

**Program Chairs:** Jennifer Hochschild, Department of Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544; (609) 258-5634; (609) 258-2809 (fax); hochschi@www.princeton.edu; or Ronald Rogowski, CFIA, Harvard University, 1737 Cambridge St., Cambridge, MA 02138; (617) 495-5107; (617) 495-8292 (fax); rogowski@nicco.sscnet.ucla.edu

## INEQUALITY AND POLITICS

**Division 1. Inequality and Politics.** Jennifer Hochschild, Department of Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544; (609) 258-5634; (609) 258-2809 (fax); hochschi@www.princeton.edu; or Ronald Rogowski, CFIA, Harvard University, 1737 Cambridge St., Cambridge, MA 02138; (617) 495-5107; (617) 495-8292 (fax); rogowski@nicco.sscnet.ucla.edu

Inequality -- of income, of power, of participation -- persists and in many cases increases, within and between nations. Beginning in the 1970's, most of the advanced economies experienced "wage dispersion," an expanding gap between the earnings of skilled and unskilled workers. While some of the less developed economies have grown with spectacular rapidity, others -- particularly in sub-Saharan Africa -- have become steadily poorer; and some have suggested that precisely the countries with the most glaring internal inequalities find growth hardest to achieve. In all countries, it is argued, increasing mobility of capital weakens labor and inhibits governmental redistribution; and increasing mobility of labor attracts anti-immigrant, or outright racist, sentiment and action.

Within the United States, many of the instruments and policies employed since the 1960's to lessen racial and gender inequalities (school integration, affirmative action, Justice Department oversight of electoral districting) have come under attack either for their premises or for their results. In many other areas of the world, most notably Africa and Southeastern Europe, renewed and intensified ethnic and religious conflict widens discrimination and inequality between ascriptive groups.

At the level of international relations, the collapse of the Soviet bloc has left the United States as the only superpower and has removed from many smaller states the "leverage" that US-Soviet rivalry once afforded them. The simultaneous growth of large

trade blocs (NAFTA, the European Union) and splintering of previously multi-ethnic states (the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, perhaps Canada) means that states, too, have become more unequal in size and power.

Political philosophers and theorists are as preoccupied with the issue of inequality in politics as are political actors. Political philosophy traditionally did not assume that inequality was necessarily bad and did assume that some inequalities were right and proper. Liberal philosophers generally challenged those assumptions, but support for certain types of inequality is making a comeback. Furthermore, what counts as an important form of inequality in changing -- most simply but not solely from a focus on class, at the expense of gender and racial or ethnic identity, to a focus on identity at the expense of economics. Philosophers and theorist also contest the very meaning of inequality: among feminist or queer theorists, for example, former concerns about discrimination have in some cases been transformed into celebrations of difference.

Do any overarching theories explain, any policy research offer remedies for, any normative approaches suggest how to assess, these trends? Does wage dispersion increase because of economic "globalization," technical innovation, or failures in education? What (as recent controversy has asked anew) is the relative importance of "nature" as against "nurture" in accounting for inequality? In the international arena and in regional blocs, can units of diverse size and power co-exist? And what policy answers, if any, flow from the alternative answers to these questions? What forms of inequality should political analysts and actors endorse, deplore, or ignore? How should inequality be measured, and how do our normative judgements about inequality affect or measurement and analysis of it? How, if at all, does the power to affect inequality influence how one judges it?

Surely students of politics, along with other social scientists, are called to offer answers to these pressing concerns. We invite panels and papers, and will offer plenary sessions and roundtables, that address them from economic and sociological, domestic and international, legal and behavioral, normative and empirical, approaches. We will particularly welcome efforts to nurture interdisciplinary inquiry. Prospective proposers are cordially invited to approach the co-chairs informally with their questions and ideas.

**Division 2. Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches.** Deborah Baumgold, Department of Political Science 1284, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1284; (503) 346-4884 or (503) 346-4866; (503) 346-4860 (fax) [indicate

department]; baumgold@oregon.uoregon.edu

Inequality has a different resonance in the history of political thought than elsewhere in the study of politics. In the late twentieth century, we assume inequality is a problem, but through most of the history of political thought it was taken for granted and, in one guise or another, celebrated. Does this shift in values render pre-modern theory irrelevant--even hostile--to contemporary inquiry? Or, is the shift in attitudes more apparent than real? In short, what can theories that treat inequality as a good contribute to our thinking? Perennial questions about the relevance of the history of political thought are particularly acute with respect to the subject of inequality. These questions can be addressed, directly or indirectly, by papers on a variety of topics. I would particularly welcome proposals for panels or roundtables that encourage critical discussion by including divergent points of view. These might focus, for example, on work of a single theorist, and include interpretations critical of inegalitarian features of the work as well as interpretations locating these in historical context.

One way in which the history of political thought can inform our thinking is by elucidating various conceptions and dimensions of inequality. Papers might focus on the conceptualization of inequality in a particular theory or tradition (republican, liberal, etc.); treat the history of a specific concept; or examine some type or dimension of inequality (e. g., citizenship, virtue). How is inequality defined? How are legitimate inequalities distinguished from illegitimate ones? How does "inequality" differ from--and relate to--other concepts of social division and diversity? Are the sources of inequality structural or is inequality seen as a product of differences among individuals and groups? Papers might address the relationship between these questions and other, core principles of a theory or tradition.

Since inequality can enter into political theory in the shape of theoretical principles and/or empirical assumptions, the subject invites consideration of the relationship between "is" and "ought." How do the "facts" of inequality impact ideas about what is possible and desirable in political practice and, vice-versa, how do inegalitarian principles shape accounts of the facts? Empirical assumptions concern illegitimate as well as legitimate inequalities: papers might address the impact of what are perceived to be illegitimate inequalities on other theoretical values and principles.

These suggestions by no means exhaust the range of topics relevant to the theme of "Inequality and Politics" nor do they touch on the variety of other subjects of interest in the historical division. I would like to encourage proposals for (1) sharply-focused panels and/or (2) roundtables or panels that

incorporate diverse approaches.

**Division 3. Normative Political Theory.** Alan Wertheimer, Department of Political Science, P.O. Box 54110, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405-4110; (802) 656-4318; (802) 656-0758 (fax); awerthei@moose.uvm.edu

After several years of important and continuing debate about political liberalism (which, among other issues, I hope to continue at this conference), this year's theme, "Inequality and Politics," provides an opportunity to put distributional issues at the center of our discussions. Although I welcome proposals on the full range of issues in normative political theory, preference will be given to proposals that focus on this year's theme.

Here are some possibilities, although I have no illusions about the causal efficacy of such suggestions. We should ask, among other things, whether and why inequality is bad, *per se*? We could have panels which focus on the forms that inequalities can take in relationships, for example, oppression, domination, exploitation, etc. What sorts of inequalities are most important? Inequalities of resources? Welfare? Power? Opportunities? We should, of course, consider interplay between political, social, and economic inequalities. We could ask whether group inequality matters? In what ways? And which groups? Race? Gender? National? Generational? Occupational? We could consider inequality in the context of institutions, policies, and practices: the family, campaigns, education, health care, taxation, inheritance, litigation. We could consider the normative relevance (if any) of bodies of empirical research, for example, genetic differences, evolutionary psychology, etc. And, of course, we should ask whether and how inequality can be justified.

I particularly encourage proposals for "meet the author" panels on recent books or articles, but I also encourage proposals for panels that revisit classic books and articles (with or without the author). In addition, I welcome proposals for panels built on a decision-forcing case. Here's an illustration taken from an article on equality of opportunity by Christopher Jencks: How should a third-grade teacher distribute her time? Should she respond to differences in effort? environmental disadvantages? genetic disadvantages? superior ability? After the presentation of the case and comments from panelists, a case could serve as the basis for an interactive exchange between panelists and audience. In keeping with APSA tradition, I will consider proposals for papers and panels based on abstracts or short descriptions. But, and deviating from tradition, some preference will be given to

papers that are (roughly) complete.

**Division 4. Foundations of Political Theory\***. Jean Bethke Elshtain, Social and Political Ethics, The Divinity School, Swift Hall, University of Chicago, 1025 E. 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637; (312) 702-7252; (312) 702-6048 or (312) 643-8298 (fax).

The Foundations division encourages a wide range of approaches to political theory and, as well, a plurality of creative styles for presenting material and engaging often controversial issues. Those who want to organize traditional panels with paper givers and discussants are, of course, welcome. But I would also welcome "meet the author" panels, roundtables, and encounters between scholars and political practitioners given the theme for this year's annual meeting. Another experiment I encourage is the circulation of a major paper to a select audience of 10-12 political theorists who would then be invited to comment briefly on that paper in order to solicit the paper writer's response as well as that of the general audience in attendance.

Bearing in mind that the 1996 theme--Inequality and Politics-- is extraordinarily broad, proposals that compel fresh encounters with the theme will be especially welcome. This should by no means discourage anyone who wishes to revisit the ways in which classical political thinkers have taken up the question of inequality (say, Rousseau's Second Discourse) but I do hope to elicit creative confrontations and appropriations from a variety of modes of scholarly discourse and approaches both within and without the standard tradition. No list of possible topics under this broad rubric could possibly be comprehensive; any list must needs fall short. But it might be a spur to inquiry to keep in mind millennial speculations concerning the 'future' of inequality as we move into the twenty-first century within established democracies; in newly emergent democracies; and in societies that govern themselves under an alternative set of ordering principles. Is inequality between 'first world' nations and other less well placed nations bound to deepen? If not, why not? Given the globalization of economic forces, what are the likely results for inequality within all countries, West and East, North and South? What does political theory, broadly understood, have to offer us by way of edification, instruction, optimistic prospects or gloomy forecasts? There are many ways to go and I welcome the opportunity to see what you come up with.

**Division 5. Formal Political Theory.** John E. Roemer, Department of Economics, University of California-Davis, Davis, CA 95616; (916) 752-3226; (916) 752-9382 (fax); jeroemer@ucdavis.edu

Papers, or proposals for panels, consisting typically of three papers and one or several discussants, are invited. A proposal to present a paper should include its abstract; a proposal for a panel should include the title of the panel session, the roster of participants, paper titles, and abstracts of papers.

Any paper, or panel of papers, using formal modelling techniques to study a political question may be proposed, as may be papers testing the validity of formal models. Consistent with the 1996 meeting's theme, proposals are especially encouraged on two broad questions: the effect on economic inequality (income or wealth distribution) of particular political processes and systems, and, conversely, the effect on the political process of economic inequality. Proposals need not, however, be limited to these questions, nor even to the general theme of "Inequality and Politics."

Submissions by e-mail are encouraged. Proposals should, in any case, contain the e-mail address of the author or organizer.

**Division 6. Political Methodology\***. Elizabeth Gerber, Department of Political Science, University of California-San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093; (619) 534-2022; (619) 534-7130 (fax); egerber@weber.ucsd.edu

The field of political methodology involves the development of empirical methods and their application to substantive political science problems. Research in political methodology cuts across traditional subfields of the discipline, including but certainly not limited to comparative politics, international relations, legislative studies, voting behavior, and public opinion. Often methods developed in one subfield have important applications to problems in other subfields. I therefore encourage the submission of papers from a wide variety of substantive areas that deal with problems of data and estimation. I also welcome proposals for entire panels.

In recent years, papers in political methodology have focused largely on issues of estimation. This includes developing new estimators, importing estimation techniques from other disciplines and adapting them to the unique problems posed by political science data, comparing alternative solutions to a given empirical political science problem, and evaluating the properties of existing estimators. It also includes the development and assessment of techniques for analyzing qualitative data. Improving the tools and techniques used in empirical political science - broadly defined- is critical to the discipline, and I encourage the submission of proposals for papers that deal with the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data.

Methodology is more than strictly estimation. In my opinion, political methodology ought to address the whole set of issues that arise in the process of political analysis, from research design, to data collection, to analysis and estimation, to evaluation and interpretation. I would like to organize panels in some or all of the following areas: innovations in survey methodologies and data collection; collecting and analyzing qualitative data; new applications of data such as testing formal theories; and new, non-data-analytic methodologies such as simulations and laboratory experiments.

**Division 7. Legislative Behavior\*.** Elaine K. Swift, Department of Government, Eastern Washington University, Mail Stop 30, Cheney, WA 99004; (509) 359-2457/2362; (509) 359-6732 (fax); eswift@ewu.edu

The 104th Congress gives us plenty to think about! What has and has not changed? Are there historical parallels? How well do leading theories stand up? What will happen in the 1996 elections? I welcome proposals for roundtables, papers, and other ways of addressing these questions.

I also welcome proposals on the equally timely theme of the 1996 meeting, "Inequality and Politics." Specific topics might include racial redistricting, class politics, gender and racial representation in the new Republican order, and the implications of dissolving congressional caucuses.

In addition, I look forward to receiving proposals on the many other subjects that have always made Congress an absorbing institution to study.

**Division 8. Presidency Research\*.** Mary E. Stuckey, Department of Political Science, University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677; (601) 232-7415; (601) 232-7808 (fax); psmes@cypress.mcsr.olemiss.edu

Proposals are invited for papers, roundtables, and panels on all aspects of presidential research. Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are welcome, but studies that offer purely anecdotal evidence should be avoided. Proposals that utilize comparative or interdisciplinary approaches and/or that develop new theoretical or methodological ground are particularly encouraged, as are proposals that apply or extend the conference theme of "Politics and Inequality."

Proposals for complete panels, especially those that might be co-sponsored with other sections, are welcome, as are participants from other disciplines. Please include an abstract detailing of the proposed paper or panel, as well as the names, affiliations, and addresses of all proposed participants. Those

interested in appearing as discussants or panel chairs should include a brief statement specifying their research interests.

**Division 9. Public Opinion and Participation.** Michael C. Dawson, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 5828 S. University Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637; (312) 702-8462; (312) 702-1689 (fax); daws@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu

Proposals for both papers and panels in all areas of public opinion are welcome for the 1996 meetings. We especially encourage proposals for both panels and papers which center on the theme of the 1996 meetings "Politics and Inequality." A wide variety of approaches to this theme in the realm of public opinion will be entertained. I encourage researchers to consider papers and panels on how inequality in politics shapes public opinion in a variety of domains. For example, how do unequal resources among individual responses shape opinion and how do neighborhood/community based inequalities affect access to information, contacts with influential individuals, etc? Does either community or individually based inequalities make one more or less likely to be embedded in information networks? Does widespread social inequality make citizens more or less likely to be influenced by the type of elite debates that contemporary public opinion researchers argue are critical to shaping public opinion and/or are these inequalities likely to generate "counter-elites" which provide a different discourse that shapes public opinion for some, but not other, communities?

Also encouraged are studies which test general theories of public opinion by the study of group conflict within politics. Which elites shape opinion for which groups in any given society? What happens to public opinion within disadvantaged groups when these groups are less likely to receive elite opinions? How well do theories of public opinion within democracies perform when democratic societies with deep "permanent" inequalities exist?

Methodologically, how useful are our empirical and theoretical tools for analyzing public opinion when significant inequalities exist? Papers and panels which seek to compare the utility of cati based surveys, focus groups, historical research, or elite interviews for both research focused on inequality and more general public opinion research will be welcomed. Papers and panels which focus on how recent statistical innovations can improve our public opinion research will also be formed.

Finally, I encourage researchers to propose topics that link public opinion research to other sub-fields such as political theory and methodology. The above is meant to be suggestive but by no means exhaustive. I look forward to a broad range of

proposals.

**Division 10. Elections and Electoral Behavior\*.**

Helmut Norporth, Department of Political Science, SUNY-Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392; (516) 632-7640; (516) 632-9023 (fax); hnorporth@ccvm.sunysb.edu

The theme of "Inequality and Politics" has an immediately recognizable ring for students of elections. It is a fact of political life that many citizens fail to participate, and those who get elected are, by definition, a numerically tiny minority. Moreover, the translation of votes cast into representational shares in policymaking institutions raises all sorts of questions about equality. Hence, I am inviting proposals for papers on topics dealing especially with the problem of inequality in designing electoral systems, in explanations of voter turnout, and in fathoming the policy consequences of elections. This is not exclusively a call for papers using quantitative models of analysis; formal-theory approaches are also welcome. I am less keen, however, on hand-wringing exercises.

In addition, I would like to see proposals dealing with any of the following topics. One rather specific one has to do with forecasting the 1996 presidential election, which will be looming over this APSA meeting. In a more general vein, I am interested in proposals dealing with the specifications of election-forecasting models. Another timely topic relates to the primary elections in 1996. What can we learn from the 1996 experience about theories of choice in primary elections? Furthermore, the 1994 midterm election has produced a new brand of divided government. What are the electoral foundations of this novel configuration? In a related vein, I would be interested in proposals taking another stab at the prospects of a party realignment. We may be too hasty in proclaiming one, but also tend to write off the possibility too quickly.

While most proposals in this section will be dealing with American elections, I am open to those with a comparative dimension as well. In particular, I am inviting proposals that are cross-national by design, that is, they examine a problem of electoral study with comparable data from several countries. Also, the transition to democracy in Eastern Europe raises questions of how our old theories of electoral choice work in new democracies.

Beyond panels of the familiar sort, I plan to set up an "author meets critics" encounter. So nominate a recent book on elections/electoral behavior along with a group of critics! I am also inclined to extend this kind of format to high-profile articles in our journals. To air out conflicting views on some highly controversial propositions in our subfield, I am thinking about setting up a one-on-one debate. So

send in your nominations.

In any event, do not let these guidelines keep you from submitting any ingenious, promising, thought-provoking proposal that does not fit any of the boxes above.

**Division 11. Political Organizations and Parties\*.**

Barbara C. Burrell, Wisconsin Survey Research Lab, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1930 Monroe Street, Madison, WI 53711; (608) 265-2029; (608) 262-3366 (fax); burrell@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu

Questions of equality and inequality historically have been central to the formation and life of political organizations and parties. The theme of "Inequality and Politics" provides us with the prime opportunity to reflect upon and advance our knowledge in this very important area of study. We should assess the extent to which political organizations and parties have worked to expand equality. I urge paper proposers to think about the ways in which their research is linked to notions of equality and inequality in political organizations and parties.

I would like papers and presentations to be historically grounded regarding how political organizations and parties have dealt with issues of equality and participation in the past, and how in the contemporary era, especially within the context of the information superhighway and expanding democratic politics globally, political organizations and parties are linking citizens to their government. Proposals that incorporate ideas concerning diversity within the overarching theme of inequality are especially encouraged. I hope that we will have a combination of traditional panels with formal papers being presented as well as roundtables and other discussion modes. Please feel free to propose whole panels or roundtables and also send me suggestions for discussants and panel chairs.

**Division 12. Law and Courts\*.**

Major G. Coleman, Department of Political Science, SUNY at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260-4121; (716) 645-2251, ext. 505; (716) 645-2166 (fax); mgcole@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu; or Howard Gillman, Department of Political Science, University of Southern California, VKC 327; Los Angeles, CA 90089-0044; (213) 740-8861; (213)740-8893 (fax); gillman@rcf.usc.edu

Proposals for panels, roundtables, and papers on a variety of topics relating to Law and Courts are invited. They may be sent to either of the co-chairs. Our ambitious goal is to put together a program that includes behavioral, ethnographic, and historical work. The proposals may be court centered or may explore the role of law outside of courts. We are interested in work that sheds light on institutional

practices or social and race relations.

In addition to projects that emphasize the theme "Inequality and Politics" we would encourage you to consider some of the following topics: the impact of the law on race, gender, class, ethnic and other types of inequality; Martin Luther King Jr.'s approach to civil rights law; voting rights jurisprudence in light of Lani Guinier's *The Tyranny of the Majority*; Critical race theory and Critical legal studies; legal, political, and economic considerations in recent affirmative action debates; conceptualizations of equality and citizenship in comparative constitutional practice; multicultural challenges to the traditions of national courts; courts and democratization; transitional protections for human rights; "new institutionalist" perspectives on American constitutional development; extra-judicial or "counter-hegemonic" constitutional practices (including perhaps militia movements); law and the politics of social movements; property law and environmental regulation; institutional v. behavioral perspectives on judicial politics; relationships among intra- and international judicial systems; a roundtable on recent "state of the field" essays.

Please be inspired but not put off by these suggestions. Any good idea is welcome. Individuals interested in presenting a paper should submit a one-page abstract that provides a brief overview of the paper and your assessment of the topic's significance to our understanding of Law and Courts. We are willing to organize discrete papers into more-or-less coherent groupings, but do not overlook the advantages of organizing yourselves into focused or provocative groupings before submitting your proposals.

Proposals for panels must provide an abstract for each paper. Proposals for roundtables must include a statement about the subject matter to be addressed as well as information about each of the participants. We also strongly encourage more imaginative formats.

Requests from individuals who wish to serve as discussants or panel chairs are also welcome. All proposals as well as requests to serve as chair or discussant should be accompanied by a curriculum vita.

**Division 13. Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence.**

Joseph Stewart, Jr., School of Social Sciences, University of Texas-Dallas, P.O. Box 830688, Richardson, TX 75083-0688; (214) 883-2571; (214) 883-2735 (fax); jstewart@utdallas.edu

The theme of the 1996 program, "Inequality and Politics," is an ideal topic for scholars of constitutional law and jurisprudence. Much of constitutional law and jurisprudence is concerned

with the definition and resolution of inequality. Proposals are invited for papers, panels, roundtables, "meet the author" panels, retrospectives, or "meet the practitioner" panels.

An effort will be made to treat constitutional law and jurisprudence both as dependent and as independent variables. That is, I hope to have an array of papers/panels which attempt to explain how or why certain patterns, doctrines, or instances of constitutional law and jurisprudence have been (or will be) produced. For example, what has been the impact of divided party government on federal judicial appointments and on subsequent doctrinal developments in federalism, separation of powers, or civil liberties?

Another array of papers/panels should detail the impact of constitutional law and jurisprudence on other political actors, public policy, the polity, or society. For example, an interesting recent development has been the narrowing of habeas corpus by the Rhenquist court. What impact has that change in interpretation had on courts' dockets or on criminal justice policy?

Preference will be given to proposals which (1) promise theoretically driven and/or empirical research which reflects the theme of Inequality and (2) are submitted by the deadline. I anticipate that some panels will not be directly related to the program theme.

I am open to proposals that treat historical or contemporary subjects, constitutional and jurisprudential developments in any venue, or doctrinal development in any substantive area. Other possible topics include studies of individual judges or justices, the role of litigation in general and by interest groups in particular, or issues in constitutional politics. Furthermore, this list is meant to be suggestive, not exhaustive.

As usual, I shall look for opportunities to co-sponsor panels with related divisions, and a special effort will be made to coordinate with the Section on Law and Courts to assure that coherence and participation are maximized. It is imperative, however, that you notify me if you are submitting your proposal to another division.

Volunteers for service as a panel chair or, particularly, as a discussant are especially solicited. Such communications should include notification of your particular interest.

**Division 14. Public Administration\*.** H. George Frederickson, Department of Public Administration, 318 Blake Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045; (913) 864-3527; (913) 864-5208 (fax);

gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu

Paper, panel, roundtable, workshop and other session proposals on all aspects of public administration are invited. Requests to serve as convener, discussant or moderator are also welcome. The conference theme, "Inequality and Politics," is, of course, an issue of importance to the field. Papers and sessions relating to this theme are especially invited.

This year there is a special effort to encourage programming innovations. We will welcome suggestions for alternatives to the traditional three papers on a theme with two discussants. Suggestions for alternative to traditional panels include "meet the author" sessions, poster sessions, scholar meeting practitioners sessions, and the like.

The theme of "Inequality and Politics" is central to the matter of bureaucratic discretion. Models of limited bureaucratic discretion (Lowi, for example) assume that issues of inequality are generally outside the range of acceptable bureaucratic discretion. Models of neutral competence are rather similar. Models of the bureaucrat as policy entrepreneur (Lewis), as leader (Dilulio or Behn), as empowered (Barzelay), as agent (Wamsley, et al), or as constitutionally based (Rohr) all assume a wider range of discretion. Should this wider range of discretion include issues of inequality (Frederickson)?

The issue of bureaucratic discretion is closely linked to the question of responsibility. Is the neutrally competent public administrator implementing public policy which is clearly inequitable being irresponsible? Is the bureaucrat making the law fair being irresponsible?

Papers and panels on bureaucratic discretion and responsibility are, therefore, especially suited to the theme of the conference.

Proposals should be in writing and include a one page abstract with details of the significance of the subject, theory, research perspectives, methods, etc. Please provide the full name, rank, institutional affiliation, telephone, and fax numbers as a part of each proposal. If a full panel is being proposed it is necessary to have prior agreement of proposed panel participants.

**Division 15. Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations\***. Joseph F. Zimmerman, Graduate School of Public Affairs, SUNY-Albany, Albany, NY 12222; (518) 442-5378; (518)442-5298 (fax).

The theme of the 1996 annual meeting--"Inequality and Politics"-- suggests specific topics relating to intergovernmental efforts to eliminate discrimination based upon age, ethnicity, religion, and race in the

United States and other nations. Papers are also sought which examine discrimination in the form of interstate trade barriers and the roles of the national legislature and judiciary in removing such barriers.

The controversies surrounding congressional bills providing for preemption of state authority to regulate product liability and the insurance industry highlight the need for papers analyzing the rationale for congressional preemption of state regulatory authority and effectiveness of the various types of total and partial preemption. Reform of the welfare system is another current issue meriting examination. The key role played by the judiciary in determining the dividing line between state and national regulatory authority, particularly the reach of the commerce clause, could be the subject of a paper or panel.

Papers building upon and adapting the dual and cooperative theories of federalism to the realities of the federal system in the United States at the end of the twentieth century will be welcomed as will proposals dealing with other aspects of national-state, interstate, and local-state relations in federal systems throughout the world.

Readers are encouraged to present proposals for papers, panels, roundtables, "meet the author," and scholar-practitioner panels. Each proposal must include the author, title, address, telephone number and Fax number for each participant. A paper proposal must contain an abstract with details on the topic, methodological and theoretical approaches employed, and data sources. A panel proposal must contain similar information on each paper. Offers to chair panels and serve as discussants will be appreciated.

**Division 16. Urban Politics\***. Kenneth K. Wong, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 5835 S. Kimbark Ave., Chicago, IL. 60637; (312) 702-0753; (312) 702-0248 (fax); stdwong@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu

Proposals are invited for panels, papers, and roundtables pertaining to all aspects of urban politics and policy. I am particularly interested in proposals that examine the following issues--(1) Cities and National Politics: In what ways are cities affected by the Reagan-Bush administration and the divided governance in the Clinton presidency? How does federal retrenchment reshape urban priorities and service delivery? What are the lessons from policy implementation in education, housing, health care, among others?

(2) Resource Allocation Within Cities: How equitable are the allocation of municipal services? What are the political conditions that facilitate

redistribution? Are there new coalitions being formed to address emerging challenges? What are the innovative practices that enable growth without sacrificing fairness?

**(3) Alternative Forms of Urban Governance:** Various structures of governance have been created to address urban problems. These include a commission that oversees Washington DC's finances, metropolitan-wide service coordination in Portland and Minneapolis, adoption of performance-based accountability systems, and contracting out schooling and other services to private service providers. How do these arrangements alter the distribution of power? What kinds of costs and benefits resulted from these practices? Are there far-reaching implications on the allocation of functions between the state and local governments?

**(4) Politics of Equality:** Within the metropolitan area, the economic gap is widening between the haves and the havenots. In what ways has politics helped sustain inequality? How can policymakers develop political strategies to address concentrated poverty, mediate conflict among immigrant groups, and manage rivalry between racial groups in urban and suburban settings?

Paper proposals should specify the topic to be investigated, theoretical and methodological approach to be used, and data sources. Detailed proposals will receive the strongest consideration. Every effort will be made to include proposals representative of the rich diversity of work in the urban field.

**Division 17. State Politics and Policy\*.** Thomas Holbrook, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201; (414) 229-5010; (414) 229-5021 (fax); homeboy@csd.uwm.edu

State politics is a very flexible subfield, able to accommodate a variety of different substantive, theoretical, and methodological approaches and interests. Evidence of this can be found in the abundance of different subjects studied and approaches used by authors on State Politics and Policy panels at previous APSA meetings. It is hoped that this tradition can be continued at the 1996 meeting. However, because of a limited number of panels available and a somewhat less limited number of paper proposals, certain guidelines will be used to determine which of the proposed papers and panel topics will be selected. Priority will be given to those papers that are comparative in nature and offer generalizable results. By this I mean that papers should analyze the dependent phenomenon in a manner that allows for generalizations to be made across states, across

time, or across states and time. Priority will also be given to those papers that address important or controversial issues in state politics. These topics could represent unresolved substantive questions or important methodological issues in state politics. Proposals for papers that address measurement issues in state politics are especially encouraged. Finally, some priority will be given to those papers and panel proposals that fit the theme of the 1996 meeting--"Inequality and Politics." Given the long history of state politics research in this area, I think the State Politics and Policy panels represent an especially rich opportunity for addressing this theme. I am particularly interested in papers that investigate the sources and consequences of inequality (political, social, economic) in the states. Studies of state policies intended to redress inequalities also seem particularly appropriate for this meeting.

Besides paper proposals, innovative ideas for panels topics are also invited. Of particular interest are ideas concerning potential roundtable topics, "state of the discipline" panels, retrospectives on a prominent scholar's body of work, or some other innovative approach. In addition, I encourage seasoned scholars who do not plan to present a paper to consider participating as a discussant or panel chair.

Paper proposals should include an abstract that (1) describes how the paper fits the criteria outline above, (2) highlights the importance of the study, and (3) provides a description of the methodological and theoretical approaches that will be used. Panel proposals should also focus on how the panel fits the criteria listed earlier.

**Division 18. Public Policy\*.** Virginia Gray, Department of Political Science, 1414 Social Sciences Building, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455; (612) 624-8529; (612) 626-7599 (fax); vgray@polisci.umn.edu

This year's program theme, "Inequality and Politics," provides a natural focus for the Public Policy Division. I welcome paper proposals that explore the topic of inequality from a theoretical, methodological, or empirical perspective: how do we conceptualize inequality; how do we measure it; what policies are reducing or exacerbating it? Some papers will, I expect, examine current reforms in welfare and other social policies and how those reforms may affect inequality.

Beyond those papers and panels that concentrate on inequality, there will be room for examination of a variety of topics in traditional areas of public policy: cross-national comparative studies, comparative state or city studies in the American context, policy evaluation, policy design, policy process studies,



case studies of particular programs, and so forth. Collectively, our division's panels should reflect the diversity and vitality of the public policy subfield.

Paper proposals should include an abstract specifying the topic to be explored, the type of analysis to be undertaken, and the contribution to be made by the proposed paper. Panel proposals should specify the topic, the types of possible participants, and justify the importance of the topic. Innovative panel formats will be especially welcome.

**Division 19. Political Economy\***. Frances Rosenbluth, Department of Politics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520-8301; (203) 432-5672; (203) 432-6196 (fax); rosenblu@minerva.cis.yale.edu

Political economy encompasses two distinct research agendas: 1) the substantive concern with the politics of economic policymaking, and 2) the application of microeconomic methods to problems in politics. Although each approach has a large and loyal following, recent efforts to cross-fertilize the two approaches hold promise for further enriching our understanding of politics. Both approaches, obviously, have much to say about the overall convention theme, "Inequality and Politics."

In this spirit of optimism, I will give priority to panels that seek to bridge the traditional and microeconomic approaches. Individual paper proposals from either approach are welcome--but understand that your paper may be matched with others on a similar theme from a different perspective. Panel proposals are encouraged to include participants from both research perspectives. Especially welcome are panels or roundtables that reconsider classic ideas in the field--such as collective action -- or that consider anew nonmainstream ideas -- such as culture. Proposals for panels or for roundtables that bridge the traditional field boundaries (American politics, comparative politics, international relations) are also especially appropriate to a field such as political economy. I also encourage proposals for panels with nontraditional formats such as decision-forcing case studies or "scholar meets practitioner" panels.

Finally I welcome offers to serve as discussants by those interested in spanning diverse approaches.

**Division 20. Women and Politics\***. Joyce Gelb, Director of Women's Studies, CUNY Graduate Center, 33 West 42nd Steet, New York, NY 10036; (212) 642-2247/2295; (212) 642-1978 (fax); jkg@cunyvms1.gc.cuny.edu

The theme of the 1996 meetings --"Inequality and Politics" -- offers a benchmark against which

research and theory related to women, participation and representation, may be analyzed and assessed. To what extent have women's movements, new approaches to empowerment and national and international trends affected women's status and role in comparative context?

In the United States, how may the impact of the 1992 "Year of the Woman" be assessed in the light of the "Contract for America"? What are the implications of attacks on low income women via proposed changes in welfare and poverty policy and on all women through affirmative action policy for a future politics of inequality? Analysis of the significance of affirmative action for gender based equality, both theoretically and empirically, would be welcome. Attention to changes in policy and politics for women at the state and local level, as well as analysis of the ways in which women officeholders make a difference politically, is encouraged as well.

Is there a "post feminist" generation? Attitudinal and survey research, particularly as it illuminates generational changes related to inequality and policy change, would be especially encouraged. What will be the future shape and scope of the feminist movement in the US; how will it address issues of economic and racial, as well as gender based, inequality?

In comparative perspective, what constitutional, institutional, electoral and partisan arrangements have proven most likely to reduce inequalities for women? How do the new patterns of ethnic and national instability affect women in particular? Have inequalities been heightened or lessened in the post-Communist politics of Eastern Europe and Russia? Comparative attention to issues of mobilization, social movement activism, political representation and policy development related to gender, particularly in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, will be welcomed as well. To what extent can comparative policy analysis suggest mechanisms for reduction of gender based inequality?

In addition to empirical research, debates related to theory will be given special attention. These may include questions of citizenship as they affect women and inequality as well as new theoretical analysis related to feminist inquiry on such issues as power, gender, political organization and community. Changing paradigms of international politics from a feminist perspective are also of primary interest. These concerns may take on new relevance in the aftermath of the 1995 Beijing meetings; proposals for a panel or roundtable dealing with the outcomes and significance of these and other international forums addressing women's unequal status and role would be welcomed.

Preference will be given to innovative suggestions

for panels; papers may also be submitted.

**Division 21. Politics and History\*.** Paul Pierson, Center for European Studies, 27 Kirkland St., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138; (617)495-4303, ext. 227; (617)495-8509 (fax); pierson@harvard.edu; or Eileen McDonagh, Department of Political Science, Northeastern University, Meserve Hall 303, Boston, MA 02115; (617) 373-2796; (617) 496-3993 (fax); emcd@neu.edu

The Politics and History division welcomes proposals from a variety of perspectives concerning this year's theme, "Inequality and Politics." We are particularly eager to consider those with the following characteristics: (1) those that use history to study political processes over time (rather than simply to generate more cases); (2) those that cross subfields (e.g., comparative and American, or comparative and international relations); (3) those that explicitly address methodological issues concerning the role of historical research in the social sciences. We encourage panels with a topical focus on historical reform eras, the role of culture and ideas in promoting or retarding political change, dimensions of citizenship, the creation and implementation of public policies, and alternative models of political development. Attention to class, race, and gender as aspects of political inequality over time and within institutional settings is encouraged.

We do not intend these suggestions to be limiting, however, and leave the door open for submission of additional ideas. Please send a one-page abstract outlining the central question, argument, and methodology of your paper as well as the topic's contribution to the advancement of our field. We encourage panel and roundtable proposals, but in all cases please use the forms provided by the APSA. We also welcome offers to serve as discussants or panel chairs. To facilitate communication, proposals and letters should include full names and addresses, institutional affiliations, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail addresses. Proposals that fail to meet the deadline set by the APSA will be reviewed only after consideration of those which were submitted in a timely fashion.

**Division 22. Comparative Politics\*.** Karen Remmer, Department of Political Science, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131; (505) 277-5104; (505) 277-2821 (fax); remmer@unm.edu

Proposals are invited for panels, papers, and roundtables that deal with theoretical and methodological issues of broad concern to students of comparative politics. While the division is open to all subjects and approaches in comparative politics, priority will be given to proposals for panels that

span regions, subfields, and/or the theoretical divide separating the study of the U.S. and other advanced industrial states from less developed regions of the globe. Topics that will receive special attention are the following: (1) the overall theme of the 1996 conference, "Inequality and Politics;" (2) the impact of international influences on domestic politics; (3) the interface between democratic institutions and economic policies and/or performance; and (4) comparative methodology. Proposals that involve imaginative or untraditional formats for sessions (e.g., initial presentations by commentators rather than paper givers) are welcome, as are proposals for panels that include a mix of junior and senior scholars.

Early submissions are strongly encouraged. All proposals for papers or panels, as well as offers to serve as panel chair or discussant, should be accompanied by a c.v. Paper proposals must provide a one-page abstract detailing the (1) substantive topic, (2) theoretical approach, (3) methodology and data, and (4) importance of the study. Proposals for panels should include a statement of the unifying theoretical rationale, an abstract of each paper, and information about each participant. Graduate students submitting proposals are encouraged to include either a draft of their proposed paper or a chapter from their dissertation. Please let me know if you are sending a proposal to another division.

**Division 23. Comparative Politics of Developing Countries.** Dwayne Woods, Department of Political Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907; (317)494-4177; (317)494-0823 (fax); woods@polisci.purdue.edu

Since the general theme of the conference is "Inequality and Politics," I would like to organize the developing areas division around the issue of "inequality and democratization." I envisage a number of panels that focus on the theme of "inequality and democratization" in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Also, one or two of these panels should be broadly comparative, looking at the issue of "inequality and democratization" across regions. In addition to the different cases and regions presented, I would like to organize a roundtable discussion on innovative methodological approaches, both qualitative and quantitative, to explore the relationship between income distribution, markets, and democratic consolidation.

1. Looking at Domestic Factors. The burgeoning literature on democratization has looked at the pace and timing of democratization, particularly focusing on the role of elites in the transition from authoritarian rule. Much of the earlier literature has

been dominated by a voluntarist outlook, explaining the nature and timing of democratic transitions on the types of "pacts" or "agreements" that elites have been able to achieve. More recently, authors such as Samuel Huntington have attempted to explore both voluntarist and structural factors behind what he refers to as the "third wave" of democratization. Other scholars have turned their attention to the role of domestic social groups in the democratization process, especially their respective impact on its consolidation. Left out of much of this literature is a political economy dimension. In other words, what is the relationship between the economy and democratization? In what ways has the transition to democracy reinforced, altered, or lessened patterns of inequality? How are we to conceptualize the qualitative nature of democratic regimes where sharp income and life-chance inequalities exist? Also, in what ways do social groups attempt to change the distributive system under democratic regimes? Who are the winners and losers? And are they winners or losers because of a structural link between a market economy and a democratic state, or because of the absence of concerted collective action by different social groups?

2. Looking at the International Dimension. The debate with dependency theorists has passed; however, their main argument that the international dimension matters is now taken as a given by scholars of developing areas. What remains problematic is the way in which developing nations are affected by the dramatic growth in international trade, the constantly shifting pattern of the international division of labor, structural adjustment programs, and the globalization of financial markets. In other words, has the internationalization of the world economy, lessened or aggravated Third World inequalities? There is a need to rethink the linkages between domestic economic choices and the role of international influences on them, especially in the context of the above theme of "inequality and democratization." Does democratization make a difference in how Third World economies are integrated into an international economic system? And, if so, does this difference have any effect on allocation of resources and to whom?

All proposals should include a brief synopsis of the papers to be presented, and, where possible, proposals for panels should leave room for an additional paper to be added among those submitted individually to the section.

**Division 24. Politics of Communist and Former Communist Regimes.** Yasheng Huang, CCS, 104 Lane Hall, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1290; (313) 998-7560; (313) 936-2948 (fax); yasheng.huang@um.cc.umich.edu

Proposals for panels, roundtables, and papers on a variety of topics relating to the study of politics of communist and former communist countries are welcome. In addition to the theme of this year's convention, "Inequality and Politics," I will be especially interested in proposals that examine the following topics: (1) the political, economic, and social causes for the collapse of communism; (2) the development of new political and economic institutions in the former communist countries; (3) the political impact and political causes of economic reforms; (4) the successes and failures of different reform strategies and their political underpinnings; (5) political economy of transitions; (6) international political and economic relations of communist and former communist countries; (7) ethnic and distributional conflicts and their impact.

This is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Preferences will be given to those proposals that address theoretical and empirical issues of our discipline, use explicit methodologies, compare cases, and are inter-disciplinary in approach and in the substance of the subject matter. I will also welcome offers to serve as discussants on these panels.

**Division 25. Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial States.** David Soskice, Department for the Study of Economic Change and Employment, Science Center Berlin, Reichpietschufer 50, D-10785 Berlin, Germany; (49-30) 25491-104; (49-30)25491-480 (fax); apsaais@medea.wz-berlin.de

This division is open to any proposals which deal with politics in advanced industrialized societies. Although we hope to attract proposals in the areas which are set out below, this aim is not in any way meant to rule out other themes. There is only one principle which we want, as far as possible, to observe: panels should have a comparative focus. We hope that will also be true of individual papers within panels, and at least that papers which concentrate on a single country provide some idea of comparative implications.

Two substantive concepts have attracted much interest over the past several years. The first has a longer pedigree than the second: this is the integration of the forces of world market liberalization and massive technological change on the one hand and the institutional and strategic responses of political, economic, and social systems at national and sub-national levels on the other. The second, more recent, is the attempt to develop theories of comparative types of advanced capitalist systems, or at least parts of them; notable examples deal with the welfare state, so-called national systems of innovation, production regimes, as well as the patterning of social democracy, and the

nature of executive-legislative relations. These two approaches are in principle - though not always in practice - closely linked. One link is that the aspects of advanced economies which are becoming systemized are largely those most affected by the forces of liberalization and technological change. The second is that it is difficult to develop theories of the differentiated institutional restructuring of domestic economies as a result of external changes without a more comprehensive understanding of the domestic systems.

We are interested in receiving proposals relating to the comparative systemic analysis of advanced capitalist economies. In particular, proposals relating to the political dynamics of insitutional change, including for instance the financial system, wage determination and industrial relations, education and training, the welfare state, and innovation system are particularly welcome. These might be at national or sub-national level; they might also be sectoral, as in particular industries or groups of industries. One approach, though by no means the only way of analyzing these questions in terms of political science, is the strategic way in which actors and institutions have responded to external pressures.

The focus of the division suggests that links with other sub-disciplines of political science might be appropriately discussed. That which most readily comes to mind is international political economy and more generally international relations. A panel to explore differences in approach between that of the political economy of advanced industrialized countries and that of international relations to the issues discussed above would be useful. Also useful might be a similar panel linking public policy approaches with these broader questions.

Two disciplines traditionally outside political science have begun to make important contributions to political science discussions of the link between world market liberalization and domestic insitutional responses, namely economics and law. Here again, proposals that cross strict disciplinary boundaries would be attractive.

***Division 26. Politics and Society in Western Europe\****. Chris Howell, Department of Politics, Oberlin College, Oberlin, OH 44074; (216) 775-8649; (216) 775-8124 (fax); [chowell@ocvaxa.cc.oberlin.edu](mailto:chowell@ocvaxa.cc.oberlin.edu)

In keeping with the theme of the 1996 convention, "Inequality and Politics," I invite proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables on the broad subject of the causes and political consequences of inequality in Western Europe. Since the middle of the 1970s there has been a stark change in the nature of the middle of politics and society in Western Europe. At the political level this has been evidenced by a rightward shift in politics,

encompassing both the rise of more conservative parties and social formations, and the ideological collapse of social democracy and Eurocommunism, even where the Left remained in power. At the societal level we have seen the return of mass unemployment, widening income inequality, an expansion of poverty, increased insecurity of jobs, political and economic pressure upon welfare states, and a weakening and loss of initiative on the part of trade unions. In short, inequality of income, wealth, life chances, and power have increased markedly in most West European societies in the past two decades or so.

Particularly welcome would be proposals which consider a series of political economy questions related to inequality. For example: what has been the fate of European industrial relations systems and trade unionism, and how have unions responded?; What role has European integration played in economic restructuring, and what kind of action is possible at the level of the European Union in response to inequality?; And how have the dual processes of economic decentralization and internationalization affected society and politics in Western Europe? Proposals considering the responses of political parties and social movements to growing inequality are especially appropriate this year. For example: how have new social movements and post-materialist parties fared under current conditions?; What processes of reorganization and reconceptualization are going on within social democratic parties?; And the high tide of neo-liberalism passes within parties of the right?

While these topics are of particular interest this year, proposals that concern any aspect of politics and society in Western Europe are welcome. Proposals for panels should provide synopses of the individual papers as well as a statement of the themes that unify the panel. All proposals should include full information on participants, including names, affiliations, addresses, phone, and fax numbers, and e-mail addresses. People who are willing to serve as discussants or chairs should indicate their areas of interest. Feel free to contact me by phone or e-mail if you wish to discuss ideas for papers, panels, or roundtables, or if you have any innovative idea for organizing a session.

***Division 27. International Collaboration.*** G. John Ikenberry, Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, 222 Stitler Hall, Philadelphia, PA 19104; (215) 898-7646; (609) 573-2073 (fax); [ikenberr@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:ikenberr@sas.upenn.edu)

Inequality is an enduring feature of world politics and it is central in theoretical debates about international collaboration. This division welcomes proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables that focus on

inequality and the problem of collaboration among nations. Possible topics that could be explored under the auspices of this division are listed below. Please note that this listing is strictly illustrative; suggestions for proposals that focus on other issues regarding inequality and international collaboration are strongly encouraged.

**Theoretical issues:** Proposals in this area might focus on the impact of power inequalities on international collaboration. International relations theories differ on the implications of inter-state inequality for cooperation and conflict. For some, such as those who focus on hegemony, inequality is a source of stability and order. For others, it generates conflict. How do different configurations of power among states influence the prospects of cooperation? Do inequalities facilitate or inhibit international agreements. Is it possible to talk in theoretical terms about the power of small states? Some theoretical traditions, such as liberalism, are silent (or at least quiet) on the role of power in cooperation between nations. What, if any, is its role?

**Thematic issues:** Proposals might also explore the role of changing social and economic inequality (or "life chances") within and between nations on world politics. Is the issue of inequality itself--between rich and poor countries--coming back into play? How has the end of the Cold War and the changing alignments of states altered how states challenge or accept international inequalities? What will be the impact of growing social and income inequalities within countries on relations among countries? If postwar economic cooperation within the advanced industrial world was facilitated by the consolidation of the welfare state, how will the erosion of this system and rising inequality alter this situation?

**Disciplinary Issues:** Proposals might also explore issues of inequality and collaboration across subfields. This cluster of topics might seek to build bridges between international security studies and international political economy -- or between comparative and international politics. Are there characteristic differences in how these different subfields conceive of and debate inequality? What new types of theoretical and empirical explorations might be advanced by cutting across traditional fields and subfields?

In soliciting proposals, this division is looking for a wide range of ideas: paper proposals, theme panels, roundtables, and more structured debate sessions.

**Division 28. International Security.** Robert Powell, Department of Political Science, University of California-Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720; (510) 642-4635; (510) 642-9515 (fax).

The Cold War is over. First, the Soviet Empire and then the Soviet Union itself collapsed. Democracy is spreading to many states throughout the world. And, the euphoria that initially accompanied these recent events has begun to fade. Old conflicts of interest and new are beginning to surface and engender security concerns.

This division welcomes proposals for panels, papers, and roundtables that focus on the sources of threats to states' security, states' efforts to deal with these threats, and the intended and unintended consequences of these efforts. Possible topics might include: (1) the relation between domestic politics and international security. Are some domestic disputes more likely than others to pose a threat to international security? Liberal democratic states are now widely believed not to use force against each other. Do other aspects of domestic institutions have important consequences for international security? (2) the relation between economic conflict and military conflict. To what extent and under what circumstances can economic competition become a security threat? (3) the international security consequences of ethnic conflict. (4) the emergence of new threats to states' security. What are these threats and to what extent is the use of force a possible result? (5) the role of international and domestic institutions and organizations in ameliorating security threats. (6) meta-theoretical. Are there more general ways of thinking about security issues that makes the study of international security seem less particularistic and more general? For example, the use of force is often an inefficient outcome of a conflict. After the fact, there is often some bargain that the states would have preferred to fighting. In this sense, international security studies examine actors' abilities to avoid inefficient outcomes. But actors face the problem of avoiding inefficient outcomes in many different economic, political, and social contexts. Is there anything fundamentally different about international-security problems? (7) methodological. The field of security studies has traditionally focused on issues in which the potential use of force is a significant issue, while cooperation theory and institutionalism have generally centered on subjects in which the possible use of military force was not a major factor. Both approaches thus have tended to select their subject matter on the dependent variable. To what extent has this biased our understanding of international security?

**Division 29. International Security and Arms Control\*.** Robert H. Dorff, Department of National Security and Strategy, US Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013; (717) 245-3273; (717) 245-3530 (fax); dorffr@carlisle-emh2.army.mil

The international system continues to reflect

elements of continuity and change as the post-Cold War world matures. The simultaneous operation of forces of integration and fragmentation creates contradictory trends and complex problems. Together these characteristics of the international system pose significant challenges to students and practitioners of international security and arms control. It therefore seems appropriate to emphasize both the scholarly and the policy dimensions, as well as traditional and new approaches, in our 1996 program. Proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables that address these dimensions and approaches, conceptually and analytically, are encouraged. Rather than listing specific topics and questions, let me simply suggest a few general ideas for proposals, keeping in mind of course that any proposal dealing with international security, arms control, and related issues is welcome.

First, the conference theme, "Inequality and Politics", suggests a focus on aspects of inequality that have particular relevance for security studies and arms control. We will make a concerted effort to constitute at least one panel or roundtable with an explicit focus on this theme.

Second, as we enter the second half of the post-Cold War decade, sufficient time has passed to justify a review and evaluation of the earlier analyses of the meaning and implications of the end of the Cold War. Those earlier assessments ran the gamut from highly optimistic to extremely pessimistic. How have the events of the 1990s borne out these analyses and their predictions in terms of international security and arms control issues? What lessons have we learned or should we learn from policies and events of the immediate post-Cold War period? We would encourage a proposal for a theme panel or roundtable addressing such questions.

Third, because the 1996 Annual Meeting will be held in San Francisco, a focus on the Pacific Rim and Asia seems appropriate. Preliminary planning is already underway to offer a short course on Asia at the Meeting. Therefore, we would be especially interested in proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables dealing with security and arms control issues in Asia and the Pacific Rim. We hope to have at least one session addressing these regional issues.

Finally, we emphasize that our priority is to have the highest quality program possible. Consequently, we encourage anyone who has a well-developed proposal for a paper, panel, or roundtable to submit it for consideration. We especially encourage proposals from advanced graduate students, and we will endeavor to include as many as possible on the program.

Panel and roundtable proposals should include the names, addresses, and topics for each participant

along with a description of the theme, focus, or emphasis. A brief abstract should accompany each individual proposal.

**Division 30. International Political Economy.** Duncan Snidal, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 5828 South University Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637; (312) 702-8078; (312) 702-0926 (fax); snidal@uchicago.edu

Inequality takes different forms in international politics. It can be reflected in the distribution of power or wealth among states, and these need not be in accord. It can be reflected in asymmetric interdependence, viewed either in terms of particular relations among states or in terms of more deeply structured patterns of interaction such as those within global capitalism or world culture. It can be reflected in the informal and formal organization of international relations, ranging from general implications of sovereignty through the specific rules and practice of the WTO or World Bank. It can be viewed at the aggregate level in comparing whole economies, at a more disaggregated level in comparing particular sectors, or at a fully disaggregated level in terms of individuals. And, of course, inequality interacts across levels so as to be (depending on your perspective) mutually reinforcing or mutually ameliorating.

Inequality also works in different ways in international politics -- or so we might think since we do not know much about it. Some arguments see certain forms of inequality as possibly promoting positive interactions among states, such as liberal trade theories based on comparative advantage. Other arguments see inequality as leading to disharmonious relations among units, such as structural theories regarding the relations of cores and peripheries. And the relation between international and domestic inequality opens a host of other important questions.

The theme of inequality thus provides a number of opportunities for innovative and exciting panels relevant to international political economy so I especially encourage proposals for panels, papers or roundtables that address it. At the same time, there is room for proposals that address questions at the forefront of IPE even if they do not directly relate to the theme. It is important that panels have an overall coherence, however, so panel proposers should include an abstract for the session as a whole in addition to identifying the individual papers and participants involved.

Finally, I propose the following experiment if any panel is willing to undertake it. The panel would be restricted to two papers whose authors would precommit to distributing their papers (perhaps

electronically) at least a month in advance to a group of twenty or so other scholars who would be specially invited to the panel, plus any others who request it. The papers would not be presented in the normal fashion. Instead several designated commentators would lead off an open discussion of the issues raised by the papers.

**Division 31. Foreign Policy Analysis.** Dario Moreno, Department of Political Science, Florida International University, University Park Campus, Miami, FL 33199; (305) 348-2859; (305) 348-3765 (fax)

The inequality of nations has been a central issue in international relations theory. It is understandable that the natural inequalities of state attract scholarly attention. In their power, size, population, natural resources, and geographic positions, states have vastly different capabilities. Robert W. Tucker observed, "states are, as it were, born unequal, so much so, indeed, that by comparison the natural inequalities among individuals, appear almost marginal." Realist, Liberal, and Radical scholars have all noted that history of the international system is one of inequality. Because of this history, the theme of "Inequality and Politics" is highly relevant to this division. Panel and papers that deal with issues of inequality from either a normative or non-normative approach are especially encouraged.

The division of foreign policy analysis will also welcome paper and panel proposals that break new substantive, analytical, or methodological grounds. Areas of substantive interest include:

(1) **Systematic Determinants of Foreign Policy:** including studies that examine the responses in foreign policy to global problem in the environment, economy, or world system. Papers that analyze foreign policy within the context of an interactive setting, whether done in formal game theoretic terms or more substantive narrative form are encouraged. In line with the conference theme, proposals that explore the systematic causes of inequality are especially germane.

(2) **Comparative Foreign Policy:** especially studies that concentrate on inequality in a comparative perspective, works that break new substantive and interpretive ground in interesting cases, and efforts that examine comparative adjustments to the changing political environment or examine how these adjustments might best be studied.

(3) **Foreign Policy Decision-Making:** include both theoretical and substantive work, examining the individual, group, and bureaucratic processes that are involved in the construction of policy options and the selection of choices.

(4) **Domestic Determinants of Foreign Policy:** particularly work that concentrate on the relative importance of domestic determinants and the interaction between the domestic polity and the international system. Papers that deal with the role of sub-groups (minorities, ethnic groups, interest groups, etc.) in the foreign policy process are also welcome.

These areas are suggestive, not exclusively or exhaustive. Panels and papers covering all topics related to the foreign policy analysis are encouraged. Policy-perspective panels and round tables may be of particular interest. I strongly encourage proposals for complete, coherent panels, including a statement of the overall theme and individual paper titles. Proposals for individual papers should include an abstract. Applicants for panel chairs or discussant positions should submit a curriculum vita or statement of research specialization.

**Division 32. Representation and Electoral Systems\*.** Jason F. Kirksey, Department of Political Science, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, OK 74078; (405) 744-5569; (405) 744-7074 (fax); kirksey@vms.ucc.okstate.edu

Paper proposals will be accepted on a wide range of topics related to representation and electoral systems. The growth in the number of democracies, especially in Eastern Europe, provides some unique opportunities to examine the topics of representation and electoral systems at the early stages. Paper proposals examining the types of electoral arrangements used in emerging democratic countries are strongly encouraged. Of particular interest will be papers examining the effects of changes in the electoral structure on the representation of previously excluded groups.

"Inequality and Politics" is the theme of the meeting. This is certainly a topic of particular importance to the Division on Representation and Electoral Systems. One panel will be devoted to the issue of inequality and politics. Paper proposals for this particular panel should focus on how the structuring of electoral competition affects not only the representative compilation of legislative bodies but also decision-making within legislative arenas. Proposals are not limited to the United States. Paper proposals examining political inequality resulting largely from electoral issues will be given preference. Recent US Supreme Court decisions involving the interpretation of the Voting Rights Act has resulted in an increased focus among scholars and practitioners on alternative election systems. Paper proposals examining the impact of alternative election systems, such as limited and cumulative voting and single-transferable vote, on representation and policymaking in local jurisdictions within the

United States are welcome. Papers comparing and elaborating on the consequences of the implementation of these systems across jurisdictions in the U.S. will be of particular interest.

The Division on Representation and Electoral Systems encourages paper proposals covering a broad spectrum of substantive and methodological perspectives. Individual paper proposals will be given preference over proposals to organize an entire panel. Requests to serve as discussants or panel chairs are welcome.

**Division 33. Conflict Processes\***. William J. Dixon, Department of Political Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85719; (520) 621-7600; (520) 621-5051 (fax); dixonw@arizona.edu

Edward N. Muller was to have served as co-organizer of panels for the Conflict Processes Division. This choice was made deliberately in the hope that highly visible and accomplished scholar of domestic conflict would broaden the Division beyond its traditional emphasis on international conflict by attracting more panel and papers proposals focusing on the domestic political arena. This goal remains a guiding principle despite Ned Muller's untimely and tragic death on June 2, 1995.

It is, of course, entirely appropriate that the division make a concerted effort to position domestic and international conflict processes on an equal footing at this time. Far from putting an end to politically motivated violence, the passing of the Cold War seems rather to have unleashed new or long latent sources of conflict, largely from within traditional state borders. Moreover, conflicts within and between states suddenly appear to be interconnected far more closely and with far more complexity than previously imagined. Indeed, as we see in the case of Bosnia-Herzegovina, even the conventional conceptual boundary between domestic and international conflict has become blurred.

As in past years, the division welcomes proposals for panels, papers and roundtables dealing with the sources, evolution, consequences, and resolution of domestic and international political conflict. It is important to add that the division imposes no methodological or theoretical orthodoxy on proposals. Efforts will also be made to accommodate novel or innovative contributions as well as those following usual panel format. Within the very wide range of potentially relevant topics, three themes deserve special emphasis. First, as noted above, proposals aimed more at the domestic political context, particularly those with a comparative and/or theoretical focus, are especially attractive. Second, individual papers or panels proposing innovative ways to interrelate or theorize

about conflict processes across the traditional national-international division are also particularly welcome.

Finally, we seek to take advantage of the special appropriations of this year's convention theme by encouraging proposals dealing with inequality and all aspects of political conflict. New theoretical or empirical studies of inequality as a cause of internal political violence would be particularly welcomed under the circumstances of this year's convention. Other topics under the convention theme might focus on the distributional consequences of domestic or international conflict, as well as on ways that international inequalities might precipitate or condition political conflicts of either sort.

**Division 34. Religion and Politics\***. Gretchen Casper, Department of Political Science, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4348; (409) 845-8594; (409) 847-8924 (fax); e339gc@polisci.tamu.edu

Scholars in the area of religion and politics have often focused on the theme of this year's meeting, "Inequality and Politics." The effect of inequality as it relates to religion and politics ranges from the individual to the international level, and has been studied across subfields, such as political theory, voting behavior, policymaking, regime change, civil disobedience, and international relations. In the past, this division has included panels on such topics as the religious roots of tolerance, a roundtable on the Christian Right, church-state relations in Latin America, and Vatican diplomacy in the Middle East. I hope that people will submit paper and panel proposals that continue this pattern and add to the ongoing and diverse debates in these fields.

One of the strengths of the Religion and Politics Division is that it offers a wide range of panels across subfields. While the fields of political theory and voting behavior have been well represented, and will continue to be so, I would like to see more work in comparative politics and international relations. Panels and roundtables that address the issue of inequality across subfields, methodological approaches, or geographical regions are encouraged, as well. However, I will consider proposals on any topic in religion and politics.

In addition to individual paper proposals, I would be very happy to receive proposals for entire panels or roundtables, as well as offers to be a chair or discussant. For panel and roundtable proposals, please give me an idea of how the papers or participants will fit together. I would also like to encourage proposals for panels that use an alternative format, such as "meet the author" sessions or retrospectives on classic works in the



field, to enhance the level of discussion at the panels.

**Division 35. Science, Technology, Environmental Politics\*.** W.D. Kay, Department of Political Science, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115; (617)373-4401; (617)373-5311 (fax); wkay@neu.edu

A number of issues currently under discussion in the field of Science, Technology, and Environmental Politics (STEP) are directly related to the theme of the 1996 annual meeting, "Inequality and Politics." Appropriate topics along these lines for papers, or even entire panels, could include (but are by no means limited to): discussions of unequal access to new technologies ("laptops for poor people"), recent allegations concerning environmental racism, North-South tensions over questions of intellectual property and global environmental policies, and the general role of R&D in addressing social and economic inequality. We would also welcome proposals dealing on a theoretical level with the relationship between the distribution of political, economic, and social power and scientific research and technological development.

The STEP Division also invites proposals that explore the general political questions surrounding scientific research, technological development, and environmental change. Participation on our panels cuts across all the "traditional" subfields in political science, and represents a wide variety of theoretical and empirical approaches. We are especially interested in work that builds upon existing STEP writings.

Participation by practitioners and interdisciplinary scholars is encouraged. In addition to the division panels, the STEP Organized Section sponsors a research workshop on the Wednesday prior to the start of the APSA meeting. Contact the Organized Section Chair for details concerning this year's workshop.

**Division 36. Computers and Multimedia\*.** David L. Martin, Department of Political Science, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849-5208; (334) 844-6172; (334) 844-5348 (fax); martidl@mail.auburn.edu.

The Computers and Multimedia Division is soliciting papers or panels which illuminate these technologies in teaching, research, or software applications. In keeping with the 1996 meeting theme or "Inequality and Politics," proposals might consider (but are not limited to) such questions as: Do computers equalize users or create information elite? Do charges for access to the Internet create inequalities? What

effect do differences in student use of multimedia have? Are microcomputers and multimedia empowering or dividing users according to access?

New software, such as forecasting models, budgeting and cost/benefit analyses can be demonstrated if participants bring their own equipment (laptops). Research on the teaching effectiveness of computer and/or media applications; evaluation of statistical, multimedia, or other software programs will be considered, as well as research applications of new or existing media resources. These topics are suggestive, not limiting, proposals.

Please submit a one-page abstract according to the APSA form on the paper, panel, or demonstration for which you wish to be considered, specifying in detail any equipment needs. Those volunteering to chair a panel or to serve as a discussant should list their experience on the topic.

**Division 37. Political Communication\*.** Michael X. Delli Carpini, Department of Political Science, Barnard College, 3009 Broadway, New York, NY 10027; (212) 854-4877; (212) 854-3024 (fax); mdelli@barnard.columbia.edu

The theme of this year's program, "Inequality and Politics," is a natural one for our division, as issues of political communication are often at the heart of both the maintenance and alleviation of unequal access to government and the goods, services, and protections it provides. This issue can be explored at a number of levels: the relative ability of different candidates, parties, public officials, and interest groups to reach voters and citizens with their messages; the relative ability of individuals and groups to process and use effectively the information received; the relative ability of different forms of communication (e.g., interpersonal, print, electronic) to shape the political agenda and inform or persuade citizens; the relative access of different classes and groups of citizens (as both producers and consumers of information) to various forms of communications; the relative ability of different national and international systems of communication to encourage or discourage political equality within and across nations; and so forth.

The Political Communication Division invites panel, roundtable, and paper proposals that address these and related issues. We welcome proposals representing the full range of inter- and intra-disciplinary perspectives, normative viewpoints, substantive topics, levels of analysis, and scholarly methods that characterize our division. Especially welcome are proposals 1) that address developments in political communications (e.g., the use of new technology, the increased use of political ads to

affect public and elite opinion in policy debates, the use of non-traditional media for political ends, the restructuring of media systems in emerging democracies, and so forth); 2) that use innovative methods, data, and/or research designs for exploring the structure, substance and impact of political communications; 3) that explore the role of political communications in the politics of race, ethnicity, gender, and class; and 4) that generally further our theoretical understanding of the role of communications in the political process.

Authors should provide a summary of their paper (minimum of one page) and indicate if the proposal has been submitted for consideration by other divisions. Proposals for panels and roundtables are especially encouraged and should include, in addition to paper summaries, a full list of confirmed participants. Also encouraged are proposals suggesting alternatives to the traditional "3-papers-and-2-discussants" format (e.g., poster sessions, sessions in which a single recent or classic work or theory is discussed, panels that include both practitioners and scholars, panels that include demonstrations of new methods or communications technologies, panels in which the audience signs up and is sent copies of the papers in advance, and so forth). In short, feel free to be creative in ways that will improve the exchange between presenters, discussants, and the audience. Finally, if you are interested in serving as a panel chair or discussant (either in addition to or in lieu of presenting a paper), please let me know.

**Division 38. Transformational Politics\*.** Anthony DeSales Affigne, Department of Political Science, Providence College, Providence, RI 02918; (401) 865-2569; (401) 865-1222 (fax); affigne@providence.edu

The 1996 program of the Division on Transformational Politics will, as always, explore the very limits of political science thought, while offering all conference-goers several nice opportunities to get away from the professional clamor of the annual meeting and the conference hotel.

For our formal program, we welcome your creative proposal for an individual presentation, full panel, or roundtable. Your proposal should address some aspect of profound change in the modern world, whether personal, social, political, or ecological. How, for example, should we understand the global challenge to patriarchy? How can we best describe the disintegration of racial hierarchy? What explains the remarkable insistence of democratic politics? What implications can we anticipate, from collective perceptions of ecological catastrophe?

In years past, panels sponsored by the

Transformational Politics Division have ranged widely and probed deeply, crossing sub-disciplinary boundaries and bringing disparate perspectives. As a result, we've had successful experiences co-sponsoring panels with other sections, and we encourage you to suggest appropriate co-sponsorship options for your proposal. In the end, the very best proposals for presentations and panels on these and related questions will comprise our 1996 program.

In San Francisco, the Organized Section will also bestow awards for outstanding achievement, recognizing members who excel as researchers, writers and teachers, while honoring those whose personal lives exemplify the unity of scholarship and activism. We welcome your nominations for these important awards.

For the 8th consecutive year, our section will organize a casual Sunday morning excursion to an interesting local attraction. At the San Francisco meeting six years ago we went up the coast, to visit a marine mammal center. Please contact us with your suggestions. Where would you like to visit while you're in the Bay Area?

Finally, we will offer informal evening sessions during the conference called "Come and Stay Alive," where we come together in a small group - for our peace of mind - with open talk, good advice, and the support of colleagues from across the discipline. If you have any experience facilitating sessions like this, or if you have suggestions for how they can be most helpful, we welcome your inquiry.

We look forward to hearing from you soon, with your ideas for an intriguing research paper, provocative panel, or free-wheeling discussion, your nominations for awards, and your suggestions!

**Division 39. New Political Science\*.** John Ehrenberg, Department of Political Science, Long Island University, University Plaza, Brooklyn, NY 11201; (718) 488-1057/1193; (718) 488-1625 (fax); jehrenbe@hornet.liunet.edu

The intensifying economic inequality which characterizes contemporary American public life stands in stark contrast to the pretensions of political equality, and the New Political Science Division welcomes the 1996 organizing theme of "Inequality and Politics." We have been committed to political and social equality for many years of course, and we will be delighted to consider proposals concerning the role of social movements, the welfare state and the market, contemporary liberalism, postmodernism, affirmative action, civil society, the future of Marxism, and any other themes which address inequality and politics in late

capitalism. Given the relentless attacks on the standard of living which continue to mark American public life, there should be no shortage of papers. Proposals need not be limited to the organizing theme, of course; there are plenty of important matters for us to address. One of the purposes of the division's panels is to help junior colleagues in an environment which is often hostile and intimidating, and we continue to welcome such proposals.

**Division 40. Political Psychology\***. Robert Shapiro, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, 420 W. 118th Street, New York, NY 10027; (212) 854-3944; (212) 222-0598 (fax); rys3@columbia.edu

The theme of "Inequality and Politics" raises a number of questions for the study of political psychology that this division would like to address along with other areas of current research. How is inequality defined and perceived at the mass and elite levels? How much emphasis should be placed on cognition versus affect and how the two are related? What influences corresponding attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs? How do these affect other political attitudes and behavior? Are processes of political manipulation at work involving the mass media and the intentional efforts of particular elites? This division is also interested in these questions in comparative perspective, particularly as they allow us to understand the influences of different social and political contexts, as well as political institutions and systems more generally. Also, what leverage is provided by different methodologies in political psychology for studying inequality and politics?

These questions clearly overlap with issues in political behavior, political communication, comparative politics, methodology, and other areas, and they may facilitate cosponsorship with other divisions.

In addition to proposals concerning the conference's theme, special consideration will be given to topics in current research that offer new theoretical perspectives, use innovative methodologies, offer comparative or interdisciplinary perspectives, or attempt to link findings bearing on individual level political psychology to aggregate or systemic politics.

The division is interested in new panel formats that authors or prospective panel chairs might propose. One format that may be selectively explored is one in which authors prepare papers examining closely related issues well in advance, and the discussants present the key papers' findings and a synthesis; the authors then respond briefly and an open discussion follows.

**Division 41. Politics and Literature\***. Vickie Sullivan, Department of Government, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866; (518) 584-5000, ext. 2355; (518) 583-0276 (fax).

This division explores the manner in which literary works, including works of poetry, prose, drama, and film, can inform the understanding of students of politics. In light of the theme of the 1996 convention, the division seeks, in particular, papers that address the issue of inequality. Participants may be interested in exploring this issue in broad terms by addressing such topics as whether literature uniquely provides us with an insight into the political character and consequences of inequality; or how literature's treatment of this issue affects political and social attitudes. Alternatively, participants may wish to consider how inequality is treated in a specific genre, author, or work. For example: how might the novel, with its characteristic examination of the inner life of the individual, be said to illuminate the issue of equality?; what insights does a specific author provide to political questions arising from relations between the sexes, or among classes or cultures?; how does a playwright or poet analyze social and political inequalities in a hierarchical society or in one undergoing transformation to a more egalitarian society?; or what reflections does an American literary work offer on life in a regime that makes the explicit claim of being founded on equality?

Other topics related to political readings of literature, and unrelated to the convention's theme, will also be considered. Proposals for a paper or for a complete panel, as well as requests to serve as a discussant, are welcome.

**Division 42. Internships and Experiential Education\***. Sally Edwards, Department of Political Science, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292; (502) 852-3313; (502) 852-7923 (fax); smedwaro2@ulkyvx.louisville.edu

Even before the establishment of the first universities in our liberal democracy, the craft guilds and the apprenticeship system were pioneering examples of the principle "learning by doing." Internships are probably one of the oldest forms of experiential learning and have been rediscovered in contemporary times with a new enthusiasm and interest as essential complements to classroom learning in the political science curriculum. In particular, experiential learning has taken on additional variations of "learning by doing," and includes classroom based simulations and game theories as well as cooperative education, field study, practicums, and service learning that espouses public and community service. With the approach of the 21st century, experiential education

has many new challenges to face as a unique complement to classroom learning.

One of these is presented by the theme of the 1996 meeting, "Inequality and Politics." The challenge for experiential educators is to give students an up close investigation and exposure to the inequalities that often appear inherent in political systems. (Those who vote receive the benefits, those who don't are marginalized). Specific panels or roundtables on experiential learning, for example, could address the following issues (these are no means exclusive): (1) service learning as a class assignment to expose students to needs of marginalized citizens, (2) traditional internships in elections that highlight which citizens are ignored in campaigns, (3) experiential education in governmental agencies or legislative offices that underscores which citizens/constituents get prompt attention and those that are ignored. These are merely suggestions, all creative applications will be considered, just keep in mind the theme of "Inequality and Politics."

Papers for this division that include the perennial questions of measuring standards, performance, and effectiveness of experiential learning tools are especially encouraged.

**Division 43. Teaching and Learning in Political Science.** Wilbur C. Rich, Department of Political Science, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181; (617) 283-2184; (617) 283-3644 (fax); wrich@wellesley.edu

This division focuses on issue related to teaching and learning in political science at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Panels and roundtables will be designed to share information about methods of teaching political science as well as the theoretical issues of teaching political sciences in the 1990s. We want to stimulate debate about what is good teaching and how to measure it.

This division recognizes that teaching is a critical part of the political scientist's role. These panels represent an opportunity to share ideas and experiences of classroom teaching and learning. We want the panels and roundtables to be as interactive as possible. Regardless of sub-field, the presentation of the learning material is crucial to engaging the student's mind. Most students will not become political scientists, but they want to politically informed.

General proposals for panels, papers, and roundtables on all aspects of political science instruction are welcome. Proposals featuring the 1996 program theme "Inequality and Politics" are especially invited. The subject of inequality often stimulates emotional discussions in class. What kind

of classroom challenges does this present to teachers? How can we teach critical thinking about these issues? What method works with what types of students?

We would like to create panels and roundtables for two general areas: [1] undergraduate teaching materials and strategies (e.g. uses of computer based instructions, audio-visual equipment, case studies methods, multicultural and gender-based materials in all subfields of the discipline) [2] assessing teaching outcomes of political science instructions (e.g. pre-test and post-test of student knowledge of subfields of political science, the impact of student evaluations on teaching styles and methods, and evaluation of interdisciplinary instructions). Some panels will be co-sponsored with the APSA Education Committee.

Please feel free to propose additional ideas for panels and roundtables. We will be particularly receptive to panel proposals that are designed to be highly interactive between presenters and audience.

**Division 44. Public Opinion and Foreign Policy\***. Jerel Rosati, Department of Government and International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208; (803) 777-2981; (803) 777-8255 (fax); rosati@barnet.slu.sc.edu

This year we are interested in a wide range of papers and panels in the general area of public opinion and foreign policy. This would include the study of the beliefs of the public broadly defined to include public opinion, political ideology, and national culture; the study of elite beliefs as well as mass beliefs; the study of public beliefs in the United States, other societies, as well as comparative analyses. Since the ultimate purpose is to extend our knowledge and understanding of the role of public opinion in foreign policy, it would be particularly helpful to further explore the content and nature of public beliefs; their origins and sources; the extent to which they are stable or open to change over time; their impact on the "politics" of foreign policy, much as for political leadership, governance, and, ultimately, foreign policy behavior; and their implications for the workings of democracy given the demands of national security. The focus could be substantive, theoretical, and/or methodological. One of the panels should be built around the conference theme of "Inequality and Politics."

The conference coordinators and I are particularly interested in panels and forums that generate exciting sessions than the conventional 3 papers-and-2-discussants format. Roundtables are highly encouraged. For example, a roundtable that discusses the viability and power of different methodological approaches to tap into public beliefs,

in addition to the traditional reliance on survey research, could be particularly enlightening and exciting. Other possible formats that come to mind are "meet the author" panels, retrospectives on a classic work in the field, or "scholar and practitioner" panels. We also are open to panel sessions that encourage a more interactive exchange between official panelists and the audience. We urge you to be imaginative -- to think of new ways of conceiving traditional topics in your field, new ways of presenting and discussing arguments at the convention, and new kinds of people to get involved in the program. We can provide a letter from APSA that would approve and legitimize these more imaginative ways of officially participating in the conference program that should ensure university support and funding.

**Division 45. Race, Ethnicity and Politics\***. William E. Nelson, Jr., Department of Black Studies, Ohio State University, 486 University Hall, Columbus, OH 43210; (614) 292-0453; wnelson@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu; or Franke Wilmer, Department of Political Science, Iowa State, Ross Hall, Ames, IA 50011-1204; (515) 294-7256; (515) 294-1003 (fax); upofh@gemini.oscs.montana.edu

Could there be a more appropriate convention theme than "Inequality and Politics" for the newly approved APSA Organized Section on Race, Ethnicity and Politics? This area has most often been approached as a topic or object of study by political scientists, rather than as a perspective through which political life can be viewed, thus yielding new insights in to the broader discipline itself. This shift from object to subject changes the focus, for instance, of "the politics of race and ethnicity in America" to American politics viewed from the perspective of a variety of racial and ethnic identities. This reveals such important questions as: How democratic has the American political experience been for Native Americans? For African Americans? For Asian, Latino, Chicano Americans? Similarly, in the area of world politics or international relations, ethnic politics is often viewed as a problem to be solved within the framework of the state system. From the perspective of those engaged in struggles over ethnic identity, however, it is the state itself, legitimated by the state system (of international law and organization) that is the problem. While we remain interested in both qualitative and quantitative studies which still treat racial and ethnic politics as a topic of interest to national, regional and global political systems, we would also like to encourage participants (both panel and papers) to think about the convention's theme, "Inequality and Politics," in terms of the experience and perspective of racial and ethnic groups and identities that have historically been marginalized in national, regional, or global contexts.

We are interested in paper and panel proposals of both substantive and theoretical interest, including those with a policy focus. What is the relationship between racial identity and civil society? How can civil society be constructed or adapted in a manner compatible with a variety of ethnic identities? Must a society come to terms with its own legacy of marginalization and inequality based on racial and ethnic identity, and if so, how? Can equality be thought of merely in terms of sameness and uniformity? What is the significance of the fact that inequalities within a single society derive from different paths of historical experience (Native American Indian, African American, Asian American, Latino and Chicano, for instance?) We would like to see participation by a broad range of scholars and subfields, including (but not limited to): American politics, urban politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory. We believe that studies of racial and ethnic politics emphasizing the theme of inequality and politics will have much to say about all of these and other areas of political science.

(NOTE: DIVISIONS WITH \* ARE APSA ORGANIZED SECTIONS)