

Draft Minutes APSA Council Meeting August 30, 1995 Chicago Hilton and Towers Hotel 9:30 a.m.–3:00 p.m.

[Editor's note: minutes still pending approval]

APSA Council: Sidney Verba, Arend Lijphart, Susan Bourque, Timothy Cook, F. Chris Garcia, John Garcia, Barbara Geddes, Betty Glad, J. Mark Hansen, Anne H. Hopkins, Mary Katzenstein, Peter Katzenstein, Margaret Levi, Susan MacManus, Helen Milner, William Nelson, Jr., Mary Nichols, G. Bingham Powell, Catherine E. Rudder, Theda Skocpol, Toni-Michelle Travis, Eddie Williams, Michael P. Zuckert

Not attending: Loch Johnson, Catherine Kelleher, Mamie Locke, David Price

APSA Staff: Michael Brintnall, Rob Hauck, Sheilah Mann, Rovilla McHenry, and Maurice Woodard

Guests: Ada Finifter, Mark Blasius, Martha Ackelsberg, Martha Kumar, Robin Remington, and Paula McClain

1. *President Sidney Verba called the meeting to order and initiated a round of introductions.*
2. *Council Action: The Council approved the Minutes of the April 8, 1995 Council minutes.*
3. *Report of the President*

a. Verba presented the minutes of the August 29, 1995 Administrative Committee. Each item and recommendation in the Administrative Committee minutes, he said, would be taken up as they appear on the Council agenda.

b. Verba reported on his visits to regional association meetings and observed that the state of the discipline is well. In particular, he noted, differences among the many divisions within the discipline were argued without rancor or acrimony. Such civil discussions were not always the case as when behavioralism was introduced to the discipline. Now, he concluded, there appears to be a blending of approaches that makes for a diverse and lively discipline.

c. Verba expressed his and the Association's gratitude for the efforts of Bing Powell, Ada Finifter, Peter Katzenstein, Mary Katzenstein, Jennifer Hochschild, Ronald Rogowski, Catherine Rudder, and the APSA staff.

d. In a year of many challenges to public funding for the social sciences, Verba acknowledged the support extended to defend against program cutbacks by colleagues in the natural sciences.

e. President Verba commended the report of the Nominating Committee on the candidates for Council Officers and members. The 1996 slate of nominees will be presented for a vote at the Business Meeting at the 1995 Annual Meeting.

f. *Council Action:* The Council, on the recommendation of President Verba, reviewed and approved unanimously the rules for the 1995 Business Meeting.

4. *Report of the Executive Director*

a. Catherine Rudder referenced her "Executive Director's Report" as prepared for *PS* and offered to answer questions that the Council might have.

5. *Appointments of President-elect Arend Lijphart*

a. Lijphart presented the Council with his list of committee appointments. He observed that the appointments were guided by the need to get the right person for each opening while acknowledging institutional, race, gender, geography boundaries that cross-cut the profession. The 1996 appointments include 56 males and 40 females, 8 African Americans and 4 Latinos/Latinas, and 5 international members, faculty from teaching as well as research institutions, and representatives from every geographic area and field.

He acknowledged the contributions of the Status Committees on Women, Blacks, Latinos, and Lesbians and Gays, as well as the Women's Caucus and the Gay and Lesbian Caucus in suggesting possible appointees.

b. Michael Zuckert hoped that as future appointments are made to the Committee on Organized Sections, individuals from liberal arts colleges would be included.

c. *Council Action:* the Council approved all appointments and authorized

the President-Elect to make any replacements as necessary.

6. *Review of the 1995 Annual Meeting*

a. Report of the 1995 Program Co-chairs

Mary Katzenstein and Peter Katzenstein happily reported that there were no crises in the planning for the 1995 meeting. They observed that the numbers of participants, panels and other presentations seemed to be increasing almost exponentially. Of particular interest were the reasons for increased participation: [1] increased student participation on the program; [2] increase in the number of papers presented to more than one division; increase in the number of cosponsored panels; and a 28% increase in the number of panel proposals. President Verba interjected that the growth and complexity of the meeting was formidable.

The Katzensteins cautioned that the Program Committee increasingly will face greater difficulties as the panel and paper rejection rates increase, as divisions find it hard to be responsive to all members who want to participate on panels.

Though special events such as the Plenary Session, "After Liberalism?" and three Hyde Park Sessions had come together nicely, Mary Katzenstein remarked that it is very difficult to secure public officials, especially when not in Washington, D.C.

b. Division of the Annual Meeting Program between Program Chairs and Organized Sections

[1] Verba reported that the Administrative Committee had discussed at length the trend to have more and more of the annual meeting program organized by Organized Section leaders. What role remained for program chairs? How will areas not represented among Organized Sections continue to be represented among program divisions?

He also observed that Organized Sections were developing excellent panels, and were articulating their collective responsibilities (such as maintaining substantive and individual diversity) through the Committee on Organized Sections.

[2] The Administrative Committee concluded that it was neither possible nor desirable to come up with a grand design for refashioning the annual

meeting program. But it did recommend to the Council that guidelines be provided to Program Chairs so that they might negotiate with the authority of the Council to further broad disciplinary aims. The Council agrees that program chairs review each division's call for papers and press on divisions the need for greater inclusiveness where appropriate.

c. Report of 1996 Program Co-Chairs

[1] Jennifer Hochschild reported that the 1996 program committee consisted of 45 divisions headed by 50 chairs and co-chairs. Twenty percent are of color, 30% are women, and 15% work at colleges, completing a committee representative of the discipline. She expressed appreciation to Organized Section Heads for their assistance in making this possible.

[2] She stated that the theme of the 1996 meeting will be "Inequality and Politics." The theme will be addressed in two ways. A separate division organized by the program chairs would be created, and each division has been asked to devote one panel to the theme.

[3] The program will be marked by several features: Hyde Park Sessions will be continued; greater effort will be made toward facilitating poster sessions; Rick Hall's experiment with legislative studies panels in the 1995 annual meeting in which the discussants present the papers and the authors comment on the discussants observations will be evaluated and encouraged if merited. Also the chairs are considering encouraging panels in which papers have been peer reviewed.

[4] Ronald Rogowski returned the discussion to the relationship between program chairs and Organized Sections, observing that only between 12–15 divisions of the programs 45 divisions are the direct responsibility of the program chairs, none of which is in American politics. To avoid intellectual balkanization and maintain diversity, the program chairs must consult with Organized Sections with the understanding that the Council has charged the chairs with responsibility for maintaining diversity. It is important that an institutional memory be codified so that it is easy to see which divisions are making efforts and which are not. It is also necessary for plenary sessions to remain in the control of program chairs. He confirmed that program chairs should have a division of their own in the program.

Council action: The Council unanimously approved the following guidelines, to be incorporated as part of the Association's Annual Meeting policy statement:

The Annual Meeting program chairs are empowered to:

[1] *Review the statement written by each member of the program committee that solicits participation in the Annual Meeting and make recommendations for changes prior to publication in PS.*

[2] *Attend to the breadth of the program by taking care that each division of the program covers a wide and inclusive definition of the subject matter of that division and in particular by encouraging divisions that traditionally have defined themselves within the field of American politics to broaden their reach if doing so makes good intellectual sense.*

[3] *Work toward increasing representation of comparative and international politics on the program.*

[4] *Superintend all plenary and evening sessions and a separate program division composed initially of at least 10 panels with allowance for incremental growth.*

d. Timing of the Annual Meeting

Hauck reported on the results of the survey of members on the timing of the annual meeting. He observed that as with the results of the 1987 survey, significant numbers of members were dissatisfied with the timing of the annual meeting though no consensus could be reached as to what alternative dates would be acceptable. Council members suggested that the present survey be seen as the first of a series of surveys in which member preferences are brought into sharper focus, e.g. members should next be asked to evaluate three specific sets of dates with accompanying rationales. Members should also be asked to rank their reasons for attending the meeting. The sense of the Council was that the timing issue should be addressed further.

7. *Report of the Committee on Lesbians and Gays in the Profession*

Verba explained that when the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession was formed, it was asked by the Council to undertake an empirical examination of the current status of lesbians and gays in the profession "culminating in a report to the Council and to the membership." That report was presented to the Council at its April 8, 1995 meeting, at which time the Council asked the committee to bring recommendations to the Council for follow-up on findings in the report.

Verba said that the Administrative Committee reviewed those recommendations very favorably and supported endorsing them as a whole, but because of the many details of each, recom-

mended full discussion and action on each.

Mark Blasius, Chair of the Committee, provided the historical context for the report, and noted that 10 years ago when he started as a graduate student, there were no papers or panels at APSA meetings on lesbian and gay politics, and gay persons even were excluded from a panel on AIDS politics until a planned disruption provoked changes. Meetings of the Gay and Lesbian Caucus were held out of public eye in private homes.

Since then, he said, there have been significant gains. The Gay and Lesbian Caucus, founded in 1988, has grown from 3 to 10 panels at the meeting. The Caucus argued successfully for an APSA policy for annual meeting sites that takes into account the legal status of lesbians and gays at such places. The Status Committee has been formed and supported. A time of invisibility, discrimination, and forced ghettoization has changed to one of active involvement and inclusion, thanks to this Council and its officers, and their predecessors. The Committee asks now that the Council codify and expand these gains.

Martha Ackelsberg, who co-drafted the report with David Rayside, said that the recommendations flow from the report. Two of the findings from the report illustrate major areas which need attention. For one, most lesbian, gay, and bisexual political scientists do not publicly so identify themselves, and most of those who do are white males. There is still a perceived climate of discrimination and ill-collegiality in departments and to a degree at the meeting. For another, there are still wide gaps in teaching on topics of lesbian and gay politics—with lesbian and gay political scientists far more likely to include such materials in their courses than others. Thus, the Committee has prepared two types of recommendations—relating to 1) personal status of lesbian and gay scholars, and 2) to issues of research and teaching. The recommendations also are broken into those for which immediate Council action are appropriate, and those which are more general guidelines for departments and political scientists in general.

The Council then discussed each recommendation (reprinted in italics below) and the following actions:

[1] *Explicitly include sexual orientation in the areas of the APSA's Guide to Professional Ethics that go beyond initial hiring to cover other aspect of employment, and broaden that document's scope to incorporate the Committee's recommendations on profes-*

sional ethics. This was referred to the Committee on Professional Ethics, Rights and Freedoms with a recommendation to rewrite APSA anti-discrimination language to cover the work environment more broadly.

[2] *Ensure that APSA benefit programs, as models for those of all employers of political scientists, offer coverage to same-sex couples comparable to that provided for married heterosexual couples, even if that entails more expensive providers of benefit policies.* Rudder reported that we are committed to this goal both for employees and members. It is a goal as we shop for new employee benefit plans. APSA, along with other professional associations such as the Modern Language Association, is working with Wohlers Insurance, who provide our member plans, to achieve this as well, and an inclusive member benefit plan will be introduced this year.

[3] *Include sexual orientation issues in Annual Meeting workshops for department chairs dealing with such issues as diversity, instructional training, and program evaluation, and, where relevant, in other Annual Meeting special programs.* This will be referred to the Departmental Services Committee to develop.

[4] *Direct the Nominating Committee to regularly consider sexual orientation, or expertise on the impact of a political system on gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, as one factor contributing to diversity in the composition of the Council and APSA offices when it nominates candidates.* Rudder noted that APSA already advises the Nominating Committee about the importance of diversity in appointments, and the instruction is taken seriously by the Committee. Future instructions to the Nominating Committee will say that diversity includes lesbian, gay, and bisexual political scientists.

[5] *Request the Managing Editor of the APSR to include expertise in gay and lesbian politics as deserving of representation on the editorial board of that publication; and together with the APSA Committee on Publications pursue implementation of recommendation #10 below (to make the same recommendation to editors of other political science journals).* Verba said that the Administrative Committee considered this recommendation extremely important, though it would not mandate any particular composition of editorial boards. This is an emerging and growing field and editors should pay particular attention to ways to be responsive to it and to having access to the relevant expertise to review the field.

G. Bingham Powell, editor of the *APSR*, said that the manuscripts about lesbian and gay politics that he has received have been highly diverse—covering policy, theory, literature, etc. This requires different sets of experts to review. It would help editors to have much more information about who appropriate experts are who cross-cut these diverse fields.

Ada Finifter, editor-designate of the *APSR*, said she was concerned about this recommendation because it implies that she must appoint a particular type of person to the editorial board. The editorial board is a small working group to suggest reviewers. It doesn't make sense, she said, to have "a" person on the editorial board to whom she might send just a few manuscripts when, manuscripts dealing with gay and lesbian themes were in many different subfields of the discipline and should be evaluated by people in that subfield. She said she would rather have people on the editorial board working in broad intellectual areas. She said she accepted the recommendation in spirit, but did not want to be directed to make specific appointments.

Blasius said he agreed there ought not be just narrow specialists on the board, but that there are many people with broad experience in political science who also have expertise in lesbian and gay political research who could be included. Finifter stated that the editorial office would be making use of several different databases of potential reviewers. By searching on keywords related to gay and lesbian politics, she was optimistic that appropriate reviewers would be found for manuscripts in these areas.

[6] *Formally acknowledge and express concern for the denial of professional status to lesbian, gay, and bisexual political scientists documented in the Report of the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession.* The Council's endorsement of the Committee Report and of the preamble of these Recommendations embodies such an acknowledgment and concern.

[7] *Urge institutions that employ political scientists to establish protections against anti-gay/lesbian discrimination, to extend benefit programs to include same-sex couples, and to develop programs to facilitate collegiality and improve the climate for lesbians and gays; and*

[8] *Circulate to chairs of political science departments the Committee's Report and its Recommendations to the Council (including part B); and urge chairs to review both documents care-*

fully and take actions responding to the Report's findings relevant to the departmental level. These are important issues. While APSA cannot speak for departments and institutions themselves, the message can be conveyed from APSA, through the Departmental Services Committee, to Department Chairs to bring back to their own departments and institutions. These recommendations should be reported in the Departmental Chairs Newsletter, and reviewed by the Departmental Services Committee for consideration of other ways to advance them.

[9] *Ensure that the Annual Meeting program committee continue to be diverse along the several dimensions important to the Association, including sexual orientation; and through the Program Committee, urge program section chairs as well as panel chairs to encourage the inclusion of lesbian and gay content in panel sessions, and to cooperate as much as possible with programmers of sessions organized by the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Caucus.* The Council commends this issue to the attention of the Program Chairs, and notes that a presentation on this issue at the Program Committee luncheon is one way to sensitize division chairs to the issue.

[10] *See [5] above.*

[11] *Communicate to funding agencies of major significance to political scientists the importance the Association attaches to research on issues related to gays, lesbians, and sexual minority status, and to the politics of sexuality in general. (This could be accomplished in part by the APSA itself applying for funding for gay- and lesbian-related projects suggested by the Committee).* Since much of APSA's contact with funding agencies pertains to curricular projects, this issue should be reviewed collaboratively by the Committee on Education, APSA staff, and the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession. It should also be brought to the attention of the Research Support Committee.

[12] *Recognize that lesbians and gays of color are even more broadly subject to pressures for invisibility, and urge relevant committees and members of staff to address these issues.* All of the Status Committees should review the Report and Recommendations for possible actions. The Council noted also there is a planned joint meeting of the heads of the Status Committees, and recommended this also be considered there.

[13] *Encourage the Association's staff and committee chairs to explore further ways in which initiatives can be*

introduced or expanded to address the concerns raised in the Report on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession and in this Memorandum, and call on staff and committee chairs to formally report back to Council on initiatives taken. The Council requests that each APSA standing committee review these issues and make a formal report back to the Council, probably at the San Francisco meeting next August.

[14] *Commission a follow-up study of members of the profession and department chairs, approximately five years from now, to assess progress made on gay- and lesbian-related concerns.* The Council agreed this was a good idea, and the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Profession should track this and make plans to do it.

Council Action: The Council endorsed the recommendations and their disposition as discussed above.

8. *Report of the Treasurer, Susan Bourque*

Bourque reviewed the financial health of the association and concluded that it was excellent. For example, she said the Trust and Development Account had risen to \$3,234,904, the result of a 20% return on investments over the past 12 months.

Council Action: Unanimous adoption of the revised budget, FY1995-96.

9. *Report of APSA's Representational Activities*

a. Robin Remington, APSA's liaison to the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) brought a letter from the new AAASS Executive Director Carol Saivetz inviting broader relations among the social sciences in this field. APSA was invited to sponsor panels at the AAASS meetings, and they in turn were invited to propose workshops for the APSA meeting. The matter was referred to the Program Chairs.

b. Brintnall and Rudder provided an update on COSSA activities regarding social science funding at the National Science Foundation and future funds for NEH. The NSF funding seems to have been resolved successfully, though there is an unpredictable future for all such funding down the road. These issues have been the highest priority for the national office.

10. *American Political Science Review*

Managing Editor Bing Powell presented his last report on the selection and production of APSR articles and issues. The Council acknowledged Powell's service with kudos and the

presentation of a certificate and an antique print by President Verba.

Incoming Managing Editor Ada Finifter reported next of the smooth transition of the APSR offices from Rochester to Michigan State. Though smooth, she commented, it was nevertheless daunting due to the sudden influx of manuscript submissions and as authors test a new editor.

She described future projects including increased computerization of office activities, and the development of a World Wide Web page. She raised the question of copyright privileges of materials that are distributed electronically both before and after they are published.

Finifter has expanded the Editorial Board by 6 or 8. She had already appointed 22 and will complete her work in the next few weeks.

Council Action: At the suggestion of the Administrative Committee, the Council unanimously adopted Finifter's request that she may use the title of Editor in lieu of Managing Editor, though care must be exercised so that the position of Editor is identified with the title of Managing Editor as stated in the APSA Constitution. Furthermore, the Council agreed to keep the title of Associate Editor.

11. *Minority Programs*

a. Ralph Bunche Summer Institute Rudder reported that the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute has been running for nine years, missing only one year in the period, to provide summer training for minority students considering doctoral study in political science. APSA has been looking for a new site for the Institute, to provide some relief to the Atlanta consortium which has supported it for the past five years.

Paula McClain and the University of Virginia have now stepped in and are engaged in a vigorous effort to establish the program there. UVA is presently committed to hosting the program for three years, and hopes to find ways to underwrite it beyond that.

b. APSA Graduate Fellows

Maurice Woodard reported on placement of APSA minority graduate fellows. The four funded APSA fellows received fellowships from Wisconsin, Rutgers, Michigan, and Chicago.

c. Minority Identification Project

Brintnall reported that this project is continuing, drawing on the support of 32 leading graduate departments in political science. Last year the project circulated names of 351 minority students from 37 different schools to graduate programs for recruiting.

d. Reception of the Committee on the Status of Blacks

Woodard reported that Paula McClain and Mitchell Rice will be honored by the Committee on the Status of Blacks at their reception at this year's annual meeting.

12. *Report of the Standing Committee on Organized Sections*

Policy about Journal Agreements

The journal agreement between the Organized Section on Political Organizations and Parties and Heldref is no longer under consideration and was not discussed. However, since there may be interest from Sections in such arrangements in the future, the Committee proposed guidelines for how to proceed in the future. They are: *When an Organized Section plans involvement with a journal, it should bring a proposal to the APSA Council which addresses key issues such as editorial succession, financial feasibility, peer review or comparable procedures for quality control, and so forth. Proposals must also, of course, show that the journal project is consistent with the APSA Constitution and the practices of the Association. Any questions which might arise with the Council on such issues would need to be worked out cooperatively with APSA before APSA could sign the contract.*

Council Action: The Council approved the guidelines.

b. Independent action by Sections using the APSA name.

The Organized Sections Committee found that the precedent set by the Presidency Research Group and the Council regarding the Archivist of the United States was a positive one that worked well for all the parties. In this case, the members of the Section who wished to interview candidates for the Archivist constituted themselves as a private group and did not use the APSA name in their activities. The Committee felt this precedent should set the basis for handling such issues in the future.

Guidelines. Drawing on the successful experience with the PRG, and also recognizing that Sections do stand for distinct groups of organized scholars with formal procedures for taking positions and an infrastructure for carrying on informed discussion, the Committee proposed three part guidelines for policy regarding independent statements or actions by Sections:

[1] *Any time scholars in an Organized Section wish to express a public position, they can constitute themselves as an independent group of scholars and speak out as they wish. The infra-*

structure of the Organized Section may be a useful tool for conducting discussion or debate about such issues, or announcing the formation of an independent group.

[2] If the Organized Section would like to speak out in its own name as an Organized Section of APSA, its position must be consistent with the APSA Constitution and legal status, and the Section should include a disclaimer in its statements that its views do not necessarily represent those of the APSA.

[3] If an Organized Section wishes APSA as a whole to make a public statement, the position needs to be approved and expressed by the APSA Officers or Council, through whatever procedures they endorse.

At the recommendation of the Organized Sections Committee, the Council deferred action in order to get views from Organized Section heads, who are meeting later.

c. Organized Section Update

Brintnall reported that two smaller sections which have not met the 250 member threshold for a full year will leave Organized Section status. The Applied Section will merge with Public Policy, and the Life Sciences Section will change to related group status. With the addition of the new Section on Race and Ethnicity, there will now be 31 active Sections.

The Organized Section on Internships and Experiential Education has recently been notified by the Organized Sections Committee that its membership has been below 250 for the year. The Section will not be included on the 1997 Program Committee and has a year to gain members. Section leaders are already considering a plan to change the Section focus to Undergraduate Education broadly defined.

13. Report of the Committee on International Programs

Hauck reported on the activities of the Committee on International Programs. Four representatives of the Japanese Political Science Association are attending our 1995 meeting. Foundation support is being explored to provide stable funding for future bilateral exchange.

The International Programs Committee has set a high priority on having the proposed Centennial Center respond to needs and interests of scholars from abroad. Discussion is underway at the Annual Meeting to strengthen the working relationships between APSA and IPSA. Ted Lowi, APSA's representative to the IPSA Executive Committee, has helped spearhead this effort.

14. Report on Education Programs

Sheilah Mann reported that APSA expects to receive funds from the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) for a syllabi project addressing syllabi for new introductory courses in political science. The objective is to develop syllabi which integrate comparative and American perspectives in the first year course.

She also noted another successful USIA Summer Institute on the American Political System, run jointly by American University and APSA. Institute participants are faculty and advanced graduate students in political science, international relations, and law, and came this year from countries in Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, Western and Eastern Europe, Asia, and South Asia.

15. Recognition of President Verba

President-Elect Arend Lijphart congratulated Sidney Verba on his good services for the Association. He said Verba is his role model for wise, generous, and accessible leadership. The Council also thanked President Verba, and Lijphart presented him with a certificate and with an antique print.

16. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned with no further business.

APSA Awards Presented at 1995 Annual Meeting

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1993 or 1994 in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: George Ross, Brandeis University, Chair; Robert Fatton, University of Virginia; and Ellis Krauss, University of Pittsburgh

Recipient: **Jonah Levy**, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Dissertation: "Tocqueville's Revenge: Dilemmas of Institutional Reform in Post-Dirigiste France"

Dissertation Chair: Suzanne Berger

Citation: Analyzing the changing role of the French state is part of one of the more important research problems in the comparative politics of industrial

societies. *Dirigiste* France in the 1960s was a model for Andrew Shonfield and a central case for John Zysman and others later. The end of high post-war growth and the growing interdependence of European and global economies threatened to turn French *dirigisme* into a monument to inflexibility, however. By the mid-1980s the Mitterrand administration was engaged in serious efforts to de-statize and deregulate France, involving privatizations and decentralization. Jonah Levy's work explores the fascinating consequences of these efforts for the French state. Bracketing misleading French public rhetoric, Levy's field work, in two well-chosen locations in provincial France, traces these consequences "on the ground." He finds that abandoning *dirigisme* is easier said than done. Statist networks and lines of political influence continue to function in the new setting, but only partially because actors at the center are reluctant to give up their centrality. The real barrier to change, Levy concludes, is the absence of a sufficiently autonomous "civil society" in France, whether in the financial and corporate worlds or in the provinces. *Tocqueville's Revenge*, therefore, lies in the weakness of the socio-political foundations for an effective decentralization of initiatives of all kinds in France. Levy leaves open for future consideration whether France will eventually reconfigure into a more effective "neo-dirigiste" model or founder on its inability to change.

Levy's work is full of comparative insight about changing state roles in the context of rapidly changing economic contexts, is written with grace and elegance and, while joining central issues in comparative politics also makes a contribution to general public debate about such matters. It raises profound questions about the complexity of comparative analyses of phenomena as complicated as "the state" and should provoke considerable scholarly debate. The state, as an object of study, having been "brought back in" a while ago, has been allowed of late quietly to move off the stage. At a moment when state roles are changing in unpredictable ways and directions and when politicians themselves are quite consciously trying to steer such changes, Levy's dissertation is an important step towards regenerating a fundamental discussion.

William Anderson Award (\$250)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1993 or