

about \$100,000 funding is needed, however, to continue the program next year. David Mares and Sam Kernell at the University of California–San Diego also have a proposal under consideration at the NSF for funding for a Latino summer institute for undergraduates considering graduate study in political science. (The proposal was subsequently turned down by the NSF.)

Michael Brintnall reported on the Minority Identification Project which also is continuing actively and is receiving substantial support from graduate programs and undergraduate faculty.

President-Elect Barker asked if we follow-up and help with mentoring Fellowship students after they enter graduate school, since a number of students often feel very isolated. Woodard replied that we do explore graduate schools to provide such support, but that we do not formally follow-up. Ron Rogowski suggested we compile success stories of mentoring from schools where it does appear to work in order to give ideas to others. Paula McClain suggested documenting the efforts of Jewell Prestage in advancing minority graduate students. Jane Mansbridge said that one idea is to coordinate with other academic departments and other schools within a city to create the critical mass of minority students in order to reduce isolation and build peer support.

### 13. Awards to Recognize Outstanding Teachers

Sheilah Mann conveyed a report from the Education Committee asking that the Council consider establishing awards for outstanding teaching. To allow diversity, the Committee has not proposed strict criteria, but does propose that there be nominations from departments, that the application require a dossier including an essay from the nominee on their teaching philosophy, and that selection be made through committee review analogous to dissertation awards.

In general discussion it was noted that many top teachers couldn't or wouldn't ever write an essay on teaching, that the nominating department could help with the essay, that the dossier could include videotapes or other non-written materials, that as an alternative APSA could publish in *PS* lists of campus teaching award winners rather than selecting our own, that we might consider a competition among teaching oriented papers presented at the Annual Meeting, that absence of a cash award might discourage nominations, and that an APSA award along the lines of the Committee suggestion could help teachers obtain campus advancement and improved compensation.

A sense of the Council was sought, and received a mixed reply, estimated by the President to be about 60-40 supportive versus skeptical.

### 14. Reports Informing the Council of Other Association Business

The reports were reviewed. These included: providing the *Guide to Ethics* to advanced graduate students; activities of the Committee on International Programs; the Comparative Constitutionalism Project; an overview and status report from the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms; *State of the Discipline II*; fields and specializations in political science; memo on demand for new Ph.D.s; the new departmental services program brochure; and the new Graduate Guide.

### 15. Conclusion

The Council concluded its meeting with President-Elect Barker expressing the appreciation of the Council to President Wilson, and to those Council members serving at their last meeting.

## APSA Awards Presented at 1992 Annual Meeting

### DISSERTATION AWARDS

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1990 or 1991 in the field of comparative politics.

*Award Committee:* Mildred A. Schwartz, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chair; John Keeler, University of Washington; Susan Shirk, University of California, San Diego

*Recipient:* Felipe Aguero, Duke University

*Dissertation:* "The Assertion of Civilian Supremacy in Post-Authoritarian Contexts: Spain in Comparative Perspective"

*Dissertation Chair:* Peter Lange

*Citation:* Felipe Aguero's dissertation is an exemplary use of theory and original research. It deepens our understanding of successful transitions to democracy by first demonstrating how Spain's transition was an uncertain one, like others that occurred in the past two decades. As old political institutions unravelled and new ones struggled to become established, the military remained a threatening force, poised to bring the state back to pre-

democratic forms. But because Spain weathered its trials, Aguero is also able to reinforce Spain's reputation as a model state.

To isolate the initial conditions that lead to democratic transformation, Aguero is necessarily comparative, contrasting Spain with other transitional states in Latin America and southern Europe. He sustains a convincing argument by examining the process of political change beyond its initial stages to include the 1981 attempted coup. The research results in isolating those factors that enable civil society to subordinate the military.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1990 or 1991 in the field of intergovernmental relations.

*Award Committee:* Dale Rogers Marshall, Wellesley College, Chair; John Mollenkopf, City of New York Graduate School; Sarah M. Morehouse, University of Connecticut

*Recipient:* Nancy Elizabeth Burns, Harvard University

*Dissertation:* "Making Politics Permanent: The Formation of American Local Governments"

*Dissertation Chair:* Sidney Verba

*Citation:* Nancy Elizabeth Burns' dissertation addresses a subject that is theoretically important but understudied. It asks why Americans created and continue to create cities and special districts in ways that have not happened in other countries and develops an explanation that informs our understanding of local politics and its place in the American political system. The broad-gauged, skillfully designed and executed research says something new and worthwhile that will have an impact on the discipline.

Burns' primary research and analysis uses case studies of the politics of government formations, historical examination of the creation of institutions, and quantitative work on where local governments have formed and have not formed in the U.S. since 1950. Burns' work shows that local governments have been created for many reasons including provision of services, increase in land values, exclusion of unwanted others, and insulation from taxes and problems of older cities. The powers of local governments to issue debt and define citizenship and their level of autonomy have been changed over time by state legislatures, the federal government, technology, and inventive individuals. But throughout their history local governments have had enough autonomy so that fights about their boundaries have

been important and the outcomes have defined a citizenship that is meaningful.

Burns' quantitative analyses of government formations and lack thereof in 200 U.S. counties over the last three and a half decades examine entrepreneurial involvement in government formation, service pressures, taxation worries, and racial variables as factors creating demand for new local governments and also examine constraints on the formation of new governments. The proposition is that the forces that have created new local governments since 1950 are those that shape American local politics. Developers and manufacturers have been the major source of the entrepreneurial resources necessary to the collective action that creates new governments. Citizen support is also necessary, but the benefits citizens seek, such as tax limitations and racial exclusion, are not identical to the entrepreneurs'. The creators of new governments make the founding politics permanent because the institutions persist after they are gone.

The dissertation expands the focus of local politics to encompass the creation of institutions in historical context and not just what happens after they are in place. It also provides an insightful, rich, and sophisticated picture of the changing influence of business, race, taxes, and the states and federal government in local politics and of the limits of local politics in the American political system.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1990 or 1991 in the field of public law.

*Award Committee:* Abigail Thernstrom, Harvard University, Chair; William Lasser, Clemson University; Christopher Wolfe, Marquette University

*Recipient:* Award Not Given

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1990 or 1991 in the field of policy studies. (Supported by the Policy Studies Organization)

*Award Committee:* Robert Kagan, University of California, Berkeley, Chair; Steven E. Rhoads, University of Virginia; Susan Rose-Ackerman, Yale Law School

*Recipient:* Yu-Shan Wu, University of California, Berkeley

*Dissertation:* "Leninist States and Property Rights: The Economic Reform in the PRC"

*Dissertation Chairs:* Chalmers Johnson and Lowell Dittmer

*Citation:* Yu-Shan Wu's brilliant and ambitious study illuminates the politics and problems of economic liberalization in authoritarian, command-economy states. Wu demonstrates that large, structural shifts in economic policy can usefully be viewed in terms of two variables: (1) the degree of state *ownership* of property and (2) the degree of state *control* of the use and disposition of property. Using this property rights framework, he provides a richly detailed yet lucid comparison of shifts toward "market socialism" in the People's Republic of China in the 1980s, the Soviet Union during the 1920s, and Hungary in the 1960s and '70s, along with Taiwan's development of "state capitalism" in the 1950s and '60s. The dissertation explains the political motives that induce authoritarian leaders to move toward "marketization" versus "privatization" of different economic sectors. It yields many fruitful insights into the factors that divert the course of change—political pressures generated by agricultural reform and changing food prices; the biography and resulting ideology of particular leaders; external security concerns and economic constraints. The supporting scholarship is staggering. Overall, Wu teaches us a great deal about the conditions that favor liberalization as well as the troublesome impediments to change. Any student of current attempts to diversify statist economies in Eastern Europe and the Third World, as well as students of China, will read this work with profit.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1990 or 1991 in the field of international relations, law and politics. (Supported by the Helen Dwight Reid Foundation)

*Award Committee:* I. M. Destler, University of Maryland, College Park, Chair; Richard Ned Lebow, Cornell University; Robert Packenham, Stanford University

*Recipient:* Beth A. Simmons, Harvard University

*Dissertation:* "Who Adjusts? Domestic Sources of Foreign Economic Policy During the Interwar Years"

*Dissertation Chair:* Robert Keohane

*Citation:* The Helen Dwight Reid Award Committee had the privilege of reviewing a number of excellent dissertations. Particularly notable were "Theory of Interstate War" by John Arquilla (Stanford) and "The Sovereign State and Its Competitors" by Hendrik Spruyt (University of California, San Diego). Our first choice is Beth A. Simmons' superb work of political economy, which sheds new

light on both the interwar period and the connections between domestic politics and international regimes.

"Who Adjusts?" is a marvelous blend of economic and political analysis. Dr. Simmons builds her study around the "implied norms" of the interwar gold standard regime, which called on nations to maintain their currencies' parity values and to eschew trade protectionism. External balance was to take precedence over the domestic economy, and nations were to "internalize" the costs of external adjustment.

Simmons then sets out to explain why nations defected from these norms when they did. She develops a sophisticated, multivariate model of the current account, in order to control for factors beyond the reach of national governments. She sets forth, and finds appropriate measures for, important political-institutional variables, including the political orientation (left/right) and stability of the government and the independence of the central bank. She tests her hypotheses quantitatively—with data bases including up to 20 countries and over 200 country-years. She also tests them through comparative case studies, carefully selected. Throughout, she shows a consistent sensitivity to historical context.

Her results are striking. She finds little evidence of tit-for-tat behavior in either devaluation or trade policy. She finds consistent relationships between domestic variables and states' foreign economic behavior. For example, stable governments were most likely to follow regime norms and internalize the costs. Regimes of the left were more likely to defect through currency devaluation, those of the right more likely to defect through protectionism. And throughout this period, domestic politics "were making a revolutionary transition from the elite politics of the nineteenth century to the mass politics of the twentieth" (p. 419). This shaped their handling of conflicts between international norms and domestic welfare.

"Who Adjusts? Domestic Sources of Foreign Economic Policy During the Interwar Years" is a landmark study, a real breakthrough in establishing connections between domestic forces and international regimes. Its impact is likely to prove durable.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1990 or 1991 in the field of American government and politics.

*Award Committee:* John E. Jackson, University of Michigan, Chair; Martin Levin, Brandeis University; Irene Rubin, Northern Illinois University

**Recipient: George Douglas Dion**, University of Michigan

**Dissertation:** "Removing the Obstructions: Minority Rights and the Politics of Procedural Change in the Nineteenth Century House of Representatives"

**Dissertation Chair:** John Kingdon

**Citation:** Our nomination for the E. E. Schattschneider Award is George Douglas Dion, for the dissertation titled, "Removing the Obstructions: Minority Rights and the Politics of Procedural Change in the Nineteenth Century House of Representatives."

This is a very important study of the evolution of rules governing the ability of a minority party in the House of Representatives to obstruct the wishes of the majority. Dion argues that efforts at obstruction by the minority party are related to their inability to get amendments passed by the whole House, which in turn is related to the cohesiveness of the majority party. The majority party, anticipating these obstructions, then tries to pass rules limiting the ability of the minority to obstruct legislation. Using formal game theory, Dion develops several propositions about when majority parties are likely to be more cohesive, when the minority is more likely to obstruct, and when there is likely to be rules changes proposed to limit obstruction. Dion provides a very rich historical analysis of rule changes, and the absence of changes, in the House of Representatives between the 1830s and the 1890s to test and illustrate his propositions. This dissertation is an excellent example of how to integrate formal theory and historical analysis to better understand important institutional features of the U.S. political system.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1990 or 1991 in the field of political philosophy.

**Award Committee:** Alan Wertheimer, University of Vermont, Chair; John W. Danford, University of Houston; Charles R. Kesler, Claremont McKenna College

**Recipient: Peter C. Myers**, Loyla University of Chicago

**Dissertation:** "John Locke on the Naturalness of Rights"

**Dissertation Chair:** James L. Wisner

**Citation:** Contemporary liberal political theory may take rights seriously, but it does not take *natural* rights seriously. It has, as Professor Myers suggests, avoided a confrontation with the question of nature. In his ambitious and compelling study, Professor Myers seeks to put

nature back into natural rights. By focusing on the most philosophically self-conscious exponent of a liberal theory of natural rights, Myers concludes that Locke sought to establish the philosophical basis for a middle position between the dogmatic rationalism of scholastic philosophy and the radical conventionalism of early modern thinkers such as Hobbes, a view that would explain what it is about humankind that makes certain rights appropriate.

Professor Myers's study is in the best tradition of Straussian political theory—sympathetic, critical, yet political. He rejects views of Locke as an ideologist or as a theological natural law theorist. Taking Locke's own words seriously, Myers argues that Locke abandons modern nominalism and conventionalism in favor of a deep quasi-Socratic rationalism. Through a patient and meticulous consideration of Locke's epistemology, Myers's Locke believes that we can gain reliable probabilistic knowledge through careful empirical study—knowledge that can establish an empirical and teleological foundation for a doctrine of natural rights. Yet Myers's Locke was also concerned that an elaboration of the grounds of human dignity and natural rights may harm the cause it was intended to serve. In arguing that philosophers should be understood as "under-labourers," rather than as the source of legislation, Locke sought to secure a place for reason, the power of evidence, and rational argumentation, thereby enabling philosophy to help provide the basis for a stable public life. If Myers is right, Locke's actual philosophical break with the premodern tradition of political philosophy is less radical than is often supposed.

This is an exemplary piece of scholarship. The writing is lucid, elegant, and subtle. Myers integrates his mastery of the Lockean texts—both political and epistemological—with pertinent references to pre-modern texts. He demonstrates an impressive knowledge of the secondary literature and is fair and sympathetic to alternative views. This is a significant contribution to our understanding of Locke. The care and thought that Professor Myers has lavished on this study are evident throughout; the fruit of his labors is a remarkably mature piece of work and is eminently deserving of the Leo Strauss Award.

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

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1990 or 1991 in the field of public administration.

**Award Committee:** Willam Gormley, Georgetown University, Chair; R. Shep Melnick, Brandeis University; Toni-

Michelle C. Travis, George Mason University

**Recipient: Bartholomew H. Sparrow**, University of Chicago

**Dissertation:** "From the Outside In: The Effects of World War II on the American State"

**Dissertation Chair:** John Padgett

**Citation:** In this ambitious dissertation, Sparrow uses resource dependency theory to examine the effects of World War II on the development of the American state. The scope of the dissertation, which includes five diverse case studies, is impressive. Sparrow's analysis, which reflects careful attention to several policy arenas, institutions, and historical eras, is thoughtful, scholarly, and incisive.

The central theme of the dissertation is that World War II required the President and Congress to extract resources from society. During the war, the President took the lead in dealing with organized clienteles, such as labor, while the Congress took the lead in dealing with unorganized interests, such as taxpayers. Following the war, this division of labor broke down but many trends triggered by the war persisted.

The dissertation includes some surprising findings. World War II ultimately weakened the American labor movement despite an increase in union membership during the war. In other areas, organized clients did not always fare as well as unorganized groups. For example, navy procurers suffered some setbacks (especially after the war), while investors experienced significant gains.

Above all, the dissertation highlights the advantages of a resource dependency perspective, as opposed to realist and structural perspectives, when trying to understand the effects of a cataclysmic international event, such as a world war. Yet Sparrow is judicious in assessing the relative merits of competing theories. He does not claim more for resource dependency theory than it can sustain.

Although Sparrow does not view the bureaucracy through the lenses of traditional public administration theory, he offers many insights into the management choices made by Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman in labor relations, social security, navy procurement, debt financing, and taxation. A patient reader learns a great deal about the constraints that face presidents when they use the bureaucracy to extract resources from society.

At the same time, Sparrow demonstrates to structuralists the necessity of treating political institutions as both agents and objects of change. In this respect, he makes a significant contribu-

tion not just to our understanding of executive behavior during World War II but, more broadly, to our understanding of how political institutions adapt to crises, how those adaptations vary across policy arenas, and how those adaptations ultimately become absorbed into a new political system.

#### PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

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

For the best paper presented at the 1991 Annual Meeting. (Supported by Pi Sigma Alpha)

*Award Committee:* John McAdams, Marquette University, Chair; Barbara Geddes, University of California, Los Angeles; Stephen G. Salkever, Bryn Mawr College

*Recipient:* **Edgar Kiser**, University of Washington

*Paper:* "Markets and Hierarchies in Early Modern Fiscal Systems: A Principal-Agent Analysis of the Choice Between Tax Farming and State Bureaucracy"

*Citation:* The Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha award is this year given to Edgar Kiser of the University of Washington for his paper "Markets and Hierarchies in Early Modern Fiscal Systems: A Principal-Agent Analysis of the Choice Between Tax Farming and State Bureaucracy." The issue—when do states operate through the private sector and when do they operate through their own bureaucratic hierarchies—is one whose importance will be obvious to anyone with even a passing familiarity with the work of Max Weber, as well as to those interested in the much more recent literature on "state capacity." Current events have shown that the size and scope of state bureaucracy can contract as well as expand—and make clear the continued importance of the question Kiser addresses.

The paper is characterized by a clear, coherent, and theoretically interesting argument, scrupulous delineation of the differences between his own and competing theories, and a serious effort to test the theory with evidence from the historical record. In contrast to existing theories that stress the role of transactions costs in the decision of rulers to establish tax collection bureaucracies, Kiser uses principal-agent theory. Rulers (the principals) and tax collectors (the agents) had very different interests, and rulers faced the continuing problem of how to structure incentives so that the tax collectors would serve their (the rulers) interests. This perspective has implications both for how rulers will choose to collect

different kinds of taxes, and for how the preferred mode of collection will change over time. Kiser clearly outlines what these implications are and provides an impressive case, based on the historical record, for the superiority of his perspective.

This, in short, is an exemplary application of social science methodology to an important issue.

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

For the best article published in *The American Political Science Review* during 1991.

*Award Committee:* Margaret P. Karns, University of Dayton, Chair; Robert Katzmann, Brookings Institution; Jonathan Bendor, Stanford University; Arlene Saxonhouse, University of Michigan

*Recipients:* **Stuart Elaine MacDonald**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; **Ola Listhaug**, University of Trondheim, Norway; and **George Rabinowitz**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

*Article:* "Issues and Party Support in Multiparty Systems"

*Citation:* For more than thirty years, analysis of democratic political systems has been dominated by the Downsian (1957) theory linking mass issue preferences, party choice, and public policy. Stuart Elaine MacDonald, Ola Listhaug, and George Rabinowitz in their article, "Issues and Party Support in Multiparty Systems," challenge the proximity-based spatial model by applying their directional theory to a multiparty system. Where the theory may have intrigued Americanists in its earlier articulation (1989) and application to American survey data, it now will command the attention of comparativists. Using 1989 survey data from Norway—the first data collected in a multiparty system on both respondent (mass) and party positions on a variety of issues—MacDonald et al. conclude that issues *are* important in electoral politics, but in ways different than has long been thought. The result is a highly readable and significant challenge to an important theory.

Two elements distinguish directional theory: the differentiation in intensity of both parties; and voters' positions on issues and voters' evaluation of parties' responsibility, i.e., their perceived ability to function effectively in government. Yet, the result is not a tendency toward the center. A centrist position does not count and alone will not win voter support. As they note, "the center is not a position of advocacy; it is a neutral zone of indifference between the two issue alternatives. . . . There are simply no

rewards for hugging the center." A party, then must be perceived to be non-centrist on at least one issue to win support. The consequence of their findings, however, is that parties must also be perceived as effective or responsible for voters are choosing not only issue position but whether they can trust the party to be effective in advocating that position in government, in the processes by which politics resolves social conflict and determines policy.

The selection committee noted that this article is part of an ongoing research program, and represents a crucial step in demonstrating the applicability of the authors' directional theory to democratic political systems other than that of the United States. We commend MacDonald, Listhaug, and Rabinowitz for their careful work and anticipate that it will not only be followed by further elaboration on their part but cited and tested by many others in both the American and comparative fields of the discipline.

#### BOOK AWARDS

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

For the best scholarly work in political science published in 1991 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Award Committee:* John Garcia, University of Arizona, Chair; Peter Skerry, University of California, Los Angeles, Byran Jackson, California State University

*Recipient:* **Donald L. Horowitz**, Duke University

*Book:* *A Democratic South Africa? Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society*, published by the University of California Press

*Citation:* It is entirely fitting that this splendid book about the prospects for democracy in South Africa by an American scholar of racial and ethnic conflict be given an award named after Ralph Bunche, an American scholar whose career is synonymous with efforts to aid the transition from colonial to post-colonial regimes in Africa and throughout the world. As Donald Horowitz's subtitle suggests, his book is an exercise in social-scientific "engineering" in the highest and best sense of that frequently maligned phrase: a thoughtful application of social-science knowledge to a practical problem that seeks not to lay down precise dicta but rather to enlighten and clarify the likely choices facing political actors. With his encyclopedic knowledge of ethnic and racial conflict around the globe, Horowitz offers, with great elegance and economy, an analysis of the institutional arrangements that present the

most hope of fostering a multi-racial democracy in South Africa. From this confluence of analytic rigor and political realism emerges hope—a result that ought to inspire politicians and political scientists alike.

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

For the best political science publication in 1991 in the field of U.S. national policy.

*Award Committee:* Lorn Foster, Pomona College, Chair; Benjamin Walter, Vanderbilt University; Elizabeth Sanders, New School for Social Research

*Recipients:* **D. Roderick Kiewiet**, California Institute of Technology; and **Mathew D. McCubbins**, University of California, San Diego

*Book:* *The Logic of Delegation: Congressional Parties and the Appropriations Process*, published by the University of Chicago Press

*Citation:* Kiewiet and McCubbins have challenged the conventional wisdom and made a convincing argument that political parties have not relinquished decision-making authority to congressional committees and subcommittees. Kiewiet and McCubbins' thesis is that Congress reflects the policy preferences of the majority party in the appropriations process. The majority party, in this case the Democrats, have delegated power to the committees and not abdicated power.

Unwilling to rest sweeping conclusions on tissues of anecdotes, *The Logic of Delegation* invites all political scientists and commentators to examine that thesis. Using an elegantly stated version of principle-agent theory, Kiewiet and McCubbins show that congressional parties do a surprisingly effective job of delegating and monitoring authority to standing committees, and that Republican and Democratic representatives do differ in particular policy choices and ultimately in the role they conceive for government in contemporary society.

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

For the best book published in 1991 on women and politics.

*Award Committee:* Mary Cornelia Porter, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Chair; Barbara Sinclair, University of California, Riverside; Eloise A. Buker, University of Utah

*Recipient:* **Nancie Caraway**, American University

*Book:* *Segregated Sisterhood: Racism and the Politics of American Feminism*, published by the University of Tennessee Press

*Recipient:* **Anne Phillips**, City of London Polytechnic

*Book:* *Engendering Democracy*, University of Pennsylvania State Press

*Citation:* Nancy Caraway's book, *Segregated Sisterhood: Racism and the Politics of American Feminism* offers a fresh and important contribution to women and politics by articulating a political theory of racism and sexism. Blending post-modern and materialist analyses, she draws on the thought of women of color with a special emphasis on Black feminism. This enables her to render a deep analysis of the history of racism in the United States women's movement and its consequences for today's politics. Weaving into the analysis her own personal narratives, she shows us how white feminists can reflect on racism from their own perspective while engaging the work of women of color in a genuinely critical way.

The book includes chapters on the racism in the 19th century women's movement, a critical review of white standards of femininity and beauty, discussions of the contributions of Black women and women of color to feminism, and a proposal for a cross-over dream that replaces old notions of sisterhood with a new politics of solidarity that maintains the importance of difference.

Caraway's book demonstrates how contemporary political theories that emphasize the connection between theory and practice can be used to illuminate the fundamental issues of racism and sexism in American political life. Enabling political theory to speak to reforming politics, she offers her readers an open and imaginative narrative that yields a clear analysis for undergraduates and an inspiring one to mature scholars. She shows how notions of community have smothered over differences and participated in the exacerbation of racism and sexism. But her politics is not one of despair. Throughout her text she invites her reader into active political life and serious political thought. She concludes by urging us to make a commitment to a multicultural feminist politics that involves us in daily politics. This book will not only challenge political theorists to reflect on how their own work can find energy in personal reflections as well as rigorous analyses, but it will open up a new discourse in political theory that directly concerns itself with the ways in which racism and sexism have shaped public life. In the tradition of women and politics, this book addresses a wide audience, uses the best of contemporary scholarship to understand gender, and shows us how we can engage in a politics that moves us closer to justice by putting sexism out of business.

*Citation:* In a sense, This book represents an intellectual odyssey. Professor Phillips acknowledges that at one time she questioned the compatibility of liberal democracy, both in theory and practice, with feminist concerns. Now, in the aptly titled *Engendering Democracy* she argues that "despite its poor record, liberal democracy may not be as antagonistic to women as previous evidence had seemed to show."

To make the point that feminist agendas and liberal democracy may be mutually reinforcing, Phillips primarily draws upon, critiques, and skillfully weaves together the literature of liberal, republican and participatory democracy on the one hand with the tenets of feminism and the often contentious schools of feminist political thought on the other. Secondly, she assesses, from a comparative perspective, mechanisms of political participation, representation and accountability intended to empower the historically powerless and/or under-represented. As illustration, she focuses on the salutary effects of the growing political equality of Scandinavian women. Along the way, she raises searching questions about the relationship between women as representatives and the representation of women's interests. Throughout, and with great appreciation for the feminist discernment of the "personal" as "political," she draws serviceable lines, based on circumstances, between the public and the private realms.

Simply put, which does not do justice to her eclectically informative, richly textured, and sophisticated presentation, it is Phillips's thesis that the insights and experiences of feminist political movements may be built upon not only to "reorder the relationship between public and private spheres," but, and this is crucial, to empower the widest spectrum of groups and interests, thereby expanding the meaning and promises of liberal democracy.

Phillips makes her case in a succinct (under two-hundred pages) work that is written in clear, brisk, matter-of-fact, and engaging prose. ("Until recently, no feminist in her right mind would have thought that democracy could deliver the goods." "One of the difficulties in coming to terms with liberal democracy is that those who challenge a consensus generally get the cleverest lines, while those who defend what is taken for granted slide into common-sense argument and fall down on intellectual appeal." "The way our private lives are organized promotes male involvement and reduces female participation. Who collects the children and who makes the tea is a vital political concern." "My own vision of a desirable future is in fact unfashionably androgynous. But it is one thing to wish for this

future and another to wish differences away.”)

Phillips' hopeful and eminently sensible prescription for employing the lessons and accomplishments of women's movements in democratic regimes and "the arguments now raging in feminist circles" to "improve what we have" has appeal for many audiences. It appears in what is termed in the United States as "The Year of the Woman," when increasing numbers of women are entering public life, and are, moreover, viewed as *the* agents of political change. It stands as a testimonial to and inspiration for once and future participants in the cause of feminism—wherever in the world they may be found.

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

For the best book published during 1991 on government, politics or international affairs. (Supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation)

*Award Committee:* Harvey M. Sapolsky, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chair; David Vogel, University of California, Berkeley; Kathleen Frankovic, CBS News

*Recipients:* Paul M. Sniderman, Stanford University; Richard A. Brody, Stanford University; and Philip E. Tetlock, University of California, Berkeley

*Book: Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, published by Cambridge University Press

*Citation:* Our choice for the 1992 Woodrow Wilson Award is *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, published by Cambridge University Press and coauthored by Paul M. Sniderman, Richard A. Brody, and Philip E. Tetlock, with the acknowledged participation of 15 others. This near communal effort advances our understanding of how the public, which to a large extent is disinterested and ill-informed about political affairs, reasons about its many political choices. The book does so by both reporting new and reworking familiar data, often in very innovative ways. The result is a theoretically rich book filled with counterintuitive findings that helps set a persuasive agenda for future thinking about politics.

In *Reasoning and Choice* we learn that the public compensates for its lack of knowledge about political issues by relying on readily accessible clues, but that the selection of clues and their linkage vary greatly by educational level. Affecting opinions in addition, the authors argue, are situational factors that must be considered to understand the dynamics of political reasoning. They probe these fac-

tors in ingenious experiments, revealing for us the surprising prejudices of liberals and conservatives. Surprising also is the coherence of a book that involves so many contributors and that is so ambitious in scope. It is quite an achievement.

#### CAREER AWARDS

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

The John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer is to honor the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration.

*Award Committee:* Frank J. Thompson, State University of New York at Albany, Chair; Beverly A. Cigler, Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg; Francis E. Rourke, Johns Hopkins University

*Recipient:* Martha Derthick, University of Virginia

*Citation:* Spurred by Max Weber's warning, political scientists have long questioned whether public bureaucracy can be kept safe for democracy. Can elected officials exert sufficient control over the vast administrative apparatus of the contemporary state? By the end of the 1980s, a growing body of empirical work (especially that focused on the federal government) indicated that the President, Congress and the courts have in fact achieved substantial leverage over public agencies.

As concerns about keeping bureaucracy safe for democracy have diminished, however, concerns about keeping administrative agencies competent for democracy have grown. Can American public administration overcome potent political forces that threaten to erode the capacity and performance of public agencies and programs? It is this question that the scholarly work of Martha Derthick has addressed in such compelling fashion.

Derthick's scholarship radiates with appreciation for the way in which American political institutions shape the dynamics and outcomes of policy and administrative processes. Some of her most insightful publications, including *Policymaking for Social Security* and *The Politics of Deregulation*, have probed cases of broad policy change. Another significant stream of her writing focuses more specifically on issues of policy implementation and administration. Whatever the focus, her work consistently enlarges understanding of the role played by public agencies in the policy process. Her powerful general observations are all the more impressive because she grounds them in sophisti-

cated, qualitative analysis of carefully selected, important cases.

Nine books as well as numerous journal articles and book chapters contain Derthick's insights. The Brookings Institution published five of these volumes, a circumstance that partly reflects the 12 years she spent with this think tank. From this and related vantage points at Harvard, Boston College, and Virginia, she has enlightened us about the relationships among political institutions, policy processes, and administration.

Derthick argues that "the setting in which public agencies must do their work . . . is not auspicious for them." In fact, "the most cherished structural features of American government pose obstacles to good administration" (*Agency Under Stress*, Brookings, pp. 4, 226).

In this vein, much of Derthick's work speaks to issues of implementing programs through a federal system. Her book, *The Influence of Federal Grants* (Harvard Press, 1970) deftly dissects the subtle politics of "cooperative federalism" as manifested in the implementation of the public assistance program in Massachusetts. This volume casts much light on the potential and the limits of federal grants as a tool for accomplishing public ends. Her landmark study, *New Towns In-Town* (Urban Institute, 1972), focuses on the Johnson Administration's abortive attempt to create model communities on federally owned lands in metropolitan areas. Lacking both knowledge of local politics in the targeted communities and an adequate supply of incentives for local players, federal officials could not influence local governments to act in ways conducive to program success.

Derthick's most recent book, *Agency Under Stress* (1990) expands and crystallizes her view of the predicament of public administration. Assessing two episodes in which the Social Security Administration sought to implement changes in the Supplemental Security Income program, Derthick diagnoses a plethora of problems rooted in the American political context. She observes, for instance, that the different branches of government frequently expose agencies to sharply conflicting expectations, ask them to do more without providing adequate resources, and blame agencies rather than help them. Above all, top policymakers evince a persistent lack of concern for administration in their deliberations. Issues of administrative capacity and feasibility receive minimal attention in the policy process. Ultimately, "the default of the President, who is the agencies' putative leader, combines with the assertiveness of Congress and the courts to make administrative agencies the fallguys

of American government. As every institution's subordinate, they are obliged to answer to each and are permitted to talk back to none." Hence, Derthick concludes, American government is filled with "agencies under stress" (pp. 4, 181).

The challenge to competent administration posed by the institutions and dynamics of American government belongs on center stage in the study of public policy and administration. We owe a huge debt to Martha Derthick for having done so much to place it there and for having beamed her very bright spotlight on this challenge. John Gaus could not have asked for more.

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

Presented each year in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

*Award Committee:* Daniel Patrick Moynihan, United States Senate, Chair; Martha Derthick, University of Virginia; James L. Sundquist, The Brookings Institution

*Recipient:* Richard Cheney, Secretary of Defense

*Citation:* Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney may well be the American Political Science Association's proudest example of what an APSA Congressional Fellowship can lead to. Coming as a Fellow to Washington in 1968 from the University of Wisconsin at the all-but-dissertation stage of his graduate studies, he was drafted into full-time public service—and has been there virtually ever since, rising from one to another post of ever-increasing responsibility in both appointive and elective office.

Beginning his public service career as a congressional staff member, he switched to the executive branch as assistant to the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, moved to the White House as deputy to the counselor to the President, then back to administration as assistant director of the Cost of Living Council. He left the Nixon administration just as it was falling into disrepute over the Watergate scandal, but President Ford drafted him back into the White House in 1974, ultimately naming him as his chief of staff.

When President Ford retired, Dick Cheney entered elective politics, winning Wyoming's only congressional seat in 1978. Within two years, he was elected by his party colleagues as chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, which placed him on the Republican leadership ladder with a bright prospect of rising to the top. However, at the outset of the Bush administration, the president plucked him from the Congress to be

Secretary of Defense.

Dick Cheney assumed his post at a historic time. During his tenure, the Soviet Union and the communist bloc that threatened Europe fell apart, the Cold War came to an end, and the United States, with allied forces, drove Iraq out of Kuwait. To Secretary Cheney fell the arduous responsibility of planning and directing the reversal of the Cold War buildup of the armed forces, scaling them down to accord with the reduced threat, lowered appropriations, and heavy pressure for further cuts.

In each of his appointive and elective posts, he has discharged his duties with integrity, dedication, distinction, and success.

#### Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

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

*Award Committee:* Suzanne Garment, American Enterprise Institute, Chair; S. Robert Lichter, Center for Media and Public Affairs; Nelson W. Polsby, University of California, Berkeley

*Recipient:* Michael Barone, *U.S. News and World Report*

*Citation:* Michael Barone has made a distinguished journalistic career of helping his fellow citizens understand and appreciate American politics in all its concreteness and diversity. In doing so, he has also provided political scientists with new tools and information for the study of this country's political process.

As a college undergraduate, Mr. Barone entered the field of journalism by working as an editor of the Harvard *Crimson*. After college he became a lawyer as well, and following law school he served as a clerk to a federal Circuit Court judge. Along the way, Mr. Barone started engaging in practical politics, participating in many campaigns in his home state of Michigan and elsewhere.

In 1972 he decided to share some of his experience with others. Together with Grant Ujifusa and Douglas Matthews, Mr. Barone produced the first edition of the *Almanac of American Politics*. From many sources the authors gathered together a great array of information about how American politics, especially congressional politics, actually works.

A reader of the *Almanac* could, for the first time, readily find out the basic biographical facts about every Senator and Representative, his or her committees and their significance, the legislator's voting record as revealed by key votes and ratings from various groups, the demographic, economic, and ethnic features of his or her area, and more, with all these

data accompanied by the authors' notably balanced explanatory essays.

The *Almanac* made it much easier for political scientists to use this information and share it with students. The book gave us a closer look at the special character of each and every congressional district. Mr. Barone filled in our political maps of America with living, breathing interests, social forces, historical quirks, and real people.

The *Almanac* also taught a lesson by demonstrating the diversity and complexity of both this country and the mechanisms through which we manage, improbably, to reconcile its varied attitudes and desires. This emphasis was useful to citizens as a whole and especially to the sometimes-forgetful members of the political science profession.

Since 1972 the *Almanac*, published biannually, has kept to its task, speaking sensibly and carefully through two of the most wrenching and eventful decades in American political history.

Mr. Barone has shown the same care and the same protean sympathy for American democratic politics in his other activities—as vice president of the polling firm Peter D. Hart Research Associates, as an editorial writer for *The Washington Post*, and now as a senior writer for *U.S. News and World Report*. He has recently published a fitting companion to the *Almanac* in his book *Our Country: The Shaping of America from Roosevelt to Reagan*. Instead of offering the *Almanac*'s cross-sections, *Our Country* proceeds longitudinally, describing the persistent forces that have bound our politics together for the past sixty years. In an era as acutely aware as ours of the cleavages that rend this country, Mr. Barone has once again provided political scientists with a necessary reminder of the things that unite us.

## APSA Publications List

\*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, add \$1.50 postage or \$3 overseas; \$80 per volume, add \$5 postage or \$10 overseas.