

year, plus naming next year's honorees.

We also completed a very successful summer institute on the American political system for foreign educators, sponsored by USIA. The institute was held jointly with the American University.

15. *Report on the APSA Research Grant Program*

Michael Brintnall noted the study of the Research Grant Program which is in the Council book. He said the Committee has not yet had a chance to review the study to consider whether to make any recommendations to the Council, and that would be forthcoming at the next Council meeting.

16. *Report from the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession*

Michael Brintnall reported to the Council that, per its charge, the Committee has underway a two-part study of the status of lesbians and gays in the profession. The first part is a questionnaire to members, which is being distributed at the meeting and is printed in *PS*. This is not sample based in order to provide the opportunity to reach as many members as possible. The second step is a survey of department chairs, which will be distributed along with the Departmental Survey, with the concurrence of the Departmental Services Committee.

17. *Other Committee Reports and Materials*

Attention was drawn to informational materials supplied with the Council book. This included information on the Oral History project which is wrapping up at the University of Kentucky and will result soon in a volume of oral histories of black political scientists. Twelve of fifteen scheduled interviews have been completed. The apparent success of the Chairs Workshop sponsored by the Departmental Services Committee, going on concurrently with the Council meeting, was also noted. Rob Hauck announced that the *State of the Discipline II* book was now in print and being distributed, and that the authors would be honored at the Graduate Student Reception. Hauck also reported that APSA had purchased a new, state of the art telephone system, which would be in place soon after the annual meeting. And Catherine Rudder pointed out the increasing number of activities at the annual meeting oriented to graduate students, and invited Council members to participate in them fully.

18. *New Business*

Rob Hauck reported on a new situa-

tion involving the APSA building which might warrant considering its possible sale. He said that the building is a significant asset, which we work hard to make contribute to the Association. The new tenant, the Eurasia Foundation, is an ideal neighbor. In addition, we are working to secure tax exemption for the property.

The State Department, however, has designated New Hampshire Avenue where we are as a new embassy row. This has generated increased interest in purchase of our property as an embassy site, especially since world events have raised demand for new embassies. We are an ideal site with a good location, a well-maintained building, and parking and consequently might be able to command a substantial premium above current market prices.

The Administrative Committee has directed staff, in the most cautious manner, to pursue the possibilities, particularly to determine if we could purchase a smaller building outside the embassy zone, and after considering all costs, have enough additional net revenue to add or fund a program. This calculation would include the cost of buying out our current tenant. It would also consider whether we had obtained tax exemption for the current building, which stays with the property. A \$1 million net revenue would fund a \$50,000 per year program. We would hope for a net twice that amount. The net revenue would definitely be earmarked for endowment of one or more APSA programs.

President Barker added that the Administrative Committee has established a procedure for this inquiry which includes full, frequent consultation and approval by the Administrative Committee and the Council.

Raymond Hopkins remarked on the wonderful building and location that we have now, and indicated he would rather work to raise new funds for endowment elsewhere than risk moving to a less desirable building. Ron Rogowski said that if a zoning decision presents us with a windfall, and we could get a building of comparable quality that is not so zoned, then we have an obligation to consider it, since the net funds could be used for activities to advance the purpose of the Association and to help political scientists in the future.

Lucius Barker reiterated that, at present, all that is called for is an inquiry into the possibilities. He asked for a vote of the Council on the Administrative Committee recommendation to look into these issues, as spelled out in the Administrative Committee minutes. In discussion, the charge to the National Office to conduct a full budgetary assessment, to include "full transactions costs, moving

expenses, loss of rental income, effect on the agreement with current tenants and all other relevant considerations" was modified by friendly amendment offered by Ron Rogowski to include after the word tenants "comparability of alternative facilities."

The Administrative Committee recommendation, so amended, passed in a voice vote with one dissent.

20. *The Council adjourned.* The next meeting will be Saturday, April 16, 1994, in Chicago, IL.

APSA Awards Presented at 1993 Annual Meeting

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1991 or 1992 in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: George T. Yu, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Chair; Mary Katzenstein, Cornell University; August Nimtz, University of Minnesota

Recipient: Daniel M. Green, Indiana University

Dissertation: "Structural Adjustment Reform, Politics and Government Political Projects: A Comparative Study of PNDC Ghana and the District Assembly Decentralization Policy"

Dissertation Chair: Patrick O'Meara

Citation: Daniel M. Green's exceptionally well researched and written study examines the impact of structural adjustment economic reform programs on politics in developing countries. He examines Ghana from 1982 to 1990 under the government of the Provisional National Defence Council. The focus of the study is upon how structural adjustment reforms affect patterns of politics and influence the political strategies of governments. One of Green's findings is that implemented adjustment reforms can have earth-shaking consequences, creating markets and granting ascendancy to market rules of economic exchange where none were previously present.

The conclusions are relevant to the greater issues facing developing countries: issues concerning economic restructuring, the political dimensions of economic reform, government capacities to redraw economic and political rules in society,

and the limits of those capacities. The study makes a major contribution to our understanding of the impact politics of adjustment has on the politics of developing countries. Students of comparative politics will read Green's work with profit.

William Anderson Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1991 or 1992 in the field of intergovernmental relations.

Award Committee: Rodney Hero, University of Colorado, Chair; Susan E. Clarke, University of Colorado; Ron Hedlund, University of Rhode Island

Recipient: **Grant Reeher**, nominated by Yale University, currently at Syracuse University

Dissertation: "Narratives of Justice: Legislators' Beliefs About Distributive Fairness"

Dissertation Chair: David Mayhew

Citation: Grant Reeher's dissertation, "Narratives of Justice: Legislators' Beliefs About Distributive Fairness" (Yale University, advisor: David Mayhew), frames the study of state legislative politics as issues of normative democratic theory. In doing so, he creates an exemplary piece of scholarship that underscores the ideological subtlety and diversity of American politics and redirects our attention to an all too frequently overlooked arena for debates on the nature of justice and fairness—the American state legislature. In short, the dissertation powerfully reasserts and reaffirms the critical role of the states as politics, and state legislatures as institutions, in understanding the development and evolution of democracy, both normatively and empirically, in the United States.

Reeher examines the beliefs about distributive justice held by the Senators of the Connecticut General Assembly, including how these beliefs are constructed, the nature of these beliefs, and patterns and relationships among these beliefs. This empirical study finds three narratives delineating distinctive beliefs about the workings of the market economy, fair distributions, solutions to distributive problems, and the role of government in the economy. Reeher persuasively argues that "beliefs matter" by demonstrating how these narratives of justice serve as cognitive filters affecting legislators' perceptions of information and issues.

In establishing the grounds for his compelling and incisive argument, Reeher creates a series of counterfactual themes: the enduring significance of distributive

justice issues in state politics, the potential for state activism on distributive justice concerns that both presage and refine national initiatives, the continued salience of ideology at every level of American politics, and the significant diversity of views encompassed within what appears to be a consensual liberal political tradition. Concerned that the assumptions and labels of American liberalism are increasingly inappropriate and misleading in contemporary political settings, Reeher explores ideological beliefs through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and a value ranking exercise. The resulting dissertation brings together normative and theoretical questions, innovative methodological approaches, and a remarkably comprehensive and engaging account of supporting scholarship in a carefully crafted and beautifully written analysis.

Edward S. Corwin Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1990 or 1991 in the field of public law

Award Committee: H. W. Perry, Harvard University, Chair; Bradley Canon, University of Kentucky; Augustus Jones, Miami University of Ohio

Recipient: **Andrew Koppelman**, Princeton University

Dissertation: "The Antidiscrimination Project: Foundations, Scopes, Limits"

Dissertation Chair: Bruce Ackerman

Citation: Andrew Koppelman's dissertation is not about a small, well-defined, manageable problem. It is an extraordinarily ambitious effort to address head-on what is arguably this society's biggest sin—unjust discrimination. Koppelman seeks no less than to effect a cultural transformation. The breadth, depth, and passion of his analysis rivals that of any of the major thinkers on this topic. He systematically analyzes and challenges the positions of liberals and conservatives, philosophers and lawyers, feminists and phenomenologists. His targets are everyone from Rawls to MacKinnon, Ackerman to Ely, Rousseau to Hegel. He is a tough critic, but he treats prior scholarship seriously as he attempts to separate the wheat from the chaff.

Koppelman states that his dissertation is an essay in philosophy not law, but his arguments have profound implications for how we might think about antidiscrimination law. His effort, which he labels the antidiscrimination project, "seeks to reconstruct social reality to eliminate or marginalize the shared meanings, practices, and institutions that stigmatize some groups of human beings on the

basis of ascribed characteristics." Specifically, his concern is with blacks, women, and homosexuals. It is not enough simply to eliminate improper governmental action. He asserts that "[a]ntidiscrimination law rests, not on an obligation of impartiality that the state owes its citizens, but on an obligation of recognition that the citizens owe each other."

Koppelman begins by surveying many theorists of antidiscrimination law and finds all of their theories ultimately inadequate because "none of [their] concerns, standing alone, can account for what antidiscrimination law actually does or our intuitions about what it should do." He then turns to build the case of why discrimination is wrong and should be a topic of primary concern. Since his argument involves more than requiring government impartiality and ultimately calls for discrimination concerns to weigh very heavily in any balancing of interests, this task is more complicated than might be suspected. With race being the prototypical case of unjustified discrimination, he systematically demonstrates why gender and sexual orientation deserve inclusion in the antidiscrimination project.

Acknowledging all along that efforts to end discrimination often conflict with other values, Koppelman looks at objections to the project. First he examines the conservative objections and the inadequacy of the liberal response to conservatives. He then turns to liberal objections to his project. He finds liberals unable to offer satisfactory rules to adjudicate conflicts between their commitment to autonomy and to antidiscrimination. Finally, he discusses what he calls "prudential objections" to the project. He looks specifically at attempts to regulate hate speech, pornography, and prostitution. Koppelman strives to maintain liberal values such as prohibiting governmental restrictions on speech arguing that restrictions are often counterproductive, but he usually and unflinchingly allows discrimination concerns to trump others.

We as scholars and as citizens are better off for this work. It will, no doubt, take its rightful place among the major works in philosophy and law about the evils of discrimination and the rights of individuals in society.

Harold D. Lasswell Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1991 or 1992 in the field of policy studies (supported by the Policy Studies Organization).

Award Committee: Joyce Gelb, City College of New York, Chair; Daniel Mazmanian, The Claremont Graduate School; and Robert Nakamura, State

University of New York, Albany

Recipient: **Scott Sigmund Gartner**, University of Michigan

Dissertation: "Strategic Assessment in War: A Bounded Rationality Model of How Organizations Evaluate Policy Effectiveness"

Dissertation Chair: Robert Axelrod

Recipient: **Mark C. Rom**, University of Wisconsin–Madison

Dissertation: "The Thrift Tragedy: Are Politicians and Regulators to Blame?"

Dissertation Chair: Kenneth N. Waltz

Citations:

MARK ROM: The committee members are pleased to present the Lasswell award to co-winner Mark Rom. His dissertation carefully traces the sources, both legislative and bureaucratic, of the "thrift tragedy" of the 1980s.

The analysis documents and analyzes the unfolding of the "thrift tragedy," evaluating it from two perspectives; the "public choice" and "public spirited." Challenging the conventional wisdom and developing an alternative view, Rom concludes that Congress was responsive and responsible, while the regulatory Bank Board made good faith efforts to reform the process. This dissertation was selected as an example of theory meshed with empirical examination.

While public choice theorists tend to see the policy process as seriously flawed, through reconstruction of the thrift crisis and evaluation of the behavior of Congress and the bureaucracy from four perspectives: representation, deliberation, timeliness and oversight, Rom challenges this assessment. He provides an incisive account of an important public issue of our time, and suggests both the possibilities for and limits to reform of the policy process.

SCOTT GARTNER: Scott Gartner's dissertation was selected as co-winner by the Committee because of its original and sophisticated approach to the study of the policy process in international security affairs.

The thesis is an innovative combination of formal modeling, organization theory and historical analysis, all integrated by his theory of policy evaluation.

Gartner's analysis advances our understanding of how wars are conducted, and is especially suggestive regarding the conditions under which strategic policies will change. The study also has broad applicability to other forms of decision making based upon quantitative indicators of success. The study contributes significantly to the literature in security studies and organizational decision making.

The research, combining historical and quantitative analysis, provides an impressive array of case material. The historical investigation ranges from naval decisions in World War I and II to ground combat in Vietnam. The statistical analysis shows that policy change occurs through a process of modified bounded rationality. The thesis demonstrates the importance of information in the conduct of war.

Helen Dwight Reid Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1991 or 1992 in the field of international relations, law and politics (supported by the Helen Dwight Reid Foundation).

Award Committee: Joanne Gowa, Princeton University, Chair; David Lake, University of California, San Diego; and Thomas J. Biersteker, Brown University

Recipient: **James A. Fearon**, University of California, Berkeley

Dissertation: "Committee Jurisdictions and Institutional Change in the U.S. House of Representatives"

Dissertation Chair: Kenneth N. Waltz

Citation: In his dissertation, James Fearon examines an issue of great importance in international relations; the origins and resolution of international crises. His analysis meets the most demanding standards that can be applied to work in the social sciences: it is rigorous, compelling, and highly creative.

He argues that crises erupt because states have private information about their resolve *and* incentives to misrepresent it. Crisis bargaining, therefore, is a process in which states attempt to demonstrate that their level of resolve is high. Because cheap talk cannot do so, these efforts inevitably involve the use of costly signals—that is, actions that can separate high and low resolve types because they are too costly for the latter to take. Into this class fall actions such as the mobilization of forces or the creation of audience costs that will make it difficult for a state to back down. Given the noise inevitably associated with it, however, the signaling process can lead to escalation rather than to peaceful resolution.

To analyze his argument rigorously, Fearon constructs a formal model of it. The model is both simple and powerful. It enables Fearon to draw conclusions that are both compelling and counterintuitive. For example, states that are known *ex ante* to have high resolve are *less* likely to be able to deter a crisis. This is so, Fearon explains, because only a highly-motivated challenger will threaten a state known to have high resolve. As a result, even if the defender sends a highly

credible signal, it is unlikely to deter a crisis. "Immediate" deterrence is, therefore, more likely to *fail* in situations in which prior beliefs about a defender's resolve are that it is high. Conversely, states that are believed to have low resolve but use costly signals are more likely to deter a challenger.

Fearon then applies his insights to the existing literature on deterrence. He argues persuasively that neither a rational deterrence nor a psychological theory of crisis bargaining can predict when or how beliefs will be updated as a crisis unfolds. In the case of psychological theories, for example, he demonstrates persuasively that such phenomena as "motivated biases" are unnecessary to explain why crises do not always end peacefully: signals can fail to produce a separating equilibrium. He also tests his theory against available evidence. He shows that the results of previous analyses are not robust to the introduction of private information and that whether information is acquired *ex ante* or *ex post* is crucial to explaining whether deterrence will succeed or fail.

In sum, James Fearon's dissertation represents a highly original contribution to a debate that is central to the field of international relations. It also demonstrates an extraordinary mastery of political science, of history, of formal theory, and of statistical methods. We have no doubt but that the dissertation will make a major impact on the field.

E. E. Schattschneider Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1991 or 1992 in the field of American government and politics.

Award Committee: Judith E. Gruber, University of California, Berkeley, Chair; Edward G. Carmines, Indiana University; John R. Hibbing, University of Nebraska Lincoln

Recipient: **David Charles King**, University of Michigan

Dissertation: "Committee Jurisdictions and Institutional Change in the U.S. House of Representatives"

Dissertation Chairs: Richard L. Hall, John W. Kingdon

Citation: David King's dissertation "Committee Jurisdictions and Institutional Change in the U.S. House of Representatives" is an ambitious and compelling study of an overlooked dimension of congressional politics and policy making—the nature of committee jurisdictions. He takes this seemingly narrow topic and demonstrates how, with imagination and a sharp eye, it can serve as a window to important theoretical insights.

Rejecting the idea that the system of committee jurisdictions is a static, unchanging institutional fact of the House of Representatives defined by its *Rules Manual*, King instead demonstrates that committee jurisdictions are a dynamic, ongoing part of the institution that change incrementally as a result of bill referral precedents.

King examines a variety of evidence to evaluate jurisdictional change including interviews with observers and participants in the committee jurisdiction process, a review of the development of the bill referral system, a content analysis of 2,500 hearings before the House Commerce Committee, and a case study of the referral history of a jurisdictionally ambiguous issue—magnetically levitated trains. From this extensive and diverse body of evidence he argues that committee jurisdictions change gradually over time as a policy agenda expands and as committee-based policy entrepreneurs pursue jurisdictionally ambiguous issues. This process, in turn, forces the institution to respond to competing demands for jurisdiction in a way that preserves the collective benefits provided by the committee system. King shows that the House has done this by ensconcing the House parliamentarians as institutional guardians whose referral criteria work to do this. Thus, the political dynamics of the “jurisdiction game” involve a series of strategic interactions between policy entrepreneurs and the parliamentarian.

King builds a solid case for the importance of the committee jurisdiction game in the U.S. House of Representatives and by implication for any legislature that organizes its work by committee. In so doing he also sheds light on ongoing controversies over the roles of distributive politics and informational efficiency in the work of Congress and over the power, purpose, homogeneity, and representativeness of congressional committees. King’s dissertation, in sum, casts a penetrating look on a long obscured aspect of modern legislatures.

Leo Strauss Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1991 or 1992 in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Stephen Holmes, University of Chicago, Chair; Lawrence Hank, Tuskegee University; Joan Tronto, Hunter College–CUNY

Recipient: Meta Mendel-Reyes, Swarthmore College

Dissertation: “Participatory Democracy: The Sixties as Metaphor”

Dissertation Chair:

Citation: This imaginative, cogently argued, and richly informative dissertation shows how, in the past two decades, political debate in the United States has been shadowed by a rhetorical struggle to define the legacy of the sixties. Left and right have been guided by rival narratives about the past. For the left the sixties symbolized the failed dream of participatory politics, while for the right it signaled an outbreak of juvenile revolt. Displaying a marvelously perceptive ear for the partisan uses of the past, Mendel-Reyes analyzes, for instance, how the sixties-as-metaphor has allowed right-wing commentators, in defiance of all logic, to associate antipoverty programs and civil rights law with drug use, sexual permissiveness, and moral irresponsibility. Additionally impressive about the dissertation is the way the author weaves together traditional textual analysis (the chapter on Hannah Arendt is outstanding), with cultural interpretations based on an amazingly wide range of sources, from political manifestoes to literature and popular culture. The author’s conclusions about the prospects for participatory democracy in America are measured and interesting. The dissertation could be published as a book tomorrow.

Leonard D. White Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1991 or 1992 in the field of public administration.

Award Committee: Thomas Vocino, Auburn University, Chair; Georgia Persons, Georgia Institute of Technology; Irene Diamond, University of Oregon

Recipient: James Anthony Falk, University of Georgia

Dissertation: “Explaining Infant Mortality: An Assessment of County Governments in Georgia”

Dissertation Chair: Jerome S. Legge, Jr.

Citation: The Leonard D. White Award Committee reviewed several excellent dissertations and we find Dr. Falk’s dissertation to be the strongest in terms of a sophisticated methodology, the testing of theory, and the added bonus of confronting the factors associated with a critical public policy problem—infant mortality in the United States. The dissertation is especially impressive in terms of the wide range of relevant public policy research that is analyzed and brought to bear on the research questions explored in this fine dissertation. The excellent literature review spawned a number of hypotheses relevant to the issue of infant mortality. With this strong theoretical underpinning, Dr. Falk then gathered an impressive array of appropriate data concerning

Georgia counties and systematically addresses his research questions with it.

By focusing on county governments in Georgia, he is able to examine systematically the impact of the structural dimensions of government such as management capacity on the quality of services provided. In this instance, the preponderance of the analysis indicates a clear relationship between management capacity and the reduction of infant mortality. These findings, if disseminated, should have great utility in the development and implementation of social welfare policies.

A key contribution of the dissertation will hopefully be its impact on future research in this area of public policy. Specifically, follow-on research should be conducted in other settings, especially outside the southern states, to determine whether the relationship among key variables found by Dr. Falk will be the same in other settings. This dissertation provides an excellent model for replication and further analysis.

In sum, “Explaining Infant Mortality: An Assessment of County Governments in Georgia” is a first-rate contribution to the public administration/public policy literature while at the same time being relevant to the contemporary health care policy dialogue. Dr. Falk is to be commended for a job well done.

PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

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

For the best paper presented at the 1992 Annual Meeting.

Award Committee: Marjorie Hershey, Indiana University, Chair; James Alt, Harvard University; Susan Okin, Stanford University

Recipient: George Tsebelis, University of California, Los Angeles

Paper: “The Power of the European Parliament as a Conditional Agenda-Setter”

Citation: The Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha award is this year given to George Tsebelis of the University of California, Los Angeles, for his paper, “The Power of the European Parliament as a Conditional Agenda-Setter.” His paper argues that under the current “Cooperation Procedure” the European Parliament has a significant power which has to a large extent gone unnoticed by political scientists. This “conditional agenda-setting” power is shown to have had important effects on some issues but not on others. Using a game-theoretic model of conditional agenda-setting, Tsebelis is able to show why this is so, and extends

the reasoning to the prediction that the changing nature of EC issues alone will make the EC Parliament more powerful in the future, even without formal changes in its rules and structures.

Tsebelis' analysis applies the institutional approach developed in the study of American legislative politics to EC institutions. The Parliament's power is rooted in the rules governing the Council of Ministers' approval of proposals from the Commission and Parliament. Essentially, the rule is that, if the EC Commission has approved, it is easier for the EC Council of Ministers to accept a parliamentary proposal (only a qualified majority is necessary) than to alter it (possible only under unanimity). Hence there is a strategic interaction among the three actors. Tsebelis shows how, if the Commission prefers compromise to the possibility of losing legislation entirely, it will approve a parliamentary proposal with which it might otherwise disagree. Having done so, such proposals will be accepted intact by a qualified majority of the Council of Ministers, for whom the unanimity needed to enforce changes may be unavailable. Therefore, when the Council is divided in a way understood in Parliament, but Parliament's position is not too far from that of the Commission, a credible threat to torpedo legislation allows the Parliament to exercise significant influence over the ultimate compromise. Naturally, in many circumstances the necessary divisions and credible threat will not exist, and the Parliament will appear impotent.

The strength of the paper lies in its knitting together of a variety of approaches and methods. The formal model is laid out in a way which makes transparent the necessary combinations of beliefs and possible outcomes. One case—car emissions standards—in which Parliament had considerable influence in raising the final level of regulation is analyzed carefully, but quantitative evidence is also reviewed about how relatively uncommon such outcomes have been. In the future, however, if issues become more complex and inter-linked, if non-economic issues become more common (facilitating the sort of coalitions needed to pass parliamentary proposals), and as the sort of changes incorporated in proposals become smaller (policy stays nearer the status quo), the European Parliament will become more powerful through its conditional agenda-setting powers, and without any further formal change in its role, structure, or powers. Those who believe in the existence of a significant "democratic deficit" in European institutions will have to contend with this argument.

The award committee was impressed with the combination of theory and

immediate substantive relevance in this paper. It blended good institutional description and analysis, empirical evidence, and timely insight. In this way it seemed indeed to deserve approval and applause as the best paper presented to the 1992 Annual Meeting.

Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)

For the best article published in *The American Political Science Review* during 1992.

Award Committee: Barbara Geddes, University of California, Los Angeles, Chair; Randall Calvert, University of Rochester; David Mayhew, Yale University

Award Recipient: **John Huber**, University of Michigan

Article: "Restrictive Legislative Procedures in France and the United States"

Citation: In an innovative application of formal theories to French parliamentary procedures, John Huber shows that legislative institutions limiting amendments from the floor are used in many of the same circumstances and accomplish the same goals as analogous institutions in the U.S. Congress. This article is one of the first to use the formal models of legislative institutions developed in the context of the U.S. Congress to examine procedures in a parliamentary system. It combines a cogent summary of the relevant formal literature and a concise discussion of the differences between French and American institutions with a series of simple and thoughtful empirical tests of hypotheses drawn from both the formal and descriptive literatures. The result is a lucid and persuasive argument that contributes to the development of theories about legislative institutions, while also increasing our understanding of French politics.

An extensive and impressive formal literature focuses on the effects of institutions within the U.S. Congress. This literature has been criticized for its narrow concentration on a single atypical legislature and its emphasis on formal models at the expense of realism. John Huber's article makes an important contribution in both the areas that critics have considered weak: it shows that theories developed in the context of the U.S. Congress do in fact apply in a parliamentary system, and it demonstrates a close link between theory and reality.

The analysis of French parliamentary procedures demonstrates that the domain of formal theories about institutions that limit amendments from the floor can be extended to include at least some parliamentary systems. In spite of significant differences between the French and

American systems (notably, legislative actors in France are parties rather than individual legislators, and the cabinet in France wields many of the powers wielded by committees in the U.S.), data collected by Huber shows that most of the hypotheses he infers from the formal literature hold in the French parliament.

One of the most attractive features of this article is the fruitful synthesis of theory with the kind of thoughtful empirical work that is only possible when the analyst has spent some time immersed in the buzzing blooming reality he or she intends to explain. The effort that went into collecting data appropriate for testing these arguments is apparent in the unusual consistency among theoretical concepts, hypotheses, and empirical operationalizations in this study. Such consistency is all too rare.

BOOK AWARDS

Ralph J. Bunche Award (\$500)

For the best scholarly work in political science published in 1992 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Ronald Walters, Howard University, Chair; Katherine Tate, Ohio State University; Dario Moreno, Florida International

Recipient: **Rodney E. Hero**, University of Colorado

Book: *Latinos and the U.S. Political System: Two-tiered Pluralism*, published by Temple University Press

Citation: This work is one of the best and perhaps the most comprehensive of all the volumes in the field of Latino politics. It is solidly grounded in political theory, yet juxtaposes it to sociological theories of race relations to explain baseline attitudes and behaviors of Latinos toward the political system. It addresses the politics of a variety of groups sharing Hispanic culture in the United States in the context of an analysis of their political behavior on the national, state and urban levels of government. Nevertheless, it challenges the widely held view that urban politics represents an avenue for upward mobility of Rainbow groups, especially white ethnics, while noting the isolated instances where Black/Latino political coalitions have been successful.

Thus, rich in its treatment of ethnic politics, it utilizes and deepens the cultural approach to politics as an important tool for understanding the behavior of institutions and the distribution of resources. In this, the study builds upon the work continuing in the field of African American politics and as such,

continues to assist in the institutionalization of the field of minority politics in general.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award (\$1,000)

For the best political science publication in 1992 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Award Committee: Kenneth Meier, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, Chair; Richard Brody, Stanford University; Thomas Kazee, Davidson College

Recipient: **Robert Durant**, University of Baltimore

Book: *The Administrative Presidency Revisited: Public Lands, the BLM, and the Reagan Revolution*, published by State University of New York Press

Citation: *The Administrative Presidency Revisited: Public Lands, the BLM, and the Reagan Revolution* by Robert F. Durant is a perceptive analysis of presidential control over bureaucracy using case studies from natural resources policy. Professor Durant argues that fear of the administrative presidency is overblown. Presidential efforts to control policy via administrative actions such as appointments, budgets, and reorganizations will trigger counter efforts by Congress, interest groups, and the bureaucracy. Such resistance to the administrative presidency moves the process into the public view and generates an open form of bureaucratic politics with ample opportunities for a variety of interests to be heard.

Professor Durant views successful presidential control of bureaucracy as a function of the political skills and tactics of the president and his appointees. Short-sided tactics such as large budget cuts often weaken bureaucratic capacity and thus prevent presidents from moving public policy in directions more compatible with their policy goals. Professor Durant has presented a carefully crafted study of both substantive and theoretical importance.

Benjamin E. Lippincott Award (\$1,500)

Presented biennially to recognize a work of exceptional quality by a living political theorist that is still considered significant after a time span of 15 years since the original publication.

Award Committee: Nancy Love, Pennsylvania State University, Chair; Henry Kariel, University of Hawaii; Ian Shapiro, Yale University

Recipient: **J. G. A. Pocock**, Johns Hopkins University

Book: *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the*

Atlantic Tradition, originally published by Princeton University Press

Citation: On behalf of my fellow committee members, Henry Kariel and Ian Shapiro, I would like to present the 1993 Benjamin E. Lippincott Award to J. G. A. Pocock for *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. The Lippincott Award recognizes a comprehensive, systematic work of political theory which has had long-term significance. Pocock's *Machiavellian Moment* arguably founded the republican school and strongly influences communitarian strains of political theory. The "moment" to which he refers occurs when a republic confronts the problem of its own instability in time. He traces this problem from its Aristotelian origins to Florentine political thought, Puritan England, and Revolutionary and Federalist America. Pocock argues that Machiavelli and his contemporaries leave an important legacy—"concepts of balanced government, dynamic virtue and the role of arms and property in shaping the civic personality"—for later struggles with "secular political self-consciousness." His interdisciplinary analysis not only spans the course of western history, but also continues to illuminate contemporary challenges to the American Republic.

Victoria Schuck Award (\$500)

For the best book published in 1991 on women and politics.

Award Committee: Roberta Sigel, Rutgers University, Chair; Christine Di Stefano, University of Washington; Lois Lovelace Duke, Clemson University

Recipient: **Virginia Sapiro**, University of Wisconsin–Madison

Book: *A Vindication of Political Virtue: The Political Theory of Mary Wollstonecraft*, published by the University of Chicago Press

Citation: As a result of Sapiro's thorough research, Wollstonecraft can now assume her rightful and long overdue place within the classical canon of western political theory. Sapiro offers a thorough and insightful thematic analysis of Wollstonecraft's writings, thereby providing the reader with an exemplary model of specifically feminist scholarship within the framework of political science and political theory. Quoting copiously from Wollstonecraft's writings, she conveys to the reader a real sense of the breadth and flavor of her subject's thought. Writing with much verve and a nice sense of humor, she weaves a narrative that places Wollstonecraft's work within the context of her personal life as well as the events

of the period. Sapiro's book thus exemplifies the maxim that "the personal is political."

Her critical reviews of earlier interpretations of Wollstonecraft are a compelling model of feminist "recovery" of the intellectual contributions of women who have been systematically misunderstood and under-appreciated by the gatekeepers of political theory. Sapiro's method of recovery is likely to inspire future efforts among political theorists to reexamine the political thought of women deemed inferior to that of the "great theorists."

In addition the book makes a provocative contribution to the contemporary reconsideration of liberal political theory as a more complex, multi-faceted tradition of thought than many adherents and critics have realized. In locating Wollstonecraft as a critic of liberal individualism securely located within the liberal tradition, Sapiro's interpretation simultaneously credits the field of women's experiences as a precious resource for liberal theorizing and rejuvenates the terrain and tradition of liberal theory.

Sapiro's masterful explication of Mary Wollstonecraft's political thought offers a major and most likely enduring contribution to the subfield of political theory. Those who teach political theory have a useful and valuable resource with which to introduce themselves and their students to Wollstonecraft as a theorist in her own right.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$5,000)

For the best book published during 1992 on government, politics or international relations (supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation).

Award Committee: Charles V. Hamilton, Columbia University, Chair; Leon D. Epstein, University of Wisconsin–Madison; Allen S. Whiting, University of Arizona

Recipient: **Theda Skocpol**, Harvard University

Book: *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers, The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*, published by Belknap Press of Harvard University Press

Citation: Our choice for the 1992 Woodrow Wilson Award is *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers, The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*, published by the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, authored by Theda Skocpol. This book provides stimulating new theoretical analyses and empirical data to understand pre-New Deal efforts at social provision in the United States. It challenges the conven-

tional wisdom that the country was a "laggard" in social welfare policies, and at the same time examines the political factors that inhibited subsequent fuller development of a welfare state.

This book carefully explains the political factors that led to the adoption and demise of Civil War pensions, as well as the development of support policies for the "maternalist phase of U.S. social policy making." The latter occurred, interestingly, at a time when women, the prime advocates, were unable to vote, but were able to build a political network to achieve their goal of mothers' pensions. The book is more than a history of these programs. It provides insights for those concerned to develop a broad political coalition to support universal social provisions.

CAREER AWARDS

John Gaus Award (\$1,500)

The John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer is chosen to honor the recipient's lifetime exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration, and more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration.

Award Committee: Barbara J. Nelson, Chair; Jeffrey Brudney; and Dennis Judd

Recipient: Francis E. Rourke, Johns Hopkins University

Citation: Maintaining an effective relationship between political officials and administrators is one of the dilemmas of governance. This was ever so—in the Yoruba and Chinese empires, in the Italian city states, and perennially in the American republic. Francis E. Rourke has made this relationship the focus of his insightful scholarship for four decades.

His interest is bureaucratic politics, first administrators as actors in the political process in competition for power or defending their organizations, and then the connections among bureaucratic organizations and the president, Congress, and the courts. Rourke's many contributions to the study of political science and public administration are not easily summarized. But central to them is the idea that the administrative state is not made a keystone of democracy by isolation from politics or overreliance on technical capacities. He urges us to consider the degrees and forms of independence and interaction inside and outside bureaucracies and to judge the interests of organizations and their actors by a sophisticated set of criteria.

His greatest skill is to theorize the messiness of bureaucratic politics. He

does so through a steadfast commitment to observation, participation, and scholarly inquiry. The body of his scholarship includes *Intergovernmental Relations in Employment Security; The Campus and the State* (with Malcolm Moos); *Secrecy and Publicity: Dilemmas of Democracy; The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education; Bureaucracy, Politics, and Public Policy; Trust and Confidence in the American System* (with Lloyd A. Free and William Watts); *Bureaucracy: Some Case Studies; Reforming the Bureaucracy*, and scores of articles and chapters. He is presently working on a study of bureaucracy and the American constitutional order.

His interest in bureaucratic politics began in 1948 when William Anderson, a professor at the University of Minnesota, visited Yale where Rourke was a first-year graduate student. Anderson invited Rourke to participate in a wide-ranging study of intergovernmental relations. Rourke saw first hand how deeply public administration was imbedded in the political arena in the United States. He likened this realization to John Keats' feeling upon reading a new book he particularly admired: "Then felt I like some watcher in the sky, when some new planet swims into his ken."

Few fields have as strong a tradition of lighting new candles as does public administration. Frank Rourke is quick to say that he owes his greatest debt to his mentor, William Anderson, who was the perfect model of a scholar and the kindest of friends. Not least of all, he gave Rourke his first opportunity to write in this field. John Gaus would understand the excitement of Anderson's invitation, and all of political science and public administration are the richer for it.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500)

To recognize notable public service by a political scientist.

Award Committee: Theodore J. Lowi, Cornell University, Chair; Donna Shalala, currently Secretary of Health and Human Services, formerly of the University of Wisconsin; and Myron Weiner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Recipient: Richard Neustadt, Harvard University

Citation: Hubert Humphrey can be known well enough through his public words and actions to have guided our committee directly to its decision. It is virtually certain that Humphrey would have considered Richard Neustadt a recipient who would bring as much honor to the award as the award would convey to him.

Richard Neustadt is the scholar Hubert

Humphrey would have chosen to become if he had remained a scholar. Neustadt has always shared with Humphrey a love of the art and craft of politics, the aesthetics of power and the perils as well as the rewards of making the big decisions and accepting responsibility for them. Humphrey shared with Neustadt a passion to convey to scholars and to the public at large the most accurate possible account of the vocation of American politics because a true account is the best testimony for democracy itself. Dick Neustadt is a genuine trustee of Hubert Humphrey's kind of political science, because he has immersed himself in political reality while keeping the process itself at arm's length.

Dick had access to the Prince even before completing his academic training. In the Budget Bureau and in the Truman White House, he was a rare example in the 1940s of a specimen to which we have grown accustomed only in more recent years: A very young person with a great deal of power. An even more unusual specimen, he closed the door on the White House, choosing academia and a life on the outside looking in. Even after he left Washington, completed his Ph.D. and entered academic life, he remained a close friend and advisor to President Truman. But he also did some of his best academic writing at that time. His two pieces in *APSR* in 1954 and 1955, "Presidency and Legislation: The Growth of Central Clearance," and "Presidency and Legislation: Planning the President's Program," quickly became essential reading for anyone doing work on the presidency, on the budget, and on president/Congress relations. Forty years later, they are still essential reading.

Since that time, Neustadt has written many books and articles on what might be called the major decisions of state. And he has been awarded most of the prizes available to people ineligible for the Nobel Award. But he is probably best known for his first book, *Presidential Power*. Published in 1960, it immediately made him Machiavelli to the new Prince, John F. Kennedy. Its embrace by political scientists made it the leading work on the presidency and winner of the APSA's 1961 Woodrow Wilson Prize. Its embrace by President-elect Kennedy put it on the best seller list. But the book also gave Neustadt an undeserved reputation for inordinate love of power. To a degree, that reputation was warranted. Here is an indicative excerpt: "My theme is personal power and its politics: what it is, how to get it, how to keep it, how to use it. . . . How to be on top in fact as well as in name." Although it does sound like love of power for its own sake, actually it is a method, in effect an advancement of

Lasswell's definition of politics as "who gets what, when, how," which Lasswell later put in a more dignified version as "the shaping and sharing of values." The distinctive feature of this point of view is the autonomy of politics—politics as something more than merely a derivative of economics or psychology.

The complete biography of Richard Neustadt would reveal at least two responses to Acton's famous aphorism that "power corrupts." The first, from his writing, would be that the *lack* of power can corrupt even more than power itself. The trick is to find out when and where. The second response is best found in his own career. Always available as an advisor to his party and administration, he remained first and foremost the scholar. And as a scholar he accepted the validity of political experience, reporting on it, analyzing it, criticizing it with a sympathy born of genuine understanding of the virtues and the limits of representative democracy.

In naming this career award for Hubert Humphrey the APSA sought to pay honor to one of its own, our Happy Warrior. And in this spirit, the Committee happily and unanimously presents the 1993 Hubert H. Humphrey Award from the Happy Warrior to the spearbearer, the strategist, the ultimate student of the Prince. The 1993 Award goes to a political scientist whose career has helped so many to take pleasure and a sense of purpose from being a member of this profession.

Editor's Note: Richard E. Neustadt of Harvard University was awarded the 1993 Hubert H. Humphrey Award by the Association in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist. The members of the award committee were: Theodore J. Lowi, Cornell University, chair; Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services/University of Wisconsin; and Myron Weiner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Though unable to attend the Awards Ceremony, Neustadt sent along comments that were read by APSA President-Elect Charles O. Jones of the University of Wisconsin. Portions of the Neustadt letter are reproduced below:

The one thing I wish to convey is that I am pleased by the award, grateful for it, happy to have it, but under no illusion that my public service, such as it has been, is on the same plane as was Hubert Humphrey's. For he—and the same could be said of my predecessors in this award—faced that supreme test of political practitioners, sudden death by ballot box. Senator Humphrey faced it gallantly and often. He took victory in

stride and he absorbed defeat without becoming either bitter or afraid, even the defeat of 1968—punished undeservedly by his own side, in my opinion. Always he returned for more, never losing sight of service as the point of public office, never ducking from the personal cost.

I've been a staff person throughout my times in government. Useful as such people sometimes are, it's not the same. As President Kennedy once put it, the elected officeholder "has to bear the burden of the responsibility; advisers may move on to fresh advice." That says it all.

The Humphrey award belongs by rights, I think, to those rare souls among political scientists who have displayed the fortitude to bear the burden. I admire them but cannot claim to be among them. I encourage students to pursue elective office, but I never did it, not in my own name. I even married a politician, and proud of it, but I have not been one: a spouse is a sort of staff person.

So I accept this year's award in gratitude, but tinged with what I hope is understandable embarrassment—and also at the far edge with a trace of fear.

What have I to be afraid of? Nothing personal, but possibly something professional. Throughout my life, political scientists whom I respect have tended to grow more remote from politics—from the policy in it, the passion of it, the messiness, the meanness, the sheer fun—with every shift of generation. Could we possibly have reached the point where the Political Science Association no longer attracts elective politicians? Or no longer welcomes them? Or no longer cares to honor what they do? Staff persons we shall always have with us, at least while international relations remains among our major subdivisions. But the cool distance from practice characteristic of so many of my younger colleagues in American politics does not augur well for the likes of Hubert Humphreys among us (not that there are or will be many "likes" of him!). I deprecate the seepage from American society in general on to us of chronic anti-politicianism, sometimes masquerading as detachment. Hence my trace—no more than that—of fear.

I'm glad we make an award named for Senator Humphrey. He was one of the liveliest, most dedicated, most imaginative, empathetic, yes and vocal politicians of my generation. The ebullience and talkativeness of *his* presidency would have put Bill Clinton in the shade. I am proud to accept that award, even if I don't truly deserve it. I hope it inspires younger members of our profession to do *not* as I have done but as I say: Climb into politics, aspire to experience responsibility.

And then remember that with all the objectivity you still command, you owe a debriefing to *us*.

James Madison Award (\$2,000)

Presented triennially to honor an American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science. The award is designed to recognize a career of scholarly excellence rather than a particular piece of scholarship.

Award Committee: Robert Keohane, Harvard University, Chair; Robert Erikson, University of Houston; Eliz Sanasarian, University of Southern California

Recipient: Sidney Verba, Harvard University

Citation: Presumably the founders of this award sought to improve the quality of political science in the United States by providing a spur to the quest for fame of its practitioners: as Madison said in *Federalist* No. 51, "ambition must be made to counteract ambition." If this be so, then the selection of Sidney Verba for the Madison Award is ironic, for we celebrate today an inner-directed individual, a political scientist who is modest, not arrogant, content to do good work rather than to trumpet his accomplishments, reflective and balanced rather than narrowly self-centered. He is poor testimony to the value of an award such as this one, since he would surely have done the same work he has done had no such awards been available.

This point is illustrated by an anecdote told about Sid Verba having to do with his appointment as University Professor at Harvard. When the President of the University indicated that one of the privileges enjoyed by a University Professor is the right to teach in any unit of the University, Sid replied, "But I am a political scientist, and I am happy doing just what I do now—teaching in the Government." The President pressed on: didn't he want to teach in the dental school or medical school? Said Sid: "What do I know about tax shelters?"

The guiding theme of Sid's work has always been equality, in particular, the difficulty of achieving real political equality when the marketplace, and networks of social advantage, generate inequality of opportunity as well as condition. One may ask where Sid learned the importance of equality, educated as he was at Harvard and Princeton, and having taught only in elite private universities? The answer may be that he was born and raised in Brooklyn, where both the meaning of equality and the fact of its frequent frustration were probably more evi-

dent than at those places of higher learning.

Sid is both a student of comparative politics and of American politics, helping to demonstrate that American politics can be fruitfully viewed in a comparative context. He began his career by co-authoring *The Civic Culture* (1963) with Gabriel Almond, and in the 1970s wrote award-winning books on *Participation in America* (1972) with Norman Nie and *The Changing American Voter* (1976) with Nie and John Petrocik. Other major works of his in American politics include *Equality in America* (1987), with Gary Orren, and *Injury to Insult: Unemployment, Class and Political Response* (1979) with Kay L. Schlozman. His continuing work on comparative politics includes *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven Nation Comparison* (1978) with Norman Nie and Jae-On Kim, and *Elites and the Idea of Equality* (1987) with six co-authors, three of them Japanese. In his work, he has always met the demanding standard that he has imposed on comparativists: that one should not write about a country one hasn't at least flown over!

What Sid Verba seems to seek in life is easy to state but difficult to realize: to make significant contributions as a political scientist, in his writing and teaching; to be a good citizen of his university, his profession and his society; to love and support his friends and his family; and to

make people laugh. Anyone who knows him recognizes not only his professional accomplishments but his generosity of spirit, innate reasonableness, concern for others—and his self-deprecating sense of humor. The most recent recipient of the Madison Award, James Q. Wilson, is reported once to have been called the “Clint Eastwood of Political Science,” and to have remarked that if this was so, Sid was the Alan Alda.

As Sid has quipped, “the plural of ‘anecdote’ is ‘data.’” Few of us can meet his standards, but we have enough data about Sidney Verba to recognize human excellence when we see it. In conferring upon him the Madison Award, we honor his accomplishments as a political scientist; those of us who know him also honor his excellence as a human being.

Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

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

Award Committee: Timothy E. Cook, Williams College, Chair; Marion R. Just, Wellesley College; Twiley Barker, University of Illinois at Chicago

Recipient: **Nina Totenberg**, National Public Radio

Citation: On behalf of my colleagues, I am happy to present this year's

McWilliams award to Nina Totenberg of National Public Radio. We found many reasons to honor Ms. Totenberg. We, like many Americans, were forcefully impressed by her courage and resourcefulness in covering the confirmations of Supreme Court nominees and uncovering information that facilitated extraordinary moments of public debate. But we honor above all Ms. Totenberg's day-in-day-out coverage of a most complex and misunderstood institution, the Supreme Court, and her incisive ability to illuminate decisions and issues on the unpromising medium of radio. H. W. Perry, Jr., in the course of his interviews with justices and former clerks for his recent fine book on how the Court chooses its agenda, adds a footnote about journalists' interviews which includes the dictum, “One person who covers the Court . . . deserves special recognition—Nina Totenberg of National Public Radio. I single her out not because I admire her work (which I do) but because she was a journalist mentioned to me frequently by my informants, most of whom had a high regard for her.” For many of us, when a Supreme Court hands down a decision, she is usually the person to whom we tune in first to make sense of what has happened. A reporter who is able to satisfy practitioner and citizen alike certainly deserves honor for “a significant contribution to our understanding of politics.”

APSA Awards and Recipients

One of the most important activities of the Association is the promotion and recognition of scholarly excellence in political science. Listed below are the recipients of each APSA award who were honored for the high quality of their work and their contributions to the discipline. A cumulative list of the award winners will be published every three years in conjunction with the Madison Award.

*“Affiliation” indicates the recipient's affiliation at the time of receiving the award.

Career Awards

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AWARD

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

Year	Recipient	Affiliation*
1983	Daniel Patrick Moynihan	U.S. Senate
1984	John Brademas	New York University
1985	Robert C. Wood	Wesleyan University
1986	No award given	
1987	Max M. Kampelman	Head, U.S. Delegation, Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms
1988	Jeane J. Kirkpatrick	Georgetown University
1989	Brent Scowcroft	Special Assistant to the President, National Security Affairs
1990	David E. Price	U.S. House of Representatives
1991	Zbigniew Brzezinski	Center for Strategic and International Studies
	C. Payne Lucas	Africare
1992	Richard Cheney	Secretary of Defense
1993	Richard E. Neustadt	Harvard University