

Sciences/Ukrainian Association of Political Scientists in league with the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The AAAS Society Fellow Program enables international scholars to learn the theory and practice of learned societies. Efforts will continue for 1997.

B. Hauck reported that the exchange program with the Japanese Political Science Association continues to provide for APSA member participation in the JPSA's annual meeting and vice versa.

### 18. Update Education and Professional Development Committee

Sheilah Mann reported on the difficulties of the FIPSE project to develop designs for comprehensive introductory courses. She also reported that the Annual Meeting focus group discussion among graduate students on the introductory courses they are being prepared to teach. Mann noted that Community college and high school teachers have received special invitations to attend the 1996 Annual Meeting. In addition, the APSA co-sponsored a national convention on science and engineering doctoral education held by the National Academy of Sciences in June. A small report will appear in the December issue of *PS*.

### 19. Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics: Follow up on outside letters of reference

The Council received a memo from Kay Schlozman, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics' dealing with the Committee's reconsideration of the language in the **Guide to Professional Ethics** regarding requests for letters from outside reference. It has been suggested that departments may be unfairly taking advantage of the faculty members professional obligation to supply letters when asked. The Committee and the Departmental Services Committee will conduct a survey of department chairs and senior faculty to collect data on departmental practices. The survey will be conducted in October 1996.

### 20. Committee Reports and Other Materials Submitted for the Council's Information

The Council was presented with the following reports and materials for its information: minutes of the Departmental Services Committee, Agenda of the 1996 Conference of Political Science chairs, Announcement of the new **Directory of Undergraduate Political Science**

**Faculty**, minutes of the Publications Committee, Organized Section update, minutes of the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession, report on the Congressional Fellowship Program, and press release on the 1996 Annual Meeting.

### 21. Adjournment

Elinor Ostrom presented Arend Lijphart with a Certificate of Appreciation, lauding him for his work on behalf of the Association. The meeting adjourned with no further business.

## APSA Awards Presented at 1996 Annual Meeting

### DISSERTATION AWARDS

#### Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1994 or 1995 in the field of comparative politics.

*Award Committee:* Scott Mainwaring, University of Notre Dame, chair; Thomas Koelble, University of Miami; and Frances Rosenbluth, Yale University

*Recipient:* **Torben Iversen**, Harvard University

*Dissertation:* "Contested Economic Institutions: The Politics of Macro-Economics and Wage Bargaining in Organized Capitalism."

*Citation:* Torben Iversen's dissertation examines the interaction between wage bargaining institutions, macro-economic policy regimes, and the welfare state in organized capitalism, focusing mostly on northern Europe and Japan. His central puzzle is to explain different patterns in institutional change in organized capitalism.

He argues that in advanced industrial democracies with well organized labor unions and business associations, macro-economic performance—especially the level of unemployment—depends fundamentally on two variables: the degree of centralization of the bargaining system, and the nature of the monetary policy regime. Two quite different macroinstitutional equilibria facilitate successful adaptation to the erosion of the post-1945 Social Democratic consensus: flexible centralization and non-accommodating decentralization. With flexible centralization, economic adjustment occurs through a coordination of macroeco-

omic policies and the behavior of unions and business associations. The Scandinavian countries for some time represented this path to adjustment. With non-accommodating decentralization, decentralized unions and employers adjust their behavior to government policies that deliberately eschew accommodation and coordination. Germany, Japan, and Switzerland have pursued this path to adjustment. Both of these outcomes are superior to those produced when centralization is combined with a non-accommodating policy regime or when decentralization is coupled with an accommodating one.

The two paths that produce better results are both Pareto optimal, but they differ markedly in the opportunities for organized interests to exercise influence. For this reason, they are supported by different coalitions. This poses the puzzle as to why different institutional arrangements arise in the first place. Building on the literatures on new classical economics, coalition formation, institutional change, and corporatist theory, Iversen argues that institutions arise as an outcome of a process of coalition formation between partisan governments and organized interests. Institutional change results when technological, environmental, and economic transformations lead to a new constellation of interests among the actors (government, unions, and employers' associations) that Iversen considers in his model.

Iversen's dissertation builds on a variety of literatures, and also contributes rich new insights to these literatures, challenging them in refreshing ways. It is comparatively broad and theoretically bold.

#### William Anderson Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1994 or 1995 in the field of state and local politics, federalism, or intergovernmental relations.

*Award Committee:* Gerald A. McBeath, University of Alaska-Fairbanks, chair; Herman Bakvis, Dalhousie University; and Marilyn Davis, Spelman College

*Recipient:* **Thomas M. Carsey**

*Dissertation:* "Election Dynamics: Candidate Strategy and Electoral Cleavages in United States Gubernatorial Elections"

*Dissertation Chair:* Gerald C. Wright, Indiana University

*Citation:* The William Anderson Award Committee honors Thomas M. Carsey for the best doctoral dissertation of 1995 in the fields of state and local politics,

federalism, and intergovernmental relations. Dr. Carsey's thesis, "Election Dynamics: Candidate Strategy and Electoral Cleavage in United States Gubernatorial Elections," was completed at Indiana University for a committee chaired by Dr. Gerald Wright.

The question Carsey's dissertation asks is: What if any difference do gubernatorial candidates and their campaigns make in the behavior of individual voters and in the outcomes of state elections? In exploring this question, Carsey develops a multi-level contextual model of voting behavior that blends the motivations of voters, party activists, and candidates into the basic institutional structure of the electoral process. He applies this model to the understudied realm of comparative state gubernatorial campaigns and elections.

Carsey advances our understanding of state politics by analysis of 75 gubernatorial elections over the period 1982–1992. Particularly commendable is his use of a rich mixture of methods: exit poll data from 95,000 respondents, content analysis of state newspaper coverage, elite interviews, and case studies. Carsey persuasively argues that gubernatorial candidates do shape the informational context within which voters find themselves through the themes they stress during their campaigns. The gubernatorial campaign is a learning process for both candidates and voters, but it is candidates who write the syllabus.

#### **Edward S. Corwin Award (\$500)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1994 or 1995 in the field of public law.

*Award Committee:* Nancy Kassop, Chair, State University of New York—New Paltz; Roy B. Flemming, Texas A & M University; Richard Cortner; University of Arizona

*Recipient:* **Charles Robert Epp**, University of Kansas

*Dissertation:* "Constitutional Courts and the Rights Agenda in Comparative Perspective"

*Dissertation Chair:* Joel Grossman, University of Wisconsin—Madison

*Citation:* Charles Epp's dissertation is a comparative study that examines the extent to which supreme courts in Britain, Canada, India and the United States have developed a civil liberties and civil rights agenda from 1960–1990. His inquiry explores the conditions under which protection for rights will thrive,

both in nations with a constitution, a bill of rights and an independent judiciary to interpret them and in those without such a structure. He uses case-level data from original court reports in Canada, England and India, supplemented by personal interviews conducted in those countries. For the United States, Epp relies on the Judicial Database. In all four countries, he examines criminal procedure and women's rights cases to identify those factors that affected how the supreme courts in these four nations responded to rights claims in these subject areas.

Epp's work provides fresh insights into the study of the determinants of judicial agenda-setting. He posits that the two standard explanations for protection of rights, those emphasizing either (a) constitutional structures, or (b) cultural factors, are insufficient to fully understand this issue. Rather, the conditions that will determine whether courts will promote judicial protection of rights are far more variable and dynamic. The most important one that emerges from his study is the existence of a support structure of resources and organizations to mobilize the legal system on behalf of rights claims. Where such a structure is absent, there is little chance that judicial protection for individual rights will develop, even if the constitutional structures or cultural factors reflecting a respect for rights exist. He concludes that such support structures existed in Britain, Canada and the United States, but not in India, in the last three decades, during which the judicial agendas in those three nations reflected an increased focus on individual rights and a corresponding decrease in their attention to economic issues.

On a broader level, Epp's research provides a valuable contribution to the study of public law across a number of dimensions. His evidence indicates that the United States was not the only country whose highest court experienced a "rights revolution" in the mid-twentieth century, and that a similar judicial transformation also occurred in Canada and Britain. Despite controversy over whether such a "rights explosion" is desirable, Epp's findings firmly establish that the United States Supreme Court is neither unique nor exceptional in this regard. The primary explanation that he offers for this development is in the growth and diversification of legal, financial and organizational resources available for appellate litigation. His findings show that this growth of resources was greatest in the United States and Canada, somewhat less in Britain, and insufficient in India to produce a corresponding increase in the presence of civil

liberties and civil rights claims on the judicial agendas of the courts of these nations. Moreover, significant normative implications emerge from this study: the most important one is what Epp calls the "partial democratization of access to constitutional courts." With the expansion of the network of interest groups and organizations that are able to gain access to appellate litigation resources, the nature of the claims brought will reflect a diversification and broadening of the legal clientele. Economic or business claims will give way to those from a wider spectrum of litigants, including criminal defendants, women, those with unorthodox views, and minority group members.

Epp has produced an impressive work that sheds new light on the dynamics of judicial agenda-setting across nations. It is meticulously researched, carefully written, and it thoughtfully addresses alternative explanations. It sets out new directions for comparative constitutional law scholars to follow, and it represents an exemplary model of scholarship within this discipline.

#### **Harold D. Lasswell Award (\$500)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1994 or 1995 in the field of policy studies. (Supported by the Policy Studies Organization)

*Award Committee:* Richard L. Engstrom, Chair, University of New Orleans; Maureen Casamayou, Mount Vernon College; Jurg Steiner, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

*Recipient:* **Robert David English**, Allegheny College

*Dissertation:* "Russia Views the West: The Intellectual and Political Origins of New Thinking"

*Dissertation Chair:* Stephen E. Cohen, Princeton University

*Citation:* The committee members are pleased to present the Harold Lasswell award to Robert David English. His dissertation addresses one of the big questions of our time, the demise of the Soviet Union. More specifically, English investigates the influence of intellectuals and their ideas on this tremendous event. This is a welcome addition to explanations stressing the economic decline of the Soviet Union and the internal power struggles within the Soviet elite.

The influence of ideas is notoriously difficult to establish. English does a splendid job to demonstrate that new ideas had indeed a strong influence on

the events in the last few years of the Soviet Union. He is able to embed this influence in the history of the Soviet Union. English shows in a subtle and sophisticated way how the memories of the heroic times of World War II slowly faded away, opening space for new ideas. History is important for English, not as objective facts, but as perceptions that can be molded by intellectuals.

### Helen Dwight Reid Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1994 or 1995 in the field of international relations, law and politics.

*Award Committee:* J. David Singer, University of Michigan, chair; Ivo H. Daalder, University of Maryland; and Lee Ann Otto, University of San Diego

*Recipient:* **Katherine Barbieri**, University of North Texas

*Dissertation:* "Economic Interdependence and Militarized Interstate Conflict"

*Dissertation Chair:* Stuart A. Bremer, SUNY-Binghamton

*Citation:* We take great pleasure in announcing our choice of Katherine Barbieri's *Interdependence and Conflict* as the best American doctoral dissertation in the field of international relations, law, and politics for 1994–95. The competition was keen with ten timely submissions; worth noting is that seven reflected the norms of scientific method, six were written by women, and all three finalists were women. The world politics field may be coming of age!

Turning to our committee's unanimous decision, we were guided by a number of compelling considerations, central of which is the theoretical and political significance of the topic: the impact of trade interdependence on the frequency, severity, and magnitude of conflict in given pairs of states. Despite several modest studies suggesting otherwise for the past two centuries, the accepted wisdom is that trade leads toward political harmony and away from conflict, and many governments try to pursue trade as an instrument of more peaceful relations. In examining this proposition and finding it seriously flawed, Barbieri demonstrates her fine social science competence in several ways. First, she translates the general hypothesis into a number of more refined theoretical versions and then shows considerable ingenuity and thoughtfulness in devising alternative indicators appropriate to each version. Second, she

began with a longitudinal and world-side date set on international trade that was so deficient in terms of cross-temporal and cross-national comparability that the originators decided to forego any major investigation resting on it, hoping that in due course some really thorough, systematic, creative, and diligent scholar might come along and reconstruct it into scientifically useful form. This is an exciting and valuable part of the story and we urge her to make more of it in the published version.

Third, in bridging very nicely the allegedly distinct fields of international security and political economy, Barbieri shows a solid command of the theoretical, empirical, and methodological literature on both sides of the street, goes on to produce a research design that is appropriate, robust and unpretentious, brings it to bear on this broad and diverse data base, and draws reasonable and insightful inferences from her statistical results. Finally, despite the methodological sophistication, her literary style is straightforward, unadorned, and fully accessible; the verbal lyrics nicely converge with the statistical music!

In sum, this is a salutary piece of work in conception and execution, and it is a credit to this young scholar, her mentors, (including her chairman, Stuart Bremer, who won this very same award more than twenty years ago) the pioneers in quantitative world politics, and in the political science profession. We wish her well in her career, and expect to hear from her for a long time to come.

### E. E. Schattschneider Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1994 or 1995 in the field of American government and politics.

*Award Committee:* Carol Cassel, University of Alabama, chair; Fernando J. Guerra, Loyola Marymount University; and Richard L. Hall, University of Michigan

*Recipient:* **Sarah A. Binder**, University of Minnesota

*Dissertation:* "Minority Rights and Majority Rule: The Partisan Basis of Procedural Choice in Congress, 1789–1994"

*Dissertation Chair:* Steven S. Smith, University of Minnesota

*Citation:* Important and lasting research is defined by the question it asks. The questions Binder poses in her dissertation are fundamental to understanding democratic assemblies: Why do majority

parties ever create rules that provide parliamentary rights and prerogatives to minority parties? and, Under what conditions do majority parties suppress minority rights?

In developing a theory to answer these questions, Binder skillfully builds on recent work that emphasizes the partisan basis of legislative organization. Her argument is two-pronged. The rules that define a legislative institution, according to Binder, are the product of purposive agents who seek legislative outcomes to their own liking. Whatever rhetoric one may hear regarding democratic principles of majority rule and fair and open deliberation, such principles give way to strategic partisan considerations. Specifically, Binder argues that rules changes are most likely to occur when the policy preferences of the respective parties begin to diverge, qualified by the condition that the emerging majority party coalition is large or cohesive. Under such conditions, minority party obstructionism is likely to be delimited by parliamentary reforms that restrict minority rights. Binder elaborates an analogous logic regarding parliamentary reforms that enhance minority rights. The less cohesive the majority party, the more likely a faction of the majority will successfully join a cross-party coalition in favor of expanding majority rights.

The second and equally important line of theoretical development goes to the importance of inherited rules and procedures. Partisan strategists cannot create parliamentary prerogatives de novo. Procedural changes are themselves adopted under a prevailing set of procedures, and inherited rules affect the relative costs to the majority of enacting new changes that affect the balance of majority powers and minority rights. In this way, institutional arrangements are path-dependent, and Binder provides a coherent account of how, when, and why changes in these arrangements take the paths that they do.

*Recipient:* **Patricia Heidotting Conley**

*Dissertation:* "Presidential Mandates: How Elections Shape the National Agenda"

*Dissertation Chair:* Christopher Achen, University of Chicago

*Citation:* Professor Conley proposes a theory that presidential mandates are claims made by presidents when they perceive the opportunity for major policy change. Presidents declare mandates based on estimates of 1) presidential ability to mobilize majority voter support, and 2) the ideological distance between the president and Congress on the



issue at hand. This turn from conventional theory bypasses unproductive discussions about whether majorities of voters provide policy direction on issues. The president claims a mandate based on subjective inferences that the people elected the president to make a large policy change, and, if Congress disagrees, that the president could marshal public support.

In Conley's simple game theoretic model, first the new president decides whether to claim his or her election means the people have mandated a policy change. If the answer is yes, the next move is for Congress to agree and enact the policy, or to disagree. If Congress disagrees, the President then concedes or fights. If the President fights, Congress likewise concedes or fights.

All players try to calculate the president's capacity to mobilize electoral support. Therefore, presidential agenda setting is a byproduct of the strategic interaction of elites.

Conley expresses her theory with elegance and skill, and provides rich detail. The first three chapters of her dissertation develop the model. Conley follows with a quantitative examination of policy mandates that presidents have claimed since 1828; and qualitative analyses of the mandate claimed in 1980, and the elections without mandates in 1948, 1960, 1976 and 1988.

The ideas posed in this dissertation are sufficiently original and sound to impact thought about American government among its readers.

### Leo Strauss Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1994 or 1995 in the field of political philosophy.

*Award Committee:* Catherine Zuckert, Carleton College, Chair; Robert Goodin, Australian National University; George Zaninovich, University of Oregon

*Recipient:* **Eyal Chowers**, McGill University

*Dissertation:* "The Modern Self in the Labyrinth: A Study of Entrapment in the Works of Weber, Freud, and Foucault"

*Dissertation Advisors:* Charles Taylor and James Tully

*Citation:* The Leo Strauss Award was established in honor of a man who dedicated his life to the study of political philosophy when that study seemed threatened with extinction in the age of positivist political science. Both the number and the quality of the dissertations

nominated for the Strauss award this year testify to the extent to which the study of political philosophy has not merely revived, but is now vibrantly alive. Chowers is and ought to feel honored to have his work selected from such a strong field of competitors by a committee representing three very different approaches to the study of political theory.

In his dissertation Chowers explores a troubling twentieth century development: modern "selves" see themselves engulfed or "entrapped" by impersonal, dehumanizing forces which, ironically, originate not in external powers, divine or natural, but arise out of human beings themselves. Such selves find it increasingly difficult to believe that they have the resources to direct, much less to revolutionize their own lives. The possibility of political action thus comes fundamentally into question.

Chowers finds the beginnings of this development in eighteenth century "Enlightenment" thinkers like Smith, Rousseau, and Herder who suggested that, if there were no divine or natural order, human beings could transform the world to make it better suited to their own needs and interests. As the power of human beings to transform the world appeared greater, Chowers observes, so did the suspicion that human beings might prove unable to control the process.

If human beings had no set "nature," nineteenth century thinkers suggested, their characteristics, both individual and collective, were products of external forces beyond their control. But Marx and Nietzsche argued that at the "end of history" human beings would be able to transcend their circumstances—either collectively or individually. What distinguishes Weber, Freud, and Foucault from their predecessors is their denial of the possibility or grounds of any such transcendence.

The originality of Chowers' analysis lies primarily in his identifying the common structure or theme in the writings of these twentieth century thinkers. Weber, Freud, and Foucault are usually understood to have offered three different, fundamentally incompatible diagnoses of the problems of modern life. The terms in which they see the conflict occurring may be somewhat different, Chowers argues, but Weber, Freud, and Foucault all picture the "self" as the locus of unending strife. This internal strife both produces and is produced by changes in external conditions or history. Since there is no end or resolution of the conflict, the view of history each of these authors gives is tragic. The summary effect or ethos produced by their analyses, if not contemporary conditions in and of them-

selves, is a thoroughgoing sense of powerlessness. " 'Man' is not sovereign, never was, and certainly cannot be under existing conditions."

### Leonard D. White Award (\$500)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1994 or 1995 in the field of public administration.

*Award Committee:* Patricia A. Wilson, Chair, San Diego State University; Carolyn Ban, SUNY-Albany; Phillip J. Cooper, University of Vermont

*Recipient:* **Sally Coleman Selden**, University of Georgia

*Dissertation:* "Representative Bureaucracy: Examining the Potential for Administrative Responsiveness in the Bureaucratic State"

*Dissertation Chair:* J. Edward Kellough

*Citation:* The Leonard D. White Award this year is given to Sally Coleman Selden for her dissertation entitled "Representative Bureaucracy: Examining the Potential for Administrative Responsiveness in the Bureaucratic State." In this particular period our nation's political and administrative history, this dissertation is extremely significant. It provides evidence that a bureaucracy reflective of the populace is most likely to ensure that the interests of all groups are considered in the decision-making process. Her work presents original empirical research to investigate the relationship between "diversity" and public policy.

There has been very little empirical work designed to investigate the relationship between minority employment in the government work force and public policy outcomes consistent with minority interest. The underlying question in Selden's dissertation is how to ensure that the power of public agencies will be exercised in the broad public interest. Her study takes place in the Rural Housing Loans Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration (FmHA). Her research provided us with "scientific proof" that bureaucratic power used to implement public policy may be more responsive to the public served if the composition of the bureaucratic work force reflects, in characteristics such as race and ethnicity, the society at large.

In conclusion, this dissertation has implications for the implementation of cultural diversity in public agencies. Additionally, her findings have both theoretical and practical implications, making her dissertation very valuable for

both the academician and the practitioner, in both political science and public administration.

## PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

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

For the best paper presented at the 1995 Annual Meeting.

*Award Committee:* Farhad Kazemi, New York University, chair; William Crotty, Northeastern University; and Vickie Sullivan, Skidmore College

*Recipient:* Jeffrey A. Segal, SUNY-Stony Brook

*Paper:* "Marksist (and Neo-Marksist) Models of Supreme Court Decision Making: Separation-of-Powers in the Positive Theory of Law and Courts"

*Citation:* Jeffrey A. Segal evaluates the evidence for the Supreme Court's deference to the Congress in decision making particularly in statutory cases where the Congress can more easily reverse the Court. Using two alternative models of the Courts' behavior of "sincere"—voting their own policy preferences—and "strategic"—voting in accordance to Congressional preferences—Segal reviews systematically the statutory cases between 1947 and 1992. He concludes that there is little evidence for the Courts' "insincere" behavior. In Segal's own words: "The Court almost always votes sincerely, and that given the checks and balances built into the American system, it is hardly irrational, myopic, or shortsighted for them to do so."

This outstanding paper shows remarkable research sophistication, using models and empirical evidence, to weigh alternative explanations. The overall quality is exemplary: the manner of conceptualization and organization, the methodology including the range of tests employed, and the time frame developed in the research which extends the analysis beyond either case study status or explanations of given courts. The argumentation is solidly grounded and the conclusion is well documented. Segal's exemplary research paper has the possibility of becoming a classic work on the subject.

### Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)

For the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during 1995.

*Award Committee:* George Rabinowitz,

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, chair; Rudy B. Andeweg, Leiden University; and Goldie Shabad, Ohio State University

*Recipients:* Robert S. Erikson, University of Houston; James A. Stimson, University of Minnesota; and Michael B. MacKuen, University of Missouri-St. Louis

*Paper:* "Dynamic Representation"

*Citation:* The responsiveness of different sets of policymakers to public opinion is at the heart of normative and empirical democratic theory. The institutional mechanism that is designed to facilitate the translation of public opinion into government policy is regularly scheduled elections. According to classic democratic theory, election campaigns present voters alternative policy programs, and through elections the public selects which of those programs become government policy. Yet, elections need not be the only route to policy control. Politicians in government, knowing that they must eventually compete for office, have reason to be sensitive to public opinion well before they are actively engaged in an election campaign.

This suggests two primary roads to mass control over public policy, one through the ballot box and the other through the sensitive antennae of politicians. Stimson, MacKuen, and Erikson, in "Dynamic Representation," develop and then follow this thread of logic to explore the impact of public opinion on public policy in the United States. They find that indeed both mechanisms matter, and that the direct link between public opinion and policy is stronger than many would have imagined. In addition, they demonstrate that the institutional arrangements set up by the US constitution stimulate a differential sensitivity to the immediate demands of the public, with the House of Representatives and the Presidency most responsive, the Senate decidedly less so, and the Supreme Court least of all. Yet, each branch in its own way reacts to the mood and temper of the times.

This work represents a major effort to improve on existing studies of representation. In addition to the paper's explicit claim of going beyond the static character of most previous studies, it improves on most of the existing literature by raising the level of analysis from individual politicians to political institutions. The authors make creative use of data and methodology to gauge both the speed and the extent of policy responsiveness. Their findings, while not counter-intuitive, are far from trivial. The paper is

well written and should be accessible to a wide readership.

The article should also be provocative. The time frame of Stimson, MacKuen, and Erikson's analysis is a thirty-five year period where the Democratic party maintained continuous control of the House of Representatives. That, as well as the rather limited number of observations (one per year) provide grounds to motivate skeptics. The core finding that public opinion on its own—quite apart from specific electoral outcomes—has a substantial impact on public policy is inherently controversial. Given the centrality of the topic to the discipline, this piece will not be the last word on the question of representation. However, the article sets a very high empirical and methodological standard and provides an intriguing political argument. In short, it is a wonderful piece of work, and one which should have a long-term impact on how we as a discipline understand the mechanisms of representation in democracies.

## BOOK AWARDS

### Ralph J. Bunche Award (\$500)

For the best scholarly work in political science published in 1995 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Award Committee:* Franklin D. Jones, Texas Southern University, chair; David D. Laitin, University of Chicago; and Christine M. Sierra, University of New Mexico

*Recipient:* Will Kymlicka, University of Ottawa

*Book:* *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, published by Oxford University Press

*Citation:* Ralph J. Bunche, in his role as director of the United Nations Trusteeship Division, and especially in his leadership of the Palestine Commission for the UN, struggled with the problem of nations that lacked states and of states that had a surfeit of nations. Liberals such as Bunche with good political judgment had inventive ad hoc solutions to problems faced by multicultural states in the context of decolonization. Yet, there were no theoretically cogent liberal principles to apply to these problems. After World War I, Wilsonian plebiscites, which hear only the voices of individual voters, had already proven to be ineffective. Today, liberal theory has had an equally difficult time addressing issues arising from the new "identity politics",

again for lack of a consistent set of principles on how a liberal state can recognize identity groups qua groups. Will Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* provides an exciting first step on the road to a liberal theory of differentiated citizenship, where individuals can be both members of cultural groups and citizens of a liberal state. Thus the book helps us rethink systematically issues that Ralph Bunche grappled with in one of his major international roles.

The fundamental contribution Kymlicka makes is to show why the granting of corporate rights for minority groups is not inconsistent with the fundamental tenets of liberalism. The book redirects debate concerning the recognition of such groups in liberal society. It is unproductive to ask whether or not we should do so. Kymlicka shows that in fact all liberal societies do so already. The question is how to do it while preserving such liberal values as social stability and individual autonomy. While hardly providing definitive answers, *Multicultural Citizenship* sets the agenda for a higher level of debate on questions of the recognition of cultural groups in liberal society. And as a bonus, Professor Kymlicka makes his points with clarity, with well-chosen examples, and with empathy for those minorities who live under conditions in which cultural "others" exert ownership of the state.

The Ralph J. Bunche award committee reviewed fifty nominated books, of great range and diversity. Many of them were of exceptional quality. Special mention should be made of Robert C. Smith's *Racism in the Post Civil Rights Era*. When many intellectual and social currents converge to point to the declining significance of race in America, Smith with rigor and passion demonstrates the continued importance of race and racism in the political and economic realms. The committee was equally impressed by Nancy Abelmann and John Lie's *Blue Dreams*. The 1992 Los Angeles riots provide the context for this book's detailed analysis of the formation and character of Los Angeles' Korean American population and the influence of American ideology in framing racial and class conflict in an urban political economy. These two books, and others, demonstrated considerable progress in social science in understanding of issues of cultural pluralism. One clear sign of the merit of Will Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* is that it stood out even next to the fine works of Smith, Abelmann and Lie, and others.

Will Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship* is a masterful book, tightly argued, and in the tradition of Ralph J. Bunche's Nobel Prize winning work.

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

For the best political science publication in 1995 in the field of U.S. national policy.

*Award Committee:* Raymond Tanter, University of Michigan, chair; Harold F. Bass, Jr., Ouachita Baptist University; and Melissa Collie, University of Texas at Austin

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

*Book:* *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*, published by University of Chicago Press

*Citation:* We selected the Aldrich book as our first choice because it resolves theoretical and empirical issues that have been central to the study of American politics generally and, more particularly, to the meaning of political parties with respect to the electorate, elections themselves, government and policy. We believe that this is really a first-class book.

At issue in the Aldrich book is why political parties developed. How and why do party alignments change? Are the party-centered elections of the past better for democratic politics than the candidate-centered elections of the present? In this pathbreaking work, Aldrich goes beyond arguments over whether American political parties are in resurgence or decline and reexamines the foundations of the American party system.

Aldrich surveys three eras in the development of American political parties—from their formation in the 1790s to the Civil War. He demonstrates how parties serve to combat three basic problems of democracy: how to regulate the number of people seeking public office; how to mobilize voters; and how to achieve and maintain majorities needed to accomplish aims once politicians assume office. Overcoming these obstacles is possible with political parties.

Aldrich brings his creative explanation up to date by looking at transformations in the character of political parties since World War II. In the 1960s, parties started to become candidate-centered organizations that are servants to their office seekers and officeholders. By becoming candidate-centered, parties became revitalized, with well-defined cleavages and highly effective governing ability.

### **Victoria Schuck Award (\$500)**

For the best book published in 1995 on women and politics.

*Award Committee:* Laura Woliver, University of South Carolina, chair; Anne Costain, University of Colorado-Boulder; and Marie B. Rosenberg, Eastern Washington University

*Recipient:* **Gwendolyn Mink**, University of California-Santa Cruz

*Book:* *The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality in the Welfare State, 1917–1942*, published by Cornell University Press

*Citation:* The 1996 Victoria Schuck Award is presented to Gwendolyn Mink for her book *The Wages of Motherhood: Equality in the Welfare State, 1917–1942* (Cornell University Press). From more than 25 books nominated, many of them of outstanding quality and scholarship, Dr. Mink's book stood out based on her original research, the advancement of theory and knowledge about women and politics she provides, and the potential impact her study will have on future research. The selection committee's criteria for the award included, "Originality, broadening the discourse within the field of women and politics, and excellence of scholarship and presentation."

Mink explains how social welfare policy in the United States became a metonym for women's inequality instead of a breakthrough for public social provision. Mink carefully examines the historical record, and integrates primary historical documents into the vast literature on social welfare policy making. She considers race, gender, class, and cultural scholarship, explaining how the goals of social policy, the clientele addressed, and the means used were channeled through a particular vision of proper motherhood and childraising. This rationale removed much of the larger political and structural causes and variables from the poverty or powerlessness of needy families, and instead aimed attention at the proper cultural and racial assimilation into the dominate culture of women needing social welfare. Women who deviated would not be helped.

These foundational principles of helping poor women and their children, woven into the history of welfare in this country help us to understand the modern situation of poor mothers and children. Contemporary debates about whether our welfare policies should be more coercive toward recipients so they will only have children within the institution of heterosexual marriage, and will raise those children in a manner and within a home which the majority culture values are also examined.

Mink reveals and highlights our historical legacies in welfare policymaking which shaped our thinking to this day.



The original objectives of social welfare policies, to alleviate some of the hardships of poverty for mothers, are sidetracked by cultural and racial assumptions. Mink's research helps us see these assumptions, and consider their legacy in modern social welfare debates.

*The Wages of Motherhood*, therefore, exemplifies the purpose of the annual Victoria Schuck Award, "for the best political science publication on women and politics" for the year.

The Victoria Schuck Award Committee consisted of Laura R. Woliver, the University of South Carolina, committee chair; Anne N. Costain, the University of Colorado—Boulder; and Marie Rosenberg, Emeritus, Eastern Washington University.

### Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$5,000)

For the best book published during 1995 in the United States on government, politics, or international relations (supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation).

*Award Committee:* Virginia Sapiro, chair, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Lief Carter, Colorado College; Richard Hof-ferbert, SUNY-Binghamton.

*Recipient:* **Herbert Kitschelt**, Duke University, in collaboration with Anthony J. McGann.

*Book:* *The Radical Right in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*, published by University of Michigan Press.

*The Radical Right in Western Europe* focuses on a subject of great theoretical and practical political consequence. How can we explain the rise and understand the nature of radical right authoritarian parties that have become real contenders in the electoral contests of democratic Western Europe? Kitschelt's judicious and interesting consideration of a range of theories applied to create a truly comparative empirical investigation, all framed by his clearly developed decision making/institutional analysis, helped him conceive and produce a richly nuanced yet still parsimonious study. This work avoids the monocausal answers sometimes generated by strongly theoretical empirical research while never becoming overwhelmed by the complexities of the subject he chose.

Kitschelt does not just dismiss alternative theories in favor of his own, but reads and reintegrates them to form a larger whole. He disagrees with those who argue radical right parties are merely continuations of old fascisms. As for previous theories on the emergence

of radical right parties, he shows that those focusing exclusively on mass-level preferences are rendered necessarily incomplete by omitting the "supply side," or leadership and institutional aspects of the problem. Nor do successful parties emerge just because economic dislocations lead to a resurgence of conservative or right-wing sentiments in some sectors of the public. Likewise as he demonstrates, racism and ethnocentrism may be catalysts in the development of radical right parties, but they are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions. Kitschelt reconsiders and theoretically reintegrates these earlier insights identifying shifts in the "competitive space" of political parties in Western Europe in the 1980s occasioned by various socio-economic changes, the set of choices that created convergence of important portions of the left and right, and the decisions and actions of radical right and leaders that determined their levels of success in the electoral arena.

In his search for a theory that is general enough to account for variation Kitschelt doesn't boil away historical or cross-national differences, but works to explain them. As he writes, "While common tendencies of the contemporary Right may be driven by the change of popular demands for political messages, the variance in the rightist parties' appeals across countries, and even within countries over time, requires a theory of political institutions and strategic cooperation within party systems and party organizations" (2). The empirical core of the book considers in succession the quite different cases of France, Scandinavia, Austria, Italy, Germany, and Great Britain.

He is rigorously demanding of his own empirical work; not only does he state his hypotheses clearly, he is just as careful about listing—and searching for—the kinds of evidence that would defeat his case. He is not deterred from his task by the fact that an ideal data set for his purposes does not exist, but in bravely forging ahead he never drags out of the data more than they can offer. He achieves that most delicate balancing act performed by scholars with both strong political and scientific commitments. He assures us from the beginning that he finds his subject matter detestable, but he holds an old-fashioned view that at least sometimes, there might be a theoretical and empirically correct answer that could be important to know. Finally, this book offers more evidence that good social science can be delivered dressed in good writing.

Many criteria could be used to determine which of a long list of books should generate the most admiration from a

committee of diverse scholars. One that surfaced repeatedly as our deliberations drew to a close was our belief that in *The Radical Right Europe* we had identified a book we could present to our graduate students as a sample of high quality, well written original research on a theoretically and politically significant topic.

### CAREER AWARDS

#### John Gaus Award (\$1,500)

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

*Award Committee:* Rosemary O'Leary, Indiana University, Chair; Helen Ingram, University of Arizona; Ken Meir, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

*Recipient:* **Lynton K. Caldwell**, Indiana University

*Citation:* Lynton K. Caldwell has written prolifically on local government, American history, international training and assistance, and biopolitics. His most influential works, however, have dealt with environmental administration and environmental policy. It is interesting to note that each of those works on environmental administration and environmental policy were written after the age of fifty, with nearly a quarter-century invested in the academic study of public administration. With a bold stroke, Caldwell decided to push in a direction that was at that time uncharted, to enter a field of study that had not yet been formed.

In a controversial article published in *Public Administration Review* (PAR) in 1963, Caldwell predicted the importance of environmental concerns for government, public administration, political science, and society generally. That article, entitled, "Environment: A New Focus for Public Policy," won the 1963 William E. Mosher Award for best article by an academic published in PAR that year.

Caldwell's life and career were changed forever. He found professional collegiality through an interdisciplinary, inter-university, focus and a widespread public affairs network. Trained as a political scientist, yet stimulated by interactions with other disciplines, Caldwell took the road less traveled and made himself an interdisciplinary scholar. He became the first to address the broader implications of ecological insights to politics, and the first to use the terms "envi-

ronmental policy” and “environmental administration” to describe his subject matter. He was alone in focusing on the distinctive, integrative character of the concept “environment” and its implications for politics, public policy, and public administration. He was the principle architect of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the inventor of the federally mandated environmental impact statement.

One of the major themes of Caldwell’s 1963 work was that existing political institutions were not established to deal with environmental policy and were illequipped to do so. For societies to cope effectively with environmental problems will require, Caldwell argued, a major reorienting of political systems—an adaption of political institutions to an ecological view of the world. He suggested that a task of public administrators, policy makers, and researchers was to find common-sense ways of achieving a balance between uninformed, expedient, piecemeal methods and hopelessly complex syntheses of all factors.

In his work that laid the foundation for the creation of the National Environmental Policy Act and the environmental impact statement, Caldwell emphasized how institutional design leads to decisions that promote environmental damage. Institutions must be designed so that policymakers are forced to consider the impacts of their decisions on the environment, he argued. He called for scholars to study the machinery by which government affects the shaping of the physical environment and to think in terms of imaginative hypotheses.

Lynton K. Caldwell’s publications—more than 250 articles and monographs and thirteen books translated into 19 languages—have provided intellectual leadership on these profound questions in political science and public administration. Through his career of original thought he has served as a courageous role model for scholars seeking to explore intellectual territories uncharted.

### Hubert H. Humphrey Award

To recognize notable public service by a political scientist.

*Award Committee:* John DiIulio, Brookings Institution and Princeton University, Chair; Jean Torcom, California State University-Sacramento; and Thomas R. Wolanin, Department of Education.

*Recipient:* **Bruce Vladeck**, Director, Health Care Financing Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

*Citation:* As Americans enter the next century, the challenge of delivering and financing health care via government will only grow. Medicare and Medicaid are huge, complicated, and vital programs in the throes of major, perhaps historic, changes.

This year’s winner of the Hubert H. Humphrey Award is a person who, as a scholar and as a public servant, has gotten centrally involved in the work of making health reform work.

Dr. Bruce C. Vladeck received his BA from Harvard University (magna cum laude) in 1970. He finished his Ph.D. at the University of Michigan in three years. He has written or edited three books, including *Unloving Care: The Nursing Home Tragedy*, over 20 book chapters, and over 50 articles. In July, 1995, he received the 1995 National Public Service Award for his outstanding contributions to public service.

Dr. Vladeck has directed the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) for the last three years. A champion of affordable, accessible, high-quality health care, under his leadership, HCFA has focused its efforts on assuring health care security for the beneficiaries of Medicare and Medicaid.

Dr. Vladeck was President of United Hospital Fund of New York from 1983 to 1993. He directed the fund’s involvement in grant making, health services, research and policy development in New York City’s health care. Dr. Vladeck was Assistant Vice President of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in Princeton, New Jersey from 1982 to 1983. Between 1979 and 1982, he served as New Jersey’s Assistant Commissioner for Health Planning and Resources Development. He taught public health and political science at Columbia University from 1974 to 1979.

Dr. Vladeck is a nationally recognized expert in health policy and financing. He has been a member of the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, chairing its Subcommittee on Hospital Inpatient Services, the New York State Council on Health Care Financing, and the New York State AIDS Advisory Council. Dr. Vladeck has been a trustee of the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and a member of the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, where he chaired the Committee on Health Care for Homeless People. He has also received numerous awards for his efforts to improve health care in the U.S. We are pleased to honor him with another.

### James Madison Award

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

*Award Committee:* Edmond J. Keller, University of California-Los Angeles, Chair; Linda L. Fowler, Dartmouth College; Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin, Germany.

*Recipient:* **Philip Converse**, Director Emeritus, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University.

*Citation:* James Madison’s approach to the establishment of the new American republic combined mistrust of human nature with faith in human reason. Fearing the “mischief of faction” and the dangers of concentrating power in a popularly elected legislature, Madison nevertheless believed that ordinary citizens were capable of self-government given appropriate institutions and safeguards. With time, deliberation and sufficient checks on the exercise of governmental power, Madison argued: “a coalition . . . could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good.”

The Madisonian mix of realism and optimism about the prospects of democratic government infuses the work of political scientist Philip Converse. One might almost say that the bulk of Converse’s work is an investigation of the extent to which and the conditions under which the Madisonian formula works in modern democracies. First he exposed the limitations and shortcomings of the mass electorate, then he turned to the examination of how faithfully legislative elite translate mass aspirations into government policy. Throughout these efforts he was continually alert to the conditions and institutions that account for variations in the fidelity of political representation. In that sense, Converse is a particularly worthy contemporary exemplar of Madison’s constructive realism.

A pioneer in the study of public opinion, Converse helped establish the paradigms that continue to influence students of voting behavior today. Co-author of such classics as *The American Voter*, *Elections and the Political Order*, and *Political Representation in France*, Converse’s work has been marked by conceptual innovation (e.g., the normal vote, attitudes and non-attitudes, ideology as constraint); ingenious applications of basic psychological theories of perception



to political phenomena (e.g., the differential visibility of various political objects); and the imaginative and meticulous application of the comparative method in classical work with Georges Dupeux on France and the United States.

Converse has also devoted much of his career to creating institutional environments so that other scholars can thrive. His many years of association with the survey research activities at the University of Michigan, including directorships of the Center for Political Studies and the Institute for Social Research, helped establish a community of scholars and a collective research enterprise that is unprecedented in the discipline. His devotion to scholarly activity continued through his presidency of the American Political Science Association and his stewardship of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. Converse brought to each of these leadership positions an unusual capacity to bring out the best in students and colleagues, in part through the example of his own professional standards, but also because of his genuine interest in and desire to facilitate the work of other people.

James Madison hoped that the government of the new republic would attract a few members of "superior talents" who would become "masters of the public business." Similarly, American political scientists understand the importance of exceptional scholars in advancing the study of politics. Philip Converse, through his mastery of our discipline as author, teacher, mentor and colleague, has made a remarkable scholarly contribution to the discipline. By bestowing the James Madison Award upon him, we celebrate his exceptional career and its legacy.

### Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

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

*Award Committee:* Marilyn S. Roberts, University of Florida, Chair; Bernard Grofman, University of California-Irvine; Katherine A. Hinckley, University of Akron.

*Recipient:* **E.J. Dionne, Jr.**, *The Washington Post*

*Citation:* On behalf of my colleagues, I am happy to present this year's McWilliams Award to E.J. Dionne, Jr., of *The Washington Post*. We, like many Americans, are concerned about the future of the democratic process in a time of growing cynicism and alienation. We honor Mr. Dionne as one of Washington's finest journalistic thinkers and for his insightful daily contributions to the political discourse of our nation. His examination of the question of why American citizens have become disenchanted with our political system has been widely recognized. His most recent work skillfully argues the return of a progressive era in America. We single him out for having the courage and conviction to ask the tough questions. His efforts assist in filling the vacuum in our current understanding of the relationship between the news Media, government and its people. Mr. Dionne has enlightened his colleagues by urging his fellow journalists to find a new role which would seek to promote genuine and reasoned debate of policy issues. His tireless efforts uplift the public and political scientists in a time that cries for reasoned debate, not more negative ads, rumor or simplistic soundbites.