

ANNUAL MEETING - AUGUST 31-SEPTEMBER 3, 1995

THE 1995 PROGRAM CALL FOR PAPERS

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: DECEMBER 1, 1994

**Program Chairs:** Mary Fainsod Katzenstein, Department of Government, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853; 607-255-3574; 607-255-4530 (fax); mfk2@cornell.edu (e-mail); and Peter J. Katzenstein, Department of Government, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853; 607-255-8936; 607-255-4530 (fax); pj2@cornell.edu (e-mail).

LIBERALISM AT CENTURY'S END:  
COMPETING PERSPECTIVES

**Division 1. Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches.** J. Donald Moon, Department of Government, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT 06459-0019; 203-347-9411 x2704; 203-343-3918 (fax); dmoon@eagle.wesleyan.edu (e-mail).

It is not possible to provide an adequate reappraisal of liberalism without careful attention to the historical contexts in which liberalism developed. In recent discussions "liberalism" is often taken as a unitary concept, juxtaposed to alternative traditions or visions, such as communitarianism or Marxism, thereby obscuring both the differences among liberalisms and the relationships of liberalism generally to its competitors. Historical approaches to the study of liberalism should provide a more nuanced picture of the variety of liberalisms, reflecting the different contexts in which liberal ideas have been articulated and the ways in which liberal theorists have encountered each other and the ideas of competitive traditions. I would particularly welcome panels that have examined the ways in which liberal theorists have responded to non-liberal thinkers, and the uses that non-liberals have made of liberal ideas. Some of the issues that might be addressed include nationalism and the cultural bases of political association, the social preconditions of liberal and democratic and/or republican institutions, the relationships between liberal and democratic ideals, liberalism and feminism, alternative conceptions of rights and consent, and the role of the market in liberal theory and practice.

A second broad area of concern that historical approaches may illuminate is the cultural specificity of liberal theory. There have been many excellent studies of the roots of liberalism in western culture,

but less attention has been devoted to the appeal of liberal ideas in non-western areas, and the ways in which non-western thinkers have appropriated and contributed to liberal theorizing, even though (at least the early phases of) anti-colonial movements have often invoked liberal values.

The broad suggestions above are not meant to be exclusive, and proposals dealing with other aspects of the convention theme, "Liberalism at Century's End" or with other topics of current interest, are also welcome. I would like to encourage proposals for panels that are sharply defined, and which are limited to three or at most four participants so that there will be opportunity for discussion both among panelists and between panelists and the audience. I will try to set up panels using individual paper proposals that are described in enough detail to make the formation of coherent panels possible.

**Division 2. Normative Political Theory.** Nancy S. Love, Department of Political Science, 107 Burrowes Building, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802. 814-865-7515; 814-632-6682 (home); 814-863-8979 (fax).

The theme "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives" provides an opportunity to address several important issues in contemporary political theory. Although I welcome proposals for papers and panels on other topics, I am especially interested in those which explore the following sets of questions.

First, what is the relationship of liberalism to identity politics and/or strategic politics? Does liberalism provide a "core" concept of substantive justice? A formal "frame" for political participation? A "hegemonic discourse" to be resisted? How do these questions intersect and overlap with the more familiar tensions between individual and community, liberty and equality, public and private, etc.? Does liberalism necessitate a politics of trade-offs and balancing acts? What (re)constructions of politics are emerging from debates with other approaches?

Second, what is the relationship between current issues in political science and political power in its many forms, including the state? Contemporary politics involves both "new" cultural identities and the politics of "image" and "spectacle." Has politics become an aesthetic phenomenon? Was it always one? What implications does this have for deliberation, judgment, reason, tolerance and other liberal-democratic values? How does this influence citizenship? Scholarship? The interactions between citizens and scholars?

Last, as the turn of the century approaches, we

might take a retrospective as well as a prospective look at liberalism. How does the ferment in political science and liberal politics today compare to the end of the nineteenth century? What challenges and controversies have disappeared? Reappeared? What, if anything, is unique about contemporary liberalism?

In addition to paper and panel proposals, I would appreciate suggestions for roundtables, lectures, and other formats. Proposals which span the distance between theoretical and practical discourse, between intellectual constructs and lived experience will be a high priority.

**Division 3. Foundations of Political Theory\***. Stephen K. White, Department of Political Science, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061; 703-231-5509; 703-231-6078 (fax).

The Foundations of Political Theory Section has always provided a forum for a wide array of voices, approaches, issues and interests in political thought, whatever the announced program theme for the given year happened to be. I intend to continue this tradition.

This year's theme, "Liberalism at Century's End," is rich in the range of theoretical questions it invites. How should liberalism respond to challenges raised in recent years by those who argue for greater use of state power to influence the patterns of cultural reproduction? In what ways do postmodern critiques raise problems for liberalism? For example, is liberalism inextricably tied to the Enlightenment project?

Is liberalism compatible with a radical expansion of the scope of "deliberative" processes in democratic regimes? How, in the long run, is the end of the Cold War likely to affect political discourse in the U.S.? For example, will we experience a new "end of ideology" in which liberalism attains a discourse-deadening hegemony? Or might the result be an enhancement of the space of possible political reflection? Also, how is the quality of individual choice being affected by phenomena associated with "postindustrial" or "informationalizing" society, such as the increasing density of electronic media.

Finally, I would welcome reflections upon the question of pluralism within the profession of political science. Since the great wars of the 1960s and 70s, things have been relatively (if not all) quiet on the methodological front. Is the pluralism of our "postbehavioral" political science merely one of suppressed hostility and studied indifference toward one another? Might it be rethought in ways that lead to more interesting intellectual exchanges across

differences?

**Division 4. Formal Political Theory.** Gary W. Cox, Department of Political Science, UCSD, La Jolla, CA 92093-0521; 619-534-1428; 619-534-7130 (fax); gcox@ucsd (e-mail).

Proposals are invited for papers that use any sort of formal model to analyze political phenomena. The boundaries of this division are demarcated by the mathematical or hypothetico-deductive nature of the analysis, not by the substantive area of inquiry. Thus, proposals are welcome from scholars interested in any of the broad array of political science research topics. This certainly includes the traditional mainstays of formal theory, such as collective decision-making, coalition formation, electoral competition between parties, and international alliances and crises. But it also includes comparative politics, into which formal theorists have made more recent forays; topics related to the program theme of liberalism, such as the debate between free and managed trade; and other domains as well.

In addition to primarily theoretical papers, papers that empirically test the predictions of extant formal models, whether by experimental, statistical or other quantitative means are also welcome.

I would appreciate it if proposals are submitted, when possible, via e-mail.

**Division 5. Political Methodology\***. John Williams, 210 Woodburn Hall, Department of Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405; 812-855-5098 or 812-855-4710; 812-855-2027 (fax); jotwilli@ucs.indiana.edu.

Political methodology is a field that focuses on the analysis of empirical data for answering questions about politics. As a subfield in political science, political methodology addresses the application and development of tools for analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. This includes designing statistical and analytical tools for addressing empirical questions unique to political science. Additionally, political methodologists introduce statistical and other methods developed in other social and natural sciences that are useful for analyzing political data.

Broad topics for inclusion into this division include papers that focus on: [1] developing estimation methods; [2] presenting unique applications of existing methods; [3] developing solutions to difficult measurement problems; [4] addressing important questions about research design; and [5] testing formal theories with statistical methods. I would like to see all papers address important substantive

## 1995 Call for Papers

questions in political science. The mix between methods, theory, and substance may vary from paper to paper, but all papers should have a relevant and novel methodological theme.

Individuals wanting to propose panels or roundtables are encouraged to do so. Topic areas might include panel models, time series analysis, survey research methods, applying maximum likelihood, ecological inference, computer intensive methods, and many others. I would be especially interested in any proposals for panels that center on the meeting's theme, "Liberalism at Century's End." Such panels might focus on methodological problems facing political scientists studying newly emerging liberal democracies or problems inherent in measuring important dimensions to the concept of liberalism.

**Division 6. Legislative Behavior.** Richard L. Hall, Resources for the Future, 1616 P St., NW, Washington, DC 20036; 202-328-5046; 202-939-3460 (fax); rhall@rff.org (e-mail).

I assume (certainly prefer) that paper proposals will be governed by individuals' ongoing research agendas rather than anything I might suggest. For legislative scholars who have more than one paper waiting to be written, finished or presented, however, I'd like to offer nudges along the following lines: Consistent with the larger program's emphasis on liberalism, I would be delighted if one or more panels or roundtables focused on the (mal)practice of liberal principles in the legislative politics of what are supposed to be the models of liberal democracy for the rest of the world. What are the pragmatic (rather than civic fictional) standards that we ought to take seriously given the extraordinarily different (relative to the West, relative to each other) historical, cultural, and economic circumstances to which emerging democracies are reacting?

Alternatively, how might we do better at reflexive criticism regarding the substantive meaning of consent, representation, and political egalitarianism as we study legislators and legislative institutions in the U.S.? Studies that focus on race, gender, and ethnicity in legislative politics would naturally fit into this category. So would general concerns about majority rule, minority rights and opposition politics in the U.S. Congress and subnational assemblies. In turn, I would be delighted to see generally comparative papers that address various questions related to the development and operation of particular institutional arrangements across different Western and non-Western legislatures.

The final thing I would note is that I have a particular taste for theoretical and methodological eclecticism.

I invite panel proposals and will otherwise try to form some panels that bring together scholars who approach some facet of the legislative world from very different angles.

**Division 7. Presidency Research\*.** Lyn Ragsdale, Department of Political Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721; 602-621-7600; 602-621-5051 (fax); lyn@ccit.arizona.edu (e-mail).

The theme "Liberalism at Century's End" for the 1995 meeting seems especially apt for research on the American presidency. I would anticipate several panels that would directly discuss the impact of classical liberalism's notions of limited government and contemporary liberalism's notions of presidential activism on the nature of the office and expectations about its occupants. To that end, I would like to see some attention to the historical development of the office. I would also expect the discussion to extend to the ways in which classical and contemporary liberalism have clashed in shaping the policy agendas of recent presidents, including President Clinton. A panel or papers highlighting the "return" of liberalism with the Clinton Administration, recast since the New Deal and the Great Society, would be of interest.

In addition, I would encourage people to submit proposals for panels and papers encompassing current important topics in presidency research such as the institutional presidency, presidential decision-making, presidential policy-making, presidential communication, presidential-congressional relations, and presidents' relations with the press, the public, and interest groups. I would also like papers that examine whether such venerable approaches to the study of the presidency as presidential power and presidential personality are still appropriate as the field enlarges its focus on long-term patterns and outcomes, irrespective of the individual presidents involved.

I would like to see papers that propose theoretical contributions to the presidency literature and those that address systematic qualitative and quantitative methodologies that are appropriate to presidency research. Papers that provide anecdotal accounts of individual presidents are not encouraged.

I also seek papers with a comparative focus which examine the differences and similarities in dilemmas executives face cross-nationally.

While the above describe my emphases, I welcome papers and panels of note with other approaches.

**Division 8. Public Opinion and Participation.**

Margaret Conway, Department of Political Science, P.O. Box 117325, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-7325; 904-392-0248; 904-392-8127 (fax); xconway@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu (e-mail).

**Division 9. Elections and Electoral Behavior.** Michael McKuen, Department of Political Science, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63121-4499; 314-553-5520; 314-553-5268 (fax); c1722@umslvam.umsl.edu (e-mail).

We welcome proposals for both papers and complete panels in the broad area of elections and public opinion. The 1995 conference theme resonates with a broad range of interests in the field. We are especially keen to see proposals that center around ways that liberalism's evolution affects the relationship between citizens and their polity. Most obviously appropriate are papers that examine how public opinion incorporates the tensions between liberal values and an activist government or papers that examine the developments in the newly emerging democracies.

Of course, we are also interested in all excellent work in political behavior. Clearly deserving topics include: models of opinion formation; systems of opinion change; individual voter models; the general and specific roles of political attitudes such as ideology, partisanship, policy preferences, group loyalty, and so on; systematic relationships between political communications and public opinion and electoral outcomes; micro-macro linkages more generally; the importance of participation for democratic values; success of recent entrants in the electoral arena (including women and minorities); the interaction between mass politics and the politics of policy-making.

We are interested in the relationship between mass politics and economic, social, and historical trends and development. We particularly seek proposals that examine the ability of alternative theoretical frameworks to account for the dynamics of both mass behavior and institutional change.

Further, our understanding of public opinion and elections depends on our methodology. We encourage proposals for papers that concentrate on methodological innovations and that raise issues relating to how research should be conducted.

The nature of mass politics is being fundamentally altered in regimes undergoing significant transitions in government structure or electoral systems. These changes make especially timely proposals that examine elections and public opinion from a comparative perspective.

All theoretically important work will elicit real

interest. If you wish to submit ideas for a full panel, please contact us well before the formal deadline. Papers primarily concerned with public opinion and participation should go to Margaret Conway; those concerned with elections and electoral behavior should go to Michael MacKuen. If you have any uncertainty, please send your proposal to both - **with a note attached**. We shall endeavor to make things come out right. Paper proposals should include author(s), title, and abstract. Please let us know if you are sending the proposal to another division.

**Division 10. Political Organizations and Parties\*.**

Jeffrey M. Berry, Department of Political Science, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155; 617-627-3465; 617-627-3660 (fax); jberry@pearl.tufts.edu (e-mail).

In the areas of political parties, interest groups, and social movements, I want to form panels that reflect the diverse research interests of this organized section. I welcome solid research papers regardless of approach.

That said, there are some areas where I hope there will be sufficient interest for panels. One such topic is the linkage between parties, groups, and movements. For example, what is the relationship between interest groups and political parties? How do social movements evolve over time into institutionalized lobbies?

A second area, relating to the theme of the conference, is liberalism and political organizations. Papers on this subject might be broad think pieces that critically assess the role of parties and other political organizations in the modern liberal state. Papers might also be empirical studies aimed at analyzing patterns of behavior relating to some principle of liberal political thought.

A third area which is of particular relevance today is grassroots empowerment. To what degree are the voices of the rank-and-file heard within their organizations? How does grassroots participation affect the capacity of political organizations to influence public policy outcomes?

These are just a few ideas; I look forward to receiving proposals on a wide variety of topics. Paper abstracts should offer a clear explanation of the theoretical issues to be addressed, the methodological approach to be used, and the nature of the data to be analyzed.

**Division 11. Law and Courts\*.** Joel Grossman,

## 1995 Call for Papers

Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706; 608-263-2031; 608-265-2663 (fax); grossman@polisci.wisc.edu (e-mail).

Proposals for papers and panels on all aspects of the law and courts are welcome. Reflecting the 1995 Annual Meeting theme of "Liberalism at Century's End," papers which address the social and legal consequences of the interrelationship between law and rights, and between individual rights and communitarian perspectives on the role of law and the courts, would be especially welcome. A comparative analysis of these relationships would be icing on the cake!

Without seeking in any way to limit the breadth or scope of paper or panel proposals, the following suggestions may be helpful: a roundtable on changes in the law and politics subfield and its relationship to the rest of political science; an evaluation of the success and future goals of the critical legal studies (or Law & Society) movement in setting our research agenda; an analysis of the transformation in role or function of particular legal/political institutions and some thoughts on how those institutions will (and will have to) function in the 21st century; the increasing (?) role of ordinary citizens in the operation (de-professionalization) of legal institutions; reassessment of the utility of studies of the impact of the Supreme Court and other courts in light of Gerald Rosenberg's *The Hollow Hope*; assessment of empirical theories and quantitative indicators which purport to explain the operation of legal/political institutions.

Proposals should include information about the author(s); an abstract or brief discussion of the paper, including data, methods, and theories employed; and an assessment of the topic's significance and the paper's contribution to our common research enterprise. Please include the (lead) author's mail, fax, and email addresses, and telephone number to facilitate rapid communication.

### ***Division 12. Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence.***

Christine B. Harrington, Department of Politics, New York University, 715 Broadway, New York, NY 10003; 212-998-8509; 212-995-4184 (fax).

Paper and panel proposals on all aspects of constitutional politics, law and social science jurisprudence are invited. Your participation as a panel chair, discussant or on a roundtable is also welcomed. Our division should make a particular contribution to this year's conference theme, "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," given the significance of liberalism in

constitutional discourse and socio-legal research. Liberal legalism has long been a topic of debate among public law scholars working on theoretical and empirical problems about the promise and capacity of liberalism to deliver social justice. Proposals might focus on rethinking critiques of liberal legalism, assessing its currency in contemporary constitutional politics and discussing its future significance for institutional reform and social movements. I am particularly interested in receiving proposals in the following areas that might be related to the conference theme, but this should not preclude other panel and paper ideas.

First, I encourage proposals addressing analytical, doctrinal and historical problems in constitutional and statutory interpretation. Along with the usual diversity of substantive focus, I am especially interested in papers and panels discussing social science approaches to doctrinal materials and work exploring links between professional and popular interpretations of rights discourse.

Second, proposals on the formation of institutions and state power through law are encouraged. Historical and contemporary research on constitutional politics, the use and organization of litigation, interest group strategies and so on, are topics which address the place of law in structuring institutional authority.

A third area deserving attention among public law scholars and political science more generally is the globalization of law. A panel, for example, comparing the law and modernization movement of the 1960s-1970s with contemporary constitutional reforms around the world might probe a variety of questions about liberalism and its institutions. Papers developing and applying comparative theoretical approaches to law and politics could also offer insights into the politics, process and institutions produced by globalization.

Constitutional politics and the promise of social justice is a fourth issue that proposals might focus on and relate to questions about the state of liberalism at the end of the century. I hope that we will have a panel on new conceptions of constitutional equality and liberty advanced through social movements and constitutional interpretation.

These suggestions do not exhaust the range of interesting work in the field. I anticipate hearing your ideas and working with you on organizing a set of engaging panels. We have always been open to co-sponsoring panels with other divisions and related groups, however, it is imperative that you let me know if you are sending your proposal to another division.

**Division 13. Public Administration\*.** Lois Recascino Wise, School of Public & Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405-2100; 812-855-4944; 812-855-7802 (fax); wisel@indiana.edu (e-mail).

Paper and panel proposals on all aspects of public administration are invited. Requests to serve as discussants or chairs are welcome. The conference theme, "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," can be interpreted in many ways relevant to the field of public administration. The theme of competing perspectives may include but is not limited to papers and panels focusing on: accountability and de-regulation, activist government and neutral bureaucracies, administrative behavior, citizen and individual rights, effectiveness and efficiency, and ethics in government.

Issues relating to the bureaucracy and civil servants might focus on diversity and employee rights, empowerment and democratic representativeness, motivation of public employees and civil servants as self-interested actors, and structuring and financing employee benefits.

Research might address global interdependence, intergovernmental relations, limited government and market solutions, multiculturalism and nationalism, public/private partnerships, the role of volunteerism and non-profit organizations in public service delivery and governance, health care reform and public law development and debate.

Papers or panels on comparative public administration are especially encouraged. These might focus on different types of liberalism such as economic and service delivery liberalism and their impact on social service states. Papers addressing cutting-edge theoretical and methodological issues, and new perspectives on the profession including teaching public administration are welcome. Other ideas that represent the rich diversity of research interests among our Public Administration Organized Section members are welcome.

Proposals should be in writing and include an abstract limited to one page detailing the topic, its significance, methodology and data if appropriate, and implications for future research, policy formation, or public administration practice. While rank is not a criterion in selection, please provide a brief description of each author including affiliation and status, phone, and fax numbers. Also clearly indicate whether the proposal has been or will be submitted to another division, and if so specify the division(s).

**Division 14. Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations\*.** Dale Krane, Department of Public Administration, The University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182-0276; 402-554-2595; 402-554-2682 (fax); dkrane@fa-cpacs.unomaha.edu (e-mail).

American federalism emerged out of the liberal values that shaped the nation's early struggles over government and political power. From its very beginnings federalism has served as a critical institutional arrangement that has made it possible to balance competing interests, foster procedural mechanisms, and maintain flexibility. Consequently, it is not surprising that the current ferment over liberalism and democracy is accompanied by demands for a "rethinking" of federalism and the "reinventing" or "reengineering" of governmental structures and processes.

In this time of rethinking fundamental political concepts and institutions, proposals for panels or papers which advance our theoretical understanding of the many changes and trends in federalism in the US and abroad are especially welcome. Analyses applying one or more of the various alternative frameworks (e.g., institutional rational choice, theories of bargaining and collaboration, or political culture) will be given priority. Also attractive would be proposals that link institutional changes (e.g., neighborhood and community governance) to debates over liberalism (e.g., strong versus thin democracy). Proposals that explore policy or management perspectives to intergovernmental relations are also appropriate. Topics such as interorganizational coordination, targeting of people versus places, mandates with or without accompanying fiscal resources, and the impact of information technologies on IGR will receive favorable consideration. Space will be made for proposals exploring the utility of federal arrangements as mechanisms to cope with ethnic, linguistic, and regional conflicts.

The mid-1960s to the early 1970s was an extraordinary fertile period for federalism studies. The distinguished scholars who produced important works at this time include Graves, Elazar, Wright, Derthick, Leach, Duchacek, and Reagan. Now that a quarter century has passed, a retrospective on this important scholarship would be extremely beneficial to the discussion of the program's themes and to an enhanced understanding of the conceptual evolution of federalism studies. Persons interested in assisting me organize one or more sessions devoted to this scholarship should feel free to volunteer.

Individuals with suggestions for additional topics should send in their ideas as soon as possible.

## 1995 Call for Papers

Likewise, persons who wish to serve as chairs or discussants should contact me. Proposal submitters should provide a one page precis. The synopsis should specify the title(s), topic(s), model(s), method(s), data, and significance of the paper or panel. To facilitate communication, proposals and letters should include full names and addresses, institutional affiliations, telephone and fax numbers, and where available e-mail addresses.

**Division 15. Urban Politics\*.** Michael Rich and Robert Brown, Department of Political Science, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322; 404-727-6572; 404-727-4586 (fax).

Proposals for panels, roundtables, and papers on a variety of topics relating to the study of urban politics and policy are welcome. In addition to emphasizing papers that address this year's program theme, "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," we are particularly interested in proposals that examine the following topics: [1] the emergence of new models of public policymaking and governance centered around community-based strategic planning, community building and neighborhood transformation initiatives that include not only business and government as partners, but also nonprofits, universities, foundations, and neighborhood organizations; [2] the impact increasing racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity has had on electoral politics, coalition building, resolution of political conflict, and policymaking in major cities; [3] the role of community-based organizations in addressing issues city governments either can't address because of fiscal constraints or have chosen not to address (e.g., housing, crime, drugs, etc.); and [4] analysis and assessment of new innovative metropolitan and regional approaches (both formal and informal) to urban governance and problem solving as manifest in David Rusk's *Cities Without Suburbs* and Neal Peirce's *Citistates*.

These suggestions, however, are not meant to limit the range of topics examined. We invite submissions that address research questions in all areas related to the study of urban politics and policy and we are open to a variety of approaches to the study of urban politics, be they quantitative, qualitative, normative, or empirical. Papers that analyze individual cities should focus upon some theoretical or empirical issue of importance in urban politics.

Individuals interested in presenting a paper should submit a one-page abstract that provides a brief overview of the paper, including research methods and data, and your assessment of the topic's significance and its contribution to our understanding

of urban politics and policy. 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. 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 16. State Politics and Policy\*.** Sandra K. Schneider, Department of Government and International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208; 803-781-8436; 803-777-8255 (fax); n350084@univscvm (e-mail).

I invite proposals for papers, panels and roundtables that cover all areas of state politics and policy. I am particularly interested in the following kinds of submissions: [1] research that focuses directly on state-level political or policy developments for their own sake. In contrast, studies that simply use the states because they provide a conveniently large set of observations are discouraged; [2] comparative analyses of state political or policy issues, rather than single-state studies; [3] research that critically examines past theories, models or approaches in the field, promising to improve upon our understanding of the role of the states in the American political system; [4] studies that explore recent political/policy developments at the state-level (e.g., the impact of legislative term limits, administrative reorganizations, policy innovations, or public program terminations); [5] research that focuses on underexamined, yet critically important, aspects of state politics or policy (i.e., the role of state-level administrative systems, the impact of state policy initiatives on national-level developments, etc.).

Of course, proposals need not be confined to the above set of topics. Any proposal that deals with state politics or policy will be given careful and serious consideration. Submissions that reflect the general theme of the 1995 APSA Meetings, "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," are especially welcome.

I also hope to organize several activities that take an introspective look at the field of state politics and policy. I would like to establish several roundtables or panels that consider such questions as: [1] Is state politics really a distinctive field? [2] What have we learned from past research in the area? [3] How effective (or relevant) are the dominant approaches in the current study of state politics/policy? and [4] What is the most useful direction for future research?

Paper proposals should contain an abstract specifying the topic, methodological approach, the type of data to be analyzed, and the theoretical importance of the study. Proposals for whole panels should provide complete information on each paper, as well as the names and affiliations of paper presenters. Roundtable proposals should describe the significance of the issue to be discussed and provide a list of prospective participants. Individuals who are willing to serve as discussants or chairs should indicate their preferences or interests in the field. I strongly encourage submissions from graduate students and younger researchers, as well as from established scholars in the field.

**Division 17. Public Policy\***. David J. Webber, Department of Political Science, 205 Professional Building, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211; 314-882-7931; 314-884-5131 (fax); poldjw@mizzou1.missouri.edu (e-mail).

An assessment of "Liberalism at Century's End," the overall theme of the 1995 Annual Meeting, necessarily includes an examination of the effectiveness of government. Policy scholars and US policymakers have acknowledged the need for such assessments by virtue of their interest in performance assessments of policy programs and the reconfiguration of public policy through improved policy design. The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 and the Gore Report on Reinventing Government provide foci for political scientists to use their theoretical, empirical, and analytical skills and methods to inform public debate and to increase our understanding of policy development. In addition to expanding a narrow notion of program evaluation, performance assessment and policy design require attention to a range of issues often suggested, but not always addressed by political scientists. These issues include: [1] identifying and measuring policy outcomes; [2] identifying and involving appropriate people and interests in performance assessment and policy design; and [3] incorporating policy reforms in bureaucratic strategic planning and program implementation.

Panels for the public policy division will not be limited to papers examining performance assessment and policy design but preference will most likely be given to paper proposals that direct some attention to linking the proposed analysis with current policy debate. It is expected that some panels will be devoted to the examination of topics of continuing interest to policy scholars, e.g., comparative public policy, the role of political and analytical theory in policy analysis, and the theoretical and empirical analyses of contemporary substantive policy issues.

In keeping with the theme of the annual meeting, even these panels are intended to be related to the assessment of governmental processes, programs, and performance.

Paper proposals should include an abstract specifying the substantive policy area or policy process that will be examined, the type of analysis undertaken, and the contribution made by the proposed paper to current academic and political assessments of government.

**Division 18. Political Economy\***. Barry Weingast, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305; 415-723-3729; 415-723-1687 (fax); fweingast@gsb-lira.stanford.edu (e-mail).

Political economy encompasses two distinct research ideas, one substantive and the other methodological. The principal focus of the former is the intersection between politics and economics, while that of the latter concerns the applicability of economic and rational choice methods to problems in politics. Over time, the overlap between and interaction among scholars in these two groups has grown.

In organizing panels, I will give priority to papers focusing on the political-economy of development in both contemporary and historical settings. Preference will be given to papers emphasizing the special contribution of political-economy to these questions, in contrast to more traditional approaches in the fields of political development and comparative politics. Potential topics include the following: the role of politics and political institutions in fostering -- or hindering -- economic growth (e.g., in the 19th century United States, and contemporary China); the political-economy of ethnicity and nationalism, especially as it relates to growth and development; the political-economy of economic reform in the former socialist countries; the political underpinnings of rapid developing in the high-performing Asian economies; and political-economy approaches to the question of why so many poor countries remain so.

Proposals for individual papers on any of these topics are welcome. Proposals for entire panels should be focused, for example, by bringing a range of approaches to a similar question; or by approaching a similar question from the standpoint of many different countries, areas, or time periods.

Finally, I welcome offers to serve as discussants by those with interests in these areas.



**Division 19. Women and Politics\***. Jane S. Jaquette, Department of Politics, Occidental College, 1600 Campus Road, Los Angeles, CA 90041; 213-259-2780; 213-259-2734 (fax).

With the growing preeminence of liberalism as a global ideology, gender perspectives on liberalism are increasingly central to core political debates. Suggestions for papers or panels that deepen ongoing critiques of the basic tenets of liberalism -- individualism, the disembodied abstract citizen, rights discourse, representation, egalitarianism, and universalism -- are encouraged.

The promotion and linkage of economic and political liberalism as international norms also suggest important topics: the evolving democratic mobilization (and de-mobilization) of women; the impact of economic liberalism on women and children, and its political implications; class, race, and identity politics that challenge or give new content to liberal political practices. Comparative panels in this area would be particularly welcome.

The variety of political (and economic) arrangements that can be called "liberal" suggests the importance of a better understanding of how liberal politics has evolved over time in countries where liberalism has long been the dominant ideology; how democratic participation functions at different levels of the policy; and how democratic governments are made accountable. Do different electoral rules enhance the prospects for women's representation? Are constitutional principles important? How do different relationships between politics and markets affect women's access to both? What are the viable models of gender/state relations that enhance women's representation and give space to women's agendas? How do political culture and nationalism shape women's political options?

Finally, a panel that looks at evolving patterns in the study of gender and politics is strongly encouraged.

**Division 20. Race, Gender, and Ethnicity\***. Toni-Michelle C. Travis, Department of Public and International Affairs, MS 3F4, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030-4444; 703-993-8718; 703-993-8714 (fax); ttravis@gmu.edu or ttravis@gmuvax (e-mail).

Proposals are invited for papers, panels, and roundtables on race, gender, and ethnicity. While each of these issues may be examined individually, proposals which focus on the intersection of these statuses in the American or comparative context are especially welcomed. The theory and practice of liberalism warrant reexamination in light of current

debates over multiculturalism, the ethnic and racial strains in newly formed states following the fragmentation of the Soviet Union, and the increasing shift in many countries toward restructuring political systems on the model of western democracies. Questions abound. How will liberalism adapt to the challenges of the resurgence of longstanding ethnic and racial conflicts? Will gender take on a new political significance as liberalism evolves? Is liberalism a failed philosophy when examined from the perspective of race, gender, or ethnicity? Looking to the future, the advent of the 21st century with electronic highway capability also raises a new set of questions about liberalism as it applies to political actors whose reality is shaped by conditions of race, ethnicity, or gender.

Please include a written abstract with each proposal. Those interested in serving as panel chairs or discussants should indicate their area of research and include a curriculum vita.

**Division 21. Politics and History\***. Cathie Jo Martin, Visiting Scholar, Russell Sage Foundation, 12 East 64th Street, New York, NY 10021; 212-750-6000; 212-371-4761 (fax).

In a rapidly changing world, one platitude offers both fear and comfort: history tends to repeat itself. Our division seeks to capture this essential truth by exploring the historical legacies of ideas, institutions, and interests that shape political development. We welcome proposals on a wide range of topics including: [1] historical interpretations of current political conflicts, interests, and identities; [2] the usefulness of historical research methodology; and [3] cross-national applications of historical inquiry.

The theme of liberalism for the 1995 meeting fits quite nicely with the broad mandates of this division. Those writing in the American subfield might address the tensions within the liberal tradition and the presence of illiberal thought in American ideology. Comparative scholars might explore the permutation of liberal thought across national settings, or the cultural underpinnings of liberalism.

We do not intend these suggestions to be limiting; indeed, we welcome proposals from diverse subfields and theoretical orientations. Please submit a one-page abstract outlining the central question, argument, and methodology. We encourage panel and roundtable proposals, but please use the proper forms. Proposals that fail to meet the deadline will be considered only after those submitted in a timely fashion.

**Division 22. Comparative Politics\*.** Ian S. Lustick, Department of Political Science, 217 Stitler Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6215; 215-898-7650; 215-573-2073 (fax); [ilustick@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:ilustick@sas.upenn.edu) (e-mail).

Comparative politics faces critical challenges from many directions: from those who regard cross-cultural generalizations as impossible (at best); from the surprise associated with the collapse of the Soviet Union; from the disarray attending transformations in political systems across Eurasia; from the complex effects of movement toward European integration on "domestic" issues and identities in various parts of Europe; from the great disparities in performance among political and economic systems in Latin America, the Middle East, South Asia, and East Asia; and from the reassertion of national, religious, and racial identities as powerful principles for political mobilization.

Each of these challenges to comparative politics is also, in a sense, a challenge to liberalism -- a political theory which presents itself as relevant across cultures; as capable of explaining the vulnerabilities of a system based on the denial of individual freedom; as a candidate for ordering political life in countries of the former Soviet bloc; as a federative principle for breaching or redefining the boundaries of established nation states; as a framework available for third world countries as they strive to escape poverty and political oppression; and as a universalist credo capable of resisting or incorporating the parochialism of nation, race, or religion.

Panels that address these or any of the other issues which engage the attention of comparativists in our profession, and that are focused substantively, theoretically, or methodologically, are welcome. Examples would include panels on the problematic delineation of the boundary between state and society; the ideological, cultural, economic, or historical factors which explain variability in the vitality of "civic society," however that term might be defined. On dynamic aspects of the construction and deconstruction of political identity; on the integration of diachronic and cross-cultural comparisons as a means of isolating particular variables of interest; on the relationship of the constitutional, cultural, and strategic "content" of politics to the coalitional, distributive, and ideological "context" of political behavior; and on the opportunities and limitations of rational choice theories as they have been or might be applied to comparative politics. Panels organized around a particularly exciting book or article are also encouraged.

**Division 23. Comparative Politics of Developing Countries.** Atul Kohli, Woodrow Wilson School, Bendheim Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544; 609-258-5349 (fax).

Proposals are invited for papers, panels, and roundtables on politics and society in developing countries. Several themes will be emphasized this year: the role of states in promoting and/or hindering economic development; politics of identity, including politics of nationalism, race, religion, and gender; the role of social classes and of other forms of economic inequality in politics; problems of consolidating and of deepening democracy; and the impact of global political-economic forces on national politics.

Written proposals should emphasize the unifying theme (preferably stated as a question or a hypothesis) that the panel papers will address. Preference will be given to proposals that [a] irrespective of methodology, raise "important," "new" questions; and [b] tend to have a cross-regional focus (though, intra-regional panels and, under exceptional circumstances, single country panels will also be considered).

**Division 24. Communist Politics and After.** Philip G. Roeder, Department of Political Science, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0521; 619-534-6000; 619-534-7130 (fax); [proeder@ucsd.edu](mailto:proeder@ucsd.edu) (e-mail); and Kathie Stromile Golden, Department of Political Science and International Studies, Morgan State University, Cold Spring Lane and Hillen Road, Baltimore, MD 21239; 410-319-3277; 410-319-3837 (fax); [kgolden@moe.morgan.edu](mailto:kgolden@moe.morgan.edu) (e-mail).

In this century communism and its demise have confronted liberals with their greatest challenges. Communism offers a coherent alternative to the developmental paths advocated by liberals. The demise of some communist regimes challenges liberals to devise successful strategies for a transition from communism and raises anxiety that those strategies may fail or not even be chosen.

The importance of these challenges has made the study of communism and post-communist politics a vibrant field in which there has recently been a healthy explosion of issues and analytic approaches. Proposals for panels and papers that reflect this new vigor and diversity in the field are welcomed. Topics for panels and papers may include, but not be limited to, the following: [1] Philosophical foundations of communist and post-communist politics (in particular, the impact of communist or liberal ideals upon these societies; the transformation of liberal

ideals as they spread in post-communist societies); [2] Political culture and public opinion (for example, the continuities and changes in attitudes toward communist or liberal institutions and ideals; the reciprocal influence between post-communist liberalization and the formation of national, class, and gender identities); [3] Popular participation (including the reciprocal influence between citizen behaviors such as violence, voting, or apathy and post-communist liberalization; the influence of the communist legacy on formal institutions such as electoral laws, political parties, and interest groups; the practice of regimes concerning the rights of individuals to participate in the political life of their societies); [4] Regimes (for example, the transformation of formal institutions, processes of policymaking, or styles of political leadership); [5] Domestic behavior of communist and post-communist regimes (most obviously, this includes their choices and implementation of alternative forms of economic reform, but it also includes a range of policies affected by differences of regimes); and [6] International behavior of communist and post-communist regimes (in particular, the consequences of liberalization for foreign policy, integration of these societies in the community of liberal states, and emerging patterns of interaction among post-communist states).

Taken together the panels and papers in this division will hopefully reflect the intellectual and methodological richness of our profession. If it becomes necessary to select among individual proposals, the narrowly construed idiographic description may suffer; to the extent necessary we will show preference for proposals that raise issues of concern to the larger discipline, compare cases, employ explicit methodologies, and are theoretically ambitious.

**Division 25. Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial States.** Jonas Pontusson, Department of Government, McGraw Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853; 607-255-6764; 607-255-4530 (fax); jgp2@cornell.edu (e-mail).

I invite proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables on any and all aspects of the politics of advanced industrial states. I am particularly interested in proposals that explore the nature and long-term significance of political changes in these states over the last two decades. Do recent electoral trends (the decline of Left parties and the rise of far-right populist parties) represent a major realignment of electoral allegiances or more transitory phenomena? Do welfare cuts and other policy changes represent an abandonment of postwar policy principles or simply fiscal retrenchment in face of economic

difficulties? How extensive is the apparent decline of tripartite bargaining arrangements and what, if anything, takes their place? The analytical challenge implicit in such questions is to distinguish between, on the one hand, incremental policy and institutional adjustments and, on the other hand, what might be called "paradigm shifts" or "regime changes." In retrospect, the New Deal of the 1930s stands out as a watershed in American politics; are recent changes in advanced industrial states of comparable scope? I hope to put together several panels that address this question on the basis of systematic empirical analysis and, ideally, bring alternative theoretical perspectives to bear on the question.

Relatedly, I am very interested in paper and panel proposals that tackle the problem of thinking comparatively about political change. Most cross-national comparisons have a static quality to them, and studies of change typically adopt an historical rather than a comparative approach. Is there some necessary trade-offs at work here? From an empirical point of view, it seems clear that the degrees of change vary across advanced industrial states: do trajectories of change also vary and, if so, how? What is the significance of cross-national variations for various theories that purport to explain political changes in advanced industrial states?

In terms of methodology, I want to encourage papers and panels that explore the territory between narrative case studies (be they single or paired) and large-N statistical analyses of linear associations between variables. Multi-nation papers and panels will be most welcome, but "cases" used in comparative analysis need not be countries. Issues of political change may be particularly suited for analyses that engage in other kinds of comparison (across time periods, policy arenas, or subnational geographic units).

Panel proposals should provide synopses for the individual papers as well as a statement of the themes that unify the panel as a whole. All paper and panel proposals should be accompanied by a curriculum vita.

**Division 26. Politics and Society in Western Europe.** Jane Jenson, Département de science politique, Université de Montréal, CP6128, Succ A, Montréal, Québec, H3C 3J7 CANADA.

Liberalism and the European Model of Society

Liberalism is usually, and quite correctly, thought of as one of the central trunks of modern European social philosophy. Yet, as the late Louis Hartz insightfully argued, liberalism never achieved hegemony either in continental political institutions,

political philosophy, or daily perspectives. Instead, liberalism has more often than not been but one school of thought in on-going complex struggles about the desirable and real structures of politics and society in almost all of Europe. Only an outdated 1950s liberal optimism, nourished by the miraculous few years of the postwar economic boom and the Cold War, would overlook the fact that not over the long run continental Europe has been a battle field controlled rather more often than not by elitist (and often anti-democratic) doctrines, corporatist notions of social and political organization, anti-individualism and resistance to the open flow of markets, both from the Right and Left. Indeed, even during the postwar period, when liberal democratic political institutions of one kind or another did come to dominate on the Atlantic side of Cold War boundaries, the majority of political actors that counted were "democratized" versions of older outlooks -- social democracy, Christian Democracy, neo-corporatist associational strategies -- rather than Anglo-Saxon style liberal individualists. Jacques Delors, current President of the European Commission, is fond of sounding a clarion call to mobilize in defense of what he calls the European Model Of Society, in which mixed economy markets coexist with extensive systems of social protection and moralization of social solidarities by negotiations among "social partners." Analyses of the "end of history" are thus remarkably shortsighted when applied to the medium-term of West European politics and society.

Yet Europe is subject to many of the same strains and uncertainties as other regions of the world. Market internationalization clearly works in the direction of liberalizing markets formerly protected by public ownership, extensive regulation and diverse forms of protectionism. Will liberalizing markets, at the undoubted cost of much greater insecurity of life situation for many Europeans, lead to greater political liberalization, or the opposite? Changes in patterns of social and occupational stratification plus globalized media culture do tend to fragment and individualize Europeans more and more. Many analysts of Europe have of late pointed to a "crisis of politics" in which older forms of ideological and party identification break down to leave alienation, volatility, and, once again, individualism. And Europe is subject to the same tensions about gender, race, and national identity that challenge and create confusion about the very meaning and content of citizenship in liberal political orders. Do these trends point in the direction of new liberalization in Europe? What kind of liberalism is appropriate to these new European times? Will this kind of liberalism develop? Is liberalism advancing or retreating, and how? That such questions can even be asked indicates that Europe is rather more at the beginning of a new

history than at history's end. Papers and panels that address these issues are solicited.

**Division 27. International Collaboration.** Joseph M. Grieco, Department of Political Science, Duke University, 214 Perkins, Box 90204, Durham, NC 27708-0204; 919-660-4315; 919-660-4330 (fax); grieco@acpub.duke.edu (e-mail).

Liberal theory has long had a major impact on the way in which students have studied and debated the subject of international collaboration. This division welcomes proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables that focus on liberalism, and its analytical alternatives, and the possibility 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 liberalism and international collaboration are strongly encouraged. [1] Theoretical issues: This cluster of topics might be concerned with the development of a critical appreciation of liberal theory, and its alternatives, as we seek to develop generalized arguments about international collaboration, the conditions necessary for it, and the restraints that may operate on the preferences of states for such collaboration. What are the differences and similarities between traditional and modern liberal theories of international collaboration? What is the analytical relationship between what might be called "domesticist" liberal theories of international collaboration (those, for example, that focus on democratic political structures or market-based economies) and what might be termed "internationalist" liberal theories of collaboration (those, for example, that concentrate on international institutions)? What are the logical strengths and weaknesses of various liberal theories of cooperation, especially in comparison with alternative perspectives such as realism and social-constructionism? [2] Empirical-methodological issues: How do we know if collaboration among a given group of states is higher or lower across different issue-areas, or is increasing or decreasing over time within a particular domain of activity? Do we have at our disposal valid and useful measures of collaboration, and if so, what are those measures? What does their employment tell us about trends in international collaboration? Can we measure differences in the degree to which international institutions or other liberal-specified variables are present and operative in one time period as opposed to another? What empirical linkages can we observe between the existence or extension of liberal domestic and international structures on the one hand, and changes in the magnitude and patterns of collaboration among states on the other? How strong are these linkages compared to those that are

specified by competing theories of international relations? [3] Collaboration in Security and Economics: This cluster of topics might seek to build bridges between the subfields of international security studies and international political economy. Are there characteristic differences in the scope and level of international collaboration in the two domains? Can liberal theories of international collaboration and their alternatives in the international security subfield (for example, theories of collective security or the relationship between democracy and the peacefulness of states) assist students of international political economy to understand collaboration in the issue-areas they study, and vice versa?

**Division 28. International Security.** J. Ann Tickner, Department of Political Science, Box 121A, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA 01610; 508-793-3319; 508-793-3030 (fax).

Dramatic changes in the international system have precipitated a lively debate about the adequacy of traditional approaches to security analysis. While papers that move forward all aspects of this debate are encouraged, examining international security in the context of the conference theme, "Liberalism at Century's End" suggests particular attention to the following questions: [1] Do liberal societies provide adequate security for all their citizens regardless of race, class, or gender? Do the security concerns of citizens coincide with the security interests of states? Can we incorporate issues of preserving group identity into traditional state centric analyses of international security? Is there a need, as some recent security analysis suggests, to broaden the definition of international security from one which focuses solely on its military dimensions to one which also includes its economic and environmental aspects? [2] Does liberal rationalism drive the composition, level, and mission of force structures, or are defense budgets in liberal states increasingly being influenced by powerful self images, electoral politics and domestic economic considerations? [3] Is western liberal civilization under attack? Is the major cleavage of security analysis changing from an east/west focus to a north/south one? Are "zones of peace" coextensive with liberal societies? If so, does it follow that the spread of liberal ideas would ensure a more peaceful world or is "order" at the center of the system related to, and dependent upon, "disorder" in the periphery? [4] The changing nature of conflict and the prevalence of ethnic, religious, and other intergroup rivalries confuses our traditional understanding of international conflict. How adequately can we study these phenomena using traditional security analysis? How can unilateral or multilateral peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding methods, that are increasingly being

advocated as solutions to these types of conflicts, be incorporated into security analysis? Is the focus on national security the integrative core of a discipline of security studies, or one among many subspecialties with a more comprehensive field of international relations.

The program theme emphasizes the strengths that can be drawn from diverse theoretical perspectives. Therefore, I encourage the submission of papers from a variety of paradigmatic orientations. Whole panels or roundtables which can contribute to cross-paradigm conversations are especially welcome.

**Division 29: International Security and Arms Control\***. David S. Sorenson, Department of National Security Studies, Air War College, Maxwell AFB, AL 36112-2764; 205-953-6094; 205-953-7934 (fax).

Given the extraordinary changes in global political patterns, the realm of security studies has evolved from a primary focus on Cold War policies to a broad range of inquiry involving both new methodologies and new issue-areas. While the field has continued to emphasize the role of and implications for military force, the range of important questions about the utility and control of military force will continue to broaden. Indeed the end of the Cold War has produced the promise of new scholarship in security studies that breaks from the paradigms of the past four decades.

Proposals for panels, papers, and roundtables that offer new insights to the study of international security and arms control are particularly welcome. Those might include examinations of the alternative uses of military force, the role of the military as a socializing agency, the relationship between military requirements and liberal values, the "transnationalization" of national militaries, and the role of the military in economic development. New approaches to arms control are also welcome, to include multilateral arms control, global enforcement of arms control provisions, and the challenge to sovereignty that such policies pose. Proposals on national regional security issues and approaches are also welcome, as are proposals on the economics of security, the military and race/gender issues, or civil-military relations after the Cold War. New applications of the more traditional security studies approaches to the post-Cold War environment could also make a significant contribution to the program.

Panel and roundtable proposals should include the names, addresses, and topics for each participant. A brief abstract should accompany each individual proposal.

**Division 30. International Political Economy.** Louis W. Pauly, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, 100 St. George St., Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1 Canada; 416-978-6804; 416-978-5566 (fax).

The theme of this year's conference neatly encompasses much of the research currently underway in international political economy. At the same time, it challenges us to synthesize our scholarship and reconsider its trajectory during a period of remarkable flux.

At the core of prominent debates in the field are competing perspectives on the linkage between liberal economics and liberal politics at both systemic and subsystemic levels of analysis. Active research programs are exploring the construction and reconstruction of liberal international institutions and ideologies. An expanding literature seeks to understand the systemic implications of differences in the ways particular states internally configure the economic and political dimensions of liberalism. Another set of studies reverses the causal arrow and brings critical analysis to bear on the domestic and regional consequences of global economic liberalism. Still other work examines the ways in which liberal ideas and norms positively or negatively affect the cross-national strategies individual decision-makers pursue in the name of governments, firms, interest groups, or social movements.

Proposals are invited for papers, panels, and roundtables that advance such research programs or conjoin them. Proposals on other analytical and policy-relevant topics are welcome, but a special effort will be made to focus sessions on specific themes ripe for theoretical re-assessment and development. Paper proposals should include an abstract. Proposals for roundtables and panels should include the name, institutional affiliation, and topic of each participant, as well as an abstract for the session as a whole.

**Division 31. Foreign Policy Analysis.** Deborah Welch Larson, Department of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1472; 310-206-5286; 310-825-4331 (message); 310-824-4561 (home); [larson@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu](mailto:larson@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu) (e-mail).

Liberal theory in international relations focuses on the process of how states relate to each other, rather than the structure of world politics as does Realism. Because analysis of foreign policy also concerns process -- internal as well as external to states -- the theme of "liberalism at century's end" is highly germane to this division.

Rather than taking state interests as determined by

the structure of power, liberalism explains how interests are formulated and aggregated into policy. Because military force is not always relevant or an issue, Liberals hold that states pursue a wide range of goals besides power and security, including ideas, values, norms, and ideologies. Proposals for papers and panels might consider the relationship between these "soft" variables and state behavior on issues ranging from trade policy or the environment to national security.

Instead of viewing the state as a rational unitary actor, Liberal theories desegregate the "state" into individuals or groups. Accordingly, proposals for papers or panels might investigate how domestic institutions or political processes influence state goals and choices. As the former Soviet Union illustrates, foreign policy may also be shaped by domestic economic needs or the requirements of maintaining a supportive domestic political coalition, also suitable topics for this division. Similarly, the need for domestic ratification affects state bargaining on trade agreements and arms control in complex two-levels games.

Alternatively, participants might try to penetrate the "black box" of governments by explaining the formulation or implementation of foreign policy decisions. Still awaiting further research are the impact of variables such as individual beliefs and cognitive processes, dynamics of advisory groups, bureaucratic politics, legislative processes, or public opinion formulation and the media on state decisions and actions.

Liberalism is particularly interested in change in state objectives. One way to approach this might be to focus on the systemic consequences of shifts in domestic regimes and goals. Papers which examine the impact of the disintegration of institutions in the former Soviet bloc on the emergence of nationalistic aggression and ethnic conflict would fall into this category. Tackling the problem from the opposite perspective, papers might assess the effects of systemic variables -- fading of bipolarity, the rise of environmental issues, global economic interdependence, or nuclear proliferation -- on state foreign policy.

Liberalism is eclectic, believing that the truth will emerge through competition in the marketplace of ideas. I invite panels which evaluate alternative methodological approaches to foreign policy analysis, such as the utility of rational choice methods and cognitive approaches, or the relative influence of domestic and external determinants of foreign policy. Papers might also consider ways to re-invigorate foreign policy analysis by introducing theories and methodologies from other disciplines, such as

economics, psychology, sociology, or history.

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 vitae or statement of research specialization. Graduate students should also submit a curriculum vitae, statement of progress on their dissertations, and table of contents.

**Division 32. Representation and Electoral Systems\*.**

Luis R. Fraga, Department of Political Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-2044; 415-723-5219; 415-723-1808 (fax); fraga@leland.stanford.edu (e-mail).

The division on Representation and Electoral Systems will accept paper proposals on any aspect of the broad issues of voting, elections, representation, and the policy consequences of representation gained through differing electoral systems. Preference will be given to essays that address three topics. First, of special interest are essays that systematically examine the type of electoral systems used in the emerging participatory states of Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Russia. What have been the politics around the establishment of particular electoral systems, what is their specific structure, and what have their impacts been on the aggregation and representation of interests within respective nations? Second, preference will be given to essays that examine recent changes in the interpretation and application of the Voting Rights Act in the United States. The Supreme Court has recently displayed a noticeable reconsideration of past legislative and judicial understandings of cohesion, compactness, the need to maximize the number of majority-minority districts, and the inapplicability of the Voting Rights Act to examining procedures of legislative decision making. How are these judicial interpretations likely to affect the future impact of the Voting Rights Act on the nature of representation in the United States? Lastly, essays that empirically compare the possible consequences of utilizing different types of electoral procedures, e.g., plurality, majority, single-member district, at-large, proportional, cumulative, single transferable vote, within jurisdictions with particular types of cleavage structures will be especially welcome.

**Division 33. Conflict Processes\*.** Marie T. Henehan and John A. Vasquez, Department of Political Science, Box 1817-B, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235; 615-343-2434 (Henehan); 615-322-6238 (Vasquez); 615-343-6003 (fax);

henehamt@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu (e-mail).

The conflict processes division welcomes proposals related to this year's theme, liberalism, and to a variety of other subjects related to understanding conflict and cooperation.

With the ending of the Cold War, liberalism has received increased attention within international relations and political science. The relationship between liberalism and conflict, including the relationships between democracy and war and trade and war, has been a focus of much research and debate. Less research has been conducted on liberalism's belief in the peaceful resolution of disputes and on the role of liberalism in the rise of ethnic conflict and nationalism in the post-Cold War era, particularly in the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia. In the theoretical realm, attempts have been made to construct a neoliberalism to challenge neorealism. Historically, liberalism was associated with the Enlightenment and the use of empiricism and the scientific approach to knowledge, and those two approaches, which have often been the hallmark of members of the conflict processes division, have been challenged by postmodernists and traditionalists.

Papers centering on any of the topics associated with this year's theme are welcome. In particular we are interested in papers that will add to our empirical understanding either through data-based studies or comparative case-studies of the accuracy and theoretical significance of liberalism's explanations of conflict and/or cooperation or its diffusion, with special emphasis on ethnicity, nationalism, and the peaceful resolution of disputes, the role of economic factors, territory, and the use of realist practices (such as alliances, military buildups, realpolitik bargaining). In addition, we are interested in assisting the cumulation of knowledge about conflict processes, particularly war, and the future of the scientific study of politics. Finally, papers that attempt to theoretically appraise competing explanations for the same set of findings (e.g., why democracies do not fight each other) will be encouraged. The section also welcomes proposals from a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches not covered by this year's theme, as well as papers from other disciplines, especially psychology, history, sociology, economics, and the life sciences.

Due to constraints on space, roundtables will be limited and individual paper proposals will be given preference over proposals to organize an entire panel. Requests to serve as discussants or panel chairs are welcome and should be accompanied by a complete vita.

**Division 34. Politics and Life Sciences\***. Janna C. Merrick, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, University of South Florida at Sarasota, 5700 N. Tamiami Trail, Sarasota, FL 34243; 813-359-4238; 813-359-4356 (fax).

The American nation is experiencing a revolution in the life sciences, particularly in health care. The clash of advancing science and lagging public policy creates an arena for discussion that is rich in complexity and diversity. The Association for Politics and the Life Sciences welcomes proposals for papers, panels, and roundtables on a wide range of life science issues. A variety of research approaches are welcome including philosophical essays, empirical studies, public policy analyses, multidisciplinary research, and international/comparative research. Proposals dealing with the following are strongly encouraged: [1] implications of changing technology and its impact on the life sciences and public policy: Examples include the Human Genome Project, assisted human reproduction, neonatal care, fetal tissue research, and organ transplantation; [2] Major illnesses. Examples include AIDS, cancer, diabetes, et cetera; [3] End of Life Issues: Examples include aging studies, euthanasia, withdrawal of treatment, and hospice care; [4] Health Care Rationing: Proposals dealing with the Clinton health care plan are strongly encouraged as are proposals which compare health care delivery systems among different nations; [5] Government Regulation: Examples include discussions of the roles of various agencies in the development and implementation of public policy. Examples include Occupational and Safety Hazard Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Technology Assessment, the National Institutes of Health, etc; and [6] Miscellaneous: Examples include biological/chemical warfare, animal research, nuclear power studies relating to health safety, and other proposals related to politics and the life sciences.

Paper proposals should include a one page abstract and a curriculum vitae. Proposals for roundtables and panels should include names of individuals who might be willing to participate. Individuals wishing to serve as discussants should submit a letter and cv.

**Division 35. Religion and Politics\***. Mary C. Segers, Department of Political Science, 721 Hill Hall, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ 07102; 201-648-5591; 201-648-5103 (fax).

In keeping with the theme of "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," I encourage papers and panels that deal with the religious roots of liberalism and the impact in turn of

the liberal political tradition on religious institutions, thought, and practice. The theme of liberalism offers scholars of religion and politics many opportunities for fruitful research and analysis. Political theorists, comparativists, and Americanists may explore linkages between religion, politics, and liberalism on themes such as: [1] The religious and moral bases of liberal values such as tolerance, freedom, equality, justice, and human rights; [2] Religious-political activism in the "culture wars" that increasingly command attention at the state and local level in American politics and society -- for example, debates about abortion, pornography, AIDS prevention, school prayer, educational choice, gay rights ordinances, and physician-assisted suicide; [3] The resurgence of religious fundamentalism worldwide and the challenge it poses to liberal democratic institutions and practices; [4] The relation between pluralism and toleration in a religiously and ethnically diverse society. The challenge of multiculturalism presents itself nationally and internationally. From the perspective of scholars of religion and politics, how do issues of inclusion and exclusion play out in struggles for gender equality and gay-lesbian rights? What is the role of institutionalized religion and religious belief in ethnic, regional, and nationalistic conflicts and rivalries? [5] The status of religious liberty as a fundamental right. How persuasive are recent constitutional justifications of religious freedom, for example, which tend to subordinate this liberty to freedom of speech and association? Historically, how is religious freedom related to the development of the liberal tradition in Western political thought? Papers discussing the constitutional status of religious liberty from a comparative perspective are welcome; [6] Religion and politics in the political thought of Hobbes, Locke, Mill, Rousseau, and other thinkers in the liberal political tradition; [7] Tensions between liberalism and antiliberalism, including the continuing debate between liberals and communitarians. What is the relation between liberal political philosophy and liberal Protestant Christianity? Papers on Catholicism and liberalism, or on the fundamentalist critique of liberal Protestantism are welcome; [8] The relationship between religion and citizenship in liberal democracies. Scholars interested in political participation might want to examine religion and the representation of interests, especially institutional religious lobbies. Or they might want to address fundamental concerns about the extent to which religious adherence promotes or undermines citizenship and civic participation. What is the role of religion and of religious institutions in the education and formulation of good citizens?

This list is not exhaustive but suggestive of ways in which the concerns of religion and politics scholars relate to the theme of "Liberalism at Century's End."



## 1995 Call for Papers

All methodological approaches are invited: behavioral, institutional, cultural, and historical. Papers on church-state relations, constitutional law, and normative theory are welcome, but preference will be afforded to those that link such discussion with the theme of liberal political theory and practice.

Proposed whole panels are invited, especially roundtables and special panels that would serve to present the broad theoretical insights of the religion and politics field to those in other fields. Panels on the state of the discipline, alternative theoretical explanations, author meets critic, and discussion of classic themes or works, will be given serious consideration. Individuals with ideas about such panels or interest in participating in them, should contact me.

**Division 36. Applied Political Science\***. Thomas J. Linney, Council of Graduate Schools, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 430, Washington, DC 20036-1173; 202-223-3791; 202-331-7157 (fax).

"Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," is the announced theme for the 1995 meeting. Proposals for papers and panels in the realm of applied political science are invited to address questions that combine a larger philosophical perspective with single or multiple events viewed from a political science perspective. Recent legislative activity, at the state or federal level, dealing with issues such as budget deficits, health care, welfare reform, tax policy, crime, child care, or industrial policy are among many current problems being addressed by applied political science. What new insights are offered by applied political science research? How has political science research shaped attitudes or legislation? Are there lessons from previous legislative attempts to deal with any of these issues that have been concisely addressed by applied political science analysis? The social sciences in general have begun to consider such questions, looking at the practical effect of policy on individuals and institutions. The 1995 APSA meeting offers applied political scientists some unique opportunities to present practical analysis on a wealth of public policy issues. Participation by scholars from overlapping disciplines is encouraged, as are papers or panels that integrate students' work with the work of political scientists in the government, business, and/or education sectors of the discipline.

**Division 37. Science, Technology, Environment, and Politics\***. Frank N. Laird, Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208; 303-871-4462; 303-871-2456 (fax); flaird@du.edu. (e-mail).

The field of science, technology, environment, and politics (STEP) provides a fertile ground for exploring the theme of the 1995 Annual Meeting, "Liberalism at Century's End." Scholars in this field have made significant contributions to the study of interest groups, the role of the state, and the issues of the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a technological society, among other issues related to liberalism. Many of the controversies in STEP, from the NIMBY syndrome to design of the telecommunications infrastructure, point to the difficulties liberalism faces in the late 20th century.

We welcome paper and panel proposals that address all aspects of STEP issues and that utilize a variety of empirical and theoretical approaches, including proposals that address directly the theme of the 1995 meeting. We would particularly encourage papers involving innovative analyses that build on the extensive work of earlier STEP scholarship. Illustrative topics that the panels might address would be: [1] What do STEP studies say about the role of interest groups in bringing about policy gridlock in the liberal state? [2] What channels of participation or representation have developed in scientific, technological, or environmental issues, and how have those channels dealt with the need for esoteric knowledge on the part of the participants? [3] How does the design of the evolving information highway affect the practice of democratic politics? [4] What are the prospects for reorienting the American R&D system away from military technology and toward civilian applications, and what groups or institutions will set those priorities?

Participation by practitioners and interdisciplinary scholars is encouraged. The STEP Section also sponsors a research workshop on the Wednesday before the APSA meeting and welcomes suggestions for workshop topics.

**Division 38. Computer and Multimedia\***. Cecilia G. Manrique, Political Science/Public Administration and Women's Studies, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, La Crosse, WI 54601; 608-785-6642 or 608-785-8434; manrique@uwlax.edu or manrique@uwlax.bitnet (e-mail).

In line with the 1995 theme of liberalism, the computers and multimedia division is soliciting papers, panels, and roundtables that address the use of computers and multimedia for enhancing individual freedom, and increasing the availability of resources and information. The theme of liberalism aptly describes the contributions of computers and multimedia, because its users can be liberated from many resource constraints. In addition, the flow and exchange of information that computers and multimedia make possible are important components

of the free market for products, technology, and ideas.

Having a computers and multimedia division puts our association on the cutting edge of society's transformation especially with the current administration's call for a "national information infrastructure" or the "information superhighway." These new technologies are the "great equalizer" because knowledge of, and access to, them transcend barriers and boundaries that faculty and students may experience.

General categories of topics can fall into the more traditional ones of: using computers and multimedia devices in quantitative analysis thus imparting numeracy to our graduates; public policy benefits from technology; computer-assisted or computer-mediated instructions. Other non-traditional areas may include: the use of laserdisk and CD-ROM technology; videotape and videodiscs; electronic mail and conferencing systems. Specific topics may include: the many uses of your original or other existing hardware and software in the classroom; tales of managing problems of software and hardware access; innovative ways of incorporating computers and multimedia in political science courses and subfields; evaluation of the effects of computer use on student skills and marketability; and the effects of the use of computer on the recruitment and retention of students particularly women and minorities.

We would therefore like to invite your participation in any of the following ways: by developing a workshop, mini-course or tutorial on computer and multimedia skills that would be of tremendous value to instruction and research; by organizing a panel on various topics including those suggested above; by proposing a paper to be part of a panel; by volunteering to serve as a discussant or chair of a panel.

Please submit a one-page abstract on the paper, panel, or workshop that you wish to be considered for. Likewise, please indicate any equipment needs for your presentation.

**Division 39. Political Communication\***. Shanto Iyengar, Department of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles, 4289 Bunche Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90024; 310-825-5536 or 310-825-1703; 310-825-0778 (fax); iyengar@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu (e-mail).

In keeping with the theme of this year's program, the Political Communication division invites panels and paper proposals that address the role of

communication processes or institutions in the functioning of liberal democratic societies. Papers that utilize communications-related theories or concepts to shed light on the adoption and development of liberal regimes in previously authoritarian societies are especially encouraged. We also welcome submissions that take up issues of current interest, e.g., efforts to design the "information superhighway," the future of the telecommunications industry, the increasing reach of satellite-fed programming, and the public policy issues raised by such technological and economic changes. Although proposals with a thematic focus and topical value will receive special consideration, we also encourage submissions that deal with the core interests of the subfield -- media "effects" on public and elite opinion, political campaigns, the state of public affairs journalism, political rhetoric, changing perspectives on free speech, and the extent of government's control over the news.

In keeping with the eclectic nature of the division, panels will represent the full spectrum of theoretical and methodological orientations -- from rational choice models to critical studies, and experimentation to participant observation. Interdisciplinary work is especially welcome.

Authors should provide a summary of their paper (minimum of one page) and indicate whether the proposal has been submitted for consideration by other divisions. Panel proposals should include, in addition to the paper summaries, the full list of confirmed participants.

**Division 40. Transformational Politics\***. Ed Schwerin, Department of Political Science, Florida Atlantic University, 2912 College Avenue, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33314; 305-476-4596; 305-476-4582 (fax).

The transformational politics division is devoted to analyzing, researching, and discussing the philosophical, theoretical, and comparative aspects of the major changes occurring in political attitudes, values, and institutions. As far as the United States is concerned, we believe that a transformational process is presently underway and that we are not only analysts of it, but advocates and practitioners as well. We consider the contemporary American movements in civil rights, feminism, environmental protection, nonviolence and conflict resolution, participatory democracy, Green and New Age politics, as being part of this transformational process.

The theme of the 1995 Annual Meeting "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives" should be of interest to many in the transformational politics

division. Domestically, there are numerous interesting debates related to liberalism such as those between individualism and communitarianism. Internationally, debates focus on the relevance of liberalism to the political transformations taking place in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. We seek panels, papers, and roundtables that address these and other issues relevant to the 1995 theme, as well as issues related to the transformational process and period. Papers may be rigorous and systematic or theoretical and anecdotal.

The Transformational Politics Organized Section also sponsors a series of support groups in the evenings during the APSA meeting where we discuss our personal experiences, and challenges as professors of political science and as practitioners of transformational politics -- in the workplace, in politics, and in our personal lives. Those who have experience as facilitators or mediators are encouraged to contact us about participating as such in the support groups.

**Division 41. New Political Science\***. Laura Katz Olson. Department of Government, Lehigh University, Maginnes Hall #9, Bethlehem, PA 18015; 215-758-3346; lko1@lehigh.edu (e-mail).

The purpose of this division is to bring together those individuals who identify with a critical and activist approach to the study of political science. We seek papers across the broadest possible spectrum of the discipline. But we expect that these papers will share the conviction that the study of politics is never value-free, and that political scientists, whatever their field or focus, have an active responsibility to connect their understanding of politics and society to the search for human betterment and social justice.

In addition to proposals for papers and/or panels that incorporate the 1995 annual meeting theme of "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," we are interested in the following general areas: [1] Currents in critical political theory, including discussions of neo-marxism, critical theory, the politics of culture, feminist theory, and the idea of new political science; [2] Contending perspectives on democracy and development, including discussions of Latin America, Asia, Middle East, Africa, and women in the third world; [3] Racial and ethnic politics; [4] The politics of gender; [5] United States political economy, public policy, the Clinton presidency and Congress; [6] International political economy, political responses to the globalization of the economy, and intervention in third world politics; [7] Urban political economy and community politics; [8] Social movements in Western Europe, the United States, and Canada,

political transformation in communist systems, and agendas for the Left.

If there are other topics or themes in which you would be interested, we invite your suggestions and proposals.

**Division 42. Political Psychology\***. Michael Milburn, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts-Boston, Boston, MA 02125; 617-287-6386; 617-287-6336 (fax); milburn@umb.edu (e-mail).

Political Psychology takes a psychological perspective of politics, political thinking, and political behavior. Since the theme of the 1995 conference is "liberalism," we are particularly interested in papers and organized panels that address the question of ideology, both liberal and conservative. How are personality variables or personality structures (e.g., authoritarianism) related to these different ideologies; what are the variety of factors that influence the development of individual's ideology; what role does gender play in this development; and how does the political system contribute to the development of these political orientations; how does an individual's ideology affect the role he or she plays in the political system?

Since political psychologists often consider issues in political communication, voting behavior, and public opinion, research that examines ideology in these contexts will also be welcomed, particularly since that will enhance the chances of cosponsorship with other areas. Papers and panels that focus on other topics in political psychology such as intergroup conflict, leadership, and political cognition will also be considered. Topics that address the conference theme, offer important new methodological or theoretical perspectives, or employ interdisciplinary or comparative approaches are especially encouraged.

To permit us to make better choices among proposals, we will favor those proposals that are well thought-out and explained in detail, including information on the theoretical issues discussed, the type of data used, the methods of analysis utilized, and the current state of the research, whether the data are already collected, the analyses done, and so on.

**Division 43. Politics and Literature\***. Diana Schaub, Department of Political Science, Loyola College, 4501 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21210; 410-617-2138; 410-617-2215 (fax).

In keeping with the theme for the 1995 program, we are soliciting papers which address the relationship

between liberalism and literature. How and what does literature contribute to our end-of-century reflections on liberalism? Do literary works offer a unique perspective of liberalism and its various permutations or the course of its evolution? What do poets and writers have to say about the conflicts between individual and community, between public and private spheres in a liberal order? What light do they shed on some of the more vexed questions and dilemmas of liberalism, in particular, what do they tell us about relations between men and women, races, classes and cultures? What is the relationship between politics and the world of imagination? Who shapes whom? Tocqueville, for instance, suggested that in an age of equality the themes and genius of poetry would be decisively altered. Does liberalism have its Muses? What is the relationship between author and audience in a democratic age? In what ways have novelists and playwrights engaged with liberalism? How have they envisioned their role: as defenders? as critics? While a chorus of politicians and political commentators has declared liberalism triumphant over its ideological contenders, what can the poets tell us about our situation at the moment? What have they taught about the adequacy or inadequacy of the alternatives to liberalism; and what have the poetic critics of liberalism, both ancient and modern, had to say? Are there aspirations and longings not understood or left unfulfilled by liberalism? Is liberalism a full human solution?

**Division 44. Internships and Experiential Education\*.**

Maureen H. Casamayou, US and Global Studies, Mount Vernon College, 2100 Foxhall Road, NW, Washington, DC 20007; 202-625-7475; 202-337-4076 (fax).

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 1995

meeting, "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," which calls for a dialogue on the "conflict-generating" interpretations of liberalism at home and abroad. The challenge for experiential educators is to divine ways of exposing the student to the diverse interpretations of liberalism and its accompanying tensions. Specific panels on experiential learning, for example, could address the following issues (these are by no means exclusive): [1] Exposing the student to the tensions generated from a clash of cultures in the workplace, with the goal of developing a deeper understanding of contemporary multiculturalism in the US; [2] Responding to race and gender-specific needs for role modeling and identification at the internship location, in the hope of improving career advancement and aspirations for women and minorities; [3] Emphasizing the interconnectedness between nations and cultures through international internships, foreign student exchanges, and by initiating a global dialogue among American and foreign experiential educators in political science.

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

**Division 45. Teaching and Learning in Political Science.** James L. Llorens, Department of Political Science, Southern University, Baton Rouge, LA 70813; 504-771-3210; 504-771-3105 (fax); jlllorens@subrvm.subr.edu (e-mail).

This division will conduct panels and roundtables on issues related to teaching and learning in political science at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Sessions will serve to share information and advance knowledge about political science instruction and to provide a forum for scholarly research on instruction.

It is important that teaching be recognized as vital to the growth of the discipline. This section will be organized to recognize innovative teaching techniques; share ideas on the enhancement of teaching and learning; examine the integration of multiculturalism into the classroom; and provide an opportunity to discuss how classroom teaching can foster interest in political science as a profession, especially among minorities and students of color.

Proposals for panels, papers, and roundtables on teaching and learning in political science are invited. Proposals featuring the 1995 program theme "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," are especially welcome. Liberalism, to today's students, has a very different meaning from that of classic liberalism. What challenges does this

## 1995 Call for Papers

present to theorists in the classroom? Student panels and roundtables are also encouraged. We anticipate some interest in the following general areas: [1] Developments in political science curricula; [2] Incorporating innovative courses into the curriculum; [3] Minority recruitment at the undergraduate and graduate level; [4] Effective preparation of undergraduates for graduate study; [5] Incorporating computer based instruction into the classroom; [6] Introducing cultural, ethnic, and gender based studies into the traditional literature.

This division is open to ideas and suggestions for panels and roundtables on any subject related to the teaching and learning of political science. We welcome the opportunity to discuss and refine ideas or proposals in the developmental stage.


### ***Division 46. Public Opinion and Foreign Policy\****

Ralph G. Carter, Department of Political Science, Texas Christian University, Box 32873, Fort Worth, TX 76129; 817-921-7395; 817-921-7397 (fax); r1011po@tcuamus.bitnet (e-mail).

The 1995 program theme, "Liberalism at Century's End: Competing Perspectives," is particularly relevant to those who study the interaction of public opinion and foreign policy. Major international events increasingly revolve around the relationship between the governed and those who govern: the rise of more democratic forms of government in Eastern Europe and the republics of the former Soviet Union, resurgent nationalism in Europe, the linkage of human rights and global trade issues as in the case of China, domestic costs of free trade pact such as NAFTA, and so on.

Proposals for panels and papers are invited which focus on either substantive or theoretical issues. Substantive examples could include the linkage of public opinion to the foreign policy behaviors of specific regimes; the role of public opinion regarding specific instruments of policy, such as the use of bilateral and multilateral diplomacy, coercive force, covert operations, and economic instruments; and the comparative analysis of such matters. Theoretical issues could examine the underlying dimensions of public opinion formulation, the processes of opinion, and tensions between elite and mass opinion on foreign policy issues.

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



The logo features the acronym 'APSA' at the top, followed by a large, stylized 'C' containing the word 'CHICAGO' vertically. To the right of this vertical text is a large, stylized '95'. Below the graphic, the text reads: '91st Annual Meeting', 'August 31-September 3, 1995', 'Chicago Hilton and Towers', and 'Chicago, Illinois'.

91st Annual Meeting  
August 31-September 3, 1995  
Chicago Hilton and Towers  
Chicago, Illinois