

## Notes from the Editor

The *American Political Science Review* depends on the kindness of strangers—most conspicuously, on the good will of those to whom we turn for evaluations of the papers that are submitted to us. Although we have little to offer in return, we do what we can to repay this kindness by sending each reviewer an individual thank-you letter along with copies of my decision letter and the other reviews of the paper. Once a year, too, we provide a little extra recognition by printing the names of the hundreds of reviewers, from every part of our discipline and from many neighboring disciplines and interdisciplinary fields as well, who have voluntarily contributed their time and expertise. This year's list, which appears elsewhere in this issue, recognizes those who reviewed for the *APSR* between mid-August, 2002 and mid-August, 2003. *Sine qua non*.

Some sense of the scope of our operation can be gleaned by browsing through this year's list, as I hope you will take a few moments to do in a spirit of appreciation to those named there. If your name appears on the list, please give yourself a well-deserved pat on the back. If the list doesn't contain the name of someone who should be reviewing for the *APSR*, including yourself, please let us know, as we are always looking to expand our list of reviewers.

Reviewing papers for the *APSR* and other journals not only constitutes an invaluable, if vastly underappreciated, form of professional service, but also can be a valuable learning experience for reviewers. Increasingly, though, reviewing for journals is coming to be regarded as a burden by scholars who are being asked to provide so many such reviews each year that they fear that their own research program will suffer as a consequence. In part such concern reflects the growth of our discipline, the proliferation of journals, and the increasing emphasis on productive research scholarship. In part, too, it reflects the more rapid tempo of the review process, as compared to the leisurely pace that was commonplace not all that long ago. In any event, more and more papers are circulating, and they are circulating faster than ever before. Because each paper goes out to multiple reviewers, a prolific researcher can keep a lot of reviewers busy. Someone who submits, say, three papers to journals in a year, has each of them rejected, and then sends each of them back out to a different journal would single-handedly be responsible for the commissioning of eighteen reviews. Of course, not everyone produces three new papers in a year. Even so, the example is hardly far-fetched, and it illustrates what editors and reviewers alike are increasingly coming up against: a growing problem for which no good solution is yet in sight but one to which greater attention is going to have to be devoted in the future.

The *APSR* has been anything but immune to these trends. As noted a year ago in my first annual editorial report, our total number of submissions rose an unprecedented 55% during 2001–2002 over the preceding

year. It was unclear at the time whether this was a one-time-only phenomenon or not, but now it is clear: It was not. Our submissions showed no signs of abating during 2002–2003. Indeed, they rose again, though thankfully not by nearly as much as in the preceding year: They were up by 9% over their record-setting 2001–2002 level. Although I would have been disappointed if submissions had fallen off substantially, I would have been distressed if they had continued to grow at the meteoric rate of the previous year, for we simply could not have handled such a huge additional manuscript load. We were able to handle the extra 9%; as evidence thereof, I can report that during 2002–2003 the median turnaround time from the day a paper arrived in our office until the day my decision letter went into the mail held steady at 39 working days. For sustaining that performance, I am pleased to acknowledge again the performance of the reviewers whose names are listed in this issue.

### IN THIS ISSUE

The cover of each issue of the *APSR* is a striking graphic that is keyed to the theme of the first article in the issue. Our two most recent covers were, in turn, depressing (the face of a trauma victim, symbolizing Hazem Adam Ghobareh, Paul Huth, and Bruce Russett's "Civil Wars Kill and Maim People—Long After the Shooting Stops" in our May issue) and frightening (a terrorist, signifying Robert Pape's "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism" in our August issue). Thus, it seemed highly appropriate to lighten up a bit on this issue's cover, which represents Clarissa Rile Hayward's "The Difference States Make: Democracy, Identity, and the American City." Probing issues associated with race in the American city, Hayward asks, "How should democrats treat difference?" Her answer is that issues of difference can be managed and structured by the democratic state in a manner that remains faithful to the norms of democracy. Indeed, rather than simply reacting to difference once it has been produced, the state can participate creatively and democratically in a continuous re-definition of difference.

The concept of difference obviously underlies the notion of representation, the subject of the second article in this issue. In "Rethinking Representation," Jane Mansbridge challenges readers to think beyond the familiar, "promissory" form of American representation, which links representative and voter in a principal-agent relationship that requires accountability. Other, albeit less familiar, forms of representation abound, however, and three such forms—anticipatory, gyroscopic, and surrogate—frame the voter-representative relationship as prudential, predictable, and parallel, respectively. With each model come different criteria for legitimacy. Mansbridge's consideration of these options

is certain to broaden readers' perspectives on what constitutes good representation and why.

A key assumption underlying democratic governance is that the ground rules should be, and/or are, applied equally to all. In another consideration of the difference that differences make, Mary Hawkesworth challenges that assumption. "Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions," Hawkesworth's investigation of the treatment of minority and female members of Congress, provides evidence that for black and female legislators, standing rules and common respect are subverted by Democrats and Republicans alike.

The focus of this issue then turns to matters of method. According to Paul McDonald, when political scientists debate the benefits and the limitations of rational choice theory, they give unduly short shrift to epistemological assumptions—to the detriment of the debate. McDonald argues in "Useful Fiction or Miracle Maker: The Competing Epistemological Foundations of Rational Choice Theory" that advocates of rational choice fall into either the instrumentalist-empiricist or the scientific-realist camp. Highlighting epistemological differences among rational choice practitioners serves three important purposes: it provides a common language in which to discuss debates within rational choice, it enhances the ability to provide a coherent defense of rational choice to its critics, and it defines a collective standard for assessing whether rational choice can serve as a "grand unified theory" for political science.

This methodological focus is sustained by Gary King, Christopher J.L. Murray, Joshua Salomon, and Ajay Tandon in "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research." Measurement would seem to presuppose a shared universe of discourse, for unless there is some common understanding of what an underlying concept means, how can there be any assurance that what is being measured is really "the same thing"? What, then, are survey researchers to do if different people have their own "yardstick" when it comes to responding to their questions? This problem stems from individual and cultural differences between respondents, especially when intangibles like "freedom," "health," and "trust" are under consideration. King and his colleagues describe a method designed to subtract out such individual and cultural biases and thereby to enable consistent cross-cultural measurement of important concepts of interest—a method that will surely be of widespread interest to researchers in various subfields of political science and several other disciplines as well.

The four remaining articles in this issue all put the spotlight on international politics. The past decade has witnessed an explosion of research on the "democratic peace," and no end seems yet to be in sight of new studies refuting, modifying, replicating, or extending previously reported conclusions about the connection between democracy and peace. This debate has largely been conducted at the level of dueling data sets, operationalizations, specifications, and techniques. That is,

fueling the debate have been ongoing disagreements concerning the soundness of empirical findings. But what about the theoretical foundations of the democratic peace thesis? Is the underlying logic sound? Sebastian Rosato answers that question emphatically in the negative. Sifting through the causal linkages of the various versions of the theory, Rosato skewers "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory" in a contribution that seems sure to stir controversy and may turn attention from the empirical back to the theoretical dimensions of the debate.

Although the idea of state sovereignty has lost ground with the onset of globalization, the operation of migration-terrorism and the ability of sleeper cells to branch out across national boundaries, the significance of the state as a political agent has been renewed in the post-September 11 world. Examining the various security environments of the United States and Europe since 1945, Christopher Rudolph argues in "Security and the Political Economy of International Migration" that changing ideas of national interest and security in relation to international migration and border control policies require the presence of the state as the only political agent that has the ability to alleviate domestic insecurities.

Finally (and, it seems, inevitably), the attention of students of international politics turns to war. Wars are, among many other things, expensive. They are so expensive, in fact, that nations often conduct elaborate cost-benefit analyses to determine whether a prospective conflict would be worth the loss of blood and treasure. As William Reed notes in "Information, Power and War," however, often little information is available on which to base such analyses. The availability of such information, Reed argues, depends on the balance of power. As nations approach power parity, they know the least about the prospective worth of conflict. Fueled by uncertainty, war is more likely in periods of power transition and multipolarity. Therefore, either to predict or to avoid war, it is necessary to evaluate distributions of information as well as power.

When two states start a war, they both seek to win. But when does one agree to lose? In "The Principle of Convergence in Wartime Negotiations," Branislav L. Slantchev develops a model that allows for simultaneous learning on and off the battlefield. During a war, a state learns about its opponents via diplomatic negotiations and military outcomes. The "fog of war" may cloud a state's understanding of its relative position in a conflict, but each side still learns about its opponent through strategic bargaining in the context of battle outcomes. The goal of each is to avoid settling prematurely on terms worse than it might get in the future, so each waits and learns from the outcomes of its battles and from the other side's responses to those outcomes. By developing a model that incorporates all these processes, Slantchev finds that peace does not emerge from war until the combatants "converge" on a place and time where each knows enough about the other to recognize a reasonable peace treaty.

## 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](mailto: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](http://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: Datastar (Datastar), 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: [bookreviews@unc.edu](mailto:bookreviews@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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:membership@apsanet.org)

Reprint permissions:  
E-mail: [reprints@apsanet.org](mailto:reprints@apsanet.org)

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,  
Cambridge University Press  
E-mail: [journals.advertising@cup.org](mailto: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](http://www.umi.com)). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969–95, is available through the APSA.