

12. *Reports on Research Support Activities.*

James Gibson described the work on NSF on the democratization initiative. Scholars interested in the project are trying to raise new money through NSF, Congress, and other sources for this work.

Catherine Rudder noted that the NRC Assessment of Graduate Programs is continuing with a release date of December 4.

13. *Reports on International Programs.*

Rob Hauck described the agenda of the International Committee and referred to several reports on international programs included with the agenda. Consistent with the Council's interest in broadening the international role of the APSA, the Committee this year, chaired by T.J. Pempel, and with Margaret Scranton, David Lampton, Rodney Hero, Ian Lustick, and Samuel P. Huntington, has become increasingly active.

14. *Reports on Education Programs.*

Sheilah Mann reported on the two faculty institutes which APSA conducted this summer in collaboration with the University of Tulsa and with American University. The institute at Tulsa addressed Defining the Core of Constitutionalism, Citizenship, and Civic Education and ran with NEH support. The program at American University was supported by the USIA, and presented an in-depth study of the American Political System to foreign political scientists from 18 countries.

Mann also reminded Council members that faculty who have received teaching awards at their home institutions will be honored at the Annual Meeting at the President-Elect's reception and will be named in *PS*.

15. *Report from the Departmental Services Committee.*

M. Margaret Conway, Chair of the Departmental Services Committee, joined the meeting to present the dues proposal from the committee. She noted that dues have been adjusted every three years in the past, which calls for relatively large increments to stay in line with costs. The Committee now instead proposes dues be adjusted on an annual cycle, with a slight increase for 1994-1995. She reported that the Committee has reviewed the different

size and dues rate categories, including looking at some alternative categories suggested by Council members, and has concluded that no modifications to them are warranted.

The new dues proposal was moved and seconded, and passed unanimously.

Conway also reported that the Committee has changed the Departmental Survey to cover questions suggested by the Council, including graduate student stipends, departmental operating budgets, and graduate student placement.

16. *Other Business.*

President-Elect Sidney Verba commended President Charles O. Jones on his service to the Association and presented a plaque and a framed political print from the Association in appreciation.

The meeting adjourned. The next meeting will be April 8, 1995 in Chicago.

## APSA Awards Presented at 1994 Annual Meeting

### DISSERTATION AWARDS

#### Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1992 or 1993 in the field of comparative politics.

*Award Committee:* Gary Marks, Chair, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Germaine A. Hoston, University of California at San Diego; David Cameron, Yale University

*Recipient:* Daniel Goldhagen, Harvard University

*Dissertation:* "The Nazi Executioners: A Study of Their Behavior and the Causation of Genocide"

*Dissertation Chair:* Stanley Hoffmann, Harvard University

*Citation:* The Almond Prize Committee, composed of David Cameron (Yale University), Germaine Hoston (University of California at San Diego), and chaired by Gary Marks (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) has decided to award the Almond Prize to Daniel Goldhagen of Harvard University whose dissertation is entitled "The Nazi Executioners: A Study of Their Behavior and the Causation of Geno-

cide." The chair of Goldhagen's dissertation committee is Stanley Hoffmann.

The dissertation draws on detailed and original historical research on the Holocaust to advance a challenging thesis concerning the perpetrators' motivations. Instead of examining political or military leaders, Goldhagen probes the motivations of ordinary soldiers, guards, and civilians who executed the Holocaust. The strengths of the dissertation are impressive. The study is well grounded, lucidly written, and is likely to be much debated in the fields of German and comparative politics and, indeed, within political science generally. Given Gabriel Almond's longstanding concern with understanding the sources of political extremism, from his study of the sources of support for Communism to his very recent work on varieties of religious fundamentalism, it is perhaps particularly fitting that the committee selected Daniel Goldhagen's dissertation.

#### William Anderson Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1992 or 1993 in the field of intergovernmental relations.

*Award Committee:* Susan A. MacManus, University of South Florida, Chair; Bryan Jones, Texas A&M University; Lenneal Henderson, University of Baltimore

*Recipient:* Dewitt John, National Academy of Public Administration, The University of Chicago

*Dissertation:* States at the Center of Environmental Politics

*Dissertation Chair:* Gary Orfield, University of Chicago

Dewitt John's dissertation, *States at the Center of Environmental Politics* (University of Chicago, Adviser, Gary Orfield) offers a provocative new dimension to federal-state intergovernmental relations. Using a series of intriguing case studies, complete with interviews with key actors and observers, and some heretofore unanalyzed national environmental data bases, John questions the conventional wisdom of Washington as the center of the federal system and of federal agencies as the gorilla in the closet, forcing states to act responsibly. His major thesis is that when use of certain governmental action tools, like those involving public services, subsidies, and catalytic action, is required, states are comparatively advantaged vis-à-vis the federal government, which is better po-

sitioned to use tools like regulation and redistribution. He presents convincing evidence that federal-state partnerships operate quite differently depending on the environmental issue at hand.

The dissertation tests and confirms three hypotheses about state environmental policies and politics: (1) Wherever they act independently, outside the framework established by federal environmental laws, states will use catalytic tools, subsidies, and public services rather more often than regulation, or at least they will use non-regulatory tools extensively in concert with regulation; (2) Wherever they act independently, outside the framework established by federal environmental laws, states will tend to focus on non-point pollution, protection of ecosystems, and pollution prevention; and (3) When states address these problems and use nonregulatory tools, the politics will tend to involve bargaining and consensual behavior, rather than public confrontations and bitter divisions between polluters and representatives of environmental values. The study also challenges the common notion held by many environmental activists that environmental policy is always more effective when imposed top-down (from the feds to the states) and through regulation.

The dissertation engages in comprehensive analyses of the reduction of the use of agricultural chemicals in Iowa, the move to restore the ecosystem of Florida's Everglades, and Colorado's efforts at conserving electricity. These case studies are the basis of the author's conclusion that states are the most innovative when left to deal with the feds' "unfinished business." When states play this role, which more often involves coalition-building and cooperation rather than confrontation, the federal government's role shifts from that of being a gorilla in the closet to being an equal at the table, supplying much-needed information and technical expertise. State-led environmental initiatives are also more likely to search for a common ground between the goals of economic development and environmental protection than federal regulatory efforts.

Demonstrative of its balance throughout, the dissertation identifies the limits of civic environmentalism, or state-centered environmental policy making. These limits are often fiscal in nature. During tough fiscal times, state environmental efforts are less likely when there is no apparent "gorilla in the closet." Second, the absence of convincing impact (outcome) data soon becomes a real problem in sustaining

supportive legislative coalitions, especially when funding becomes tight.

In summary, *States at the Center of Environmental Politics* makes important theoretical, substantive, and methodological contributions to the literature on intergovernmental relations, state politics, and the environmental policy-making process.

#### Edward S. Corwin Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1992 or 1993 in the field of public law.

*Award Committee:* Robert Carp, Chair, University of Houston; Gayle Binion, University of California-Santa Barbara; and John A. Stookey, Arizona State University

*Recipient:* Deena Rabinowicz Dugan

*Dissertation:* "The Politics of Medical Malpractice Reform in the American States"

*Dissertation Chair:* J. Woodford Howard, Jr., Johns Hopkins University

*Recipient:* Susan Brodie Haire, University of North Carolina-Greensboro

*Dissertation:* "Judges' Decisions in the United States Courts of Appeals: A Reassessment of Geographical Patterns in Judicial Behavior"

*Dissertation Chair:* Don Songer, University of South Carolina

*Citation:* The central focus of Haire's dissertation is the degree to which there are significant regional and local influences on the decisional behavior of federal judges. Her data base consisted of voting records (published in the *Federal Reporter*) of regular judges on the U.S. Courts of Appeals in obscenity, employment discrimination, and search and seizure cases between 1982 and 1989. The selection of independent variables included: region, the individual state, the circuit, the appointing president, the politics of the home-state senator(s), and the facts of each individual case.

Haire found, among other things, that judges "decide cases differently in patterns that reflect the boundaries of their home regions, states or circuits," and her study reinforced the findings of other scholars that "judges' policy preferences sharply varied across appointing administrations." Unlike most studies in this general realm, Haire developed some original and sensitive controls for case content, and this

added greatly to the sophistication of her analysis and conclusions.

Another innovation was her utilization of a new conceptualization of region that is grounded in empirical differences in political opinion. (Most prior studies of regional effects have used definitions of region that are based on highly impressionistic judgments of similarities in culture or that are based on combinations of circuits that keep circuit boundaries intact.) Haire's conceptualization allowed her to examine separately the effects of circuits as institutional actors and those of regions as contextual influences arising from geographical entities whose boundaries are only modestly correlated with circuit boundaries.

Finally, it must be noted that Haire's dissertation is very clearly and thoughtfully written, and it contains a very high degree of methodological sophistication. Her concluding chapter is useful not only for its synthesis of her findings but in its suggestions for future research to build on her own significant findings.

*Citation:* Using case studies of ten states, Dugan's dissertation focuses on the legal and political interplay that comprised the reform of medical malpractice during the past two decades. She begins her study by documenting that between 1975 and 1980 doctors perceived a brewing crisis over the affordability and availability of medical negligence insurance. The organized medical profession sought legislative relief in every state by proposing enactment of a package of eight reforms, ranging from regulation of lawyers' contingency fees to monetary limits on liability payments for pain and suffering, in medical negligence cases. Dugan explores the legislative responses in all fifty states in light of reigning theories of state policy-making. She then compares the contributions of each branch of government and of concerned interest groups to the policy outcome in a series of individualized case studies of ten states across a continuum of high to low tort reform.

Her findings are significant in themselves and also because they undermine conventional wisdom in a variety of ways. First, contrary to "diffusion theory," she demonstrates that state legislatures enacted independent rather than uniform packages of tort reforms. Second, her evidence suggests that political variables offer stronger explanations of state independence than do social and economic variables, such as industrialization, urbanization, and regionalism. Finally, her focus on the political

interests and organizations that were active in her case studies revealed that the medial profession's organization and resources were the most significant. Contrary to conventional belief, trial lawyers seldom mounted successful opposition to the powerful medical associations. Though prior reform of the legislative process affected policy outcomes within state government, governors provided the strongest leadership, if any, in overcoming legislative inaction. State judges seemed interested most in developing discrete bodies of law in the name of states as "laboratories of social experiment." When the national medical associations failed to win uniform adoption of its agenda in the various state legislatures, Dugan documents how they then began to seek uniform legislation in Congress.

Using very careful and meticulous scholarship, Dugan's findings are significant and convincing. Her research, much broader and more eclectic than most public law dissertations, underscores the continuous interactions between the legal sector and the broader realms of politics and public policy.

#### **Harold D. Lasswell Award (\$250)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1992 or 1993 in the field of policy studies. (Supported by the Policy Studies Organization)

*Award Committee:* David Rosenbloom, Chair, American University; Chris Bosso, Northeastern University; and Lettie Wenner, Northern Illinois University

*Recipient:* **Steven Kent Vogel**, University of California-Irvine

*Dissertation:* "The Politics of Regulatory Reform in the Advanced Industrial Countries"

*Dissertation Chair:* John Zysman, University of California-Berkeley

*Citation:* The committee members are pleased to present the Lasswell award to Steven Kent Vogel. His dissertation explains change and stability in the patterns of economic regulatory reforms in the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Germany during the past 15 years. It demonstrates the great utility of comparative public policy analysis based on a broad array of in depth case studies.

Vogel challenges the conventional wisdom that advanced economies are caught up in the megatrends of globalization, privatization, and deregulation. Instead, his analysis convincingly dem-

onstrates that, in terms of regulatory reform, the overall trends have been toward reregulation and divergence (as opposed to convergence), and that these processes have been driven by the state rather than by private interest groups.

After examining each country's policies in terms of commitment to competition, type of reregulation, governmental regulatory capacity, and implementation, type of reregulation, governmental regulatory capacity, and implementation, Vogel finds that regulatory reforms in the U.S. and Great Britain fit a pattern of pro-competitive governmental disengagement whereas Japan, France, and Germany have engaged in strategic retrenchment. The study indicates the limitations of much economics based regulatory theory and it substantially advances knowledge and understanding of regulatory policy in advanced economies.

#### **1994 Helen Dwight Reid Award Citation (\$500)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1992 or 1993 in the field of international relations, law and politics. (Supported by the Helen Dwight Reid Foundation)

*Award Committee:* John T. S. Keeler, University of Washington, Chair; Richard Herrmann, Ohio State University; and Michael J. Smith, University of Virginia

*Co-Recipient:* **Jonathan Kirshner**, Cornell University

*Dissertation:* "International Monetary Relations: The Question of Power"

*Dissertation Chair:* Michael Doyle, Princeton University

*Co-Recipient:* **Randall Warren Stone**, Brown University

*Dissertation:* "Pursuit of Interest: The Politics of Subsidized Trade in the Soviet Bloc"

*Dissertation Chair:* Timothy J. Colton, Harvard University

*Citations:*

**JONATHAN KIRSHNER:** The committee members are pleased to present the Reid Award to co-winner Jonathan Kirshner. His dissertation is a rigorous and exhaustive study of the ways in which states wield power in international monetary relations. This is an ambitious piece of work that will be viewed as an important contribution to

the literature by specialists in both IPE and security affairs.

Kirshner's thesis begins by presenting a theoretical framework for the analysis of monetary power. He explores in depth the potential utility of three types of monetary power: currency manipulation, the exploitation of monetary dependence and systemic disruption. He notes that only a relatively small number of states are able to resort to monetary power, and that fear of undermining currency arrangements may often lead such states to refrain from utilizing that power. However, he explains, when monetary power is employed in a propitious context it can produce swift and powerful effects at relatively little cost.

Kirshner then devotes nearly 400 pages to demonstrating the extent and limits of monetary power in more than a score of wide-ranging cases. A more selective research strategy might have sufficed (and would have doubtless accelerated completion of the thesis!), but readers will applaud his heroic effort to assess virtually the entire universe of important cases. In regard to currency manipulation alone, he examines twenty-four agent-target relationships ranging from France-Germany in 1911 to Nigeria-Biafra in 1968. The more celebrated cases such as Suez 1956 are included along with rather obscure but fascinating ones such as the (aborted) German scheme to flood the world with counterfeit pounds during World War II. When Kirshner turns to monetary dependence, he provides nothing less than a comprehensive comparative analysis of the power relationships embedded within all of the major monetary systems, i.e., those revolving around the pound sterling, the dollar, the franc and even the mark of the 1930s. Further light is cast on the power dynamics of those systems through Kirshner's analysis of (generally unsuccessful) attempts at systemic disruption, e.g., the French challenge to the dollar system in the 1960s.

Part III rounds out Kirshner's analysis by providing an assessment of "missed opportunities" (cases in which states rather surprisingly opted not to exercise monetary power) and some speculation on the future of monetary power. He argues convincingly that monetary diplomacy is likely to become a "more significant feature of the international system in the coming years" and thus, implicitly, makes the case that those who wish to understand that system would do well to reflect on the findings of his excellent study.

**RANDALL WARREN STONE:** Professor Stone's dissertation is an outstanding example of the new scholarship on the ex-Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. "Pursuit of Interest" was based largely on 90 interviews with officials in Moscow, Warsaw, Prague and Budapest as well as research in major collections of primary-source documents in three of those capitals. As a result of this fieldwork, Stone was able to produce a thesis that effectively challenges much of the received wisdom regarding the politics of subsidized trade in the Soviet Bloc.

The questions at the heart of Stone's thesis are: 1) Why was the Soviet policy of economic integration with Eastern Europe such a conspicuous failure?, and 2) What explains the inability of the Soviet leadership to use political and economic resources to political effect? The dissertation answers these questions by exploring both the economic context of and the political motivations related to foreign trade. In regard to the former, Stone challenges the "liberal" perspective that attributes the failures of the CMEA exclusively to inefficiencies of the command economy. He presents and defends an alternative "subsidized trade" theory that focuses on the way in which the Soviet-subsidized prices employed in CMEA trade encouraged the East Europeans to distort trade negotiations and multilateral integration programs so as to maximize their shares of the subsidy; these maneuvers, he shows, severely limited the potential to expand trade and subverted Soviet initiatives to promote integration.

In regard to political motivations, Stone contests what he deems the "realist" theory of USSR-East European trade relations. Within this perspective it is assumed that the pursuit of power outweighed purely economic considerations such that the Soviets managed their trade relations so as to maximize Soviet strategic interests. Stone argues that the realist view squares poorly (given its assumption that the side with more resources will prevail) with the Soviet Union's record of failure in economic relations with Eastern Europe. Through both a statistical analysis of trade data and case studies of severe crises (e.g., Czechoslovakia 1968) he undermines the claim that the Soviets used trade subsidies to reward or punish satellites. He is thus led to present and defend an alternative "institutional theory." This view assumes that the Soviet bureaucracy was extraordinarily ineffective: "Its management policies created incentives to smother uncomfortable information, to ignore viola-

tions of international agreements, to avoid conflict with Soviet allies—in short, to do everything but vigorously pursue the national interest." As he illustrates, while top Soviet leaders tried repeatedly to promote the cause of economic integration, the Soviet bureaucracy consistently allowed itself to be manipulated and out-manuevered by the East Europeans.

In short, Stone's thesis is an original, insightful and provocative study that casts a great deal of light on the demise of the Soviet Bloc while also contributing, more broadly, to the literature on international political economy.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1992 or 1993 in the field of American government and politics.

*Award Committee:* Ryan J. Barilleaux, Chair, Miami University; Patricia Hurley, Texas A&M University; and Keith Krehbiel, The Ohio State University

*Recipient:* **Scott C. James**, University of California–Davis

*Dissertation:* "Coalition-Building, the Democracy, and the Development of American Regulatory Institutions, 1884–1936: A Party System Perspective"

*Dissertation Chair:* Karen Orren, University of California–Los Angeles

*Citation:* Dr. James's dissertation offers a party system perspective on the development of American regulatory institutions between 1884 and 1936. He argues that efforts by Democratic party leaders to retain control of the presidency over a half-century provided the driving force behind the adoption of key laws establishing federal regulatory institutions, including the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission. He demonstrates how the need to fashion a majority coalition in the Electoral College shaped the regulatory policy alternatives adopted by Democratic Party leaders and how that same need changed the party itself. Under pressure from the demands of party building, what had been an agrarian and anti-statist party was transformed into a coalition in support of expanded national government power and the consolidation of corporate capitalism. Dr. James's study illuminates American political development during a crucial period in national history, the evolution of American political parties, presiden-

tial politics, and political factors affecting policy choice.

### **Leo Strauss Award (\$250)**

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1992 or 1993 in the field of political philosophy.

*Award Committee:* Lawrence A. Scaff, Chair; Pennsylvania State University; Penny Weiss, Purdue University; Bernard Yack, University of Wisconsin–Madison

*Recipient:* **Melissa Williams**, University of Toronto

*Dissertation:* "Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation"

*Dissertation Chair:* Dennis F. Thompson, Harvard University

*Citation:* This year the Leo Strauss Award is given to Melissa Suzanne Williams for her important work on problems of representation: "Voice, Trust and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation" (Harvard, 1993). In this timely dissertation Dr. Williams develops a critique of the liberal theory of representation, using an approach that takes into account marginalized groups and historical identities. Alert to the connections between fair representation and basic equality, the author succeeds in setting forth a compelling case for rethinking the standard ways we have conceived of representation in American politics. Surveying liberal theories of representation and group activity from Madison through Mill, Dr. Williams shows the limits to their voluntarist and individualistic assumptions. These limits are illustrated further in considering the experience of marginalized ascriptive groups, such as those involved in the woman suffrage movement and the enfranchisement of African-Americans during Reconstruction. "Voice, Trust and Memory" argues that as a practice mediating between the preferences of citizens and governmental policies, representation requires consideration not only of individual interests, but also of group-based claims for fairness. Such consideration leads to elaboration of a "group-based theory of fair representation," a theory that promises to address the weaknesses in liberal orthodoxy while rectifying the inadequate representation of historically marginalized groups.

Representation is a complex and important political issue. Dr. Williams' carefully crafted questioning promises

to challenge our comfortable habits of thought and contribute to improved understanding of the practice of fair and effective representation. A model of lucid reasoning, her work exemplifies the best traditions of theoretical inquiry into matters of lasting significance for democratic politics in the United States.

#### Leonard D. White Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed in 1994 in the field of public administration.

*Award Committee:* Patricia S. Florestano, University of Baltimore, Chair; James Pfiffner, George Mason University; Joseph McCormick III, Howard University.

*Recipient:* Marissa Martino Golden, University of Pennsylvania

*Dissertation:* "Bureaucratic Behavior in a Political Setting: Reactions to the Reagan Administration in Four Federal Agencies."

*Dissertation Chair:* Judith E. Gruber, University of California–Berkeley

*Citation:* The Leonard D. White Award Committee reviewed several excellent dissertations. The award this year is given to Marissa Martino Golden for her dissertation entitled "Bureaucratic Behavior in a Political Setting: Reactions to the Reagan Administration in Four Federal Agencies." Her dissertation applies original empirical research to political conventional wisdom in an in depth fashion. It is subtle and does not rely on an across-the-board approach. It is especially impressive in terms of originality, the persuasiveness of the argument, and its contributions to the field.

She uses the Reagan presidency as a lens through which to study the issue of bureaucratic responsiveness to the presidency. The research focuses on the extent to which, and the reasons why, high-ranking career civil servants in executive branch agencies are responsive to the presidency. Using interviews with career civil servants in four federal agencies, the case study approach provides a detailed look at the reactions and responses of government employees to the Reagan administration, its policy goals and its application of the administrative presidency.

Using an adapted framework of exit, voice, loyalty and neglect, she examines reactions and responses to the Reagan presidency in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the Food and Nutrition Service, the Civil

Rights Division, and the Environmental Protection Agency. A major contribution of the research which will hopefully be used by others in the future is the model that she developed which identifies the conditions that affect bureaucratic behavior in the setting of the administrative presidency. The conditions are: 1) the application of the administrative presidency, especially the management tools of political appointees, 2) bureaucratic self-interest, 3) bureaucratic role perception, and 4) agency context. It is her argument that the variation in these conditions produce behavior on the part of career civil servants that ranges from cooperative to resistant.

In conclusion, the dissertation is an excellent contribution to the public administration field and is likely to have an impact on future research. Dr. Golden is to be commended for a job well-done.

#### PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

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

For the best paper presented at the 1993 Annual Meeting. (Supported by Pi Sigma Alpha).

*Award Committee:* William Keech, Chair, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Linda Fowler, Syracuse University; and Edward Kolodziej, University of Illinois

*Recipients:* Paul Sniderman, Stanford University; Edward Carmines, Indiana University; Philip Tetlock, University of California-Berkeley; and Anthony Tyler, University of California-Berkeley

*Paper:* "The Asymmetry of Race as a Political Issue: Prejudice, Political Ideology, and the Structure of Conflict of American Politics"

*Citation:* This paper addresses the enduring "American dilemma" regarding race. It presents interesting and counterintuitive findings about public opinion and racial attitudes, and interprets their implications for partisan strategy. The paper reveals that liberals and conservatives are more or less equally likely to express negative stereotypes towards blacks. Ironically, however, such prejudice has a larger impact on the policy preferences of liberals than of conservatives.

The explanation for this surprising finding is that conservatives are consistent in their opposition to government aid for blacks regardless of their racial attitudes. But liberals who dislike

blacks are cross-pressured by their negative feelings, which are at odds with their normal support for an activist role for government. Race, then, poses a particularly acute dilemma for Democrats and liberals. The authors conclude that the influence of prejudice "is now most pronounced exactly where it is least suspected," which renders it a particularly vexing challenge for the left's agenda of racial justice.

These important substantive findings are embedded in a deeper theoretical argument. The authors contend that the conventional arguments that prejudice is a direct source of opposition to programs for blacks, and that conservatives are more prejudiced than liberals are based on a misspecified model of reasoning about political choices. The paper attacks the notion that prejudice and ideology are mutually reinforcing, and instead argues that "rather than prejudice defining the politics of race, it is closer to the mark to observe that politics now defines the role of prejudice" (p. 20).

In disentangling the effects of prejudice and ideology, the authors are sensitive to the nuances of question wording and clever in using experiments to differentiate "real" attitudes about race from socially acceptable responses. This paper's substantive and theoretical import is well supported by its methodological sophistication. We congratulate the authors on their achievement.

##### Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)

For the best article published in *The American Political Science Review* during 1993.

*Award Committee:* Gregory A. Caldeira, Ohio State University, Chair; James L. Gibson, University of Houston; and Robert O. Keohane, Harvard University

*Award Recipients:* Elisabeth R. Gerber, California Institute of Technology; and John E. Jackson, University of Michigan

*Article:* "Endogenous Preferences and the Study of Institutions"

*Citation:* Gerber and Jackson examine a question of broad interest to political scientists and in particular to students of political institutions, political behavior, and public opinion: are individual preferences, or attitudes, fixed and exogenously determined? This question is not merely a matter of curiosity; it has substantial implications for a wide range of problems in the social sciences. Indeed, exogenous and fixed individual preferences figure as critical

assumptions in many of the most important and frequently used empirical and normative models of political institutions. The empirical evidence Gerber and Jackson present in this study on two issues—support for black civil rights and for the Vietnam War—clearly belies the assumptions of fixed and exogenously-determined individual preferences. Individual preferences did *not* remain stable across time; they shifted markedly in response to changes in the positions of the political parties from election to election. With the publication of this paper, scholars will no longer be able to assume, without further investigation, that preferences are exogenous.

This is not an easy paper; but Gerber and Jackson patiently lead the reader through the many steps they have taken. They begin by modifying and then formalizing the traditional model of two-party electoral competition to take into account the role of political parties and their strategies in shaping the behavior and attitudes of individuals. Preferences of voters respond directly to the actions of parties as the latter attempt to fashion a successful electoral strategy. Voters are Bayesians, in the sense of calculating their expected utility based on priors about the utilities of each outcome; and then updating after a choice based on experience with the outcome versus the original prior. “Surprise,” a significant difference between the anticipated and actual “utility” of an outcome, leads individuals to incorporate this information in their expected utility. Large shifts in the positions of the political parties constitute the “surprise” which motivates shifts in expected utilities and individual preferences.

The issues of Vietnam and civil rights provide classic situations in which to tease out the interaction between the strategies of the parties and the preferences of individuals. On this pair of issues, the Democrats and Republicans radically shifted their positions over a short period of time. From 1956 to 1960, the Republicans became more supportive of civil rights relative to the Democrats; and then by 1964 the parties reversed positions. On the Vietnam War, the Democrats were more “hawkish” in 1968; by 1972, the Republicans and Democrats had traded places on the War. These sharp turns by the political parties, according to the argument, should have brought about changes in individual preferences. And this is precisely what Gerber and Jackson find on both issues. Thus, on civil rights, Democrats became less supportive in 1960 and then more supportive in

1964; and, on the Vietnam War, Democrats demonstrated significantly less support in 1972 than in 1968.

It is impossible to do justice here to the painstaking and clever analysis of the data. One of the more admirable features of this paper is the way in which the authors confront and defeat serious methodological problems. One of the problems they face is the lack of sufficient panel data; another revolves around changes in the wording and format of questions. On these and other issues, Gerber and Jackson muster impressive firepower to bring these problems under control and yet manage to keep the paper focused on the substantive issues.

This article has all of the marks of an enduring contribution to political science, one very much in the spirit of the many contributions Heinz Eulau has made in his long and distinguished career as a scholar. Gerber and Jackson deal with an important problem, one of general interest to scholars across the subfields of the discipline; ground the question well and clearly within a theoretical framework; engage in the bold, but appropriate, use of sophisticated methods, well-adapted to the question at hand; treat their data with considerable candor and caution; present original findings on the relationships among parties, individual citizens, and the electoral system; connect macro- and micro-level processes; and relate these new findings to new and old work in the literature. Perhaps most important of all, these results on the endogeneity of preferences should resonate on the research agendas of political scientists of many different stripes. The results, of course, stand to complicate our lives considerably; but they will force us to enrich our theories and data about political institutions.

## BOOK AWARDS

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

For the best scholarly work in political science published in 1993 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Award Committee:* Merle Black, Chair, Emory University; Charles S. Bullock, III, University of Georgia; and Wilbur Rich, Wellesley College

*Recipient:* Raphael J. Sonenshein, California State University-Fullerton

*Book:* *Politics in Black and White: Race and Power in Los Angeles*, published by Princeton University Press

*Citation:* The winner of the Ralph J. Bunche Award is *Politics in Black and White: Race and Power in Los Angeles* by Raphael J. Sonenshein. This fine book analyzes the successful development of a biracial coalition in the most important city of the American West. It traces the growth of a coalition between African-Americans and liberal whites that repeatedly supported Tom Bradley as mayor of Los Angeles.

Sonenshein argues that “the conditions for biracial coalitions are most auspicious when the ideological affinity between Blacks and white liberals is enhanced by both mutual interest and long-standing trust among leaders.” According to the author, “Goodwill alone is not enough, but neither is cold self-interest.”

*Politics in Black and White* is more than a study of Los Angeles. Sonenshein contrasts differences between biracial politics in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York in ways that students of urban race relations will find theoretically stimulating. In addition, Sonenshein demonstrates the utility of historical analysis in contemporary political science by tracing the strains and successes in the Bradley coalition over more than two decades. Through the use of interviews, public documents, and participant observation, he brings the dynamics of biracial politics to life.

A consequential topic, insightful analysis, and lucid style make *Politics in Black and White* essential reading for all scholars of American race relations.

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

For the best political science publication in the field of U.S. national policy in 1993.

*Award Committee:* Jennifer Hochschild, Chair, Princeton University; George Edwards, Texas A & M University; Robert Thomas, University of Houston

*Recipients:* Jeffrey Berry, Kent Portney, and Ken Thomson, Tufts University

*Book:* *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*, published by The Brookings Institution

Among a field of excellent books, *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy* had an edge. It is a thorough, detailed, imaginative study of a subject that everyone talks about but few know much about. Using a meticulously developed methodology, the book identifies five cities with exemplary community organizations and deep commitments to the idea and practice of participatory democ-

racy. It then examines the impact of strong democracy on the participants, politics, and policy outcomes of those cities. The authors found, to put it too briefly, that community organizations can enhance democracy, make people feel more involved with their community, and improve policy-making and policy outcomes. Even the best organizations do not transform cities or solve deep structural problems—but even the less-than-best need not disintegrate into personal politicking or ideological stalemate. Sorting out the nuances and subtleties of what community organizations actually do, as distinguished from what proponents claim and opponents fear, provides a fascinating tour for the reader through the minefield of politics in America.

Simply outlining the argument does not do justice to the quality and importance of *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy*. It was a difficult research task even to identify the right cases, never mind to then study all of them in detail. Furthermore, the interviews, surveys, media reports and other data were collected systematically and thoroughly, and the book quietly introduces some important methodological innovations. It then uses these data to address issues fundamental to our discipline: what is the relationship between structural constraints and individual agency? How do class, race, personality, and policy issue interact to make some political actors more effective or more gratified? What happens to proposals on the way to implementation, and after? How can we improve the process of citizen participation? How can we improve the outcomes of city politicking? On each of these issues, the authors provide thoughtful, provocative analyses backed by careful examination of their data and a broad sense of the historical and social context.

*The Rebirth of Urban Democracy* leaves many questions unanswered, but that is as it should be. It could turn out to be as important a book as *Who Governs?*, for the same reasons—it uses a detailed analysis of local events to address large philosophical and empirical questions in a way that speaks to political activists and analysts alike.

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

For the best book published in 1993 on women and politics.

*Award Committee:* Sue Tolleson-Rinehart, Chair, Texas Tech University; Janet K. Boles, Marquette University; and Mary Katzenstein, Cornell University

*Recipient:* Cynthia R. Daniels, Rutgers University

*Book:* *At Women's Expense: State Power and the Politics of Fetal Rights*, published by Harvard University Press

*Citation:* Cynthia R. Daniels has confronted one of society's most wrenching contemporary dilemmas—the placement of “fetal rights” in opposition to a woman's rights. The result of her confrontation is a book that is careful, smart and interesting. It unites the best of the scholarly traditions bestowed by political philosophy, the study of public policy and of the law. And it is timely. There is much here with which her readers may disagree, since the new question of “fetal rights” engages religious, moral, ethical and ideological beliefs in ways that the coolest intellect might find inflaming. But, as Daniels herself acknowledges, society-wide anxiety about broken homes, addiction, poverty, and violence has created a terrain upon which “fetal rights” advocates have played. Thus a text that takes a clear-headed, carefully thought-out position on what the state *is* doing, as well as what it *ought* to do, when claims to women's individuality and physical sovereignty appear to conflict with the claims of those who would place the “rights” of the fetus first, is most welcome indeed.

Daniels, using the tools of political philosophy and case studies of public policy and law, argues that advances in medical technology have created a disturbing environment in which the fetus emerges as a person, and the pregnant woman begins “. . . literally to disappear from view . . . [but] The invisible woman would reemerge later as a threat to the fetus's health, as a barrier to fetal life, as an actor alien to the fetus's interests” (p. 21).

Daniels sees in this stark, wrenching clash of pregnancy and citizenship a profound challenge to the liberal state. Taking three cases, that of women's employment at a battery plant, a terminally ill woman forced to undergo a Caesarean section, and a cocaine-addicted woman. Daniels considers the reach and limitations of the liberal state.

Having found a lack in liberalism, Daniels nevertheless does not abandon liberal precepts. The conflict between pregnant women and the putative rights of fetuses makes clear that the ancient liberal construct of self-sovereignty must be rethought, and perhaps re-grounded, but it cannot be abandoned. Daniels' book helps us make sense of this extraordinary conflict, and thereby helps us with the rethinking we must do.

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

For the best book published during 1993 on government, politics, or international relations (supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation).

*Award Committee:* Samuel C. Patterson, Ohio State University, Chair; Arlene W. Saxonhouse, University of Michigan; Randolph M. Siverson, University of California, Davis.

*Recipient:* Carol M. Swain, Princeton University.

*Book:* *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress*, published by Harvard University Press.

*Citation:* Occasionally, the scholarly landscape is enhanced by a work of political science that brings impressive research to bear on both theory and practice. *Black Faces, Black Interests* is such a contribution. Carol Swain has conducted an intensive analysis of congressional representation, using the various data resources of public opinion data, roll-call votes, and elite interviews. She brings these armaments to bear on crucial issues of political representation: “How does Congress represent the interests of African Americans? Must blacks be represented by blacks to be properly heard? How do members of Congress respond to the needs of blacks in their districts, and what do congressional voting records reveal?”

Her statistical evidence is wide-ranging and interesting. But the riveting richness of her work lies in the “thick description” of the representational circumstances of elected persons in congressional districts of varying African American presence. Her accounts of the representative-constituent relations of John Conyers and George Crockett of Michigan, William Gray III of Pennsylvania, Mike Espy of Mississippi, John Lewis of Georgia, Mervyn Dymally and Ron Dellums of California, Floyd Flake of New York, Alan Wheat of Missouri, Katie Hall of Indiana, Robin Tallon of South Carolina, Tim Valentine of North Carolina, Lindy Boggs of Louisiana, and Peter Rodino, Jr. of New Jersey offer penetrating insights into constituency representation across the diversity of congressional districts.

Swain's conclusions and appraisals are striking. The potential for increasing black representation in Congress through racial gerrymandering has been exhausted. But African American politicians can get elected to Congress in

white-majority districts, as well. Concentrating blacks in a few districts may elect black representatives, but this practice tends to be a politically-inspired effort to diminish black representation overall, or a partisan effort to minimize the election of Democrats, or both. More strikingly, Swain argues that “whites can represent the interests of blacks,” and “blacks can represent the interests of whites,” without gaining the intrinsic value of the presence of black politicians among the memberships of representative bodies. The lessons taught for a sensible and meaningful future politics of race are profound. Verily, in a civilized democratic society whites and blacks “must embrace a politics in which effective representation depends on commonalities of principles and values, not just on shared pigmentation.” Carol Swain’s *Black Faces, Black Interests* is compelling and provocative. It will be an important part of American controversy about political representation in the years to come.

## CAREER AWARDS

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

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

*Award Committee:* Beryl A. Radin, State University of New York, Albany, Chair; Randall B. Ripley, Ohio State University; Paul Light, University of Minnesota.

*Recipient:* James Q. Wilson, University of California at Los Angeles.

*Citation:* For much of the twentieth century, scholars in the public administration field have struggled with the relationship between politics and administration. While some individuals have advocated a clear separation between the two, others have sought ways to develop a synthesis that links them.

Few scholars were as clear as John Merriman Gaus about the need to close the gap between politics and administration. He wrote: “I do not see how any advance in a reasonable explanation of political life can be made in our time without this kind of humble turning to a first-hand observation of government in action, of the functions which people perform collectively through its use, of how they are best organized throughout the community.

A theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also.” (Gaus 1950, 167–68).

In his amazingly productive career (more than a dozen books and scores of articles that span a wide array of subjects and approaches), James Q. Wilson has, indeed, “turned to a first-hand observation of government in action.” And unlike that other Wilson (Woodrow), he eschews a “science” of administration and, rather, appreciates the ways in which public organizations interact with the political institutions of the American society.

As his colleague and former student, John Dilulio, Jr., noted in a profile in *PS: Political Science and Politics* (Vol. XXIV, No. 4, December 1991), Wilson’s work encompasses three interlocking elements: criminal justice, public administration, and a perspective on American government. Most of this career was spent at the Department of Government at Harvard University; after 26 years, Wilson moved back to California, with joint appointments at UCLA’s Graduate School of Management and its Department of Political Science.

The breadth of his interests has allowed Jim Wilson to approach administration as a set of tasks related to the policy process that focuses on the achievement of specific policy outcomes. He emphasizes the relationship between these tasks and the context within which they operate—unique organizational cultures and diverse external environments. His work in the criminal justice field (for example, *The Investigators* in 1978 and *Varieties of Police Behavior* in 1968) examines the ways in which the culture of law enforcement agencies has affected the way that these groups have organized their work. Although *Varieties of Police Behavior* is usually thought of as a criminal justice book, it contributes much to our understanding of the more general relationship between agency environments and agency actions. Police bureaucracies, while distinct cultures, are a part of the public administration world.

In *The Politics of Regulation*, Jim Wilson focused on one type of administrative decisionmaking—the regulatory process—and confronts it as a political, rather than simply economic, set of decisions. He notes: “But politics differs from economics in that it manages conflict by forming heterogeneous coalitions out of persons with changeable and incommensurable preferences in order to make binding decisions for everyone.”

His 1989 book, *Bureaucracy*, is his most developed work in public administration. A volume that challenges traditional stereotypes of bureaucracies, it has evoked the interest of the general public and, at the same time, has become a standard text in universities across the country.

*Bureaucracy* reminds the reader that organization matters—a fact, according to Wilson, that is disputed only by economists and everybody else. In what has been described as a reverse Festschrift, Wilson draws on the work of his students and colleagues to present an encyclopedic volume that addresses most of the questions students are likely to ask about government bureaucracies.

The introduction to the book captures Wilson’s approach. “This book is an effort to explain why government agencies—bureaucracies—behave as they do. . . . It is a book filled with details about police departments, school systems, the CIA, the military, the State Department, regulatory commissions, the Postal Service, the Social Security Administration, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Forest Service, and many others. The details are not there simply to make the book long, but rather to persuade the reader that bureaucracy is not the simple, uniform phenomenon it is sometimes made out to be.”

In *Bureaucracy*, Wilson examines the behavior and activities of individuals within an organization—the operators, the managers, and the executives. He demonstrates how these three types of employees have different mixes of incentives, goals, constraints, and opportunities. He places the operations of public organizations squarely in the context of the society’s political institutions, reminding us that the American political structure (particularly the central feature of the American system—the separation of powers) creates special problems for these organizations.

Others have honored James Q. Wilson for his contributions to the political science field. The conferring of the Gaus award to him reminds us that political science as a discipline has paid much too little attention to public administration and the institutions that carry out the public’s business. Today we not only recognize Jim Wilson’s exemplary scholarship but offer testimony to the study of public administration as an important and legitimate field within the political science discipline.



### 1994 Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500)

To recognize notable public service by a political scientist

*Award Committee:* Thomas E. Mann, Brookings Institution, Chair; Lorraine McDonnell, University of California at Santa Barbara; Nelson W. Polsby, University of California at Berkeley.

*Recipient:* **Donna E. Shalala**, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*Citation:* The Hubert Humphrey Award was established by the American Political Science Association a dozen years ago to recognize "notable public service by a political scientist." The first recipient of the award was Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the senior senator from New York and a member of the Association. This year's award committee, which in addition to myself included Lorraine McDonnell and Nelson W. Polsby, is pleased to present the 1994 Hubert Humphrey Award to another distinguished public servant and longtime Association member, Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

In our judgement Donna Shalala's career is a remarkable record of notable public service. After receiving her Ph.D from the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, Secretary Shalala held academic appointments at Baruch College and Columbia, teaching and writing on state and local government finance and the politics of education. From 1975 to 1977, she served as a trustee and treasurer of the Municipal Assistance Corporation, which helped reverse New York City's financial collapse. In 1977 Shalala joined the Carter administration as assistant secretary for policy research and development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. She left government service in 1980 to become president of Hunter College and then eight years later was appointed chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the first woman to head a Big Ten University. Secretary Shalala was sworn in as a member of President Clinton's cabinet on January 22, 1993 and since then has occupied prime office space in the Hubert Humphrey Building.

Throughout her career in academia and in government, Secretary Shalala has exhibited personal qualities that have contributed mightily to her record of achievement: an inquisitive, penetrating and analytic mind, boundless energy, a love of politics, compassion and generosity, a wonderful sense of humor, and a capacity to work effec-

tively with all variety of people. In assembling what is widely regarded as an unusually strong management team at HHS, she adhered to a philosophy that has served her well throughout her career. In her words, "I pick the best people, give them the support they need and hold them accountable for results."

At HHS Secretary Shalala has spearheaded efforts to reform the welfare system and to refocus and reenergize such programs as Head Start, women's health, childhood immunization, biomedical research and AIDS prevention. Her leadership at HHS builds on a lifelong interest in public policies toward children and youth. Shalala brings to the Clinton administration a discipline and political savvy not always in evidence in the White House, and she has forged warm and productive relationships with members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. But then what did we expect of the woman who turned the University of Wisconsin football team into a Rose Bowl champion!

Donna Shalala shares with Hubert Humphrey an exuberance and intelligence that make it altogether fitting that she receive this award established in his memory. We are honored by her presence this evening.

### Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

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

*Award Committee:* Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Chair, University of Pennsylvania; Kathy Frankovic, CBS News; and Stephen Hess, The Brookings Institution

*Recipient:* **Thomas Bryne Edsall**, The Washington Post

*Citation:* The Committee recommends that Thomas Bryne Edsall be given the McWilliams Award. Thomas Bryne Edsall began his career on the *Providence Journal*, moving on to the *Baltimore Sun*, before taking his present assignment covering national politics for the *Washington Post*. He is the author of *The New Politics of Inequality* and *Power and Money: Writing about Politics, 1971-1987*, as well as *Chain Reaction* with Mary D. Edsall.

In 1981, he won the first prize for national reporting and the Bill Pryor Memorial Award of the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild. In 1988, the Boston *Phoenix* named Edsall one

of the top ten political reporters in America.

## APSA Publications List

\*Items marked with an asterisk are available from Customer Services Department, University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106; (800) 521-0600.

### PERIODICALS

**The American Political Science Review.** The leading quarterly journal of scholarly articles and book reviews in political science. Included in APSA membership. Back issues: \$20 per copy, \$80 per volume.

**PS: Political Science & Politics.** Quarterly journal of Association news and lively articles of political analysis. *PS* is the best single source of information on professional opportunities. Included in APSA membership. Back issues: \$10 per copy, \$40 per volume (\$15 for the spring issue which contains the preliminary program).

**The Political Science Teacher.** Stimulating quarterly magazine on education, curriculum, and teaching. Distributed to U.S. individual members only. **Fall 1990 issue was the last separate issue of *The Teacher*. As of March 1991 *The Teacher* was incorporated into *PS*.** Back issues of *The Teacher* are available while supply lasts for \$4 each (includes postage).

**This Constitution: A Bicentennial Chronicle.** A special Fall 1991 issue (No. 19) devoted to the *Bill of Rights* is available at \$6 per copy. Add \$1 postage each copy.

### DIRECTORIES

**APSA Membership Directory.** Names, addresses, current position, institutional affiliation, highest degrees, and fields of specialization of APSA individual members. Index includes listings of women, Black, and Hispanic political scientists, a geographical listing of members, and a listing of members by fields of interest. 1994-96. \$35 members; \$55 nonmembers. Triennial.

**APSA Biographical Directory.** Names, addresses, current position, institutional affiliation, highest degree, fields of specialization, and honors and publications of APSA individual members. Index includes listings of women, Black, and Hispanic members, a geographical listing, and a listing of mem-