

Thomas D. Lancaster, Emory University
 Michael S. Lewis-Beck, University of Iowa
 David B. Magleby, Brigham Young University
 Douglas Madsen, University of Iowa
 Dwain Mefford, University of Southern California
 Ronald I. Meltzer, University of Buffalo, SUNY
 David S. Meyer, Boston University
 Daniel Mou, University of Wisconsin at Madison
 Robert G. Muncaster, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 Joyce Marie Mushaben, University of Missouri-St. Louis
 Helmut Norpoth, State University of New York at Stony Brook
 Terrel L. Rhodes, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
 John D. Robertson, Texas A&M University
 Virginia Sapiro, University of Wisconsin at Madison
 James N. Schubert, Alfred University
 Roberta Sigel, Rutgers University
 Michael P. Smith, University of California, Berkeley
 Debra Stewart, North Carolina State University
 Stuart Thorson, Syracuse University
 Ronald Tiersky, Amherst College
 Carole Jean Uhlaner, University of California, Irvine
 Michael Wallerstein, University of California, Los Angeles
 Leonard Weinberg, University of Nevada, Reno
 Susan Welch, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 David M. Wood, University of Missouri-Columbia

The Association's Selection Committee also assisted the American Council of Learned Societies to award travel grants to the IPSA Congress. ACLS travel grant recipients are:

Teh-Kuang Chang, Ball State University
 Martin Edelman, SUNY, Albany
 Joyce Gelb, City College, CUNY
 Judith A. Gillespie, Boston University
 Gregory J. Kasza, Whitman College

Gary F. Prevost, Saint John's University
 Darryl Roberts, Duke University
 Laura L. Vertz, North Texas State University
 James L. Wiser, Loyola University of Chicago

Organization of Power To Be Theme of 1986 Annual Meeting

Matthew Holden, Jr.
 University of Virginia

The function of the annual meeting is, among other things, to allow colleagues to put on display, for collegial advice, criticism, and instruction, the varied forms of research and writing that, in our highly individualistic discipline, we take seriously. The 1986 meeting will serve that function fully. APSA programs can never be turned into Procrustean beds. But colleagues are particularly encouraged to consider how their work may be related seriously to the 1986 program theme, "The Organization of Power," predicated on the view that there is a fundamental coherence in the political phenomenon and a potential intellectual coherence in the analysis of the political phenomenon.

"Politics" as a fundamental human activity, to adapt language from Walton Hamilton, "is not [simply] the televised soapbox or the [search] for votes, but [in the] Aristotelian tradition . . . the usages and traditions, the arrangements and policies, by which [the human species] is governed, and through which [human beings]—usurping the function of the gods—attempt to shape destiny." In a quite different intellectual tradition, Masao Maruyama expresses politics as "the organization of control by man over

Matthew Holden, Jr., Henry L. and Grace M. Doherty Professor at the University of Virginia, is program chair for the 1986 annual meeting which will be held at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C., August 28-31, 1986.

Association News

man." If human beings seek to shape destiny, they must seek to control the collectivities in which they operate, lest divergent actions vitiate that which they seek.

Therefore, the theme of the *organization* of power not only refers to formal structures (see Loomis and Ingraham below on the power of organization in that sense), *but to an active process*. Human striving to achieve, stabilize and exercise power implies the counter-efforts of other human beings to undermine, evade, overthrow or insulate themselves from existing or potential arrangements of power. (This drives us to consider, among other things, the micro-political level—the individual—and the connection to the formal structure, including values about authority [cf. Eckstein below] and the acquisition and holding of political beliefs [some of which are referred to in the Sigel note below].)

The program design is, in form, essentially parallel to that which has been used for several years. Section 6 (Eckstein, below) provides for new attention to power and authority in non-governmental entities, here designated "social organizations" or "private governments." Section 18 (Politics and Economics) gives a more express intellectual recognition of what John Maurice Clark once called "the interpenetration of politics and economics." Section 19 (see Hamilton, below) provides a vehicle for special attention to the welfare state.

The section chairs have, and will exercise, wide latitude to interpret the specific relevance of the program theme to their sections and to decide when to adopt a different approach altogether. We will all try our best to be fair and to be seen as such. But we do not promise to be inert. The program chair may also exercise the discretion, in consultation with section chairs, to create a very small number of panels or workshops on matters of major interest that cannot easily be accommodated within a single section. The program chair would be particularly interested in proposals regarding:

(a) reconsideration of the relevance of political studies occurring in anthropology, sociology, and history—which

appear to have less place on our agendas now than they did 20 years ago;

(b) studies in literature and politics, if conceived on a broad integrative basis, with a deep foundation in literature and in politics;

(c) studies in the "popular cultures," rather than in the "high cultures," as expressions of ideas of authority, rebellion, etc. and their consequences for political systems;

(d) relevance of archaeological and other evidence about ancient societies, notably Greece and Rome, for the reconstruction of our knowledge of their politics, and of the relevance of their politics to contemporary ideas of empirical theory;

(e) conceptualization, and notably empirical examination, of the fundamental resources of control in society, e.g., force, money, information;

(f) the application of concepts and theories from modern political science to major historical experience or to problems that arise mainly in other disciplines, e.g., (1) the decision to initiate the Columbian expeditions as a forum for testing ideas about political decision-making and policy innovation; (2) the political element in the making of rules about property that are fundamental to "the market"; or (3) the imaginary treatment that would have been entailed if cost-benefit analysis had been applied to the problem of whether to adopt the Kansas-Nebraska Act;

(g) consideration of the relationship between changes in analytical technique and the capacity to answer a question, as manifest in particular fields of political analysis over the course of modern political science;

(h) methodological work referring to the problems of *discovering and identifying* research questions worthy of the time and intellectual attention of grown men and women, in contrast to the already-recognized-as-important issues of *verification*, and other problems in the methodology of "soft" research; and

(i) the anticipation or forecasting, on the basis of carefully ordered thought and data, of major scientific or technological

developments, e.g., human gene therapy, space colonization, etc.

If there are such panels or workshops, they will be very few and must be screened more severely than if they were proposed for the regular sections. Proposals will be the more welcome if their makers are able (a) to provide preliminary drafts, of fairly short length, based upon work in progress, rather than work that they intend to initiate; (b) to show clearly whether the problem is a *new* problem in political science or whether there is a line of implicit or explicit theory bearing on it; (c) to show whether the problem requires data or merely the most careful thought possible; (d) to show, if data are required, whether the data needed are qualitative or quantitative and that the best effort has been expended; and (e) to show that the problem, as stated, deserves to be regarded as significant from the viewpoint that the maker of the proposal will sustain. Such preliminary drafts should be in a state capable of completion before July of 1986 and should include prior formulations of the problem in political science as a discipline, command of the relevant literatures, sources of data, etc.

The Program Chair particularly invites suggestions as to the impact, if any, of the defense-oriented environment since 1945 upon the domestic politics of the United States, and/or other countries, particularly as it may suggest any re-examination of the Lasswellian concept of the "garrison state."

Policies and Deadlines

Paper proposals and offers to appear as discussants or panel chairpersons should be submitted as early as possible. The deadline for receipt of submissions is December 1, 1985. Proposals for whole panels are welcome, but persons with suggestions for panels should get their requests in early.

Please write directly to the appropriate section chairperson listed below. Anyone who applies to more than one section chairperson should indicate that fact to the relevant chairpersons. More general inquiries or suggestions may be addressed to:

- Matthew Holden, Jr., Department of Government and Foreign Affairs, 232 Cabell Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22905; (804) 924-3422.
- Norinne Hessman, Convention Coordinator, APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036; (202) 483-2512.

Prospective participants should be aware of two APSA Council policies which will be enforced by the Association: (1) acceptance of a proposal by the Program Committee obligates you to preregister (with appropriate fee) prior to June 1, 1986. If you fail to preregister, you will not be listed in the final program; (2) you may serve on no more than two panels of the official program. However, you may serve as a paper author on only one panel of the official program. This rule applies only to participation on the panels organized by the Program Committee and does not affect participation on panels organized by "unaffiliated groups."

You may offer to participate in panels in several sections. However, if you receive invitations for more than one paper presentation, you may only accept one of them. You may not appear on more than two official panels, irrespective of the nature of the participation. If you do apply to several sections, please inform each section chairperson that this is a multiple application. Also, in that case, please notify the other section chairpersons as soon as you have accepted an invitation for participation in another section.

Section 1. Positive Political Theory.

Russell M. Hardin, Committee on Public Policy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637.

Positive Political Theory uses formal models to explain political outcomes and to analyze normative constraints on political action. The models are most commonly set theoretic, game theoretic, or microeconomic equilibrium models that are generally based on the assumption of narrow rationality, or self interest. Much of the work in the field has had surprising, often negative implications for our understanding of politics. Major in-

Association News

sights in the field include the difficulties of aggregating individual into collective choices and of motivating individuals to collective action. Such results have remade both our positive and our normative views of political activity.

Panels in the Positive Political Theory Section will be diverse in their substantive and theoretical focuses. While the final structure of panels will depend on the best submitted papers, I expect to arrange panels on recent experimental work, critical assessments of the theoretical foundations of the field, the effects of dynamic or over-time considerations on the models, and applications of the models to normative theory. I also expect to see panels on the formal analysis of institutions, groups, elections, and preference formation.

Section 2. Empirical Theory and Research Methods. Steven J. Rosenstone, Department of Political Science, Yale University, 3532 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.

Panels in this section will be concerned with the development and use of innovative methodological techniques to address substantive political problems. I am particularly interested in the following topics: (1) models and methods of survey measurement (including question wording and order, measurement error, non-response, scale effects, instrument effects, and survey design); (2) ecological inference and the analysis of historical data; (3) the analysis of data sets built from pooling cross-sectional survey data gathered at different moments in time; (4) problems that arise in practice when employing simultaneous equations methods; (5) simulation and artificial intelligence; and (6) new software. I will welcome paper proposals and suggestions for panels in any of these and related areas. I will be most receptive to papers that will be reporting innovative methodological work rather than applying existing techniques.

Section 3. Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches. Alan Gilbert, Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208.

The 1986 program theme, "The Organization of Power," will be used to provide for a broad representation of current work in political theory. The selection of papers will not, by any means, be governed by that theme alone. The present design is to emphasize three main sorts of panels, whether cast within that theme or within other conceptions deemed significant to political theorists, that would include reinterpretations of or controversies about how to interpret major past and contemporary theorists.

(1) The first sort of proposals would be for panels and papers involving philosophical arguments, recapitulating or modifying those of leading theorists, that have relevance for debates about the nature of democracy, political participation and individuality. (For instance, papers along these lines might provide insight into the challenges to the subjection of women and their impact on conceptions of the self and political deliberation.)

(2) I would be interested in proposals which clarify the classes of liberals and Marxians. Such proposals might, for example, reassess arguments about the effects of war and revolution on regime structure and human well-being or appraise modern claims about basic historical change, moral advance and decay.

(3) I would also look for panels suggesting new or resuscitated ways in which modern arguments and debates might be seen in comparison to those of the ancients.

Lively, pointed discussion is more likely if panels remain small and papers focus on the same or closely linked issues. I prefer panels composed of two papers and one discussant or roundtables among scholars who have previously written on a subject to larger, more loosely defined panels. (I also want to provide opportunity for newer voices in the discipline, possibly including advanced graduate students.) Such arrangements will, I hope, encourage audience participation.

Section 4. Analytical and Critical Theory. Scarlett G. Graham, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt Univer-

sity, 1208 18th Avenue-South, Nashville, TN 37212.

The organization of power has for centuries provided the principal framework for sorting and classifying political regimes. Modern explorations of the origins of power have linked society and government into still other frameworks of analysis, going beyond the notion of formal power to that of effective power. Power relationships important for political analysis have been found in property, class structure, and even language and the structure of communication. Recent concern with the crisis of authority raises serious questions as to how adequately the relationship between formal and effective power, between regimes and the societies they govern, is understood. Critical theorists have raised these same questions in rather different terms for an even longer time.

Panels and papers that help to clarify and sharpen discourse on power as a concept, an analytical device, or a tool of social criticism will be especially appropriate to the overall theme of the program. The many indirect problems of substance and method that result from a focus on power are equally appropriate topics. The general program theme should be viewed as an opportunity for analytical and critical theorists presenting their work to share a common point of departure, not as an unduly restrictive limitation on the diversity of concerns to be considered or approaches to be employed.

Section 5. The Practice of Political Science. Jewel L. Prestage, Dean, School of Public Policy and Urban Affairs, Southern University, Southern Branch Post Office, Baton Rouge, LA 70813.

The panels in this section will be directed toward issues, problems, concerns and patterns in the growth and development of the profession and the discipline as well as the contemporary state of the profession and the discipline. In addition, work focusing on the future of the profession is being solicited. The aim is to include the broadest possible range of scholarly endeavors which address the general area of "the practice of political

science" within the context of the program theme, "The Organization of Power."

Among other things, proposals will be considered for:

(1) Examination of the social structure of political science as a discipline, and the evidence as to whether the structure of the discipline inhibits either opportunities for some members of the profession more than others or the examination of some social status questions more than others. Clearly, this involves a set of questions now under some discussion, both as to the status of women and as to the status of several ethnic minorities, among them Afro-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans.

(2) The various means in which education in political science is absorbed in professional activity in government or the private sector, outside the academic system, and the extent to which habits of mind or bodies of knowledge and skills acquired in the graduate world of political science serve well or ill. The section chair will particularly be interested in proposals and comments from colleagues who, having undertaken careers in the private sector, nonetheless, retain an active intellectual connection with the discipline.

(3) Active political participation as a learning experience that yields a systematic or substantial re-interpretation of political science and politics, e.g., when political scientists have been deeply engaged in activities and responsibilities outside the political science setting, what have they deemed themselves to learn? Political scientists are recurrently involved in activities as various as street-level community organizing, political campaign management, campaigning for and being elected to a variety of offices from local school board to the Senate, etc. What has their experienced-based learning (a variety of participant-observation, so to speak) had to do with the reformulation of ideas in scholarship?

(4) Are there "continuing education" models for use in the study of politics, by political scientists, and in the mastery of pedagogy? Is there a staleness problem inherent in our work, as there may be in many other lines of work, and what are

Association News

constructive means, free of self-flagellation, that we may use to help overcome the staleness problem?

(5) What are the significant changes taking place in the demography, economics, politics, and administration of higher education that significantly affect (a) our capacity for effective teaching, (b) our capacity for research and publication of findings, and (c) our occupational prospects?

(6) If an adult education course were designed for elective politicians and journalists, reflecting contemporary political science, what should it contain? If an adult education course were designed for political scientists, reflecting what contemporary journalists and elective politicians know, what should it contain?

These are provisional questions subject to refinement. The section chair will welcome proposals for papers and volunteers to act as commentators or panel chairs. The section chair will also welcome additional proposals, beyond the range of the items mentioned above, provided they are submitted on a timely basis.

Section 6. Power, Authority, and Private Governments. Harry Eckstein, School of Social Sciences, University of California-Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717.

Panels in this section will be concerned with the nature, determinants, and consequences of governance in social organizations and institutions, such as families, schools and universities, workplaces, trade unions, and political parties.

Examples of pertinent issues are: (1) whether such organizations and institutions can, through their internal authority relations, form participatory attitudes and behavior; (2) whether the internal structures and processes of political parties (or other organizations) can provide effective training in political leadership; (3) whether problems of maintaining order and discipline in formative organizations (e.g., schools) tend to prevent effective attainment of their goals (education). Many other issues are appropriate, as are papers on whether the governance of "private" organizations in fact has significant consequences for

political life; and on general organization theory. Also appropriate are papers that mainly describe the governance of "private" organizations.

The papers may be case studies, comparative research, largely speculative essays, or critical analyses of existing literature on governance in the institutions and organizations listed above.

Section 7. Comparative Politics: Public Policies and Policy Making. Arnold J. Heidenheimer, Department of Political Science, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130.

Papers given in these panels might compare policies across national political boundaries, or across policy fields, or both. Papers comparing policy or policy implementation in subnational units will be welcome if they also meet one of the above criteria. Papers which emphasize the temporal dimension as a distinct variable are also solicited if they overlap with the basic criteria. The panels will of course reflect the diverse methodologies which are employed, but I would favor their having a primary geo-political and policy area focus, i.e., a panel on U.S.-West European economic policy comparisons, one on comparing environment policies in developing countries, etc.

A focus on conceptual problems encountered in the identification, classification and analysis of policies across national institutions and policy fields might be an effective way to explore how the organization of power creates both problems and opportunities for research in this field. Are decisions in similar policy fields handled differently in more "corporatist" or "pluralist" systems, in those with stronger or weaker bureaucracies? How is policy conceptualization developing in other countries and languages, does this lead to somewhat different priorities as to selection of research topics? Is one observer's policy another's non-policy, and how do they explain their reasons?

Some varieties of policy comparisons which might be especially welcome because we have seen rather few of them are: (1) policy comparisons between American states and smaller developed countries; (2) comparisons of

taxation, transport and agriculture policies; (3) analyses and critiques of the comparative policy implementation literature; (4) international agencies and their influence on convergence or divergence in national policies; (5) organized professions and public policies; (6) the impact of social program cutbacks; (7) attempts to measure degrees of policy impact, success or failure.

Section 8. Comparative Politics: Publics, Leaders, and Institutions. Alberta Sbragia, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260; (412) 624-3725.

This section is well suited to a wide-ranging exploration of the organization of power in diverse societies. Proposals for papers or panels that relate the structure and behavior of mass publics, diverse types of public and quasi-public elites, and a wide variety of institutions—and especially the linkages between them—to the organization of power at both the national and subnational level will be given priority.

Proposals which integrate two or three of the section's themes are particularly desirable, such as studies of elite-mass linkages, the structuring of conventional and unconventional participation, interactions between mass publics and elites, institutional responses, links between institutions and elite composition or transformation, and studies of elite recruitment and institutional stability. Also welcome are proposals concerned with linkages between national and subnational elites and institutions. Both historical and contemporary cases are acceptable.

I prefer proposals which provide explicit comparisons between nations or across levels and time periods. If they do not fall in that category, they should deal with issues of broad theoretical concern. While papers focusing exclusively on the United States are inappropriate, papers which include the United States in a comparative study are suitable. Finally, proposals for a panel that would synthesize and evaluate the status of what we know about the links between publics, leaders, and institutions would be extremely welcome.

Section 9. Comparative Politics: Process of Development and Change in Contemporary Societies. Edmund J. Keller, Department of Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

The panels in this section will focus on the organization, location, and execution of political power in contemporary societies. While participants are encouraged to be comparative in their analyses, rigorously analytic case studies are also appropriate. Panels are not restricted to any particular area of the world or any specific type of regime. Presenters are strongly encouraged to engage in cross-national and cross-regional comparisons, but this is not obligatory.

Political economists, who have recently rediscovered the importance of the "State" in politics and public policy in both post-industrial and Third World countries, have raised some interesting questions about the nature of power in contemporary societies; about the relative power of different groups or classes in certain situations; and about the consequences which grow out of the uses and abuses of political power. I am sure there are many other questions relating to this theme which shed light on the general issue of "Development and Change in Contemporary Societies."

Volunteers for chairing panels or acting as discussants, as well as for presenting papers, are welcome.

Section 10. Public Opinion and Political Psychology. Roberta S. Sigel, Department of Political Science, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903.

Priority will be given to panels and papers that relate topics of public opinion and/or political psychology to the 1986 APSA theme, "The Organization of Power." Panels on public opinion consequently should strive to explore questions which relate perceptions of power, authority and conceptions of legitimacy to the structure and expression of public opinion while panels on political psychology might stress the origins of such attitudes as well as their overt manifestations. Emphasis on change—either secular or individual—in the mass public's

Association News

orientations are particularly welcome, So are papers reporting on new or "resurrected" methodologies for investigating the topics.

Among potential topics could be: Public Opinions (including mass media, agenda setting, schema and structures of public opinions, manipulation of it, including propaganda); Political Socialization (especially changes over the life course, gender-related attitudes, etc.); and Political Psychology (including the development of attitudes, such as trust, prejudice, alienation, etc. and their relation to personality).

Panel topics will be selected on the basis of importance to research in the area, especially those which point to new directions in substance and/or methodology. Panel organizers should bend every effort to select papers that lend coherence to each panel.

Section 11. Political Parties and Elections. William Crotty, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60201.

The theme of the 1986 APSA annual meeting is the organization of power. I am particularly interested in theoretical and conceptual approaches to the organization of political and social power as it relates to intermediary institutions of political representation and mobilization. I would be interested in, in addition to longitudinal, cross-national or cross-sectional comparative works; empirical data-based studies; and innovative research approaches. I would like to see studies relating to organization of power for the politically less well-off and, secondly, as it relates to areas that are just beginning to receive extended academic conceptual and empirical development. Among these I would include: PACs and political finance and its impact; organization of minority, women and gay political groups and the distribution of political rewards; organization and political change; the redefinition of political coalitions; the mass media and its import on political organization and political expression; the institutionalization of power in mass and legislative parties and the redefinition of their roles; and the value of party and

campaign management as they affect the organization of power and the distribution of influence at all levels. All serious academic proposals for papers, roundtables and panels which fall within these bounds will be given consideration. In general, I would like to see papers that reconceptualize approaches to the more traditional areas of concern; that help develop or reach out to new areas; and/or that add something of substance to our cumulative understanding. There should be a sense of intellectual excitement to our efforts.

Section 12. Interests, Groups, and Social Movements. Burdett Loomis, Department of Political Science, 504 Blake Hall, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045.

"The Organization of Power" is a theme that cuts close to the quick in the study of political interests and social movements. First, in a Bentleysque world, interest group activities constituted all we needed to know about how power was organized. To an extent, the pluralistic implications of these ideas continue to hold sway in the study of American politics.

From a second, more contemporary perspective, we see the organization of increasing numbers of interests, ranging from political action committees to neighborhood groups to corporate "public affairs" divisions. In addition, loosely-structured, but often potent, social movements frequently emerge as powerful forces.

Paper proposals and panel topics will be welcomed across the breadth of scholarship on interests, groups, and social movements. The program theme suggests two general categories as possible guides in framing these submissions. First, I would encourage research and writing that examine the *impact of organized power*. Studies of PACs, activist movements, corporate actions, or foreign lobbying are only a few examples of the kinds of work that might be done. The scope of such research could vary from the smallest governmental units to the broadest comparative frameworks.

Second, I would prevail upon scholars to

make proposals that emphasize the *power of organization* (or the lack thereof). Given the richness of incentive theories and social mobilization perspectives, we could profit from a series of papers, panels, and roundtables that discuss this central element in harnessing the political strength of societal forces.

Although most papers and topics would fall into one of these broad categories, I welcome as wide a range of submissions as possible. In particular, suggestions for roundtables or other panel formats would be appreciated.

Section 13. Public Law and Judicial Politics. Harold J. Spaeth, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

The theme of the 1986 program, the organization of power, suggests that panels and papers that deal with subjects such as the following would be especially appropriate. (1) Formal and informal relationships among judges on a given court, within a judicial system, or between judges and other participants in the judicial process (attorneys, clerks, administrative agencies and officials, police, prosecutors, jurors, etc.). (2) Formal and informal relationships between courts or administrative tribunals. (3) Analyses of the impact of judicial activity on litigants, other courts, administrative agencies, or affected publics. (4) Court management studies. (5) Judicial administration: structure, personnel, processing cases, proposals for reform. (6) Various aspects of administrative law. These subjects stress endogenous and/or exogenous linkages between or among courts, judges, participants in the judicial process on the one hand and the environment in which they function on the other.

A roundtable or two which focuses on an aspect of judicial management or administration about which there is much discussion and debate may prove to be attractive: e.g., the litigation explosion: can courts cope? Are the justices really overworked? Any suggestions in this regard will be appreciated.

I recognize that the foregoing matters encompass a relatively limited portion of the subfield—a portion, moreover, in

which most judicial scholars do little, if any research. Although preference will be accorded proposals compatible with the theme of the 1986 program, I shall adopt a catholic approach and will therefore welcome papers and proposals on all other topics as well.

Section 14. Legislative Process and Politics. Bruce I. Oppenheimer, Department of Political Science, University of Houston, University Park, Houston, TX 77004.

Certainly the organization of power has been a significant focus of research, if not a major one, in the study of legislative process and politics. This is especially true in the study of the internal workings of legislative institutions—committees, leadership, and party organizations and in the study of Congress.

Less systematic attention has been given to the organization of power between legislative institutions and other competitors for policy influence, e.g., executives, courts, bureaucracies. Similarly, less systematic attention has been paid to the variety of ways in which state legislatures organize power. Accordingly, I would encourage papers and panels which address these aspects of the problem.

This does not mean that I intend to neglect areas in which a substantial research base addressing the 1986 theme already exists. Such a substantial base exists with regard to legislative elections, decision making, committees, leadership, representation, and reform. In these aspects, it seems strategic to urge that proposals on these topics stress historical analysis of the organization of power, rather than being limited to examining the topic within a narrow time frame.

Section 15. Political Executives. Stephen J. Wayne, Department of Political Science, George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052.

Consistent with the theme, the organization of power, I would like to encourage the section on political executives to focus on consensus—building and conflict—minimization by and within the

Association News

executive. Specifically, I invite proposals on three major groups of questions.

1. How do political executives build external support to achieve their principal objectives? How do they structure their own advisory systems and internal decision-making and action-forcing processes to formulate, coordinate, articulate, and implement public policy? How do they use their public visibility, their symbolic and ceremonial functions, and their media-related activities to enhance their political stature and satisfy the psychological dimensions of their office?

2. What is the impact of different forms and modes of organizing power? How does the organization of power affect its exercise? Has institutional tinkering, public and congressional liaison, political rhetoric, and/or symbolic actions enhanced the executive's ability to achieve objectives? Have such actions merely satisfied and extended performance expectations? Has the organization of power in previous administrations influenced transition planning start-up structures and strategies, and the cycling of policy goals in the current administration?

3. What prescriptions for organizing power do those who have held office offer? If practitioners had to do it all over again, what changes would they make and why? Why, for instance, do ex-presidents seem recently to have supported the idea of a six-year, non-renewable term, to the nearly-unanimous opposition of political scientists? Discussions with past and present executive officials might shed light on this question as well.

Proposals for papers, panels, roundtables, and workshops on these and related topics are welcome. Please let me know if you wish to write a panel, chair and organize a panel, or be a discussant. Graduate students and recent Ph.D.s in particular are encouraged to participate. I would also welcome comparativists and students of public administration to help us broaden our understanding of how political executives organize and exercise power.

Section 16. Organizations and Administration. Patricia W. Ingraham, The

Maxwell School, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210.

This section will discuss not only the meeting's major theme, "The Organization of Power," but also its corollary, the power of organization. Thus, the primary focus of this section will be on those organizational processes that relate to the creation, acquisition, and use of public bureaucratic power. In that context many topics and types of analyses will be appropriate, but proposals will be most welcome in three areas: (1) patterns of bureaucratic influence and power in public policy processes and outcomes; (2) bureaucratic power within the context of democratic theory; and (3) the relationships between the organization and use of bureaucratic power and the definition and pursuit of the public interest.

Proposals reflecting important empirical research are encouraged; agency and/or policy specific case studies will also be useful provided they are presented in a framework that permits wider discussion and application.

To allow for coherent presentations, as well as audience discussion at the annual meeting, panel organizers should limit the number of papers proposed for each panel to three. The use of multiple discussants will be discouraged.

Section 17. Federalism and Subnational Politics. Thad L. Beyle, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

This section will focus the conference theme, "The Organization of Power," on questions relating to federalism and subnational politics. Panels will be selected that explore a variety of analyses and viewpoints on how power is or is not organized in the states and their substate units and what this can mean for the changing roles of the levels of government and politics in our federal system.

Possible subjects for panels and papers can range from the constitutional (separation of powers and home rule); to the institutional (governors vs. legislators and mayors vs. councils); to the political (culture, interest groups, PACs and par-

ties); to processes (redistricting, budgeting and planning); to policies (taxation, regulation, education). Also of interest are possible panels on the role of political money, the media, and intergovernmental relations and organizations.

Suggestions for panel topics as well as roundtables or workshops should be justified in terms of their theoretical importance, relationship to ongoing research in the field, and the overall conference theme, "The Organization of Power." Paper volunteers should include a clear statement of the topic they will be investigating, preliminary hypotheses tested, units of analysis, and the theoretical and methodological approaches. Discussant volunteers should include a description of their research interests and qualifications.

Section 18. Politics and Economics.

Stephen Elkin, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; (301) 454-6734.

The study of political economy is built on the premise that economy and polity are powerfully interconnected. The proper understanding and evaluation of political life cannot proceed without similar study of economic life. (Correlatively, there are at least some who maintain that the proper understanding and evaluation of economic life cannot be achieved without a deeper understanding of political life.) Political economy then takes as its underlying purpose the study of whole regimes, how they work and how they may be made to work better. In its contemplation of reform, political economy joins hands with political philosophy.

In keeping with the preceding remarks and with the program theme of "The Organization of Power," I am particularly anxious to receive proposals for panels and papers that have both empirical and normative elements. Proposals which consider present and past interconnections between polity and economy are welcome, but especially encouraged are those that combine such empirical analyses with how the interconnections between economy and polity ought to be organized. In this vein, proposals that consider the manner in which a market

society impedes or enhances popular control of authority will be particularly welcome. I also want to encourage proposals by those interested in the political economy of the good society. More specific topics might include: the political role of the business corporation in democratic political orders; the political business cycle and its consequences of popular control of authority; the relation between economic and political democracy; the interconnections between popular control of authority and a country's competitive position in the international balance of trade; and the long-term prospects of the mixed regime of market capitalism and popular control.

Section 19. The Future of the Social (Welfare) State.

Charles V. Hamilton, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

The panels in this section will be concerned with the will and the power of states and societies in providing social protection benefits for their constituents. In the process of examining the causes and consequences of "welfare-state" developments in different societies, attention will be given to current and projected trends and to the implications for public policy. Most industrial nations are struggling to meet the needs of their people while facing increasing limitations on their resources. Neither budget-cutting nor program tinkering satisfactorily addresses the long-term problems confronting the United States and other "welfare states." People across the political spectrum believe we need to reexamine the basic premises of current social programs and then fashion an equitable and manageable system of social protection for future generations.

Consideration of these issues would call for panels addressing (1) underlying values of democracy in relation to the question: who should be helped? (2) issues of programmatic substance and administrative structures in responding to: what sort of assistance—delivered by whom—ought to be provided; as well as (3) economic concerns in terms of how to pay for the social protection benefits. Clearly, the role of the private sector has to be considered.

Association News

Within these three broad categories, panels are encouraged to address the topic in a variety of ways: historically, comparatively, demographically, but, hopefully, always focusing on long-term future policy options. In addition, papers that deal with the impact of international economic developments on domestic social policy are welcome.

Section 20. Public Policy Analysis. Don E. Kash, Science and Public Policy Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019.

The panels in this section will be selected with an eye to representing the most innovative work in the policy analysis area. In particular, I invite proposals which focus on the policy process, theoretical considerations, and specific substantive areas of policy.

I would like to encourage panel participation by academics, researchers from policy research organizations, and political scientists who are actively involved in the making and implementation of policy. With regard to the substantively oriented panels, I would find it particularly attractive to have panels which focus on current and future policy issues. In this connection, I would like to encourage papers which carry the substantive analyses to the point where particular policy recommendations are made. Please include as a part of your proposal a brief narrative statement of the goals of the panel and how the panel relates to work going on within the policy analysis field.

Section 21. International Relations: National Security and Conflict Analysis. Catherine M. Kelleher, National Security Concentration, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; Janice Gross Stein, University of Toronto.

Panels in this section will emphasize the significance of the ways in which power has been organized, applied, and constrained in the postwar search for security. Of particular interest will be papers examining the dynamics of conventional and nuclear deterrence; the relationship of military, economic, and diplomatic power to specific conflict outcomes; the

predominant patterns in resource allocation in hot peace and cold conflict; and the role of perceptual and process variables in the effective organization/restraint of power. Proposals may cross system levels or time, and should deal with questions of enduring theoretical or policy interest. To ensure critical interchange, panels will be kept small, and panelists encouraged to adhere strictly to the schedule for submission of finished papers prior to the Washington meeting.

Section 22. International Relations: Global Political Economy. Jeffrey A. Hart, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Recent work on global political economy has focused on three areas: (1) describing international challenges to state-society relations within the nation-state, (2) comparing and explaining differences in foreign economic policies across nation-states, and (3) describing and explaining changes in international economic regimes. In all three areas, the explanatory significance of the organization and distribution of power in the international system has been raised as a central theoretical question. A thorough reexamination of the role of power in global political economy should be a major theme of this year's meeting.

One very important question, stated most directly in a recent article in *International Organization* by Bruce Russett, is the accuracy of the oft-asserted proposition that U.S. political and economic hegemony began to erode in the early 1970s (and continues to do so).

Another key question is the impact of increased competition in world markets on national defense/security policies and *vice versa*. To what extent has competition increased because of declining hegemony? Are there other possible explanations for increased competition? Several scholars have pointed out the tendency of the United States and a few other countries to react to increased competition by raising defense spending, especially in areas likely to benefit specific industries (and especially high technology industries). Will the U.S. be able to reassert its military and economic

hegemony by these means? There is also a growing literature on the use of defense spending to increase overall investment and growth. A critical survey of the growing literature on "military Keynesianism" might be another theme for this year's meeting.

In the area of foreign economic policy, one crucial question has always been that of protectionism. Will there continue to be reductions in trade barriers through multilateral trade diplomacy, or does the current trend toward increased use of nontariff barriers presage a return to a less open world economy? The focus of international economic diplomacy increasingly has been on domestic measures not considered to be under the purview of multilateral agreements: e.g., tax incentives, preferential credit arrangements public procurement policies, R and D subsidies, antitrust/competition regulation, and corporatistic bargaining arrangements. The United States claims that its major trade partners engage in "targeting" and "industrial policies" prejudicial to U.S. firms. The other industrialized countries accuse the United States of engaging in unilateralism and extraterritoriality in recent trade disputes. Since 1986 is likely to be the year in which new multilateral trade talks are begun, it would be appropriate to have at least one panel devoted to a review of the international economic policies of the major trading countries, the newly industrializing, and the other developing countries. The relation of the global trade regime to the pursuit of New International Economic Order goals should also be examined.

Finally, many scholars and practitioners seem to believe that the international financial system is in a potential state of crisis due to the debt repayment problems of several large debtors (both in the form of developing countries like Brazil and Mexico, but also in the form of large but unprofitable enterprises). Bank crises and failures can undermine confidence in the world financial system. What are the origins of this situation and what are the prospects of change?

In the interest of making panels more interesting, I would like to see a few proposals for roundtables (discussions with-

out papers) and for panels in which there is a decidedly dialectical flavor (papers and counterpapers, or critical discussions of a single scholarly work).

Section 23. International Relations: Interdependence, Organization and Power in the International Year of Peace. Lawrence S. Finkelstein, Political Science Department, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL 60115.

The section will depart from the fact that 1986 has been designated "the international year of peace" to explore the contributions of emergent scholarship to understanding the roles of international institutions in ordering relations among states in varied conditions of autonomy and interdependence.

Forty years experience with international institutions since World War II has resulted in the contemporary paradox that the relations of states with and in international organizations have never been more turbulent while scholarly interest in these phenomena seems resurgent. In the domain of scholarship there prevails a pluralism which may appear healthy to some and chaotic to others. Explanations are sought in approaches which, however labelled, emphasize hierarchical power and leadership, power as authoritative allocation of values, interest aggregation, communication and "learning" processes. Focus wavers between substantive consequences and procedural behaviors. The intellectual structure and the empirical equipment for evaluation remain underdeveloped.

The section, therefore, will seek to elicit comparative evaluations of the roles of international institutions in the organization of power to effect desired outcomes. Scope is thus allowed for comparisons of: the analytical rationales, contributions and limitations for competing scholars or approaches; global and less than global institutional responses to international problems; empirically supported evaluations of organization achievements in dealing with different functions, or the same functions in different ways; organizations and procedures; influence of and upon actors. Permutations on the theme are invited.

Section 24. International Politics: Distributions of International Power. A. F. K. Organski, Center for Political Studies, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

To answer the most important questions in the field of international politics one must know at least two pieces of information: actors' intentions and actors' capabilities. Panels in this section of the international relations program will present research concerned with these two areas.

We are interested in new ideas, and estimating procedures that will help illumine the way actors' intentions are translated into foreign policy decisions that are made. We are particularly interested in attempts to model this process.

Our second focus will be on the study of the capabilities of national systems. Panels will focus on issues arising from the distributions of nuclear and non-nuclear power that undergird the operation of systems in both Communist and non-Communist international orders. The panels will seek to present up-to-date conceptions of estimating these distribution changes that should be expected, and the effects of changes in the working of the international order.

In regard to the non-nuclear component of national capabilities, research on changes in the capabilities of the members of the system will be of particular interest. Such changes may be due to:

1. Shifts in the capacity of political systems to mobilize resources. There would be interest in research that deals with changes in the capacity of political systems to mobilize resources.
2. The increase in the capacities of a country increased through resource

transfers from another country. This section will present research that addresses the issue of the role of aid in international affairs. How effective are economic or military or other transfers in improving the recipient's capabilities? Again, what effects does the transfer of resources have on the preferences of the recipients? How can one model the effects of the transfer of resources?

3. Changes in alignments and alliances due to members' "switches." How does that process come about? How do countries "change their minds"? What best ways are there to model the process?

On the nuclear side we are interested in exploring distributions of nuclear power and the effects that expected changes in the distribution will have on the stability and operation of the systems they help support. Panels in this portion of the program should address such questions as: the patterns of nuclear proliferation, the effects of the Strategic Defense Initiative of the U.S. government on the operation of the nuclear order, etc. In the case of the latter, it is hoped to present new work not only on the evaluations of the operation of that program on the position of the superpowers, but, also, and very important, on what will be the effects of "mutual assured defense" if successfully established, on the present structure of international power (e.g., how will NATO be affected? How will U.S.-Chinese relations be affected, etc.). In the fray over the program this very important question has been largely overlooked.

The suggestions above are only illustrative and are not meant to exclude other ideas and research on the structure of international power, changes in that structure and the effect of changes on the stability and operation of the system. □