

Association News

2. expectations of benefits from participating in the project.
3. a description of courses taught and how participation might be used in revising course syllabi, presentations and assignments.

Please send the curriculum vitae and letter by February 15, 1989, to: "Civil Rights in America," American Political Science Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Applicants will be notified of selection by April 1989.

1989 Annual Meeting

Policies and Deadlines

Paper proposals and offers to appear as discussants or panel chairpersons must be submitted as early as possible. The deadline for receipt of submissions is December 1, 1988. Proposals for whole panels are welcome, but persons with suggestions for panels should get their requests in early.

Please write directly to the appropriate section chairperson listed below. More general inquiries or suggestions may be addressed to:

Nelson W. Polsby, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720; (415) 642-6323 (Program Chair).

Norinne Hessman or Ann Peyser, APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 483-2512.

Prospective participants should be aware of two APSA Council policies:

(1) Acceptance of a proposal by the Program Committee obligates you to preregister (with appropriate fee) prior to June 1, 1989. If you fail to preregister, you will not be listed in the final program.

(2) Participants may appear on two (but no more than two) panels in any capacity—chairing a panel, acting as discussant or presenting a paper. This rule

applies to APSA Program Committee panels, APSA Organized Section panels, and Unaffiliated Group panels.

If you apply to several sections, please inform each section chairperson that this is a multiple application. Also, in that case, please notify the other section chairpersons as soon as you have accepted an invitation for participation in another section.

Call for Papers

There are two unusual features of this year's program. Organized sections of the Association are for the first time taking responsibility for panels in their subject matter as integral parts of the Program Committee. And there will be six series of panels focused on special themes: Thomas Hobbes, The French Revolution, Political Science in Washington, The Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Bill of Rights, and Party Realignment.

In most other respects, the program for 1989 will remind political scientists of the programs of other years. The maintenance of continuity is, after all, part of the joy of associating with such a well-loved institution as the APSA annual meeting. Section leaders, each of whom is well qualified to give leadership in his or her respective field of competence, will announce their own proposed programs below. Please also attend to the announcement on general ground rules which the national office enforces at the direction of the Council of the Association.

Section I. Applied Political Science.

Howard J. Silver, Consortium of Social Science Associations, 1625 I Street, NW, Suite 911, Washington, DC 20006; (202) 887-6166.

Panels in this section should focus on how our political science training is applied in government at all levels, the non-profit sector including academia, and the for-profit sector. Interpret "applied political science" as broadly as you desire. Training of political scientists in the application of their knowledge can also be a focus. Ap-

plying political science in conjunction with other social and non-social sciences can also be the subject of panel proposals. Panels that used to be in the "political science as a profession" section would be welcome here.

Section 2. Conflict Processes. Jacek Kugler, Department of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235; (615) 322-6222.

Proposals dealing with the broad topic of conflict and cooperation are invited. Scholars whose academic interests center on various forms of domestic and international conflict including initiation, escalation, anticipation, resolution and avoidance of conflict are invited to submit proposals. The objective is to provide a forum where students of international, comparative, normative and formal theory can find common ground to present their research.

Work in this field is very diverse. Panels and roundtables will simply aim to represent the most innovative work in the field. Panels on conflict and cooperation may focus on industrial bargaining, trade, foreign debt, capital flight, governmental stability, racial discrimination, strikes, demonstrations, domestic violence, terrorism, revolution, war, arms control or deterrence. All approaches to this topic—including empirical, formal and normative evaluations—are equally encouraged. Possible topics for roundtables on conflict and cooperation could center on topics such as the contributions of research in related disciplines, conceptual and methodological problems, or broad assessments of major research programs or prominent schools of thought.

We encourage an early submission of proposals for panels and individual papers. Such inquiries should include a reasonably descriptive abstract of the proposed panel, roundtable or paper.

Section 3. Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations. Ellis Katz, Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University 025-25, Philadelphia, PA 19122; (215) 787-1482; and Robert Thomas, Department of Political Science, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77004; (713) 749-4887.

To encompass the diverse elements for Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations for the 1989 Program, we invite panels, roundtables and workshops on a full range of topics. These topics may cover areas such as (1) the administrative and fiscal dimensions of federalism and intergovernmental relations, (2) theories of federalism, (3) comparative federalism, (4) constitutional aspects of federalism, (5) federalism and the political process, and (6) state politics and political culture.

Suggestions for sessions, papers and other forms of participation should be sent to Ellis Katz.

Section 4. Foundations of Political Theory. George J. Graham, Jr., Department of Political Science, Box 1814-B, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235; (615) 322-6222.

This section is open to proposals from the panoply of approaches to and applications of political theory and philosophy within the discipline. The section will include panels on topics directly generated from the Foundations of Political Theory Section, on the history of political thought, and on analyses and criticisms of texts. These three broad frameworks for panels will facilitate the development of individual panels responsive to the theorists from across the discipline. In addition to paper proposals, all suggestions for particular panels (by phone or mail) are welcomed by the organizer, especially at this earliest stage of planning. The section will include panels that will cross the above identified three divisions.

The APSA summary description of the Foundations of Political Theory Section states it "is committed to the linkage of political theory and philosophy with political science as a discipline, with the consequences of development, in successful cases, of cross-fertilization and stimulation that links work often seen as incompatible. The section is committed to the notion that theorists can make their work understandable to others and can share in the knowledge offered by others." Obviously, these commitments are shared by many who are not members of the formal section, and the commitments are seldom

pursued by theorists who do not also share deep interests in the history and contemporary developments of political theory and in the most careful textual analysis.

All political theory subjects submitted will be carefully considered. It is recommended that potential proposals be reviewed before submission to see whether they better fit other sections (such as the Formal and Normative Political Theory Section) or the special panels for the 1989 Meetings (such as the Hobbes section). The particular panels will include topics in classical, modern, and contemporary theory as well as those that fit the "foundations of theory" theme.

Section 5. Law, Courts and Judicial Process. Karen O'Connor, Department of Political Science, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30309; (404) 727-6572.

I am interested in receiving proposals covering a wide range of approaches and areas of interest within the broad rubric of Law, Courts and the Judicial Process. Proposals dealing with state and local courts, administrative law, alternative dispute resolutions processes, constitutional doctrine, interest group litigation and comparative law among others will be welcome. This list, however, is not meant to be inclusive. All strong proposals will be considered. I also urge those with large, sharable data sets to contact me concerning their willingness to participate in some sort of forum/roundtable to educate others concerning their availability and use.

Section 6. Legislative Studies. Alan Abramowitz, Department of Political Science, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322; (414) 727-0108.

I would like to encourage proposals for panels and individual papers on a wide variety of topics including comparative studies of national, state, or local legislatures as well as studies which focus on the U.S. Congress. I am especially interested in proposals which deal with linkages among external environments (constituencies, elections, interest groups, etc.), internal organization and decision-making proc-

esses (committees, party organizations, coalition formation, etc.), policy outcomes, and legislative oversight of the bureaucracy. In addition, of course, I would like to receive proposals which focus on any one of these areas. I would like to have at least one panel on the implications of the 1988 elections for presidential-congressional relations in the U.S.

Section 7. Political Organizations and Parties. James L. Gibson, Department of Political Science, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77004; (713) 749-4322 (BIT-NET: POLSBR @ UHUPVMI).

I hope that the 1989 Political Organizations and Parties panels will reflect a balance between conventional and innovative research efforts. On the conventional side, papers dealing with party organizations, parties and electoral politics, parties and money, PACs and other interest groups, party elites, and such process concerns as linkage, integration, realignment, governance, etc., are certainly welcomed. I would also especially encourage papers that might not ordinarily seem to fit within the traditional conceptions of political organizations and parties. For instance, papers that are cross-national in focus are encouraged, as are papers that combine a concern with political organizations and parties with other institutional and process concerns (e.g., interest group activity in the courts; the role of parties in the legislative process). Diachronic analyses are also especially encouraged, as are papers that relate to the themes connected to the bicentennials of the French Revolution and U.S. Bill of Rights. It should also be stressed that the section invites papers on political organizations other than political parties. Note that no methodological orthodoxy is being imposed on the papers—research based on eclectic methods, so long as they are rigorous, is welcomed. Formal analyses are especially encouraged. I also solicit your suggestions for additional topics for the meeting, and especially ideas for roundtables. Finally, please make a special effort to encourage graduate students to consider participating in the meeting.

Section 8. Policy Studies. Rita Mae Kelly, School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287; (602) 966-4529.

Panels and papers focusing on the advances made in policy studies during the twentieth century will be particularly welcome for the 1989 meeting. The advances discussed can focus on theory, methods, or specific policy areas. Papers assessing the implications of quantum reality, relativity theory, and chaos theory for policy studies and the development of a policy science are most desired. In addition to these themes panels on the integration of political philosophy, empirical theory, and policy are sought. More traditional panels focused on theory building in policy studies, comparative policy studies and analysis, the policy process, implementation, and outcomes, and substantive policy are also encouraged. Framing all of the above in a comparative and/or global perspective is a good idea.

Section 9. Politics and the Life Sciences. Denise L. Baer, Department of Political Science, 303 Meserve Hall, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115; (617) 437-4405.

The life sciences contribution to the study of politics encompasses a broad spectrum of both theoretical approaches and substantive concerns—ranging from traditional political thought on the meaning of human nature, to reassessments of the social and biological construction of gender, to incorporation of somatic and physiological variables affecting cognitive development and behavior of elites and masses, to sociobiology and consideration of concepts of genetic and cultural evolution, to public policy on health issues and the environment and controversies over the social and political impacts of new biomedical technologies and biotechnology in general.

In the interest of stimulating a broader consideration of these issues in political science, I would be especially interested in receiving proposals for papers that reassess fundamental concepts and themes in traditional or behavioral political science

in the light of either current social and political events, or contemporary research and theory from the life sciences. These might include, for example, the new reproductive technologies and the social control of women, or child care policies and the political socialization of infants and toddlers in private vs. public full-time care. Alternatively, pluralism (in David Truman's anthropological sense) vs. (methodological) individualism might be reassessed.

These suggestions are not meant to restrict proposals—proposals reflecting the diverse range of biopolitics (from practitioners as well as newcomers and critics) will be welcomed and seriously considered. Suggestions for roundtables and workshops are encouraged. Individuals with suggestions for panel themes are encouraged to submit their ideas early to allow time for panel development. Those who wish to serve as panel chairs or discussants should indicate their preferred areas or topics of interest.

Section 10. Presidency Research. Terry M. Moe, Department of Political Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305; (415) 723-3583.

The president is the single most important actor in American politics, so it is not too surprising that political scientists, historians, and journalists have invested heavily in presidential research over the years. This enormous literature is fascinating, diverse in substantive focus, and highly informative. It is also among the most atheoretical bodies of research in the entire discipline.

My guess is that the major reason for this state of affairs is probably the obvious one: the presidency's natural focus on a single office and its individual occupants has served as an inherent constraint on generalization and theory. This has not prevented scholars on the order of Neustadt and Barber from making important theoretical contributions to our understanding of presidential behavior. But it has made the job of theory-building a very difficult and perplexing one.

This section offers students of the presidency, as well as anyone else who would like to get in on the action, an opportunity

to address the problem head on. Each of the panels will be oriented by theoretical concerns. These concerns may be explored in application to any combination of the substantive topics that are now a familiar part of the literature: presidential personality, the institutional presidency, the president and Congress, the president and the media, the president and foreign policy, and on and on. They may also be explored in the abstract—that is, largely through conceptual or methodological argument—without detailed attention to any particular substantive area. Anyone with interesting ideas about the problems and prospects for theory, especially if these ideas are somewhat unorthodox and out of the mainstream, is encouraged to submit a proposal for organizing a panel, writing a paper, or serving as a discussant.

Section 11. Public Administration. Donald F. Kettl, Department of Government and Foreign Affairs, 232 Cabell Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903.

The Organized Section on Public Administration welcomes the opportunity to coordinate the subfield's panels in the official program. I encourage you to submit proposals for papers, as well as offers to chair or serve as a discussant on panels, covering the full scope of issues in public administration. These issues include, but certainly are not limited to: bureaucracy, organization theory, bureaucratic politics, public management, intergovernmental administration, budgeting, personnel management and the public service, leadership, privatization, regulation, responsibility and ethics in administration, and bureaucratia reform.

Detailed proposals for papers will receive the strongest consideration. In addition, prospective panel chairs should present as much information as possible, including if possible the names and topics of prospective presenters. Early submissions are encouraged.

Section 12. Religion and Politics. Clarke E. Cochran, Department of Political Science, Box 4290, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409; (806) 742-3121.

The religion and politics program should reflect the great diversity of research topics and methods in this field. I welcome proposals reporting empirical research on religion and politics in the United States, the developed nations, and the third world, as well as normative and historical research on religion and politics, scriptures and politics, church and state, and political theology. I encourage proposals reporting local, national, and cross-national research.

In particular, I invite research proposals dealing with the less-developed areas of the field. These include empirical cross-national research; women, religion and politics; and ethnic minorities, religion, and politics. Findings on the impact of religion on the 1988 elections would also be appropriate. Specifying these themes does not exclude others. I shall strive for a balance among new and old topics, empirical, normative, and historical research, and areas of specialization.

The Religion and Politics Section of the APSA has always attempted to mix types of panels; therefore, you are invited to submit proposals for roundtables and for panels focusing on one major work in the field, as well as the traditional panels featuring two or three papers with commentators.

Section 13. Representation and Electoral Systems. Joseph F. Zimmerman, Department of Political Science, SUNY at Albany, Albany, NY 12222; (518) 442-5378 or 439-9440.

Issues of representation and alternative electoral systems at the national, state, and local levels in the United States and abroad are the major concerns of the section. The presidential election of 1988 and the 200th anniversary of the United States Constitution invite an assessment of the electoral college. Other topics include gerrymandering, redistricting criteria, the run-off election versus the alternative vote, the single member district system and the election of women and minority candidates, characteristics of absentee voters and poll voters, the model city charter and representation, limited voting, cumulative voting, the federal voting rights act as amended, voting behavior, voter

turnout, the media's role in voter education, campaign finance, and federal election laws other than the voting rights act. Suggestions for panels, papers, and roundtables are invited.

Section 14. Science and Technology Studies. Norman J. Vig, Department of Political Science, Carleton College, Northfield, MN 55057; (507) 663-4120.

The purpose of this section is to encourage more rigorous scholarship on science and technology, institutions of great importance to contemporary society which have generally been neglected by political scientists. We are particularly interested in conceptually rich papers, while not excluding case studies or policy analyses that raise important theoretical concerns. Panel suggestions are encouraged from all perspectives in political science, but attention is directed to the following substantive areas:

1. linkages between politics, economics, and technology, including issues such as industrial policy, international trade, technology transfer, and development strategies;
2. international "regimes" for the application, dissemination, and regulation of science and technology;
3. the impact of science and technology on law and civil or constitutional rights;
4. the politics of knowledge and expertise, or the role of specialists in political decision making, and mechanisms or procedures for resolving conflicts among different kinds of expertise;
5. the politics of risk assessment and management, especially concerning long-term global risks such as ozone depletion, deforestation, and the greenhouse effect;
6. the role of scientists as interest group representatives of academic and other institutions;
7. cross-national comparisons of policy-making for science and technology;
8. the effects of new communications technologies on political campaigning

and electoral politics, political socialization, and private international communication (e.g., between groups in the U.S. and in the Soviet Union or Central America).

Suggestions for other topics are also invited. All panels will be encouraged to consider the distinctive contributions which political scientists might potentially make to a better understanding of how scientific and technological developments are related to politics and social change generally.

Section 15. Urban Politics and Urban Policy Section. Clarence N. Stone, Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742; (301) 454-6720.

The urban politics and urban policy panels will reflect the diversity of scholarship and interests of urbanists. The life of our urban areas is understood by looking at their history, location, governments, participation of residents, problems, and policies. All of these perspectives should be grounded in appropriate theory.

In addition to proposals for papers concerning the topics listed above, I would welcome suggestions for proposals that focus on defining the nature of research in urban politics and policy and defining future directions that urban research should take.

Suggestions regarding panels on the subjects above or any other topics relevant to this section are welcome and will receive serious consideration. All proposals should include a statement of the topic to be investigated, hypotheses to be tested, data to be employed, and theoretical or methodological approaches to be used. If you have suggestions for panels please send your ideas to me early.

Section 16. Women and Politics Research. Susan Welch, Department of Political Science, 511 Oldfather Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588; (402) 472-5704.

This section will be broad gauged in its approach. Paper and panel proposals are welcome that deal with any aspect of

women and politics research, including women and public policy, political behavior of women, women and political institutions, and topics relating to the theory, concepts, and methods concerned with the study of women and politics. Proposals dealing with women in a comparative perspective and those dealing with minority women are especially welcome. Papers examining the experience of women during 200 years of the American Constitution would also be appropriate.

Section 17. Political Methodology. John R. Freeman, Department of Political Science, 1414 Social Science, 267 19th Avenue South, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455; (612) 624-6018.

Panels in this section will cover many familiar topics: measurement and estimation problems; cross-sectional, panel, and time series methods; cross-level inference; simulation methods; and so on. Panels on less familiar topics like network and/or text analysis may be organized as well. In all cases, priority will be given to papers that introduce or develop new methods, and which systematically demonstrate these methods' value relative to existing approaches to the study of politics.

The convention gives us an opportunity to address some larger methodological issues. To this end, I hope to organize several panels on questions such as the following: (1) Do some fields of our discipline face greater methodological challenges than other fields? For example, is theory building in Comparative Politics inherently more difficult than in American politics because of the relative severity of certain methodological problems in the former field, e.g., the difficulty of constructing accurate, cross-culturally meaningful measures of political phenomena? (2) What is the status of the results of purely experimental or inductive analysis of political data? What, if any, contribution do exploratory factor analysis, vector autoregression, and related methods make to the study of politics? (3) How are formal and statistical models related? What statistical models are implied by psychological and rational choice theories of politics, for instance? and (4) Are text and numerical

analyses complementary in any sense? If so, what kind of research design best exploits the relative virtues of each approach? Proposals on these topics or on any other larger methodological issues are welcome.

Section 18. International Law and Organization. Donald L. Horowitz, Department of Political Science, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706; (919) 684-6039.

Proposals for panels and for papers will be welcome on any pertinent topic or theme. However, special priority will be given to proposals dealing with the following issues:

(1) *The comparative politics of divergent national approaches to international law.* What explains why particular states in the international system adopt and maintain the approaches they do? When changes occur in the approach of a state to international law, how and why does it happen? What is the comparative politics of such changes?

(2) *The comparative politics of international organizations.* Given the profusion of international organizations—bilateral and multilateral, regional and global—there is a shortage of work comparing one organization with another and one type of organization with another. Is political life inside international organizations different from political life elsewhere? Are organizational cultures distinctive, or is there a more general politics (bureaucratic or otherwise) of international organizations? To what extent do the functions performed by international organizations affect their politics, even apart from the interests of (and funding provided by) constituent states? These are just a few of the questions that lend themselves to comparative analysis.

(3) *The role of law in international organizations and the role of international organizations in the making of international law.* Since many international organizations are charged with responsibility for developing new legal norms, how do they perform this function? Are the legal products of international organizations being assimilated into general international law doctrine, and if so by what mechanisms, or are they largely compartmentalized? To

what extent are international organizations regulated and constrained by law?

Please provide a brief written summary of the panel or paper you propose.

Section 19. National Security and Foreign Policy Studies. Leon V. Sigal, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT 06457; (203) 347-9411.

Panels will take several forms. Analytical issues will be addressed in the usual panel format, especially those relating the policy process and domestic politics to decisions and actions from a variety of theoretical perspectives, among them, psychology and economics, as well as political analysis. Comparisons among different political systems will be especially welcome. Alternatively, workshops may assess progress in addressing some analytical issues and perspectives with or without papers. Some issues of special moment, such as a retrospective on the policies and policymaking of the Reagan Administration, the implications for national security of U.S. economic policy or of new thinking in Soviet military doctrine, low-intensity conflict, conventional arms control in Europe, or START will be organized as policy forums, with panels of discussants.

Proposals from prospective conveners, presenters, and discussants are welcome, the more detailed, the better, in order to facilitate grouping by common interest.

Section 20. International Political Economy. Stephan Haggard, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1737 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Students of international political economy are now engaged in a number of controversies concerning the future of the field. What are the advantages of the "systemic" theory as opposed to formulations that span or combine several levels of analysis? How can models drawing on microeconomic theory be reconciled with approaches stressing the importance of institutions, norms or social aggregates, such as classes? How can comparative/historical analysis be integrated with theory construction?

I will seek to accommodate proposals for individual papers, but particularly wel-

come are ideas for well-integrated panels that address these controversies. I also welcome panels that explicitly address method or that bring theory to bear on particular historiographical controversies. Finally, I will favor panels that include economists, sociologists or historians either as paper writers or discussants.

Section 21. Comparative Politics—First World. Richard Gunther, Department of Political Science, 223 Derby Hall, 154 N. Oval Mall, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210; (614) 292-6266.

While panel proposals dealing with a broad array of topics will be considered, I am particularly interested in paper and panel proposals concerning The New Democratic Politics—that is, changes in partisan ideologies, electoral competition and public policy which have taken place in advanced industrial societies in recent years. It has now been two decades since the seemingly stable configuration of partisan alignments, ideologies and programmatic commitments of the post-war era were challenged by the emergence of The New Left; and a decade has elapsed since the emergence and rise to ascendancy in some countries of The New Right. More recently, important European socialist parties (e.g., those of France, Spain and Great Britain) have been forced to reassess and reformulate their ideological and programmatic commitments, while once-important Eurocommunist parties have undergone crises and decline. A considerable amount of research has been conducted with regard to the emergence of postmaterialist values and their impact on electoral politics and public policy. More recently, studies have been published concerning Reaganism and Thatcherism, as well as changes in European socialism and the rise and fall of Eurocommunism. I believe that it is now time to embark upon a broad-gauged and systematic analysis of these changes—their basic features, their causes and their consequences.

Considerable debate has taken place over the impact of postmaterialism on contemporary politics and over such questions as the longevity of phenomena like the Reagan revolution. Indeed, what has

been most striking about the breakdown of the old order is that it has taken on a wide variety of forms in different countries. In some instances, it has been manifested in an increased polarization of partisan conflict at the elite level and realignment or dealignment at the mass level. In most cases, it has shifted the "center of gravity" of partisan politics, and significantly altered the tone and substance of policy debate. It is hoped that papers presented at the 1989 Meeting will contribute to an overall assessment of these developments.

Panels and papers from a wide variety of perspectives could contribute to this objective. Systematic assessments of the formal ideologies or programmatic commitments of parties in advanced industrialized societies would focus on the central set of variables relevant to this change. Of equal value would be studies of the electoral causes or consequences of such ideological shifts. Studies of public policy or redefinitions of the role of the state in the aftermath of the breakdown of the Keynesian consensus would represent yet another distinct approach to these issues. Alternatively, studies of cleavages and coalitions in parliamentary bodies could explore the institutional status of changing party ideologies. In short, this conference theme could accommodate papers by political theorists as easily as those by empirical political scientists. But it is hoped that whatever the approach, the ultimate product will be a better understanding of these transformations.

Section 22. Comparative Politics: Second World. Ellen Comisso, Department of Political Science, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093; (619) 534-3180.

If liberal democracy is, so to speak, the "political shell" of advanced capitalism, what then is the appropriate political shell of contemporary socialism? Put differently, is there socialism without Stalinism and if so, what does it look like? The theme of panels in this section will be redefining the socialist experience as both a domestic and an international phenomenon, although proposals are welcome on any

aspect of political life in communist systems.

Panels structured around the following issues will be particularly welcome: (1) the relationship between economic and political liberalization; (2) the political and social impact of the "second" economy; (3) national consciousness, regional loyalties and political order; (4) causes and problems of regime transformation; (5) the changing (or not so changing) distribution of power between and within state and society; (6) new forms of political action at the grass roots and among elites; (7) new modes of integration into the international economic order; (8) reliance on force v. diplomacy in the conduct of international relations.

Treatment of such questions in historical and comparative (both among socialist states and between them and non-socialist states, e.g., the NICs) perspective is to be encouraged, as are roundtables on more speculative aspects of recent developments.

Section 23. Comparative Politics—Third World. Barbara Geddes, Department of Political Science, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1472; (213) 825-4441.

Proposals for panels and papers will be especially welcome if they fit into one of the following broad areas.

(1) Extensions of economic theory and approaches to the study of politics in the developing world. Papers might, for example, include treatments of political leaders as support or survival maximizers, game theoretic analyses of political interactions, explanations of the evolution of political institutions, or examinations of the effect of rent seeking on political stability and economic development. Proposals which adapt models developed for use in democratic contexts to authoritarian or revolutionary settings would be especially interesting.

(2) Explanations of democratization. Just when the affinity of developing countries for authoritarianism had been compellingly explained and was therefore, in Albert Hirschman's words, "understood in its majestic inevitability and perhaps even permanence," numerous Third World

countries began new experiments with democracy. This trend has stirred the imagination of citizens and scholars around the world, but persuasive general explanations of the turn toward democracy have been slow to emerge. Papers which propose theories to account for democratization in the developing world, and which use comparisons among several cases to test proposed theories, will be viewed with enthusiasm.

(3) Explanations of differences in economic performance among developing countries. This topic includes assessments of the effects of different government strategies for fostering development; explanations of why officials in particular settings choose particular policies; and analyses of the effects of different political institutions on policy choice and implementation. Comparisons between democratic and authoritarian governments and between post-revolutionary and non-revolutionary governments are encouraged, as are comparisons between economic successes and failures within any political or geographical category.

Section 24. Formal and Normative Political Theory. Kristen Monroe, Department of Politics and Society, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717; (714) 856-7449.

What is the nature of contemporary formal and normative political theory? How is it related to more traditional forms of political theory? Are certain kinds of questions best analyzed using the formal or the normative approaches? What are the limitations of these approaches for understanding political action? Papers in this section will focus on these questions. I am particularly interested in papers in (but not limited to) the following areas: (1) democratic political theory, (2) rational actor theory, (3) contractarian theory, (4) social choice theory, (5) dynamic and contextual models, (6) the new institutionalism, (7) game theory, and (8) cultural theory. Proposals should include a brief abstract (1-2 pages) that clearly indicates which of the above topics will be addressed most directly in the paper. Feel free to propose papers which overlap with topics listed in the Foundations of Political Theory section

since joint panels can be arranged if appropriate.

Section 25. Ethnic and Racial Minority Studies. Lorn S. Foster, c/o Department of Government, Pomona College, 425 N. College Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711-6336.

For the past 25 years ethnic and racial minorities have been instrumental in creating social change. A contributing factor in the demands of various ethnic and racial groups in the United States for social change was the obvious dissonance between its political ideals and institutions, particularly the issue of political equality. The demands on the part of these various ethnic and racial groups has resulted in the redistribution of political power in American society. The focus of these panels will be on the differential power and group conflict between ethnic and racial groups in the United States. Various panels will examine the role of ethnic and racial minorities on national and subnational political behavior, institutions, and policy. One of the reasons that ethnic and racial politics are more prevalent in American politics today is the result of immigration patterns over the past 20 years. Two panels will focus on immigration policy. In 1990, all legislative bodies will begin the reapportionment process. As a consequence we will no doubt see increased conflict between ethnic and racial groups over the distribution of legislative seats. One panel will address itself to interethnic conflict over legislative seats. If there is sufficient interest a panel or panels will focus on ethnic and racial politics from a comparative perspective.

Section 26. The Bill of Rights. Lucius J. Barker, Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Consistent with the bicentennial celebration, the central objective of this section is to analyze the nature, functioning, and impact of the Bill of Rights on our politics and society. Hopefully these analyses will come from a range of scholarly disciplines and perspectives.

Among the topics that might be con-

sidered are: (1) the origins and development of the Bill of Rights; (2) the politics and law of incorporation; (3) federalism and the Bill of Rights—states as actors in restricting or promoting individual liberties; (4) developmental trends in rights policies and litigation in particular substantive areas, e.g., free speech, religion, rights of the accused; (5) expanding areas of litigation under the Bill of Rights, e.g., privacy; (6) impact of technology on protection of individual rights; (7) interest group and institutional participation in formulation, implementation and enforcement of rights; (8) underutilized or latent clauses in the Bill of Rights, e.g., the right to bear arms; and (9) the Bill of Rights in comparative perspective—the influence of the Bill of Rights on constitution-making and development in other countries, and vice versa.

Of particular interest are suggestions for panels and papers which, in treating various topics, illuminate the interaction of law and politics, and the dynamic relationships of various interests, individuals, and institutions in the development, formulation, and implementation of particular provisions and policies relating to the Bill of Rights.

Section 27. The Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Raymond E. Wolfinger, Department of Political Science, 210 Barrows Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720; (415) 642-2337.

Among the topics that might be explored in observance of the 25th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are: (1) the evolution of civil rights law since 1964, particularly the extent to which the intentions of the authors have been met, exceeded, and disappointed; (2) the effect of the act on southern politics; (3) more broadly, the effect of the civil rights movement on the South; (4) a retrospective look at the civil rights movement; (5) a look back at the enactment of the bill by important participants. I should add that the first two points might well include the 1965 Voting Rights Act as well.

Section 28. Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité: The French Revolution at 200. Roger Masters and Anne Sa'adah, Department

of Government, Silsby Hall, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755.

The 1989 American Political Science Convention provides a welcome occasion to mark the 200th anniversary of the French revolution—*la Revolution*—by reassessing its causes, its consequences, and its continued relevance from the perspective of our discipline. Do specific political events change history? How did (and do) political ideas and theories influence the course of events? To what extent were the changes in political culture and social structure associated with the French Revolution critical to Western political history? And how have institutional developments altered—or maintained—the fundamental transformations, both in France and elsewhere, that were inaugurated by the revolutionary era?

These issues invite a dialogue between French specialists and other members of our discipline. We will try to foster such dialogue at a series of panels at the 1989 APSA Convention in Atlanta. In order to impose some coherence on a vast subject and thereby facilitate the publication of papers prepared for the panels, we propose to focus discussion around the following topics:

1. *The Revolution and Political Theory*: the use by revolutionaries of pre-revolutionary political theory—and by post-revolutionary theorists of the symbols and historical events of the Revolution.

2. *The Revolution and Political Institutions*: the transformation of the Monarchy into a Republic in the Revolution itself; the role of fundamental law in French politics; French political leadership from Robespierre and Napoleon to Leon Blum and Charles de Gaulle; Parliament and the bureaucracy; the multiparty system as an instrument of modern democracy.

3. *The Revolution and Political Culture*: the tenacity—and fragility—of the French republican tradition; Paris and the provinces; the multiple identities of Left and Right.

4. *The Revolution and Modern Society*: the political transformations of social class, economic structure, and principles of legitimacy; the impact of the French Revolution in Europe; 1789 as the model of social

transformation in the Third World.

Section 29. Political Science in Washington. Norman Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute, 1150 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 862-6476.

This section will look at both political science and political scientists in Washington. One focus will be how political science is or is not used in policy making or policy deliberations. A second will be how political scientists practice their trade in Washington—with a look at the role of think tanks, one at universities in Washington, and another at political scientists in government. Other potential topics include political scientists as lobbyists; how political science views Washington; and how Washington—journalists, lawmakers, executives and others—view political science and political scientists. Ideas for panels or papers along these or other lines are welcome, the earlier the better.

Section 30. Thomas Hobbes: 1588-1988. Richard Ashcraft, Department of Political Science, 405 Hilgard Avenue, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024; (213) 825-4331/1576.

This will be a series of five panels devoted to an examination of the scientific, religious, political, philosophical, and economic aspects of the thought of Thomas Hobbes. Papers are invited which explore any of these features of Hobbes's writings. Especially welcome are proposals which offer new insights or new directions in scholarly research on Hobbes.

Those interested in participating in the miniconference should send their suggestions or proposals (along with a cv) to Professor Ashcraft at the above address.

Section 31. Party Realignment. Hal Bass, Department of Political Science, Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, AR 71923; (501) 246-4531, x168.

I intend to cast my net as widely as possible. Papers on party realignment typically address changes in the partisan composition of the electorate. I anticipate this outlook will prevail in most of the panels established. Additionally, I welcome

paper proposals that extend the realignment perspective to party organizations, governmental institutions, and public policies. I have no prejudices with regard to space and time. The territorial focus may range from subnational to national to cross-national. Indeed, I especially encourage paper proposals that consider realignment in political systems other than that of the United States, as well as those that approach the topic comparatively. In turn, the temporal dimension may be historical, contemporary, or both. In addition to paper proposals, I solicit suggestions for roundtables and offers to chair panels and appear as discussants. I look forward to receiving your proposals.

Section 32. Political Economy. David Vogel, School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720; (415) 642-5294.

This year's panels in political economy will emphasize four themes:

(1) Comparative studies of public policies toward business in the advanced industrial nations, including privatization, taxation, economic deregulation, industrial policy and health, safety and environmental regulation.

(2) The politics of business, either domestic or comparative, including business political activity, business organizations, theories of business power, business ideology and business ethics, i.e., corruption.

(3) National security and political economy, focusing on the debate surrounding America's "competitiveness" and the "rise and fall" of America as a "great power."

(4) The impact of the globalization of the American economy on domestic politics and economic policy.

Because there are substantial disagreements among scholars on a number of these topics, I would like to encourage proposals for panels and roundtables that will provide a forum for intellectual controversy and debate.

Section 33. Political Psychology and Political Behavior. Stanley Renshon, Political Science Program, City University Gradu-

Association News

ate Center, 33 West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; (212) 642-2355.

This section will welcome proposals that explore the relationship between psychological and political processes. Some possible topic areas include political; socialization, leadership, participation and behavior, belief and attitudes systems, conflict and conflict resolution, and decision making. In addition, I would like to encourage proposals which examine the psychological dimensions of public policies designed to address social problems.

Proposals may focus at any level of analysis, and employ any appropriate methodology. Both empirical and non-empirically based theoretical papers and proposals are welcomed.

New!

Section 34. Electoral Behavior and Public Opinion. Paul Allen Beck, Department of Political Science, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210-1373; (614) 292-7087/2880.

My intention is to represent the diversity

of current research on electoral behavior (both voting and participation) and public opinion. I expect most of the papers in this section will be based on empirical studies of mass publics in the United States, and such proposals of course are encouraged. But I also welcome proposals based on (1) cross-national research, particularly including the United States; (2) experimental studies; (3) solely theoretical treatments of important issues; or (4) the relationship of electoral behavior and public opinion to the wider political arena. I hope to organize at least one panel around different approaches to data from 1988 general election studies and another around analyses of voting or participation in the primaries/caucuses. Given the limited number of panels in this section and the considerable amount of current research on its topics, I anticipate no roundtables without papers or state-of-the-field panels, although I would be open to especially original suggestions. I will receive proposals for papers and panels, as well as offers to serve as chairs and discussants, through **December 15, 1988.**