

Call for Papers 2000 Call for Papers 2000 Call

Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End

Program chairs: Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner, Columbia University

The 96th Annual Meeting will convene
August 31 - September 3, 1999 in
Washington, D.C. at the Marriott Wardman
Park and the Omni Shoreham.

The deadline is Monday, November 15, 1999.
<http://www.apsanet.org>

Questions? Call APSA at 202-483-2512 or email meeting@apsanet.org

2000 Program Call For Papers

Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End

Program Chairs:

Ira Katznelson, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, p: 212-854-3646, f: 212-222-0598, iik1@columbia.edu

Helen Milner, Institute of War and Peace Studies, Columbia University, Mail Code 3347, 420 West 118th Street, New York, NY 10027, p: 212-854-5138, f: 212-864-1686, hvm1@columbia.edu

Power, choice, and the state have been central concepts in political science since its founding as a self-conscious discipline. By reconsidering these orienting themes, we seek to initiate discussion about both the distinguishing characteristics and internal coherence of political science as well as late-century developments that challenge how the discipline deploys its key organizing concepts.

From its founding, political science has transacted with history, its parent discipline, and the other social sciences. Once (perhaps again), the "state" defined its special focus. Arguably, "power" and especially "choice" have been more widely shared across disciplinary lines. Are there, or should there be, clear and coherent distinctions among these disciplines for the creation of knowledge? Further, do power, choice, and the state integrate political science across its own subfields and methodological variations? Will political science fragment, much as sociology has, or narrow its focus, much as economics has done?

Worldly developments at century's end challenge more than the character of the discipline. They command reexamination of the concepts of state, power, and choice. Sovereign states are being pressed on many fronts, from globalization to ethnic and regional movements. Their number, scale, capacities, and competitive advantages vis à vis other forms of political organization have become open issues. Power, too, is not static. The nature of power, even what we mean by the term, has been brought into question by nuclear weapons, the velocity of financial exchanges, and new communications technologies, among other transformations. In these circumstances, the very character of choice and rationality of agents become open issues.

✧ Denotes an APSA Organized Section

Division 1: Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches
Bernard Yack, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Political theorists study older texts and thinkers for many reasons: to find inspiring alternatives, to make sense of the past, to figure out where we came from or where we went wrong, or to create some critical distance on the shared opinions of the

day. As a result, they have developed a great variety of approaches to the interpretation and evaluation of political philosophies and ideologies, all of which will be represented in this division.

Proposals on all topics and thinkers are welcome. But, in keeping with this year's theme, special attention will be paid to proposals that relate to one or more of the following four issues.

1. *The State and its Alternatives.* The history of political thought and philosophy is rich with various ways of conceptualizing political authority. It can help us gain a better sense not only of the origin of the state, but of its strengths and limitations.

2. *The Sources of Power.* How is power generated and how is it exercised? The variety of answers to these questions offered in the history of political thought and philosophy helps us broaden our understanding of the phenomenon as well as the range of tools that we enlist to understand it.

3. *Choice and Necessity.* How much control do we have over the shape of our communities, the nature of political authority, or the direction of our own lives? Reflection on past texts and thinkers can help us determine the role and limits of choice in political life.

4. *Political Study before Political Science.* What was the study of politics like before there was a specific "discipline" of political science? To what extent did the study of politics suffer from or flourish because of this lack of discipline?

✧ Division 2: Foundations of Political Theory
Joan C. Tronto, Hunter College, CUNY

The study of politics is older, richer, and more diverse than the modern discipline of political science. The conference theme purports to identify three unifying concepts that capture the essence of political science as a way to study politics: power, choice, and the state. Drawing upon broader foundations of political knowledge, this division can provide various kinds of reflections on this theme.

Issues political theorists might consider when addressing questions of power, choice, and the state include: (1) meanings and assumptions underlying power, choice, and state as central concepts in political science; (2) historical and genealogical explorations of how these concepts have become central in political science; (3) alternative conceptions of what constitutes the central theme of the discipline; (4) alternative formulations of the central issues and concepts useful for studying politics, which might include alternative ways to understand political knowledge; and (5) the place of the study of political theory within the discipline of political science.

In light of this wide range of concerns, papers, and panels are welcome that explore the thematic implications of the central concepts of power, choice, and state, as well as those that reflect upon the discipline of political science itself. Papers and panels from outside this mainstream tradition of political science will shed new insights by comparison. Proposals are therefore welcome that explore the foundations of political thinking and debates from the standard repertoire of theorists within the canon of political theory, from outside of this standard repertoire, from critical and radical perspectives, from all historical eras, and from outside the Western intellectual tradition.

Division 3: Normative Political Theory
Nancy J. Hirschmann, Cornell University

This year's convention theme of power, choice, and the state would seem tailor-made for political theorists. Certainly "power" and the "state" have been central conceptual categories for political philosophy since as far back as Plato, and, though many would argue that "choice" rose to a similar level of importance only in the seventeenth century, it is clearly central to contemporary normative and political theoretical questions. Discussions of power, choice, and the state raise many issues relevant to normative theory. Among others topics, normative political theorists can fruitfully consider the meanings of these concepts in contemporary contexts, how the meanings have changed and are changing, and the intellectual, ethical, and political relationships among these concepts; the relationship between state and society, between laws and social norms, and between power and knowledge; the significance of power/knowledge for "choice," as well as for "equality," "justice," or "freedom"; the constitution of individual agency, the social construction of subjectivity, and the effects of individual subjectivity, agency, and choice on the theoretical meaning and political realization of power and states; and the possibilities/plausibility of concrete realization of democratic ideals like agency, free will, and community, which theorists have long identified as the foundations for the power of legitimate states.

Also, the fact that power, choice, and the state are situated within the context of political science as discipline may give us pause. Given that political theory is often marginalized within political science, what does normative political theory actually contribute to the "discipline" of political science, to notions, strategies, topics, and methods generally seen as the domain of our empirical colleagues? For instance, what kinds of contributions can normative theory make to analyses of the globalization of markets and the international distribution of resources? To public policy issues ranging from welfare to education to violent crime? Newer theoretical approaches of feminist, critical race, and "postmodern" theory all have lodged critical interventions in questions concerning power, the state, and choice. But in pushing political science beyond its familiar bounds, do they encourage theory's further marginalization? Can such approaches provide new insights and point political theory and political science in new directions, or should they be abandoned in favor of more conventional approaches? What do "new" and "old" approaches tell us about the place of theory in the discipline? Can theory's normative dimensions serve as

a unifying force for the discipline, or do they justify theory's marginalization within the discipline?

Proposals for papers and panels employing diverse theoretical strategies and methods, and attending to a broad range of specific foci are encouraged. As usual, proposals that contest, reinterpret, and push beyond the conference theme will also be welcomed.

Division 4: Formal Political Theory
David P. Baron, Stanford University

Proposals are invited for papers and panels on formal political theories of political institutions and behavior. The substantive foci of the proposals should be inclusive, encompassing formal models of political institutions and states, models of the participation of individuals and groups, comparative studies, and dynamic models of the evolution of institutions, the state, and political behavior. Theories that incorporate multiple institutions, such as elections and legislatures or legislatures, bureaucracy, and courts, are encouraged. Methodological approaches may extend beyond game theory, equilibrium and stability analysis, social choice, and bounded rationality. Proposals that take new methodological or modeling approaches, provide comparisons among approaches, or combine approaches are particularly welcomed. Papers that develop and empirically test a formal theory using econometric methods, experimentation, or simulation are also welcomed.

The themes of the meetings are power, choice, and the state as each separately or in combination constitutes the focus of disciplinary political scientists, and proposals for papers and panels that examine these themes from the perspective of formal theory are encouraged. For example, a proposal might model whether power corresponds to formal authority or to the influence over choices made by an institution, determine how power could/should be measured, and list its comparative statics properties. Other broad questions worth considering include: Are institutions more appropriately viewed in terms of their formal choice structure or as arenas in which preferences and information are aggregated and interests compete over outcomes? How is the concept of a state formalized and what determines its boundaries, structure (e.g., federal, unitary, hierarchical), and performance? What is the relationship between the state and supranational institutions to which states belong?

★ Division 5: Political Psychology
Laura Stoker, University of California, Berkeley

This division welcomes paper and panel proposals that link the disciplines of psychology and political science. Although all proposals will be considered, we encourage submissions that address one or more of the concepts identified in the conference theme: (1) Power--for example, studies of formal and informal status hierarchies, resource inequalities, intergroup

conflict, or obedience; (2) Choice—for example, psychological perspectives on individual and group decision making, or on the role political institutions and opportunity structures play in influencing choice; and (3) State—for example, studies focusing on public opinion and political behavior in crossnational and other comparative political contexts, or on how public opinion influences state-level processes and outcomes.

As is fitting for a meeting held “at century’s end,” the conference theme also encourages scholars to take stock of political science as a discipline. With this in mind, we also encourage submissions whose focus extends beyond the psychology of individuals and makes connections with findings and arguments established in other fields of political science. This might be done in any number of ways. A proposal might focus on political institutions or processes as central explanatory concepts, or develop and ideally test the implications of individual-level arguments for political aggregates, institutions, or processes. Such papers would illustrate how research in political psychology does more than test psychological theories in political contexts, demonstrate its relevance to scholars working in other areas within the discipline, and help define an agenda for further development of the field.

★ **Division 6: Political Economy**
John Duggan, University of Rochester

Political economy, narrowly defined, would include the formal (either theoretical or empirical) analysis of the interaction between political and economic variables. Thus, for example, papers on the political determinants of taxation and fiscal policy, inflation, the distribution of income, and economic growth are encouraged. But, more broadly, political economy would include the application of economic methods to the study of all political phenomena. As such, formal analyses of voting, campaigning, legislative and parliamentary decision making, etc., are also encouraged. In keeping with the conference’s theme of power, choice, and the state, special consideration will be given to papers focusing on the nature of the state (e.g., the origins of the state, the design of constitutions, and the comparison of different forms of political systems) and the consolidation and exercise of power (e.g., bargaining, war, and revolution).

While much political economy work is conducted within the rational choice/gametheoretic framework, submitted papers may employ rigorous analytical methods more broadly defined to include, for example, evolutionary game theory, axiomatic methods, or computerized simulations.

★ **Division 7: Politics and History**
Dan Carpenter, University of Michigan
Gerald Gamm, University of Rochester

The theme of the 2000 annual meeting—power, choice, and the state—suggests the influence that historically oriented

political scientists have had on the contemporary study of politics. Landmark studies of state formation are grounded in historical work. Scholarship on race, class, and gender draws on an array of historical perspectives. And a growing body of rational choice analysis looks to the past to test and generate new theories of politics. Historically oriented political science has been transformed by methodology whether by “sectionalist” studies, quantitative history, rational choice, or other strains. Both as a substantive area and as a methodological approach, history is contributing to fresh perspectives in political science.

We welcome proposals for papers that are innovative, methodologically self-conscious, and address questions that are (or should be) interesting to political scientists. Although we expect to form some panels that explicitly address the convention theme, we anticipate that many of the best proposals will represent ongoing and new research that is not necessarily related to the concepts of power, choice or the state. We encourage proposals across a broad range of methodological and substantive interests. These include comparative and international politics, the role of gender, race or identity politics in historical evolution, American institutional development, culture and history, and many other approaches.

The best papers will draw carefully on history to advance the systematic study of politics. They will represent good social science, broadly understood. Papers should be theoretically driven or otherwise related to exploring the implications of theory. Evidence may come from an array of places—archives, abstract models (including analytic narratives), quantitative research, case studies, oral histories, interpretive accounts, etc.—but the data should be appropriate to the theory being assessed. Given the ascension of choice-based theories over power-based theories in much of contemporary political science, we invite papers that demonstrate how historical politics can help mediate this divide. We welcome papers showing the historically situated character of rational and nonrational choices as well as how these choices shape power and the state.

★ **Division 8: Political Methodology**
John Williams, Indiana University

The field of political methodology is making great strides as the twentieth century comes to an end. Not only is the field becoming more successful in developing methods that are uniquely suited to processing political science data and answering questions about politics, but political methodologists have become much more adept at adapting state-of-the-art methods produced by statisticians and econometricians in a timely and useful fashion for use in political science. However, political methodology is about more than the development and use of highly technical methods. Political methodology is about connecting the best empirical analysis to important questions that the research community addresses. As such, the focus is not only on statistics but also on any methods that are useful for solving an important political science puzzle. Thus, there is a broad array of papers that would be of interest for political methodology panels. These papers include, but would not be

limited to: (1) papers that develop estimators for particular problems in political science; (2) novel applications of existing methods in political science, even if these methods are not state-of-the-art; (3) Bayesian applications that are becoming increasingly common and important in political methodology; (4) applications of simulations that assess model fit to data or produce predictions from models that are not analytically tractable; (5) unique applications of research designs and qualitative methods that help elucidate an important puzzle in political science; (6) experimental methods that are useful in testing formal and psychological theories of politics; (7) statistical analyses that test formal theories in political science.

In summary, political methodology is a very inclusive subfield of political science. It is distinctive in that developments in political methodology can and have been very useful in a wide number of other subfields. We welcome proposals for both technical and nontechnical papers as long as the papers promise to shed light on important puzzles in political science.

Division 9: Teaching and Learning in Political Science

Mark P. Petracca, University of California, Irvine

At century's end, teaching and learning in political science faces a number of ongoing challenges. Students entering college or university are apparently much less interested in the systematic study of politics and seem to know less about political development, processes, and institutions than was the case a few decades ago. The discipline of political science is challenged to both attract and educate such students, particularly in the art, practice, and science of democratic governance. The changing demographics of colleges and universities in the United States also challenge the discipline to develop effective ways to engage and educate undergraduates, especially those who will not become majors. Finally, renewed emphasis on the importance of undergraduate education at colleges and universities simultaneously challenges the discipline to expand the range and type of instructional venues for undergraduates (e.g., honors and mentoring programs, specialized seminars, computer instruction, internship opportunities, etc.) and to effectively train and mentor graduate students, not only as research scholars, but as future teachers.

This division invites proposals for papers, roundtables, panels, and interactive sessions that variously identify, analyze, discuss, and disseminate initiatives, programs, innovations, and methods responsive to these challenges for teaching and learning in political science at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

In keeping with the theme of APSA 2000, the following questions are intended to stimulate proposals addressing a wide range of issues in undergraduate and graduate education. What constitutes (or should constitute) the canon or "core curriculum" of political science at century's end? How has the "canon" of political science changed over the century? How and how well are the key organizing concepts of political science as discipline most effectively transmitted and translated in undergraduate education?

What, if anything, distinguishes teaching and learning in political science from that which occurs in history and the other social sciences? How is teaching and learning in political science influenced by interdisciplinary studies and how is the discipline of political science influencing interdisciplinary studies? How are world developments, relevant to the constitution of states, the varieties of power, and the range of choice, reflected in the discipline's approach to undergraduate and graduate education?

★ Division 10: Undergraduate Education
Pemilla M. Neal, Dickinson College

The Undergraduate Education Section of the American Political Science Association invites papers or full panel submissions on key aspects of teaching political science, particularly as concerns the meeting's theme—*Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice and the State at Century's End*. We welcome especially papers which creatively offer insights into the best ways to teach undergraduates about the changing nature of power, the changing position of the state, and the implications of choice in today's world.

★ Division 11: Comparative Politics
Melanie Manion, University of Rochester

Political science as a discipline attempts to explain empirical regularities in political choices and the set of constraints that structure these choices. Comparative politics is well suited to these attempts. In keeping with this year's theme of power, choice, and the state, the comparative politics division particularly welcomes panel and paper proposals along two lines of inquiry: (1) Research that considers crossnational variation in formal and informal constraints on choice (ideally both), (2) Research that considers challenges to the power of the state to define and enforce acceptable political choices.

Formal constraints are reflected in different constitutional arrangements (e.g., electoral rules, executive-legislative relations, judicial authority); informal constraints are shared expectations produced in different historical and cultural contexts. Here, we are interested in the effects of constitutional arrangements in established democracies as well as the emergence, stability, and effects of such arrangements in new democracies. Regarding power and choice in different states, we are interested in challenges from society in the form of ethnic, religious, and regional movements; challenges from the state apparatus itself in the form of official crime and corruption; and challenges from outside the state in the form of crossnational political and economic integration.

We do not discourage proposals for papers focusing on these questions within one or a few countries. However, we will give preference to panels that span countries and to papers that promote generalizability and cumulation of knowledge across countries selfconsciously in their methodology and substantive focus.

Division 12: Comparative Politics of Developing Areas

Susan Stokes, University of Chicago

In some parts of the developing world today, the ferment of political democratization and economic liberalization has settled. In others, authoritarian regimes are in place, civil conflict rages, and economic patterns are little altered. In regions where the challenge is not democratic transition but consolidation and deepening, political scientists increasingly borrow the concepts and methods developed to study the advanced industrial democracies. Scholars of developing areas in which democratic institutions are missing or where the leap to the market has not yet been completed also sometimes turn to concepts and methods that germinated in the study of advanced industrial states. Hence, the dramatic changes of the past decades have had a unifying effect on political science. The effect has not been one-sided; scholars of the developed world also turn increasingly to new democracies and developing areas for the institutional and historical variation they offer. What are the benefits and perils of disciplinary convergence? How far has it gone, how far should it go, and what intellectual strategies will allow us to benefit from the new crossregional conversations?

This division welcomes papers that address the methodological challenges of a world that increasingly invites borrowing and adaptation among scholars of developed and developing societies. Papers that address these methodological challenges directly are of interest; but just as welcome are papers that explore these issues indirectly, by testing strategies of borrowing and adaptation as they address pressing questions in today's developing areas. Challenges to state sovereignty now rivet students of the advanced industrial countries; limitations of power or choice in states constrained by foreign actors have long preoccupied scholars of developing areas. What research strategies will allow scholars of both regions to learn from each other's earlier answers (or from each other's failures to provide good answers)? Similarly, scholars who attempt to analyze important political outcomes in new democracies increasingly turn to studies of old democracies to understand the effect of institutional variation, political party structures, or ethnic and religious cleavages. Papers are encouraged that deal with these questions of globalization, the impact of institutions on outcomes, the causes and consequences of ethnic conflict and cooperation, or the challenges of a market economy that advance the crossregional conversation.

Division 13: The Politics of Communist and Post-Communist Countries

Stephen E. Hanson, University of Washington

A decade after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, people living in communist and post-communist societies still live in an environment of high institutional uncertainty. Asian Leninist regimes continue to struggle with profound economic transformations that could potentially threaten communist party control. Most post-Soviet states have been unable thus far to overcome

a devastating mix of political weakness, economic stagnation, and cultural confusion. Ethnic conflicts in the Balkans have exploded into full-scale international war. And even the most successful post-communist countries in East-Central Europe must now adjust to the sweeping institutional changes necessary for membership in the European Union.

While such revolutionary transformations have posed difficult personal challenges for many people living in the old Soviet bloc, they represent a golden opportunity for political scientists interested in testing and refining theories of institutional change. Indeed, since 1989 communist and post-communist studies has become one of the most vibrant and exciting subfields of the discipline. The sudden breakup of long-standing political and economic structures in much of Eurasia has forced students of the region to directly confront some of the most vexing questions in comparative politics theory. How do individuals make political and economic choices in places where even the medium-run future is largely unpredictable? Why do powerful states collapse, and how does state autonomy and capacity get rebuilt once old state institutions become corrupted? Does the preservation of one-party regimes facilitate economic marketization, or is democratic contestation ultimately a stronger impetus for economic reform? What factors promote or impede the consolidation of democracy—or of authoritarianism? How does the globalization of liberal capitalism interact with legacies of Leninism to produce divergent political and economic outcomes? Finally, what kinds of power are most important in reorienting social action in times of rapid change? Are materialists right in claiming that those with the most money and coercive power will exert a decisive influence over the rebuilding of state institutions? Or do ideological and cultural forms of power also play crucial roles in environments of institutional turbulence?

We welcome papers from diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives addressed to the sorts of questions raised above about the nature of power, choice, and the state in post-communist contexts. We are particularly interested in papers that engage in careful analysis of empirical evidence and creative reexamination of current theory, and that make a contribution to broader intellectual debates in our discipline.

Division 14: Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies

Geoffrey Garrett, Yale University

The dramatic political changes in the developing world during the 1990s should not conceal the fact that the pace and extent of change in the advanced industrial societies have also been substantial. The nation-state is being challenged from above through regional integration and from below by decentralization. Innovative political arrangements abound. In the case of the European Union, empowering supranational institutions has gone hand in hand with the promotion of "subsidiarity" (the devolution of authority to the lowest possible level). In North America, NAFTA has coevolved with separatist movements in Canada and Mexico and devolution of power to the states in the U.S. In Australasia, regionalism and decentralization are less advanced, but they are prominent on the political agenda.

Throughout the industrial democracies, these phenomena have clear political and economic dimensions, but culture and ethnicity also powerfully influence them.

Rethinking our understanding of comparative politics in a world where the nation-state's primacy as a political unit is being increasingly called into question is a key task for the early years of the next millennium. Panels and papers that address this theme are encouraged, but quality rather than content will be the primary selection criterion. Proposals should be genuinely comparative; single country-case studies can only succeed if there are strong methodological justifications for them.

★ Division 15: Politics and Society in Western Europe

Jytte Klausen, Brandeis University

The European state system constructed by the postwar settlements of 1917 and 1945 has faded in importance, while visions of European federalism and economic integration that failed in the past have come close to realization. The transformation raises questions about the relationship between states and the global order, and between elites and society-based political organization.

The changes have posited a number of distinct challenges to political science as a discipline. As Europe evolves as a political unit, much of what we used to think of as "European"—strong programmatic parties, an emphasis upon social equality and political representation over civil liberties, and cohesive national communities—have receded. The shift is seen also in a renewed interest in constitutional reform on questions of national self-determination, non-discrimination, and equal representation for women. Yet, contrarian tendencies can also be observed from new nationalism to reasserted state capacities, most notably on immigration and security issues.

The division will focus on the tensions between liberal conceptions of open societies and political organization based upon bounded identities. Discussions of the institutional frameworks involved have high priority. Are courts becoming more important? What are the processes of change doing to party systems and collective organizations? Are European democracies becoming more or less elite-driven? Is the apparent victory for liberal economic and political ideas matched by institutional changes? These are some of the questions in need of addressing. Papers and panels that consider questions about tradeoffs between economic and political integration and societal mobilization, the possibilities of transnational political organization, and issues related to national and transnational state-building and citizenship—social and civil, as well as political and economic—are particularly welcome. Papers and panels that take a "long" perspective on European political and societal development will be given priority, irrespective of methodology.

Division 16: International Political Economy
Jeffrey Frieden, Harvard University

International political economy includes any international topic in which the interaction of economic and political factors plays a major part. This includes work on the boundary between international political economy and comparative political economy (including its American subcategory). Within these broad guidelines, all scholarship with a logically consistent argument and/or systematically analyzed evidence is welcome and scholarship with both is doubly welcome. Proposals for intellectually cohesive panels are also encouraged.

Division 17: International Collaboration
Joanne Gowa, Princeton University

The theme of the APSA 2000 meeting, *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End*, creates a wide variety of possibilities for panel and paper proposals in this division. Panels and papers that examine the creation and maintenance of formal and informal mechanisms for international collaboration in light of recent developments are particularly welcome. Among the problems that might impede or prospects that might enhance international cooperation that have arisen as the century draws to a close are: the end of the Cold War, the diffusion of monitoring technology, and the acceleration of capital flows. A substitute for that best-selling but increasingly anachronistic basic text, *Theory of International Politics*, is especially sought.

Integrated panel proposals—e.g., those that include at least three papers with an analysis of the same substantive problem using varied methods of analysis or those that use the same method to examine different issue areas—are encouraged, as are more standard panel and paper proposals on all aspects of international collaboration.

Division 18: International Security
Peter Fevers, Duke University

The field of international security is well-positioned to consider the two interlocking themes identified for this year's conference: political science as a dependent discipline and whether world developments dictate a fundamental reexamination of the core concepts of power, choice, and the state.

Security has played a key role in the development of the discipline; security concerns after World War I precipitated the creation of international relations as a separate major subfield of political science. International security has always been highly interdisciplinary, making effective use of economics, psychology, sociology, and history. While the transfer of knowledge has essentially been one way with economics and psychology, international security is arguably distinctive among political science subfields as an arena for genuine collaboration and mutual exchange of ideas with sociologists and historians.

At the same time, international security has traditionally focused on the three concepts singled out for special attention this year. We study the choices states make in the wielding of power. Fruitful advances have been made over the years in unpacking those components, and each seems particularly ripe for reconsideration today. Has the information technology revolution changed the nature of coercive power? Is the state the relevant unit of analysis when the most prominent uses of force involve ethnic conflict and substate violence? Do attempts to open up the black box of the state give more theoretical and empirical leverage, or have they simply added descriptive texture? Does it make sense to talk of "state choice" when governments are constrained by democratization internally and globalization externally? Does the system constrain state security choices or do states choose the security system they inhabit?

Special consideration will be given to papers and panels that address the themes in innovative ways. Of particular interest are papers and panels that are truly multidisciplinary in their approach to questions. Likewise, we are especially interested in panels that bring several different methods to bear on the same problem.

★ Division 19: International Security and Arms Control

Pia Christina Wood, Old Dominion University

One decade after the end of the Cold War, the shape of the emerging international system or world order remains obscure. The rapid pace of change, including both integrative and disintegrative forces, has transformed the relatively stable, bipolar system dominated by the two superpowers into a world characterized by uncertainty. In this context, the theme of *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End* is particularly relevant. Accordingly, we invite proposals for papers, panels, or roundtables examining one or more aspects of the following themes:

The sovereign state, accepted for decades as the basic unit of the international system, is being challenged internally and externally. International organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the United Nations, supranational organizations such as the European Union, multinational corporations, and transnational religious movements all threaten the supremacy of the state. At the same time, growing nationalism and ethnic conflict have undermined state structures from within. What are the likely sources of conflict in the coming decades and what role will the transforming state play? How are states responding to both domestic and/or international ethnic, religious, linguistic, and resource conflicts? Is conflict resolution ultimately the purview of states?

As the concept of the state is changing, so are views on the nature of power. Definitions of power and national security no longer focus exclusively on military might but encompass factors such as technol-

ogy, economic growth, and education. Increasingly, trade competitiveness is considered crucial to a nation's power and global position. Have geoeconomic concerns replaced geostrategic concerns? Will the world continue to coalesce into regional trading blocs and how are states responding? What choices are states making between economic growth and military spending?

While global military spending is on the decline, there is no shortage of available weapons, particularly given the economic incentives to join the lucrative international arms trade. The sales of increasingly destructive conventional weapons, along with the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, have alarmed numerous states and led some to question the effectiveness of arms control agreements. What strategies can states pursue to stem the tide of proliferation? Are current arms controls initiatives superfluous given the emerging security threats of the twenty-first century?

★ Division 20: Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy

Steve M. Saideman, Texas Tech University

The Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy section is broadening itself to become the Foreign Policy section of the APSA, so we are interested in receiving proposals addressing both domestic and international sources of foreign policy. We will be looking for papers and panels that are theoretically informed and well-executed and which address interesting policy concerns. While proposals treating a diversity of topics and approaches are welcome, this year's theme of power, choice, and the state suggest areas of particular interest. Papers incorporating power into theories of foreign policy would be interesting. In regards to choice, three different questions seem relevant. Have studies focusing on domestic collective choice mechanisms helped us understand why states behave as they do? How are states constrained by nonmaterial factors (ideas, identity, ethnicity) when making foreign policy? Are politicians more constrained now than before due to political competition, the rise of global media, and increased sensitivity to casualties, or is this just an American phenomenon?

In considering the state in foreign policy, paper and panel proposers might want to reconsider autonomy in making foreign economic policy in light of the recent economic crises. Of course, this year's theme also invites examination of the three concepts, how they interact, and consideration of what unifies our discipline. One way to determine what binds or divides the study of foreign policy is to apply the theories and methods from one subfield to another.

Additionally, to determine how power, choice, and the state are central aspects of foreign policy, we can consider the dynamics and dilemmas that states face as they make transitions to democracy and capitalism. These transitions make it less clear who has power internally and whether such states are powerful. These states simultaneously face relatively few and relatively

severe constraints, as old coalitions have broken down and crises present opportunities for new groups to form. Finally, such states face the difficult task of building a state while institutions are still in flux, which should have implications for their foreign policies.

★ Division 21: Conflict Processes
James D. Morrow, Stanford University

In accord with the theme for the 2000 Annual Meeting, we invite submissions to Conflict Processes that address whether the changing nature of the state and power have changed the processes of conflict, both internal and external to states. Have changes in how power is generated and projected led to new patterns or types of conflict? Have changes in the role and scope of the state produced new conflicts or resolved old ones? Have these changes shaped the choices facing parties in conflict in ways that make resolution of their differences easier?

We hope to receive proposals that address these issues and others in all sorts of political conflict. Power is a principal concept for understanding conflict; advances in how we understand the operations of power in conflict and how to assess its use and its effects seem appropriate to the theme. The state is an actor, a forum, and an object of internal and external conflict, and is consequently central to the study of conflict. Finally, conflict is the result of human action; choice is critical to understanding the processes of conflict.

As always, Conflict Processes seeks to advance theoretical and empirical research on conflict that is both rigorous and cumulative. Proposals for complete panels and individual papers are welcome. We encourage proposals that address the link between external and internal conflict in the hope that we can learn more about such connections and draw together those who study conflict among states with those who study conflict within states.

★ Division 22: Legislative Studies
Patricia Freeland, University of Tennessee

Recognizing the diversity of legislative studies, we seek papers, panels, and roundtable proposals that cover all areas of legislative research. In keeping with the conference theme of power, choice, and the state, we seek submissions that examine the impact of various types of change on the legislature. How have changes such as alterations in institutional rules and procedures, the demographic composition of the representatives, shifts in the role of parties and partisanship, and, in some of the states, term limits affected the legislature? Second, we hope some scholars will submit proposals that deal with the evolution and operation of legislatures in new democracies.

Also encouraged are papers that examine the concept of accountability. Do variables such as campaign financing, relationship with the executive, the nature and type of interaction with constituents, or policy performance influence acceptability?

Division 23: Presidency Research
Bruce Miroff, SUNY-Albany

Century's end seems an appropriate moment to take stock of presidency research, to assess how far the subfield has come since its modern founding in Neustadt's *Presidential Power* (Wiley, 1960) and to anticipate future directions of research. We would like to see presidency scholars engage in critical reflection on both the traditional and the emerging theoretical frameworks that guide our empirical undertakings. We would also like to see a critical engagement with history—both the history of the subfield and the history of the presidency itself, especially in the century now ending, where its personalities, powers, and paradoxes have been so central to the dynamics of American politics. The three concepts at the core of this year's program—power, choice, and the state—can serve nicely as the vehicle for taking stock of presidential scholarship. "Power" has been central to Neustadt's paradigm as well as to many of those who have challenged it. In this vein, we encourage papers, panels, and posters that treat the constitutional, legal, and institutional powers of the presidency as well as "relational" powers that come into play in presidential dealings with Congress, the bureaucracy, the media, interest groups and social movements, the general public, and foreign governments.

"Choice" has also been central for Neustadt and others when they emphasize the uniquely individualized character of presidential action. Here, papers, panels, and posters are encouraged on the topics of presidential personality (an area that Bill Clinton has done much to revive!), appointments and staffing, decision making, and the rational choice approach.

"The state" is less familiar as a concept in contemporary presidency research, but its macro focus should prod us to ask questions about the political, institutional, policy, socioeconomic, and cultural structures that influence presidential actions. Papers, panels, and posters examining how presidents are affected by and affect any of these structural forces are welcomed.

★ Division 24: Public Administration
Gregory B. Lewis, Georgia State University

Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End. How relevant is this conference theme to the academic field of public administration? Are power, choice, and the state central issues in our research? Should they be? Would now be a good time to reconsider how well the field has addressed the challenge issued by Dwight Waldo in *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration* (Holmes and Maier, 1984)? Are we interested in another discussion of whether the study of public administration is a discipline and how it relates to such other fields as political science, economics, public policy, and management? The division welcomes paper and panel proposals that respond creatively to these questions and to the conference theme in general.

In addition, we invite papers and panels contributing to our knowledge of a wide variety of current issues and continuing themes in the study of public administration. We seek a healthy balance of theoretical and empirical work. New research on public organizations, management, budgeting, personnel, and decision making; on government reinvention and privatization; on political and judicial control of the bureaucracy and the politics-administration dichotomy; and on efficiency, responsiveness, accountability, and effectiveness are all welcome. Comparative perspectives, both cross-national and subnational, are encouraged. Graduate students are particularly encouraged to submit paper proposals.

★ Division 25: Public Policy
Gary Mucciaroni, Temple University
Paul J. Quirk, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

We welcome paper proposals reflecting the entire range of political scientists' concerns, theoretical approaches, and research strategies in the area of public policy. The subfield of public policy is exceptionally diverse. Most scholars seek to understand policy-making processes and the determinants of policy outcomes. Many, however, deal mainly with the consequences of policies, or seek to evaluate the merits of alternative policies. There are also a notable variety of approaches—from qualitative case studies, to quantitative analysis, to formal modeling, to historical, philosophical, and interpretive approaches. We plan to accept papers reflecting high-quality, innovative, and careful work of any of these types.

In keeping with the general plan for the meeting, we will put together one or more panels or roundtables that deal with this year's theme of *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End*. Relevant papers might, for example, seek to identify the locus of power for making policy choices, within or outside of the state, with comparisons between policy areas, political jurisdictions, or periods of time.

Although we are likely to accept few proposals for entire panels, we would welcome suggestions of panels or roundtables that would address the general conference theme. Paper proposals should be spelled out in some detail and should indicate the current status of the work and the steps required for satisfactory completion by the time of the meeting.

★ Division 26: Law and Courts
Roy B. Flemming, Texas A&M University

Empirical inquiry situated at the intersection of law, courts, and politics has broadened and become more diverse in recent years. Scholars in the field increasingly draw from literatures on rational choice, neoinstitutionalism, and comparative politics to construct explanations of socio-legal phenomena that are more complex and nuanced than in the past. These efforts both challenge previous understandings of law and courts and supplement them, thereby enhancing and fostering pluralism in

the field. Scholars who apply social scientific methodologies to the study of law and courts are thus well positioned to address the theme of the 2000 conference and to contribute to the wider dialogue about the direction of political science.

Courts and the law have complicated and contingent relationships to the state. Papers are encouraged that use comparative methodologies to investigate efforts in emerging democracies to develop the "rule of law" and to create independent judiciaries. Research in this area would illuminate an important aspect of the transformative politics of state-building. The field also has long concerned itself with the counter-majoritarian potential of courts and "cause litigation" that could limit state power or destabilize it. A more recent variant of this interest is the construction of separation of powers games that place courts in more complex institutional and political settings. The revival of historical institutionalism as an approach to the courts clearly has a bearing on the evolution of the state. Papers incorporating these perspectives in studies of either developed or developing democracies would make a strong contribution to our knowledge of the relationship of litigation and the courts to the state.

The choices courts and judges make is a traditional interest in the field. Research informed by neoinstitutionalist and rational choice approaches have begun to identify the conditions that limit and qualify understandings based on the attitudinal model. The contextual conditions as well as individual processes that lead to preference changes and strategic decision making remain a central issue for the field. Papers exploring this question are invited. The power of courts and the law continues to be a complicated, unresolved problem. The ability of courts to shape the legal consciousness of citizens raises important questions about the hegemony of law and how it affects democratic politics. A somewhat similar issue is the role courts play in shaping the agendas of other governmental institutions and the distribution of attention to social or policy issues in society. The empirical complexities of these issues call for papers with diverse and innovative methodologies.

The research of scholars interested in the politics of law and courts is sufficiently wide-ranging that it is important to stress that this call is not intended to discourage the submission of papers that deal with other kinds of questions using the diverse methodologies of the social sciences.

Division 27: Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence
Gerald N. Rosenberg, University of Chicago

As the century turns, the field of constitutional law and jurisprudence faces several challenges, and they will be the focus of this year's panels. A long-standing challenge is that political scientists who study constitutional law and jurisprudence are not alone. Legal academics and philosophers also address these topics, perhaps more famously than we do. What do political scientists who study constitutional law and jurisprudence bring that others lack? What do we, as a discipline, have to offer? In keeping with the theme of this year's conference, papers that implicitly or explicitly work with this framework and with notions

of power, choice, and the state are particularly welcome.

Within this general framework, there is room for a rich variety of work. As we approach the end of the century, our field has rediscovered constitutional history. Constitutional law, and understandings of it, exist in a given time and in a given place. Historical papers, working with this year's theme, are thus also encouraged.

At century's end, it has become increasingly apparent that the study of constitutional law and jurisprudence in the U.S. is too U.S.-centric. With the worldwide explosion in constitution-writing, we have been forcibly reminded that the United States is not the only country in the world with a constitution. We need to consciously expand our work to speak to the experience of countries and cultures other than those of the United States. Thus, comparative constitutional work, especially proposals tied to this year's theme, is strongly encouraged.

With these guidelines in mind, we encourage proposals for panels in addition to paper proposals. Panel proposals can offer an intellectual coherence that is often harder to achieve with individual paper proposals. That being said, efforts will be made to coordinate with the Law and Courts division so as to present as diverse and stimulating program as possible.

★ Division 28: Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations
John Kincaid, Lafayette College

This year's theme of *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State* is naturally suited for students of federalism. The theme also raises, from the perspective of federalism, serious questions about the discipline. Is the concept of "the state" compatible with "choice" in multicentric federal arrangements? Is the concept of "power" embedded in the concept of "the state" recognizable in federal systems having multiple centers of power? Do the current and emerging challenges to the state render statism a relic of the modern era and federalism a paradigm for the postmodern era? Can, or should, political science as a discipline escape its statist past and embrace theories of pluralism and federalism that might more theoretically and satisfactorily accommodate conditions of diversity, networking, and power fluidity? These are trenchant matters to consider for the new millennium. Preference will be given, therefore, to panel and paper proposals that address the annual meeting's overall theme.

Proposals will also be welcomed on traditional and ongoing issues of federalism and intergovernmental relations. Especially salient are issues of whether devolution, reinventing government, statutory and political reform, and judicial support for state powers are occurring, and to what extent, in American federalism today. Issues of state-local, interstate, and interloca relations have taken new turns that deserve attention, as do the roles of state and local governments in international affairs. Abroad, there are a multitude of federalist developments, including the European Union and similar regional entities, turns toward devolution in the United Kingdom and other countries, developments in Nigeria and South Africa, the ongoing struggle

for reform in the Russian Federation, and the tragedy of Yugoslavia.

★ Division 29: State Politics and Policy
Kim Quaille Hill, Texas A&M University

The field of state politics research is perhaps one of the most extensive in political science in terms of the time span over which scholars have systematically examined its most prominent topics and the amount of research that has been accumulated on those matters. However, we have not made remarkable progress toward advanced scientific theory in recent decades in most of the major subtopics we study. In the 1950s and 1960s, efforts to develop and test middle-range scientific theory began to supplant older descriptive and case-study literature. Since that scientific "passage," however, we have not advanced notably toward general theory. Theoretically oriented research has typically remained preoccupied with middle-range formulations, such as the testing of novel, individual explanatory concepts or measures, the examination of new political events and patterns in ad hoc fashion instead of in the reflection of existing theoretical expectations, or the competitive testing of theoretical formulations of very limited explanatory scope based on simple, linear additive models that ignore both temporal and crosssectional causal complexity. Too little research has deliberately pursued broadly applicable and abstract theory.

For the preceding reasons, we particularly encourage paper and roundtable proposals intended to advance general theory. Such proposals might include, but are not limited to, ones that offer especially comprehensive tests of theoretical propositions, that propose and test unusually broad and abstract theoretical formulations, or that offer comparative tests of the explanatory power of two or more general theoretical formulations. Individual research projects and roundtables that explore notable data collection issues with high relevance for theory testing are welcome, as well. Proposals that integrate the convention themes of power, choice, and the state with these theoretical objectives are also encouraged.

State politics research has also been relatively deficient with respect to exploring the explanatory boundaries of its extant theoretical concerns. This deficiency takes at least two forms. On one hand, many scholars have assumed that any theoretical formulation that is relevant to democratic systems, democratic legislatures, democratic chief executives, and so on must be as applicable to such institutions in the states as it would be to their counterparts at the national level. Yet we know that there are constitutional, contextual, practical, and behavioral differences of various kinds that discriminate between these two kinds of political systems. Little research has systematically considered ways in which states are distinctive political systems, and thus subjects for amended versions of some theoretical formulations.

Similarly, little research has made more than the most rudimentary case for why a particular theory should apply equivalently to state and national political institutions or patterns. On the other hand, American states share some similarities with subnational units of government in other Western democratic nations. Such similarities are, of course, themselves bounded

by crossnational differences of culture, constitution, and convention. Little research on the American states has systematically addressed these kinds of comparative similarities and differences or their implications for the construction of general theory. Thus we welcome proposals that investigate either of these two kinds of theoretical boundaries.

Finally, we especially encourage proposals specifically intended for the poster sessions. We would like to see posters from senior scholars so as to raise the visibility and prestige of this portion of the program.

★ Division 30: Urban Politics
Philip Thompson, Columbia University
Barbara Ferman, Temple University

As we begin the twenty-first century, cities are again the locus for change in the U.S. Immigration from Latin America, the Pacific Rim, India, and the Caribbean is changing the demographic landscape in many large cities, although (due to low rates of voting) the political impact has yet to be felt. African Americans have suffered prominent mayoral defeats in large cities, and there is a surprising lack of black community mobilization in response to the elimination of welfare, astonishing rates of black male incarceration, and growing (once again) racial economic inequality. Within the Euro-American population, interest in cities is being revived from an unusual source—the environmental movement—in the form of reviving cities to combat the destructive effects of urban sprawl. Changes in communications technology have made many businesses less reliant on cities and this has hurt some cities. However, business mobility has helped other cities with desirable lifestyle amenities to become magnets for business and job growth. The labor movement, reeling from the effects of globalization, governmental privatization, changing demographics in the workforce (more female, more “minority,” more urban), and the changing nature of work (more part-time, less place-based) is being forced to redefine its identity and mission in light of the times.

What do these changes portend for the urban landscape of the next century? Will new political, social, and economic cleavages replace the older ones that dominated many twentieth-century cities? To what extent will the power dynamics within cities shift and with what consequences?

★ Division 31: Women and Politics
Gwendolyn Mink, University of California, Santa Cruz

In keeping with the theme of the 2000 program, the Women and Politics division would like to devote at least one panel to examining the reciprocal relationship between the political categories “women” and “gender,” on the one hand, and the discipline of political science, on the other. How have the concepts and approaches of political science informed or illuminated the study of women/gender and politics? How has the political study of women and gender challenged or altered

political science? What new insights or perspectives does the study of gender bring to understanding power, choice, and the state?

In a similar vein, the division seeks panels and papers that interrogate the assumed concepts of the subfield, such as “gender,” “sex,” “feminism,” “equality,” and “politics.” Work that explores the impact of global economic and political changes on women’s citizenship and women’s movements in different national and transnational contexts would provide an especially interesting prism through which to probe these concepts. So, too, would work on the intersectionalities that mark differences and hierarchies among women. How does stratification among women, either within or among nations, affect the meaning of gender equality and struggles to achieve it? How has solidarity among women, either within or among nations, changed relations of gender power or women’s relationships to states? The division encourages papers that theorize these issues and/or that examine them in light of empirical topics such as immigration, poverty, reproduction, privatization, the family, sexual violence, and state feminisms.

★ Division 32: Race, Ethnicity, and Politics
Cathy Cohen, Yale University
Mitchell F. Rice, Texas A&M University

The papers and panels for this division may cover such topics as the politics of demography, race, and ethnicity; the politics of intercultural and interethnic development; minority leadership; political participation; welfare; diversity and affirmative action; the presidency and race/ethnicity; and other topics. However, all papers and panels should take into account the following points. Consistent with the conference theme, race and ethnicity will continue to be a part of the debate over power, choice, and the state. As the new millennium begins, important questions about these three concepts and race and ethnicity and politics remain. Some of these questions are: What do Proposition 209, Hopwood, Initiative 200, and similar events say about the state of affairs of the politics of race and ethnicity? How are demographics changing the political debate about race and ethnicity? How are our political, legislative, and judicial institutions responding to issues about race and ethnicity? Will the new millennium lend itself to more a conservative or liberal political perspective on race and ethnicity or can we expect a new kind of political climate? What international events and activities are helping to shape the discussion of race, ethnicity, and politics in the U.S.? What about the future of race and ethnicity and the job market in the “ivory tower” in political science and related fields?

Scholarly papers and panels are expected to produce lively dialogue and interaction and should focus on the major ethnic and racial groups in the U.S., including Native Americans. We encourage participation from a broad range of scholars and subfields in the discipline as well as a broad range of perspectives.

★ **Division 33: Religion and Politics**
James L. Guth, Furman University

In keeping with the theme of power, choice, and the state, we encourage papers and panels that focus on the contribution of religious ideas, institutions, and movements to the distribution and exercise of power, both in the international sphere and within nations. The study of religion and politics has always been enriched by the confluence of diverse scholarly perspectives and methodological approaches, a tradition that is especially appropriate for this conference's theme. In recent years, political philosophy has generated new thinking about religion and the state, while students of American politics have produced a burgeoning literature on the influence of religion on the political process. The rise of religious movements challenging state institutions in the developing world is an increasingly important topic in comparative politics. Proposals addressing the conference theme are welcome from these and other subfields within the discipline. And in keeping with the emphasis on interaction with other disciplines, we encourage suggestions for papers or panels incorporating crossdisciplinary or interdisciplinary approaches, especially those utilizing perspectives from economics, history, and sociology. And we would like to see proposals for panels considering our discipline's successes and failures in advancing knowledge on the intersections between religion and state power.

★ **Division 34: Representation and Electoral Systems**
Burt L. Monroe, Indiana University

The concerns of our division connect directly with the themes of this year's conference. Within democracies, electoral systems are the means by which we choose those--our representatives--who would exercise the power of the state. Moreover, the questions that arise in the study of electoral systems and representation have been subjected to the full range of historical, sociological, economic, philosophical, legal, and psychological approaches that coalesce in the "discipline" of political science. We have in our division a microcosm of political science and we should take advantage of the opportunity presented by this metatheme.

With that in mind, we would like to receive proposals for papers and panels that connect to these broader concerns. In particular, we are interested in research that uses novel theoretical or methodological tools to investigate questions of electoral systems and representation or uses the substance of electoral systems and representation to illuminate broader theoretical questions.

There are many possibilities for applying broader perspectives to our concerns. What do formal theories of voting or social choice have to say about real-world electoral systems? How can institutional and sociological approaches be combined to better understand electoral systems and representation? Can we better understand our core questions (such as how electoral systems affect party systems or minority representation) through

the study of elections for bodies or offices other than national lower houses (e.g., local or regional elections, upper houses, presidents, nongovernmental institutions)? Do we have theories and tools that travel from two-party systems to multiparty systems? Do we have theories that travel from advanced industrial democracies to post-communist, post-authoritarian, and otherwise transitional democracies?

There are similarly many possibilities for using our substantive topics to illuminate broader issues. How does the study of electoral systems illuminate or interact with the study of other institutions (presidentialism, federalism, etc.), institutions generally, or institutional change? What do experiences of electoral reform have to say about institutional engineering or unintended consequences? What impacts do electoral systems have beyond those we normally study? Can we make meaningful theoretical or empirical statements about effects of electoral systems on distributive politics, on policy efficiency, on conflict management, etc., or are we limited to discussions of disproportionality and party systems? How can the study of political representation inform the debate over majoritarian versus consensus democracy?

★ **Division 35: Political Organizations and Parties**
Paul Allen Beck, Ohio State University

Three different types of proposals for individual papers and whole panels on political organizations, especially political parties and interest groups, are welcomed. First, APSA panels should serve, above all, as forums for presentation of the best current research in the field. Therefore, proposals involving "cutting edge" original research on any aspect of political organizations, utilizing any approach, and focusing on any country or countries are strongly encouraged.

Second, we will look favorably upon proposals that explicitly address the annual meeting theme of *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End*.

Third, 2000 marks the 50th anniversary of the Report of the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System." We are especially interested in receiving proposals for papers or panels on it and its various themes. They can be based on contemporary, historical, crosstime, crossnational, or purely theoretical (formal or normative) perspectives and can involve such topics as party responsibility, party organization, candidate selection, party campaigning, electoral mobilization and turnout, party development (in new or established democracies), congressional parties, divided government, party conventions, party platforms or manifestos, campaign finance, and the competition between parties and interest groups.

All proposals must contain a clear statement of both the theoretical question(s) to be addressed and the research design and, where relevant, how they will address any of the themes outlined above. In choosing among proposals, a premium will be placed on how well the projects are developed in the

proposal and either their “cutting edge” quality or their relationship to the meeting themes.

★ Division 36: Elections and Voting Behavior
Katherine Tate, University of California, Irvine

In the 1983 edition of *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, Herbert Asher wrote that voting behavior research traditionally combined a “careful elaboration of theoretical approaches” with “sophisticated statistical analyses,” adding that “when one asks where is the ‘science’ in political science, a common reply is to point the questioner to the field of voting behavior.” As the organizer for elections and electoral behavior, I am seeking more of the same—papers that exemplify the high theoretical and technical approach very characteristic of this subfield. Empirically oriented, methodologically sophisticated examinations of the political forces affecting the vote, voting behavior, and election outcomes are all welcomed.

At the same time, as the 2000 meeting’s theme involves a reconsideration of our discipline, we ask for papers that offer broader conceptualizations than developed in the past. Much of the work on elections and behavior comes from a focus on U.S. presidential and congressional elections, and we would welcome research that analyzes data from other elections and especially some from outside the U.S. context. Much of the work on elections and behavior concentrates on two political stimuli: parties and the economy. Are these two variables properly and fully conceptualized, or should they be radically reconceptualized and measured?

Finally, the central theme for the 2000 meeting is power, choice, and the state. New, previously subordinated, groups have mobilized and new democracies have formed in the last few decades. How have these groups fared using electoral, ballot box methods? Have they been empowered? What political impact are they having?

★ Division 37: Public Opinion and Political Participation
Jon Hurwitz, University of Pittsburgh

At first blush, the conceptual themes of the 2000 conference—power, choice, and the state—may appear to constrain and limit analysts of public opinion and political participation. In actuality, however, the vast majority of those working in these areas ultimately address at least one of these concerns, implicitly if not explicitly. The best work in public opinion has typically explored the consequences of attitudes—i.e., why they matter, the degree to which they influence those in power, and the difference they make in state policy. By the same token, the most seminal work on participation has been able to speak to the impact of participation on the characteristics of the government.

In short, the selected theme can serve, ideally, to encourage those submitting papers to this division to focus attention on

one or more of these three concepts. Preference will be given, consequently, to papers addressing:

- public attitudes toward elites in positions of power and authority, as well as acts of participation designed to affect the power structure;
- the linkage between public opinion and public policy, particularly studies examining the degree to which the mass public exerts influence over elite decisions;
- mass decision making, either in the formulation of policy attitudes or pertaining to participatory behavior;
- attitudes toward the power structure, including judgments and perceptions of majority and minority groups.

This list, of course, is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. Any study of public opinion or participation that takes a theoretical approach will be given due consideration, and will be preferred to work that is purely or mainly descriptive.

★ Division 38: Political Communications
Darrell M. West, Brown University

Political communications are central to the three themes of this year’s conference: power, choice, and the state. The power of the media is a long-standing question in the field of political communications. How and to what extent do the media exercise power? And how responsible is the exercise of this power? The role journalists play in framing choices within society and the manner in which journalists cover other power centers, such as Congress, the president, courts, groups, and local government also are fundamental questions. The relationship between political communications and the state continues to vex scholars.

To answer these and related questions, we will consider a broad range of historical, political, institutional, and behavioral studies of political communications. Proposals that explore the history of the media, the manner in which journalists cover political institutions and public policy, the impact of media on society, culture, and government, the role that race, gender, and class play in political communications, and the challenge of new media technologies linked to talk radio, the Internet, and the proliferation of communications outlets will be considered. In your proposals, please outline four things: what your topic is, why it is important, how you plan to study it, and a general sense of the argument you plan to develop.

★ Division 39: Science, Technology and Environmental Politics
Dave Guston, Rutgers University

Power, choice, and the state are as central to science, technology and environmental politics (STEP) as they are to the larger

discipline. But one of the primary reasons why STEP has not been more central to disciplinary study has been the presumption that STEP is devoid of the application of power, independent of human choice, and therefore to be separated, like the economic market, from the actions of the state. Recovering examples of the application of power, the dependence on choice, and the role of the state should be guiding principles for STEP. The disciplinary significance of this agenda should also be apparent. The sociology of science and technology has revealed, theoretically and empirically, a new world of social practice that political science has yet to fully incorporate, and the new economics of science reinterprets the science-market analogy for explanations of environmental and technology policy as well as of the social organization of science. Political scientists should consider these questions explicitly as they examine the politics of science, technology, and the environment for the sake of understanding, as well as for the characterization and improvement of outcomes.

Paper and panel proposals on all aspects of STEP are welcome, as are suggestions or proposals for the workshop the section regularly sponsors on the day preceding the conference.

★ Division 40: Computers and Multimedia
Michael C. Gizzi, Mesa State College

The end of the twentieth century has seen a revolution in information technology that has fundamentally transformed the way we live, work, and play. The changes taking place have not escaped political science. Technology has had significant impact on political science, in the way that we teach, in what we teach, and in how we conduct research. The information age has been equally important in the way that political scientists are able to conduct research, and has revolutionized the ability to collaborate with colleagues across great distances. Moreover, information technology has made it possible for scholars to create and share innovative electronic data archives, offering scholars considerable benefits. In keeping with the conference theme of *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End*, the Computers and Multimedia division invites proposals for papers, roundtables, and posters that consider how information technology is impacting the discipline of political science in teaching, research, and our professional associations.

Also welcome are papers and posters that undertake empirical research on the effectiveness of instructional technology on teaching. While higher education is under considerable pressure to use information technology in teaching, there is currently very little hard evidence of the impact that such technology has on student learning. Thus, we encourage papers that report on evaluation efforts of the use of technology in the classroom. We also invite examinations of the growing field of Internet-based distance education. Are Internet courses effective? What are the costs of such courses to faculty and students? Other possible topics include (but are not limited to) innovative ways to deal with Internet-based plagiarism; the ways technology enables crossinstitutional collaboration of students and faculty; and the possibilities and limitations of electronic media on scholarly publications and journals.

Computers and Multimedia encourages presenters to make use of technology in their presentations, and to archive their papers (or create links to their own web sites) at the CMS web site (www.apsanet.org/~cms/) in advance of the conference.

★ Division 41: Politics and Literature
Joseph M. Knippenberg, Oglethorpe University

As a discipline, political science has long sought to apply universal categories to phenomena like the use of force, attempts at persuasion, and efforts to find common ground or to carve out a realm of individual freedom. In so doing, it has often had to abstract from the particular cases and from the individuals who are subjected to the exercise power, make choices, and comprise the state. Political scientists turn to literature (as they do to history) to recover the particularity and individuality missing from their science. "Power" is an abstract term, but particular people have it or are subject to it. "Choice" is meaningful only when one can understand the concrete alternatives that are present in a particular situation. And the "state," however impersonal it is in theory, in practice operates by means of individuals upon other individuals.

The study of literature informed by the questions of political science is peculiarly suited to address what one might call the "human dimension" of the grand themes of the discipline. We especially welcome papers that examine literary presentations of, for example, the responsible or irresponsible exercise of power, the dilemmas individuals confront in times of great political change, and how the state manifests itself in the lives of particular individuals and communities.

We recognize that diverse literary genres and traditions might speak to these large issues, not merely from a point of view fully cognizant of present circumstances and stresses, but rather also from a perspective informed (at least potentially) by insight into common human concerns and issues. Because we are concerned with the present, we do not limit ourselves to papers about the so-called "Great Books." Because we are concerned with the timeless or common human concerns that might instantiate themselves in particular situations, we do not limit ourselves to papers about contemporary literature. Because we recognize that literature is a powerful tool for insight, we welcome papers that address its role in the political science classroom.

In addition to papers addressing the overarching themes of the conference, we are receptive to any meritorious contribution to our understanding of how literature illuminates political phenomena.

★ Division 42: New Political Science
R. Claire Snyder, Illinois State University

The conference theme, *Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State at Century's End*, raises a

host of issues of interest to New Political Science. As noted in the general call for papers, "from its founding, political science has transacted with history, its parent discipline, and the other social sciences." In fact, political science actually emerged out of the social sciences, which were founded in order to find "reasonable solutions for the nation's growing social problems, especially those arising from poverty, crime, labor unrest, and business cycles produced by urbanization and industrialization." What is the significance of these origins for New Political Science, which continues to strive "to make the study of politics relevant to the struggle for a better world?" We welcome papers that evaluate the state of the discipline in light of its historical and contemporary normative purposes.

Does political science as a discipline offer anything important to those who are struggling for economic justice and human dignity in the U.S. and around the world? Or are we simply talking amongst ourselves? How do we bring together those on the left who are engaged in separate conversations within postmodernism, feminist theory, and queer theory? Is it important for the left to maintain a clear ideological focus? Or should we move "beyond ideology" and try to form coalitions with those who are more to the right?

How should we understand the concepts of power, choice, and the state in a world that is becoming rapidly globalized and increasingly fragmented? How do we make sense of the overlapping matrices of power that organize the world by gender, race, class, and ethnicity? How does the ideological belief in choice both enable and constrain political analysis? To what extent should the state remain the proper focus of political knowledge and action?

We welcome proposals from a wide variety of engaged perspectives, including feminisms, critical theory, Marxism, ecology, postmodernism, cultural theory, hermeneutics, and political economy.

★ Division 43: Ecological and Transformational Politics

Stephen Woolpert, Saint Mary's College of California

Ecological and Transformational Politics (ETP) welcomes papers on "ecological politics" in three areas: (1) problems such as global climate change, depletion of natural resources, diminishing biodiversity, pollution, or other issues concerning human interaction with the natural world; (2) any political subject in which the focus is on the processes, patterns of interaction, and emergent properties of whole systems, rather than discrete events and units of analysis; (3) teaching and research strategies that foster ecological literacy, environmentally responsible citizenship, and an affinity for the living world.

ETP also invites papers on "transformational politics" (i.e., profound transitions and major turning points), both in the lived world of politics and in efforts to understand it, in four areas: (1) new modes of thinking about the nature of power, choice, and the state, as well as ways to transform such understanding into action; (2) political efforts to bring about a fundamentally better world, via social movements, community empowerment,

organizational renewal, innovative policy making, collaborative leadership, etc.; (3) methodologies that liberate persons to see things as they are and to live authentically in response to the truths they discover; (4) teaching strategies that encourage students to ask why, to strive for the integration of knowledge, and to achieve educational synergy between an alert mind and practical experience.

Such creative approaches germinate well in an interdisciplinary environment. Therefore, ETP welcomes papers that enrich political understanding by transcending traditional academic boundaries and papers that incorporate recent advances in other disciplines. It encourages all presenters to locate their knowledge in a larger context and to communicate across specialized languages.

2000 Call for Papers Guidelines for Participation

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

1. Participation Limitation

In the Fall of 1987, in order to provide opportunities in the Annual Meeting by the greatest number of people, the APSA Council limited participation in the Program. As a result, presenters are limited to TWO APPEARANCES on sessions organized by the APSA Program Committee, Organized Sections, and Related Group panels. **An appearance on the Annual Meeting Program takes the form of paper or roundtable presenter, or discussant. Chairing a panel or roundtable and presenting a poster do not count toward the two-participation rule.**

2. Preregistration

The APSA Council requires all program participants to preregister by **April 14, 2000**. Participants who do not preregister by April 14 **will not** be listed in the *Preliminary Program*.

3. Exempt Participants

Prospective participants may request of a division chair or panel organizer an exemption from the preregistration requirement if they are: **A) not a political scientist; B) appearing on only one panel; and C) not an exempt participant in 1999**. An exempt participant receives a badge for admission to all Annual Meeting activities but will not receive an Annual Meeting Program or the reduced hotel rate.

4. Paper Delivery

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

5. Panel Schedule

Panels are scheduled in fourteen (14) time slots beginning at 8:45 a.m. on Thursday and concluding at 12:30 p.m. on Sunday. **Participants are expected to be available for any of the fourteen time slots**. If your schedule is limited by a teaching or travel constraint, inform the division chair or panel organizer upon your acceptance as a participant, or by April 14, 2000.

Deadline: Monday, November 15, 1999

2000 Proposal Submission Process: New Secure Database, New Instructions

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

	Electronic Submission (available September 10 at APSA website)
Deadline	November 15, midnight EST
Address/Method	http://www.apsanet.org
Requirements	Email address and internet access*
Confirmation of Receipt	1. Unique ID number assigned for each proposal 2. Email confirmation with ID number within 24 hours
Notification of Acceptance	APSA website beginning February 15, 2000

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

- You may submit **up to two** papers or **two** organized panel proposals. Additional proposals from the same author or organizer will not be accepted. All paper proposals will be considered for poster presentation.
- You may submit each proposal to **no more than two** Divisions.
- All submissions must be received electronically by **Monday, November 15, 1999**.

Confirmation of Proposal Receipt at APSA

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

Deadline: Monday, November 15, 1999

Acceptance Notification

Beginning on February 15, 2000 the APSA website will feature a searchable database by proposal ID number or last name. If accepted for a panel or poster presentation, the database will indicate the division to which you were accepted. (Note: Only first authors and panel organizers will appear on the acceptance database – see forms on website for further clarification.)

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

* **Note:** If you do not have access to a computer or an email account, please contact APSA at 202-483-2512 and we will be happy to mail the submission forms. Mail proposals to APSA must be postmarked by November 15, 1999 – submissions postmarked after this date will be returned.

A New Resource for Political Science Professors



The New York Times Political Science Classroom Guide helps you:

ENLIVEN classroom discussions

SAVE TIME planning lessons

ADD DEPTH and scope to business issues

EXPAND textbook assignments.

This guide contains
general methodologies
and course-specific
strategies for using
The New York Times in:
American Government
International Relations
Global Politics
Geopolitics
Judicial Politics and Law
Public Policy

VISIT www.nytcollege.com for a sampling of the CASE STUDIES, STRATEGIES and LESSON PLANS included in this Classroom Guide. Learn how many of the nation's top educators are helping their students by using The New York Times.

SPECIAL SAVINGS OFFER AND BONUS GIFT:

Sign up with 10 of your students for a 12-week subscription to The New York Times and get a FREE New York Times 1999 Almanac. Students, faculty and staff save 50% off of home delivery prices.

Call today: 1-888-698-2655 or visit www.nytcollege.com.

The New York Times

College Program | Expect the World® | www.nytimes.com

CODE: PSAD199-1