

## Notes from the Editor

Welcome to the first-ever February issue of the *APSR*, which, by no coincidence, is also our first book reviewless issue. As indicated in prior “Notes from the Editor,” beginning with the first issue of Volume 97, the *APSR*’s cover dates now become February, May, August, and November, rather than the familiar March, June, September, and December. This change has been made to accommodate the APSA’s new *Perspectives on Politics*, which will be published on a quarterly basis, with its inaugural issue appearing a month from now, in March 2003. Formerly bundled with the *APSR*, *PS* will now appear in your mailbox in January, April, July, and October; by now you should already have received the January 2003 issue. These changes have been necessitated by the complexities of publishing and distributing three quarterly journals rather than two.

The launch of *Perspectives on Politics* is also the reason why book reviews, a staple attraction of the *APSR* in decades past, do not appear in these pages. The book review operation is alive and well, but has emigrated to the new journal, in whose March 2003 issue it will reappear. The new challenge for the *APSR* is to claim, or to reclaim, the attention of those who in the past have opened up the *APSR*, if at all, to keep abreast of new books in their areas of interest. If that description fits you, then I invite you to take a few minutes to browse recent issues of the *APSR*, including this one. If you do, I am confident that you will find something (or, I strongly suspect, several things) well worth reading—and I hope that the exercise will prove habit-forming.

### IN THIS ISSUE

In another departure from long-standing practice, the address of the immediate past President of the American Political Science Association does not appear as the lead article in this, the *APSR*’s first issue of the year. The reason is that the interested parties—Robert Putnam, the president who delivered the address, Jennifer Hochschild, the editor of *Perspectives on Politics*, and I—agreed that presidential addresses fall more within the purview of *Perspectives on Politics* than of the *APSR*. Accordingly, President Putnam’s address is to appear in the June 2003 *Perspectives on Politics* rather than here, and in future years the addresses of Presidents Skocpol, Rudolph, and their successors will continue to be printed in *Perspectives on Politics*.

Putnam may be gone from this issue, but he is not forgotten. In our first article, Robert T. Gannett, Jr. addresses the distinctly Putnamian theme of civic engagement. In “Bowling Ninepins in Tocqueville’s Township,” Gannett notes that many scholars, and most prominently Putnam, have drawn on Tocqueville to guide their interpretations of what they consider the distressingly low levels of political participation in the United States today. However, Gannett disputes a reading of Tocqueville as trumpeting the importance of a dense social network that breeds interpersonal

trust, energizing the populace and thereby breeding healthy democracy. That reading, Gannett argues, is not so much incorrect as it is incomplete, for it neglects the distinctly *political* origins of civic vitality. (Hence this issue’s cover graphic: a township hall. As readers will soon see, though, that idyllic image is distinctly out of keeping with the sanguinary subject matter of several other articles in this issue, which deserve an “R” rating for violence.) Gannett’s analysis not only clarifies the meaning of Tocqueville’s work, but also serves as a superb example of how deep familiarity with political theory can enrich our understanding of important contemporary political processes.

An intriguing pairing with Gannett’s reconsideration of Tocqueville is Vincent Phillip Muñoz’s reconsideration of the thought of another icon, James Madison, the “Father of the Constitution.” Proponents of sharply contrasting positions routinely cite Madison on a wide variety of issues, a tendency nowhere more evident than in disputes about the proper relationship between church and state. In “James Madison’s Principle of Religious Liberty,” Muñoz contends that those who have tried to use Madison’s teachings as a guide to the proper constitutional interpretation of church-state relations have consistently misunderstood Madison’s position. According to Muñoz, Madison’s guiding principle was that the Constitution is “religion-blind,” and the implications of that principle for what constitutes an “establishment of religion” or the “free exercise thereof” turn out to differ dramatically from what Madison’s interpreters of various schools of thought have urged. This is a genuinely interesting analysis that specialists and general readers alike will profit from reading, and one that could inform policy debates for decades to come.

Yet another influential figure whose analyses of key aspects of American politics and society have long outlived him was W.E.B. Du Bois, whose writings concentrated on “the problem of the color-line.” In “Unreconstructed Democracy: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Case for Reparations,” Lawrie Balfour addresses a question that “has gone largely unasked in American public life”: “What does the United States owe the former slaves and their descendants?” While conceding that Du Bois himself would not necessarily endorse a campaign for reparations, Balfour nonetheless finds in Du Bois’s analyses several bases for favoring reparations, or, at the very least, for giving the case for reparations a more serious hearing than it has heretofore received.

The likelihood of reparations may seem remote (indeed, Du Bois dismissed reparations as a pipedream), but other policies intended to ameliorate the long-term consequences of slavery and racial injustice are quite real. Race-conscious legislative redistricting and minority-majority districts have been a source of controversy in this country for two decades now, and no cessation of the controversy is yet in sight. In “Black Opinion on the Legitimacy of Racial Redistricting and Minority-Majority Districts,” Katherine Tate uses this

controversy as a means, not only of understanding African Americans' opinions on this important policy issue, but more broadly of clarifying how citizens try to counterbalance competing principles and goals—in this case, a belief in “color-blind” policies, on the one hand, and a desire for greater minority representation, on the other.

The emphasis on conflict—among competing values and/or different groups—that runs through the first four articles in this issue of the *Review* plays out even more starkly in the next six articles. In “No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder Since 1955,” Barbara Harff identifies 35 cases of genocide or political mass murder (“politicide”), analyzes the conditions that gave rise to them, and, importantly, points to specific nations where these conditions are present today. Harff's research warrants serious attention from scholars interested in understanding why geno-/politicide occurs as well as from anyone who is concerned with preventing it.

Estimating the risk of another form of mass political violence, civil war, is the focus of James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin's “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” After identifying 127 civil wars during the post-World War II era, Fearon and Laitin observe that what puts countries at risk of civil violence is not ethnic or religious diversity, but rather a host of other conditions that give rise to insurgency (defined as a military conflict technology characterized by small, lightly armed bands practicing guerrilla warfare from rural base areas). The conditions that favor insurgency, Fearon and Laitin establish, are “largely independent of cultural differences between groups and even group grievances.” This conclusion bears directly on the validity of widely held interpretations of the sources of political instability and violence, and—like the conclusions reached in several other articles in this issue—has major policy implications as well.

A different form of political transition comes under scrutiny in E. Spencer Wellhofer's “Democracy and Fascism: Class, Civil Society, and Rational Choice in Italy.” Here the underlying question is how a political system can rapidly change from democracy to fascism—a question that has been extensively studied in the context of Weimar Germany. Analyzing Fascist voting patterns in Italy, 1919–1921, Wellhofer turns up evidence that directly contradicts a class-based interpretation and offers only mixed support for a “civil society”-based interpretation, but seems consistent with a rational choice-based interpretation. That is, Fascist electoral successes in Italy appear to have been most marked among those who stood to gain the most materially from the Fascist program—a pattern that Wellhofer chillingly characterizes as the “rational” appeal of fascism.

Similar questions motivate Debra Javeline's analysis of mass grievances and the potential for political protest in transitional Russia. The point of departure for “The Role of Blame in Collective Action: Evidence from Russia” is the observation that when people are victims of severe hardship and injustice, their typical response is to suffer in silence. Only occasionally do

they protest, and when they do, political scientists seem unable to explain why they are acting in this unusual way. Javeline constructs an account that centers on the role of blame, the disarmingly simple idea being that discontent is unlikely to lead to protest unless specific wrong-doers can be identified against whom to protest. This idea performs nicely, Javeline finds, in the case of mass responses to the wage arrears crisis in Russia, and it holds out considerable promise, she argues, for broadening our understanding of various forms of collective action in Russia and elsewhere.

In Branislav L. Slantchev's “The Power to Hurt: Costly Conflict with Completely Informed States,” the spotlight stays on conflict but the scene shifts to the international arena. Slantchev's guiding question is why, given the enormous costs of a war, the combatants delay in reaching a settlement that would end it. The key distinction in his analysis is between a nation's ability to bear the costs of war and its ability to impose them, and the most intriguing result—reached via a sophisticated formal modeling exercise and enlivened by confrontation with several specific historical cases—is that each side will keep fighting as long as it maintains its ability to impose costs on the other side, i.e., as long as it has the “power to hurt” its enemy. As viewed from this perspective, the answer to the question of why nations continue to wreak damage on one another appears to be “Because they can.”

Of course, some wars inflict more casualties than others. Mercifully, while relatively minor skirmishes flare up regularly, particularly brutal wars with many casualties occur infrequently. This tendency has been well known to students of international conflict for more than a half a century, and is so consistently borne out in practice that it seems to be one of the rare instances in political science of the operation of something approaching an empirical law. However, as Lars-Erik Cederman points out in “Modeling the Size of Wars: From Billiard Balls to Sandpiles,” it is an “acute embarrassment” that scholars have generally ignored this lawlike behavior rather than trying to account for it. That is precisely the task that Cederman sets for himself. Employing an agent-based approach, and importing state-of-the-art theoretical advances from physics, Cederman provides an original and compelling theoretical explanation for the “power-law” distribution of war severity.

A certain resemblance in spirit and in substance to Cederman's analysis of wars is evident in Bryan D. Jones, Tracy Sulkin, and Heather A. Larsen's “Policy Punctuations in American Political Institutions.” Here the phenomenon to be accounted for is the tendency of political institutions to produce long periods of policy stasis interrupted by sudden sharp breaks. Incrementalism may be the norm, but the real engine of dynamism comes as a “punctuation” that overcomes the normal “friction” or “stickiness” of political institutions. Jones, Sulkin, and Larsen integrate this interpretation theoretically and distill from it some straightforward statistical implications. They go on to demonstrate that these implications are indeed borne out in a wide array of political phenomena in the U.S., including election

results, media coverage patterns, legislative enactments, and budget outlays. Here, then, is a theoretical approach at once broad enough to encompass political phenomena that are typically treated in isolation from one another; concrete enough to yield specific, testable propositions; and powerful enough to produce accurate predictions.

The perils of producing accurate predictions motivate the final article in this issue. In “Coping with Uncertainty: Analyzing Risk Propensities of SEC Budgetary Decisions, 1949–97,” George Krause notes that uncertainty permeates decision-making in all sectors of government. Focusing on one particular agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, Krause tests a model of budget requests, the key insight of which is that these requests provide agencies with a means of hedging against an uncertain future. Faced with uncertainty in its political environment and a consequent inability to anticipate the consequences of alternative courses of action, an agency should proceed cautiously, in a risk-averse manner. Krause’s case study of the SEC yields evidence consistent with this interpretation, thus providing initial empirical support for a line of interpretation that should be expected to find broader applicability in research undertaken in a wide variety of decision-making contexts.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

### General Considerations

The *APSR* strives to publish scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience of scholars and practitioners, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates a significant research problem, or answers an important research question, of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive for a presentation that will be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Therefore, authors should not submit articles containing tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that have already been published or are forthcoming in other places, or that have been included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including on-line journals). In many such cases, subsequent publication of this material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review by other journals or duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts that have been submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Submission of manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or as part of a book or other larger work, is also strongly discouraged. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss any such pub-

lications related to a submission in a cover letter to the Editor. You should also notify the Editor of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review by the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. The Editor may request copies of related publications.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and, in the event that the article is accepted for publication, to permit other scholars to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. For example, for surveys, at the least, sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings should be given; you should calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for RDD Telephone Surveys and In-Person Household Surveys* (Ann Arbor, MI: AAPOR, 1998). This document is available on the Internet at <<http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html>>. For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, subject payments and debriefing procedures, and so on. Articles should be self-contained, so you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by capitalizing the first letter in the variable name and italicizing the entire variable name the first time each is mentioned in the text. You should also use the same names for variables in text and tables and, wherever possible, should avoid the use of acronyms and computer abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables appearing in tables should have been mentioned in the text and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

As part of the review process, you may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear; the review process works most efficiently if such information is given in the initial submission. If you advise readers that additional information is available, you should submit printed copies of that information with the manuscript. If the amount of this supplementary information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing anonymous copies in the Specific Procedures section below.

Manuscripts that are largely or entirely critiques or commentaries on previously published *APSR* articles will be reviewed using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts, with one exception. In addition to the usual number of reviewers, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being criticized, in the same anonymous form that they are sent to reviewers. Comments from the original author(s) to the Editor will be invited as a supplement to the advice of reviewers. This notice to the original author(s) is

intended (1) to encourage review of the details of analyses or research procedures that might escape the notice of disinterested reviewers; (2) to enable prompt publication of critiques by supplying criticized authors with early notice of their existence and, therefore, more adequate time to reply; and (3) as a courtesy to criticized authors. If you submit such a manuscript, you should therefore send as many additional copies of their manuscripts as will be required for this purpose.

Manuscripts being submitted for publication should be sent to Lee Sigelman, Editor, *American Political Science Review*, Department of Political Science, The George Washington University, 2201 G Street N.W., Room 507, Washington, DC 20052. Correspondence concerning manuscripts under review may be sent to the same address or e-mailed to [aprs@gwu.edu](mailto:aprs@gwu.edu).

### Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should not be longer than 45 pages including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices. This page size guideline is based on the U.S. standard 8.5 × 11-inch paper; if you are submitting a manuscript printed on longer paper, you must adjust accordingly. The font size must be at least 11 points for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including notes and references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception of tables for which double-spacing would require a second page otherwise not needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6.5 inches, as is typical for manuscripts (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*), and printed on one side of the page only. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. The *APSR* style of embedded citations should be used, and there must be a separate list of references at the end of the manuscript. Do not use notes for simple citations. These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers. Papers not adhering to these guidelines are subject to being rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may place footnotes at the bottom of the pages instead of using endnotes, and you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text. However, manuscripts accepted for publication must be submitted with endnotes, and with tables and figures on separate pages at the back of the manuscript with standard indications of text placement, e.g., [Table 3 about here]. In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If your paper is accepted for publication, you will also be required to submit camera-ready copy of graphs or other types of figures. Instructions will be provided.

For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. For unusual style or formatting issues, you should consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. For review purposes, citations and references need not be in specific *APSR* format, although

some generally accepted format should be used, and all citation and reference information should be provided.

### Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. You are invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. The Editor will refer to this list in selecting reviewers, though there obviously can be no guarantee that those you suggest will actually be chosen. Do not list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it, or any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends.
2. Submit five copies of manuscripts *and* a diskette containing a pdf file of the anonymous version of the manuscript. If you cannot save the manuscript as a pdf, just send in the diskette with the word-processed version. Please ensure that the paper and diskette versions you submit are identical; the diskette version should be of the **anonymous** copy (see below). Please review all pages of all copies to make sure that all copies contain all tables, figures, appendices, and bibliography mentioned in the manuscript and that all pages are legible. Label the diskette clearly with the (first) author's name and the title of the manuscript (in abridged form if need be), and identify the word processing program and operating system.
3. To comply with the *APSR*'s procedure of double-blind peer reviews, only one of the five copies submitted should be fully identified as to authorship and four should be in anonymous format.
4. For anonymous copies, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in the list of references. In no circumstances should your prior publications be included in the bibliography in their normal alphabetical location but with your name deleted. Assuming that text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should include full citations as usual in the bibliography. Please discuss the use of other procedures to render manuscripts anonymous with the Editor prior to submission. You should not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information. *All acknowledgments must appear on the title page of the identified copy only.* Manuscripts that are judged not anonymous will not be reviewed.
5. The first page of the four anonymous copies should contain only the title and an abstract of no more than 150 words. The first page of the identified copy should contain (a) the name, academic rank, institutional affiliation, and

contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all authors; (b) in the case of multiple authors, an indication of the author who will receive correspondence; (c) any relevant citations to your previous work that have been omitted from the anonymous copies; and (d) acknowledgments, including the names of anyone who has provided comments on the manuscript. If the identified copy contains any unique references or is worded differently in any way, please mark this copy with "Contains author citations" at the top of the first page.

No copies of submitted manuscripts can be returned.

### ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

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

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

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

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

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

### BOOK REVIEWS

The *APSR* no longer contains book reviews. As of 2003, book reviews have moved to *Perspectives on Politics*. All books for review should be sent directly to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Susan Bickford and Greg McAvoy. The address is Susan Bickford and Gregory McAvoy, *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB No. 3265, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265. E-mail: [apsrbook@unc.edu](mailto:apsrbook@unc.edu).

If you are the author of a book you wish to be considered for review, please ask your publisher to send a copy to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors per the mailing instructions above. If you are interested in reviewing books for *Perspectives on Politics*, please send your vita to the Book Review Editors; you should not ask to review a specific book.

### OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

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

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

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*  
E-mail: [rhauck@apsanet.org](mailto:rhauck@apsanet.org)

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

Elizabeth Weaver Engel,  
Director of Member Services  
E-mail: [membership@apsanet.org](mailto:membership@apsanet.org)

Reprint permissions:  
E-mail: [reprints@apsanet.org](mailto:reprints@apsanet.org)

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,  
Cambridge University Press  
E-mail: [journals\\_advertising@cup.org](mailto:journals_advertising@cup.org)

### EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING *APSR* AND *PS* ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

#### Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no

fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

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

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

### **APSR Authors**

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials

without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

### **Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials**

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

### **INDEXING**

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