

Notes from the Editor

It is well known that the bulk of the economic cost of a war is incurred many years after the armed hostilities themselves have ceased. By any reasonable and humane accounting, the human cost of a war is likely to far outweigh the economic cost. The immediate human toll, tallied in body counts, is apt to be terrible. But how much of the human cost, like the economic cost, does not become clear until long afterwards? That question, applied to one particular form of armed conflict, civil war, motivates the chillingly-titled “Civil Wars Kill and Maim People—Long After the Shooting Stops” by Hazem Adam Ghobarah, Paul Huth, and Bruce Russett. Analyzing death and disability data for 1999, Ghobarah, Huth, and Russett paint a grim picture of the impact of the civil wars that were fought earlier in the decade and show how this impact was manifested in particular diseases and conditions and how it affected particular groups of non-combatants. This is not a pleasant article to read, but it is undeniably an important one.

Conventional wisdom associates support for military spending with conservative parties and support for social welfare programs with liberal parties. In “Both Guns and Butter, or Neither: Class Interests in the Political Economy of Rearmament,” Kevin Narizny stands the conventional wisdom on its head by proposing the unconventional hypothesis that, when confronted with international threat, liberal governments should be more likely than their conservative counterparts to support rearmament policies, while conservative governments should be more likely to pursue strategies of alliance-formation or appeasement. Narizny tests this hypothesis, which builds on the class bases of liberal and conservative parties, against the historical experiences of France, Britain, and the U.S. His findings are bound to evoke widespread comment and debate, as they bear directly on issues about which feelings run high and careful analysis is frequently lacking.

A key question for political science—some would even say *the* key question—is how institutional arrangements, or rules, affect decisions or outcomes. In “Bargaining in Legislatures: An Experimental Investigation of Open versus Closed Amendment Rules,” Guillaume R. Fréchette, John H. Kagel, and Steven F. Lehrer bring experimental methods to bear on a specific institutional arrangement that shapes legislative decision-making in many nations: the “closed” or “open” process by which legislation is amended. How are legislators’ decisions affected by the operation of a “closed” amendment rule, in which proposals must be voted on without being subject to change, as opposed to an “open” rule, in which amendments can be offered that alter the substance of legislation? The answer that Fréchette, Kagel, and Lehrer provide will, of course, be of interest to legislative scholars. However, those interested more broadly in the impact of institutional arrangements should regard this as a pertinent case in point and may also discover in it a new and useful way to approach their subject matter.

The focus on institutional arrangements carries over, albeit in an altogether different light, in Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks’s “Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance.” The reallocation of authority away from central states has raised as yet unresolved questions about how multi-level governance should be organized. Hooghe and Marks distinguish between two types of multi-level governance: in one, jurisdictions are general-purpose, non-intersecting, and durable; in the other, they are task-specific, intersecting, and flexible. This framework sets out the basic institutional options for organizing multi-level governance and provides an analytical basis for assessing these options.

The next two articles in this issue shift the focus from politics inside the “black box” to the input side of the political process. In “Activists and Partisan Realignment in the United States,” Gary Miller and Norman Schofield offer an explanation of partisan realignments that is tied to the balance among competing values, e.g., the free use of private property versus the pursuit of equality, or protection of individual freedom versus advancement of a good society. In Miller and Schofield’s account, politicians reach out to activists who are not currently part of their party’s electoral coalition. These attempts, when successful, alter the pattern of electoral support that parties receive; a new electoral coalition then gains control of government; and policy directions change as a consequence. By shifting the extent to which different values are realized in policy outcomes, such changes produce a new set of disaffected citizens, and the activists among them become inviting targets for politicians seeking to produce a new electoral coalition. Employing this activist-based approach, Miller and Schofield produce an account of electoral support for U.S. political parties over the last century that is capable of explaining why the Democratic and Republican parties switched sides on overarching economic and social issues.

Of course, the formation of electoral coalitions presupposes that people take the trouble to vote in the first place. In “A Behavioral Model of Turnout,” Jonathan Bendor, Daniel Diermeier, and Michael Ting confront what has been called the “paradox that ate rational choice”: Why do people vote even though the probability that they will be pivotal in deciding the outcome is too small to make this costly act rational? Several different answers have been proposed in the past—most notably, perhaps, by grafting onto the rather cold-blooded cost-benefit calculus the idea that people derive psychic benefits from voting. By contrast, Bendor, Diermeier and Ting strike out in a provocative new direction, attempting to marry rational choice and behavioral approaches to individual decision-making by portraying citizens as rational adapters rather than optimizers. The resulting account holds great promise as a resolution of the paradox of voting and, more broadly understood, as a step toward synthesizing

analytical approaches that are often viewed as contradictory.

“In what sense, if any, do rights exist?” So begins “The Construction of Rights,” by Keith Dowding and Martin van Hees. If one has a right to do x but cannot exercise it, does one really “have” that right? That question may sound suspiciously like the age-old poser about whether, if a tree falls in an uninhabited forest, it makes a sound, but it is actually one of the bases of Dowding and Van Hees’s framework for understanding the extent to which individuals have and can exercise rights—a framework in which rights are viewed as being built on a foundation of more fundamental moral values.

Political philosophers devote much of their attention to timeless questions like the one that Dowding and Van Hees ask, but in “Identity and Liberal Nationalism,” Evan Charney weighs in on some especially timely issues: the relative values of cultural identity and individual liberties. How, Charney asks, can a nation or nation-state pursue the benefits of forging and maintaining a collective identity without sacrificing the benefits of pluralism and commitment to individual rights? Charney contends that recent liberal attempts to justify the elevation of collective identity as a means of nurturing the self-worth of individuals founder due to their inconsistency and to their promotion of an undesirable view of what it means to be an autonomous individual. This assessment takes on a special resonance as we weigh the costs and benefits of post-September 11 policies and practices.

All political science researchers, including (or especially) political philosophers, engage in textual analysis of one sort or another. Recently, though, with the vastly increased availability of massive textual data bases and the advent of high-speed computers, systematic techniques for analyzing texts have proliferated rapidly. In some of these, human “coders” conduct word or phrase counts “by hand,” while in others, computers perform this drudgery. Similarly, some of these techniques score texts according to pre-defined categories or dimensions, while others operate more inductively in an attempt to coax the underlying meaning out of a set of texts. In “Extracting Policy Positions from Political Texts: Using Words as Data,” Michael Laver, Kenneth Benoit, and John Garry present a new computer-based, inductively-oriented technique of content analysis and demonstrate it by extracting policy positions from party manifestos and legislative speeches. The most striking characteristic of this novel technique is that it is “language-blind.” That is, it does not even require knowledge of the language of the texts that are being analyzed. Although that characteristic makes the technique an unusual (some might even say “bizarre”) way to try to capture the meanings of texts, the logic of the technique is straightforward and its applicability is potentially broad.

Finally, in the March, 2002, issue of the *Review*, Mark Peceny, Caroline Beer, and Shannon Sanchez-Terry considered what they called the “dictatorial peace,” arguing that some of the same factors that help produce peaceful relations between democratic nations

also produce peace among authoritarian regimes. In a follow-up analysis in our “Forum” section (“Identifying the Culprit: Democracy, Dictatorship, and Dispute Initiation”), Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam dispute the claim that democracies are likely to be the aggressors in interstate conflicts with personalistic dictatorships, and report results that support the opposite conclusion. The exchange between Reiter and Stam, on the one hand, and Peceny and Beer (“Peaceful Parties and Puzzling Personalists”), on the other, raises several important issues. Is the willingness of personalistic dictatorships to initiate conflict a consequence of their perception that other types of regimes are institutionally constrained and unwilling to go to war, or does it stem from a lack of institutional constraints that enables personalistic dictators to go to war without carefully considering the consequences? Should we be asking instead “What causes personalistic dictatorships to initiate conflicts they are likely to lose?”

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

General Considerations

The *APSR* strives to publish scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience of scholars and practitioners, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates a significant research problem, or answers an important research question, of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive for a presentation that will be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Therefore, authors should not submit articles containing tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that have already been published or are forthcoming in other places, or that have been included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including on-line journals). In many such cases, subsequent publication of this material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review by other journals or duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts that have been submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Submission of manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or as part of a book or other larger work, is also strongly discouraged. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss any such publications related to a submission in a cover letter to the Editor. You should also notify the Editor of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review by the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. The Editor may request copies of related publications.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and, in the event that the article is accepted for publication, to permit other scholars to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. For example, for surveys, at the least, sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings should be given; you should calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for RDD Telephone Surveys and In-Person Household Surveys* (Ann Arbor, MI: AAPOR, 1998). This document is available on the Internet at <<http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html>>. For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, subject payments and debriefing procedures, and so on. Articles should be self-contained, so you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by capitalizing the first letter in the variable name and italicizing the entire variable name the first time each is mentioned in the text. You should also use the same names for variables in text and tables and, wherever possible, should avoid the use of acronyms and computer abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables appearing in tables should have been mentioned in the text and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

As part of the review process, you may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear; the review process works most efficiently if such information is given in the initial submission. If you advise readers that additional information is available, you should submit printed copies of that information with the manuscript. If the amount of this supplementary information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing anonymous copies in the Specific Procedures section below.

Manuscripts that are largely or entirely critiques or commentaries on previously published *APSR* articles will be reviewed using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts, with one exception. In addition to the usual number of reviewers, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being criticized, in the same anonymous form that they are sent to reviewers. Comments from the original author(s) to the Editor will be invited as a supplement to the advice of reviewers. This notice to the original author(s) is intended (1) to encourage review of the details of analyses or research procedures that might escape the notice of disinterested reviewers; (2) to enable prompt publication of critiques by supplying criticized authors with early notice of their existence and, therefore, more adequate time to reply; and (3) as a courtesy to criticized authors. If you submit such a manuscript, you should therefore send as many additional copies of their manuscripts as will be required for this purpose.

Manuscripts being submitted for publication should be sent to Lee Sigelman, Editor, *American Political Science Review*, Department of Political Science, The George Washington University, 2201 G Street N.W., Room 507, Washington, DC 20052. Correspondence concerning manuscripts under review may be sent to the same address or e-mailed to apsr@gwu.edu.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should not be longer than 45 pages including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices. This page size guideline is based on the U.S. standard 8.5 × 11-inch paper; if you are submitting a manuscript printed on longer paper, you must adjust accordingly. The font size must be at least 11 points for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including notes and references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception of tables for which double-spacing would require a second page otherwise not needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6.5 inches, as is typical for manuscripts (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*), and printed on one side of the page only. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. The *APSR* style of embedded citations should be used, and there must be a separate list of references at the end of the manuscript. Do not use notes for simple citations. These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers. Papers not adhering to these guidelines are subject to being rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may place footnotes at the bottom of the pages instead of using endnotes, and you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text. However, manuscripts accepted for publication must be submitted with endnotes, and with tables and figures on separate pages at the back of the manuscript with standard indications of text placement, e.g., [Table 3 about here]. In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If your paper is accepted for publication, you will also be required to submit camera-ready copy of graphs or other types of figures. Instructions will be provided.

For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. For unusual style or formatting issues, you should consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. For review purposes, citations and references need not be in specific *APSR* format, although some generally accepted format should be used, and all citation and reference information should be provided.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. You are invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your

manuscript. The Editor will refer to this list in selecting reviewers, though there obviously can be no guarantee that those you suggest will actually be chosen. Do not list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it, or any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends.

2. Submit five copies of manuscripts *and* a diskette containing a pdf file of the anonymous version of the manuscript. If you cannot save the manuscript as a pdf, just send in the diskette with the word-processed version. Please ensure that the paper and diskette versions you submit are identical; the diskette version should be of the **anonymous** copy (see below). Please review all pages of all copies to make sure that all copies contain all tables, figures, appendices, and bibliography mentioned in the manuscript and that all pages are legible. Label the diskette clearly with the (first) author's name and the title of the manuscript (in abridged form if need be), and identify the word processing program and operating system.
3. To comply with the *APSR's* procedure of double-blind peer reviews, only one of the five copies submitted should be fully identified as to authorship and four should be in anonymous format.
4. For anonymous copies, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in the list of references. In no circumstances should your prior publications be included in the bibliography in their normal alphabetical location but with your name deleted. Assuming that text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should include full citations as usual in the bibliography. Please discuss the use of other procedures to render manuscripts anonymous with the Editor prior to submission. You should not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information. *All acknowledgments must appear on the title page of the identified copy only.* Manuscripts that are judged not anonymous will not be reviewed.
5. The first page of the four anonymous copies should contain only the title and an abstract of no more than 150 words. The first page of the identified copy should contain (a) the name, academic rank, institutional affiliation, and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all authors; (b) in the case of multiple authors, an indication of the author who will receive correspondence; (c) any relevant citations to your previous work that have been omitted from the anonymous copies; and (d) acknowledgments, including the names of anyone who has provided comments on the manuscript. If the identified copy contains any

unique references or is worded differently in any way, please mark this copy with "Contains author citations" at the top of the first page.

No copies of submitted manuscripts can be returned.

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually "moving wall"), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available on-line through JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/>). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR* and *PS* through the APSA website (www.apsanet.org) with their username and password. Individual non-member access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of both the *APSR* and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datarstar (Datarstar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

BOOK REVIEWS

The *APSR* no longer contains book reviews. As of 2003, book reviews have moved to *Perspectives on Politics*. All books for review should be sent directly to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Susan Bickford and Greg McAvoy. The address is Susan Bickford and Gregory McAvoy, *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Department of Political

Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB No. 3265, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265. E-mail: apsrbook@unc.edu.

If you are the author of a book you wish to be considered for review, please ask your publisher to send a copy to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors per the mailing instructions above. If you are interested in reviewing books for *Perspectives on Politics*, please send your vita to the Book Review Editors; you should not ask to review a specific book.

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association's address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512 (voice), and (202) 483-2657 (fax). E-mail: apsa@apsanet.org. Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*
E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for nonreceipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Elizabeth Weaver Engel,
Director of Member Services
E-mail: membership@apsanet.org

Reprint permissions:
E-mail: reprints@apsanet.org

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,
Cambridge University Press
E-mail: journals_advertising@cup.org

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING APSR AND PS ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small

classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci*; *America, History and Life 1954-*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; Econ-Lit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (www.umi.com). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969-95, is available through the APSA.