach to a core aspect of American public law reflects the author's immense store of knowledge, an impressive research capacity, an exceedingly fluent writing style and an ability to bring these attributes to bear on the conventional narrative and to transcend it. Kersch's agonistic narrative of the sweep of American constitutional development from the late nineteenth century to the present moment is, the Committee believes, an enduring work of constitutional law and theory.

Harold D. Lasswell Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of policy studies.

Award Committee: Vicki L. Golich, California State University San Marcos, chair; David Vogel, University of California Berkeley; Christopher Bailey, Keele University.

Recipient: **Michael Harrington**, University of California Los Angeles
Dissertation: "Trade and Social Insurance: the Development of National Unemployment Insurance in Advanced Industrial Democracies"

Dissertation Chair: Jeffrey A. Frieden, Harvard University

Citation: With great pleasure, this year's Committee presents the Harold D. Lasswell Award to Michael Harrington in recognition of his excellent dissertation, which stood out as exceptional among a very strong field of contenders.

Harrington's dissertation makes an important contribution to our

understanding of social insurance policies in advanced industrial democracies. We know that social welfare policies were adopted by advanced industrial countries in different ways and at different times; we also know that once implemented these policies varied in their application and effects among countries. National unemployment insurance programs are among the most significant of these social policies. Indeed, many scholars consider these programs to be critical factors that can help explain cross-national differences in a wide range of key economic variables, including structural unemployment, socio-political stability and growth, and class-based partisanship. Few have examined the determinants of the public policies that led to the unemployment systems adopted in the first place. Harrington's dissertation begins to fill this gap.

Harrington focuses on the degree to which societies, and groups in society, are exposed to exogenous economic risks associated with trade; he carefully looks at the relationship between trade and social insurance in both historical and contemporary perspectives. He argues that those who face a strong likelihood of being adversely affected by economic conditions beyond their control (in terms of trade shock, for example) will be the strongest supports of publicly-provided unemployment insurance. He uses statistical analysis and case studies of three European countries – Great Britain, Belgium, and Switzerland – and the United States to evaluate the degree to which countries, and groups within countries, vary on the trade-shock-unemployment insurance dimension, and the extent to which this variation has affected the propensity to provide or demand particular forms of public unemployment policies.

We believe Harrington's work has substantial implications for our comprehension of other insurance-like public policies. This dissertation is sure to have a significant impact on students of public policy, as well as scholars of European politics, social policies in general, and political economy even more broadly. To quote from Jeffrey Frieden's nomination letter, "It constitutes a convincing theoretical presentation and empirical evaluation of an argument that makes eminent good sense, that goes a long way toward explaining modern social policies,

and that complements other important work in Political Economy."

Although a runner-up category does not exist, the Committee wishes to acknowledge the very fine dissertations of Philip Jude Ardoin (Louisiana State University) and John Donald Smith (The Florida State University).

Helen Dwight Reid Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

Award Committee: J. Deborah Sparr, Harvard Business School, chair; Rob Paarlberg, Wellesley College; and Etel Solingen, University of California, Irvine.

Recipient: **Kristian S. Gleditsch**, University of Glasgow

Dissertation: "Peace Has Its Victories, No Less Renowned Than War"

Dissertation Chair: Michael D. Ward, University of Colorado, Boulder

Citation: From a strong field of submissions, the dissertation of Kristian Skrede Gleditsch nonetheless stands out. Gleditsch presents a path breaking application of statistical geography to the study of international and domestic conflict. He develops a new data set based on distances between polities in the international system since 1816, and employs this data alongside more conventional measures of conflict and political democratization to add a missing spatial dimension to the democratic peace debate. The democratic peace, he demonstrates, is not only dyadic; it is profoundly regional, in a Deutschan security community sense.

It is rare to find a dissertation that succeeds simultaneously as an integrative theoretical exercise and as an empirical exercise. Gleditsch succeeds at this exceptionally ambitious task through a disciplined and sustained effort at inquiry and analysis. His work is grounded in a thorough knowledge and a fair rendition of analytical arguments in both the international relations and democratization literatures, a detailed grasp of existing data base options, and an innovative application of spatial statistics. The inferences he draws regarding spatial clustering of political outcomes, including both internal and international conflict outcomes, present a powerful challenge to most prevail-

ing statistical approaches. Analytically, Gleditsch compels us to add a regional level of analysis to our work, in order to understand outcomes at both the state level and the system level.

This is a long and necessarily technical piece of scholarship, yet it manages to avoid being tedious. The author's thinking is alive with curiosity and propelled forward by new empirical discoveries. Heavy use is made of the work of other scholars, and always in a constructive manner. Small minded sub-disciplinary gamesmanship is completely absent from this dissertation. Gleditsch's work is a model of intellectual rigor, stamina, and spirit, and our committee agrees unanimously that it should be the winner of the 2000 Helen Dwight Reid Award for the best dissertation in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

E.E. Schattschneider Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of American government and politics.

Award Committee: Luis Fraga, Stanford University, chair; Karen O'Connor, American University; and Howard Rosenthal, Princeton University.

Recipient: **Glen S. Krutz**, Arizona State University

Dissertation: "Explaining Institutional Change: The Rise and Impact of Omnibus Legislating"

Dissertation Chair: Jon Bond, Texas A&M University

Citation: In this extremely creative and insightful dissertation, Glen Krutz argues that the increased use of omnibus legislation is an effective mechanism used by both President and Congress to achieve policy goals in an environment of growing issue complexity. Although omnibus legislation has been used since the 81st Congress in 1949-50, it has become more and more common in national legislation. It now comprises almost twenty percent of all bills enacted. Building upon important work in Congressional decision making, divided government, and budgetary politics, Krutz's sophisticated integration of theoretical literatures and his empirical examination of over 1,000 major bills from 1949-94 reveals that "omnibus

legislation is a way to manage uncertainty in legislative institutions in order to get things done, and that leaders, members, and the president all gain something in striking omnibus bargains." The analytical design that engages both micro-factors of strategic bargaining and macro-factors such as institutional constraints allows Krutz to make a major contribution to our understanding of how American government continues to evolve in ways that result in legislative productivity. As Krutz so eloquently states, "[Omnibus bills] provide a way to circumvent the pressures of deficit politics and issue complexity, the gridlock of divided government, and the gridlock of committee jurisdiction fragmentation. In this regard, omnibus bills tell a collective story of successful strategic-level and institutional adaptation to challenging circumstances." Dr. Krutz has made a major contribution to our understanding of American national institutions that will be cited favorably for many years to come.

Leo Strauss Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Susan Shell, Boston College, chair; Mark Lilla, University of Chicago; and Melissa Williams, University of Toronto.

Recipient: **Aurelian Craiutu**, University of Northern Iowa

Dissertation: "The Difficult Apprenticeship of Liberty: Reflections on the Political Thought of the French Doctrinaires"

Dissertation Chairs: George Kateb, Princeton University and Alan Ryan, Oxford University

Citation: It is a pleasure to nominate Aurelian Craiutu's *The Difficult Apprenticeship of Liberty: Reflections on the Political Thought of the French Doctrinaires*, for a Leo Strauss Dissertation Award.

Craiutu's dissertation introduces English-speaking readers to a rich and largely neglected vein of liberal thought which emerged in post-revolutionary France, in opposition to both ultra-conservative and radically revolutionary parties. As Craiutu ably shows, the so-called 'doctrinaires' were determinedly moderate, inclined toward flexibility

and accommodation, and yet firm in their opposition to a will-based theory of sovereignty that they associated with tyrannies of both the right and left; their thought thus belies on a variety of fronts the name assigned to them by their opponents. The Doctrinaires attempted to steer a middle course between the reassertion of royal absolutism and the churning chaos threatened by reliance on unmediated popular will. That conservative forces dominated the elective Parliament at crucial constitutional moments made their political and rhetorical situation especially complex. Cries to strengthen the hand of Parliament vis a vis the king had the perverse effect of enabling the forces of monarchical absolutism. But immediate political considerations, as Craiutu shows, were not the only reason for the Doctrinaires' shaded enthusiasm for popular government. Doubtful of all theories linking legitimacy to sheer assertions of the will, be it of the monarch or the people, Guizot, in particular, formulated a new theory of sovereignty as an adjunct of moral and political reason. The purpose of representative institutions, on this account, was not so much to express the people's will as to gather and give force to the wisdom of what he called 'the capable ones,' largely seated, in his mind, in the emerging middle classes. Guizot thus combined a Kantian belief in the accessibility of moral knowledge with an unKantian emphasis on the natural superiority of a few. For similar reasons, the Doctrinaires do not view government (as opposed to centralized administration) in as hostile a light as do many other liberal thinkers; for a forceful government may well represent the best tool available for liberating the collective wisdom that custom and party otherwise keep down.

Doctrinaire thought also contributed mightily, as the author compellingly argues, to a new, historically informed approach to political analysis whose most famous practitioner is Tocqueville. Not least of the merits of Craiutu's study is the light it sheds on Tocqueville's debt to the prior work of Guizot, whose widely read *History of Civilization in Europe* also influenced thinkers such as John Stuart Mill. Craiutu persuasively traces the source of such famous Tocquevillian themes as the

ineluctability of the spirit of equality, the priority of social conditions over more formal political arrangements, and the dangers of centralized administration and the 'despotism of the majority.' Thanks to his study, English speaking readers will be less likely to approach Tocqueville as if he were 'born in a desert,' and more alert to his special merits.

Finally, in a suggestive final chapter, Craiutu points to ways in which the Doctrinaire tradition might inform contemporary efforts to establish liberal government in post-Communist Europe.

Leonard D. White Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of public administration.

Award Committee: Joel D. Aberbach, University of California, Los Angeles, chair; Kathy E. Ferguson, University of Hawai'i; and Cornelius M. Kerwin, American University.

Recipient: William W. Newmann, Virginia Commonwealth University
Dissertation: "The Pattern of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Developing an Evolutionary Model"
Dissertation Chair: Paul Hammond, University of Pittsburgh

Citation: The committee to choose the recipient of the Leonard D. White award for the best dissertation complete and accepted in 1998 or 1999 in the field of public administration is pleased to select William M. Newmann for this honor.

Dr. Newmann's dissertation, completed at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh, is an impressive study focusing on organizational issues in presidential decision making.

Newmann presents evidence that there is a consistent pattern in the evolution of the foreign policy decision making process within any president's administration. Over time, presidents narrow the number of advisers they rely on, make more and more decisions using informal and ad-hoc processes, and bypass the standard interagency structures initially created as the foundation of the decision making process. This occurs because of increasing time constraints on decision makers (narrowing), learning by the presi-

dent and his senior advisers about the strengths and weaknesses of both the formal structures and the individual participants, and as a function of the pattern of political pressures the president experiences over the course of his term.

The dissertation uses case studies of the decision making processes on strategic arms control and nuclear strategy during the Carter, Reagan, and Bush administrations to demonstrate the hypothesized pattern. "Structured, focused comparison," the use of a standardized set of questions for each case, is the method employed.

The work is empirically rich, dynamic, and gives proper attention to the complexity of organizational goals and practices. Newmann is sufficiently modest in suggesting that the evolutionary pattern of decision making he finds could be different in other areas, but he has made an important contribution to the literature on the structure of foreign policy decision making within the executive branch of the U.S. government.

ARTICLE AND PAPER AWARDS

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

For the best paper presented at the 1999 Annual Meeting.

Award Committee: Gary King, Harvard University, chair; and Evelyne Huber, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Recipient: Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University

Paper: "Accounting for Outcomes of Post-Communist Regime Change: Causal Depth or Shallowness in Rival Explanations"

Citation: The award goes to Herbert Kitschelt for his paper "Accounting for Outcomes of Post-Communist Regime Change: Causal Depth or Shallowness in Rival Explanations."

This paper's main contribution lies in providing a compelling critique of rapidly proliferating explanations of regime diversity of post-communist countries, based on a conceptualization of excessively "deep" and "shallow" explanations, and in developing instead a theoretical explanation that links the hypothesized causes to the outcome through identifiable mechanisms and

maintains a clear analytical separation between the causes and the outcomes. Explanations that seek the roots of post-communist regime forms in religious traditions, zones of administrative control in the early part of the 20th century, or geo-strategic considerations in the late 20th century, fail to link these factors to the process of regime formation in the post-communist world. In contrast, explanations that identify the bargaining strength of the bureaucracy versus newly emerging parties, or the composition of elites, or the authoritarian intentions of executives in 1990 and thereafter as the causes of regime outcomes, produce statistical results with a high degree of variation explained, but at the cost of using as independent variables factors that are part of the very phenomenon that needs to be understood, the emergence of the autonomous political articulation of social forces versus the continuing strength of authoritarian elites. The nature of the bureaucracy under communist rule - professional versus patrimonial - which in turn had its roots in the nature of the bureaucracy in pre-communist times, interacted with the strength of the emerging civil society, which again had its roots in the vibrancy of civic and political associations before the communist takeover, to create the conditions for democratic governance and the enforcement of civil and political rights.

Professionalized bureaucrats were less inclined to subvert both economic reform and political transparency and accountability by appropriating state resources, and the constellation of strong opposition parties facing a collapsed or accommodative former communist party was favorable for the establishment of democratic procedures. The empirical test of these various explanations is based on simple correlations and clearly needs to be developed further. However, the paper is an excellent example of one of the two kinds of papers usually presented at the APSA meetings, and highly representative of the one kind that was nominated this year, namely works in progress, as opposed to polished papers ready to go to print. This paper provides a lucid evaluation of competing explanations and charts new theoretical paths in an important emerging area of comparative politics.

Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)

For the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during 1999.

Award Committee: Lisa Martin, Harvard University, chair; Nancy Bermeo, Princeton University; and Bryan Jones, University of Washington.

Recipient: **Carles Boix**, University of Chicago

Paper: "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies," *APSR* 93(3) 609-624.

Citation: In "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies," Carles Boix undertakes a sophisticated analysis of change in electoral systems. His model addresses a fundamental issue in the study of the structure of democracies. Boix understands electoral rules as endogenous to the calculations of political elites. Elites can, in times of rapid change such as an extension of the suffrage, act to change the rules of the game to lock in advantage. The extent of the threat to the existing party regime by challenging (socialist) parties proves to be the most important variable in explaining the extent of adoption of proportional representation. Boix provides a clear definition and measure of threat, as the size of the socialist force and the existing divisions among the non-socialist parties. The effect of these two variables is multiplicative. Boix manages to convey a complex argument in clear terms. His development of theory and presentation of persuasive empirical work is impressive, leading us to a new understanding of the strategies of political leaders in designing and changing electoral institutions.

BOOK AWARDS

Ralph Bunche Award (\$500)

For the best scholarly work in political science, published in 1999, which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Marc Howard Ross, Bryn Mawr College, chair; Henry Flores, St. Mary's University; and Claire Kim, University of California, Irvine.

Recipients: **Steven L. Burg**, Brandeis University and **Paul S. Shoup**, University of Virginia

Book: The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention (M. E. Sharpe)

Recipient: **J. Morgan Kousser**, California Institute of Technology

Book: Colorblind Injustice: Minority Voting Rights and the Undoing of the Second Reconstruction (University of North Carolina Press)

Citation: Professors Burg and Shoup have written the only "detailed history" of the Bosnian war that highlights the incompatible goals of the three major warring factions. Their conclusions, although appearing to give no hope for an immediate settlement to the crisis, identifies the conditions under which outside powers can intervene in a conflict so complex and difficult to understand. A conflict of this nature, reinforced by the intransigence of all parties, can only be settled through the sacrifice of the self-interests of the intervenors. Although the authors present their analysis with the greatest detail, they do so while maintaining the highest scholarly standards through the presentation of the Bosnian conflict in a carefully balanced and thoughtful manner.

Citation: J. Morgan Kousser's "Colorblind Injustice: Minority Voting Rights and the Undoing of the Second Reconstruction" is an impressively researched and important book. Starting with the First Reconstruction following the Civil War, Kousser shows how electoral laws and political institutions have been systematically designed to thwart minority voting power in the U.S. While the Second Reconstruction following World War II brought important advances in minority voting rights, Kousser argues persuasively that this progress has been seriously threatened by the radical "colorblind" turn initiated over the past decade by so-called conservative jurists and scholars. This book is a fine example of how historical analysis can enrich our understanding of contemporary policy issues.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award (\$1000)

For the best political science publication in 1999 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Award Committee: Katherine Tate, University of California, Irvine, chair; Lee Epstein, Washington University; and Deborah Stone.

Recipient: **David Cole**, Georgetown University

Book: No Equal Justice: Race and Class in the American Criminal Justice System (The New Press)

Citation: U.S. law enforcement is an ongoing trade off between protecting the rights of defendants and protecting the safety of citizens. In No Equal Justice, Professor David Cole shows how the Supreme Court has interpreted the constitutional rights of citizens in ways that ultimately emphasize safety over individual rights. The problem is compounded as the police too prioritize safety over rights, using sometimes rational but also very clearly racially discriminatory rules to target minorities and poor Americans. At the same time, Cole provides a very subtle analysis about the nature of the racism that permeates the criminal justice system. It is far more problematic than intentional and explicit racism, but encouraged by apparently "race-neutral rules." In some ways, this book reminded the committee members of Michael Lipsky's Street Level Bureaucracy, because it analyzes how power originates through bureaucratic discretion. Cole's book, after all, engages the central problem of political science, namely the distribution of power. We chose it over other fine books in public policy as well because he provides a set of public policy recommendations toward restoring the constitutional guarantees of rights that should be extended to every person in the criminal justice system, not only the rich, to include America's racial minorities and the poor.

Victoria Schuck Award (\$500)

For the best book published in 1999 on women and politics.

Award Committee: Shannon Stimson, University of California, Berkeley, chair; Jane Jaquette, Occidental College; and Janet Martin, Bowdoin College.

Recipient: **Judith Baer**, Texas A&M University

Book: Our Lives Before the Law: Constructing a Feminist Jurisprudence (Princeton University Press)

Citation: In Our Lives Before the Law, Judith Baer has written both a challenging and thoughtful book. Her construction of feminist jurisprudence moves discussion beyond individual responsibility, or rather challenges scholars to develop more fully their analysis of individual

responsibility to include consideration of related institutional responsibilities in responding to the needs of individuals in society. Her exploration of the jurisprudence of the past thirty years, in such areas as fetal protection and reproductive freedom, illustrates how government as well as other institutions of society structure decision outcomes, and more importantly shape the conceptualization of the issues at hand and the boundaries of debate. Yet they do so often without appropriate attention paid to accountability. Both individuals and institutions, she argues, can be held accountable for policy outcomes. Baer provides a broader analytic and conceptual framework in which to consider and critique dependency scholarship, and to assess why in the final two decades of the twentieth century issues of equality, rights, responsibility, and discrimination remain at the forefront of debate by feminist theorists and policy practitioners, yet the lives of many women remain unchanged. "There [still] can be no escape," she writes, "from the threat of abuse or the demand for care." [p.3].

Baer's book enunciates, in her words, an "imperative jurisprudence," a theoretical approach which "would inquire not what people are like or what the world is like to them but what they and society require for the maintenance of human life and civilization." [p192]. It is a timely contribution that addresses a most difficult arena for difference feminism - the law. However, her argument by extension speaks as well to scholars examining the policy making process within American politics. It combines a sophisticated critique of theoretical literature with an analysis of cases in a logically compelling and nuanced way. Accessible to non-specialists and students, yet authoritative and rich in its analysis, Our Lives Before the Law is a book eminently worthy of the Victoria Schuck prize in women and politics.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$5000)

For the best book published in 1999 on government, politics, or international affairs.

Award Committee: John Aldrich, Duke University, chair; Ray Hopkins, Swarthmore College; and Nancy Rosenblum, Brown University.

Recipient: Barry O'Neill, Stanford University

Book: Honor, Symbols, and War (University of Michigan Press)

Citation: Honor, Symbols, and War by Barry O'Neill analyzes often-imprecise ideas with logical rigor, synthesizing contemporary understandings from the theory of games, the philosophy of language, and comparative linguistics, to make a bold assault on such concepts as honor, face, and prestige and their role in war-making and peace-seeking. O'Neill combines a focus on issues of enhanced scholarly recognition, especially the role of symbols, norms and ideas, with the technical rigor afforded by the strategic calculus.

The core to the book's success is the careful elucidation of the meaning of symbolism. O'Neill develops conceptions of message, focal, and value symbols. These conceptions (especially the first two) are then contextualized in a systematic collection of symbols in international relations discourse, as presented in the news. This core is completed by tying this logical and empirical set of conceptions to the beliefs, strategies, and actions of game theory.

O'Neill then proceeds to develop a series of specific instances of this core approach. He begins with the idea of national honor, ties it to a game of incomplete information, and develops not only the logic of what he calls the basic game of honor, but also the nature and form of challenges to honor and commitments based on the necessity to retain honor. He next considers "face," again embedding his conception in a game theoretic setting, and then analyzes insults as challenges to (or as he puts it, "assaults on") face, and derives results about international commitments based on face. He continues by examining models of apologizing based on honor and based on face and how the international setting for apologies differs from the inter-personal setting. His last set of theoretical topics develop comparative analyses of prestige, normative regimes, and moral authority. He applies the full range of what are by now carefully integrated accounts to important aspects of issues dealing with nuclear weapons.

Overall, the growing importance of norms, ideas, and institutions in our globalized world is a reason to especially praise this book. The

importance of symbolism in politics, celebrated by Harold Lasswell decades ago, is rejuvenated in important ways that captures intuitive sensibilities underpinned by mathematical game analyses. Aesthetically, the book is both accessible and yet technically rich. The committee was and we believe the community will also be impressed by the originality of insights and results obtained, and their potential applicability to domestic as well as international politics. It is precisely because this set of ambitious is so audacious and yet O'Neill is so successful that Honor, Symbols, and War is awarded the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award for 2000.

CAREER AWARDS

John Gaus Award (\$1500)

The John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer Award honors the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, recognizes and encourages scholarship in public administration.

Award Committee: James Q. Wilson, University of California, Los Angeles, chair; Jonathan Bendor, Stanford University; and Camilla Stivers, Cleveland State University.

Recipient: **Herbert A. Simon**, Carnegie Mellon University

Citation: Herbert Simon revolutionized the study of public administration by showing the fundamental limitation of scholarly arguments based on plausible but untested assumptions and indicating how those assumptions might be put to a more rigorous empirical test.

The essential feature of that test required the scholar to make human decision-making the core principle of administration. When a person chooses, he expresses a preference for one outcome over another. When he chooses rationally, that person wishes to achieve that outcome at the lowest cost. To understand organizations, therefore, one must understand the circumstances under which decisions lead to efficient outcomes. Measuring efficiency is not easy, but difficult as it may be it is a far more rewarding enterprise than evaluating organizations on the basis of proverbs that at best rest on convenient assumptions and at worst are contradicted by other proverbs of equal plausibility.

Simon did not, however, delegate the study of organizations to classi-

cal economists. Though he shared their interest in rational choice, he knew that scarcely any person can assess all of the alternatives in light of all of their possible consequences. And so he helped us confront the limits on human choice by making us understand his concept of "bounded rationality." Human choice typically ends, he showed, not when people select the very best alternative, but when they satisfy their immediate needs. "Satisficing" is a term that vividly expresses reality while making more complicated the process of analysis. The difficult task of the scholar is to understand human decisions under conditions of limited rationality. Models of behavior that assume people maximize the attainment of some goal are not much help when people cannot maximize. To explain and deepen his perspective, Simon did pioneering work on computer simulations of human thought.

Herbert Simon is the author of 27 books. A measure of their value is that some were first written nearly a half a century ago and yet remain today required reading for any student of public administration.

He has served in the Bureau of the Budget, the Census Bureau, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the President's Science Advisory Committee.

We have honored Herbert Simon by giving him the James Madison Award for a lifetime of distinguished contributions to political science. Other organizations have shared our view. He has received the Nobel prize in Economics, the Gold Medal of the American Psychological Association, and equally distinguished prizes from the American Management Association and scholars in the field of artificial intelligence. He holds honorary degrees from twenty universities, including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the University of Michigan.

Today, the American Political Science Association takes great pride in conferring upon Herbert Simon the John Gaus Award in recognition of his lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration.

Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

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

Award Committee: Christopher Foreman, Brookings Institution,

chair; Susan E. Howell, University of New Orleans; and Craig A. Rimmerman, Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

Recipient: **Alan Ehrenhalt**, *Governing Magazine*

Citation: Alan Ehrenhalt's "major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics" is beyond dispute. We are impressed by the overall quality and breadth of his work, and by the respect he commands among political scientists. Ehrenhalt has carefully unveiled the consistencies, changes and conflicts that mark American public life and policymaking. By carefully exploring selected slices of our politics, he has raised provocative and timely questions about our larger political condition. As the long-time editor of *Congressional Quarterly's Politics in America* Ehrenhalt created a major gateway allowing both scholars and reporters instant access to every individual in the modern Congress and to every electoral constituency shaping it.

In his book *The United States of Ambition: Politicians, Power, and the Pursuit of Office* Ehrenhalt posed a deceptively simple question: "Who sent these people?" His carefully researched and artfully written answer to that question drew our renewed attention to the sheer hunger for office as a primal animating force in political life. His recent collection of essays, drawn from his writing for *Governing* magazine where he serves as editor, is *Democracy in the Mirror: Politics, Reform, and Reality in Grassroots America*.

Few political journalists can match Ehrenhalt's insight, breadth of knowledge, and attention to important questions.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500)

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

Award committee: Matthew Holden, Jr., University of Virginia, chair; Robert Gallucci, Georgetown University; and Kathryn Sikkink, University of Minnesota.

Recipient: **John Ruggie**, Columbia University

Citation: The Humphrey Award is given annually for notable public service by a political scientist. The committee was particularly motivated to recognize Hubert Humphrey, in whose honor this award is named,

began as a political scientist who moved to the world of practice, and always kept a relationship to the community of political science. The committee also determined that no realm of public service could be more compelling than service on the global scale, and no realm more compatible with the tradition of Hubert Humphrey than an interest in the international realm.

The chosen honoree is John Ruggie, formerly was the Dean of the School of International and Public Affairs At Columbia University, formerly Acting Director of Research at the United Nations Institute for Training and Research., currently Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations, on leave as the Burgess Professor of Political Science at Columbia University. Ruggie eminently meets the test.

We need but refer to Ruggie's eminent attainment as a scholar and general theorist of international relations. We need but mention his six books (at last count) and his range of penetrating articles, often anticipating by a long time what other scholars will later develop, on a wide range of topics, including political economy and international institutions.

We here commend Ruggie in the world of practice. As Assistant Secretary General, Ruggie has been engaged with a wide variety of United Nations' policy and administrative issues. These include his role in an independent review of UN operations in Rwanda, the questions of the United Nations role in Kosovo, the United Nations' financial issues, the United Nations and global commerce, and the issues of the United Nations Millennium Summit. These engagements reveal a capacity displayed by few scholars, and provide the material—we may hope—for the deepening and enrichment of the intellectual community as well. We are pleased to recognize and congratulate a colleague who remains actively engaged with the scholarship of political science and who actively displays the competence of political science in the changing worlds of power. John Ruggie is a rare example, worthy of emulation, of individual who is simultaneously an outstanding scholar and deeply committed to and involved in policy making, and thus a worthy example of the scholar into practice in the tradition of Hubert Humphrey.