

## PS Appendix

### APSA Awards Presented at the 1983 Annual Meeting

#### DISSERTATION AWARDS

(Each award includes a cash prize of \$250)

**Gabriel A. Almond Award** for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1981 or 1982 in the field of comparative politics.

*Recipient: Miriam A. Golden, Cornell University. Austerity and Its Opposition: Italian Working Class Politics in the 1970s.*

*Selection Committee:* Trond Gilberg, Pennsylvania State University, Chair; Robert Jackman, Michigan State University; Kay Lawson, San Francisco State University.

*Dissertation Chair: Sidney Tarrow.*

*Citation:* Miriam Anna Golden's dissertation *Austerity and Its Opposition: Italian Working Class Politics in the 1970s* is distinguished by thorough and sophisticated field work over a protracted period of time, and also the systematic testing of significant hypotheses which go beyond the field of inquiry of this dissertation, thus representing a contribution to the more general field of comparative politics. Specifically, Ms. Golden examines the hypotheses that (a) "as interest groups become more numerous, more powerful, and/or as they enter increasingly into the political realm, the abilities of political parties to aggregate and articulate interests will decline"; (b) "interest groups have become more numerous, more powerful, and/or entered increasingly into the political realm because of pressures from below"; (c) "the effectiveness of collaboration between political parties and trade unions depends on the extent to which parties offer unions political opportunities that outweigh the unions' internal organizational strength." The examination undertaken to test these important hypotheses shows a high level of skill in field work and data manipulation, enhancing the substantive value of the research findings.

The significance of the hypotheses tested, the field work undertaken, and the utilization of research methodology establish Miriam A.

Golden's dissertation as the best among those submitted for the Gabriel A. Almond Award this year.

**William Anderson Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1981 or 1982 in the field of state and local politics, federalism or intergovernmental relations.

*Recipient:* No award given this year.

*Selection Committee:* Andrew Cowart, SUNY, Stony Brook, Chair; Virginia Gray, University of Minnesota; Deil Wright, University of North Carolina.

**Edward S. Corwin Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1981 or 1982 in the field of public law.

*Recipient: Mark Silverstein, Cornell University. Liberalism, Democracy, and the Court: Felix Frankfurter, Hugo Black, and Constitutional Decision-Making.*

*Selection Committee:* David Rohde, Michigan State University, Chair; Harry Clor, Kenyon College; Sheldon Goldman, University of Massachusetts.

*Dissertation Chair: David Danelski and Benjamin Ginsburg.*

*Citation:* The winner of the 1983 Edward S. Corwin Award for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public law is Mark Silverstein of Cornell University for his dissertation: *Liberalism, Democracy and the Court: Felix Frankfurter, Hugo Black, and Constitutional Decision-Making*. The author's purpose is "to develop an understanding of the core political values" of these two significant judicial figures, and to shed some light on "how and at what stage they operate in the decision-making process."

The focus for the description of values is the pre-Court writings and careers of the subjects. Dr. Silverstein draws on Frankfurter's correspondence and an imaginative use of the marginal notes in and index to Black's private library to describe both their common political goals and their sharply different conceptions of the uses of state power and of the proper

judicial role. The second half of the thesis describes the influence of these values of the justices' decision making in the areas of state criminal procedures and freedom of expression between 1937 and 1951. The analysis appropriately recognizes the dynamic character of decision making, and employs private memoranda, draft opinions and notes of the justices to depict the manner in which values shape outcomes.

What emerges from this analysis is a complex and sophisticated conception of the judicial role which rests on the consequences of the tension between majority rule and judicial review. The justices differed in their views of what the judicial role demanded. In the words of the author, "In the case of Frankfurter and Black, role did not directly determine judicial votes but rather dictated the process of decision-making employed to reach those votes."

I cannot hope to do justice to the scope of this research in the few minutes I have here. I can only draw your attention to this remarkable piece of work and express my pleasure at having the honor of citing it as the winner of the 1983 Corwin Award.

**Helen Dwight Reid Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1981 or 1982 in the field of international relations, law and politics.

*Recipient: Deborah Larson*, Stanford University. *Belief and Inference: The Origins of American Leaders' Cold War Ideology*.

*Section Committee:* Margaret Hermann, Ohio State University, Chair; Catherine Kelleher, University of Maryland; Harvey Starr, Indiana University.

*Dissertation Chair: Alexander L. George*.

*Citation:* It is with pleasure that the Helen Dwight Reid Award Committee announces the selection of the doctoral dissertation by Deborah Larson entitled *Belief and Inference: The Origins of American Leaders' Cold War Ideology* as the outstanding dissertation in international relations written in 1981-82. This dissertation was submitted to Stanford University and was under the direction of Alexander George.

Larson's study of the origins of American leaders' Cold War ideology shows both conceptual and methodological sophistication, being particularly impressive because it is at once cross-level and cross-disciplinary. Larson perceptively has adopted a multilevel approach in showing how the Cold War ideology of such leaders as Truman and Byrnes was molded by the national and international context in which they found themselves.

Describing a number of psychological phenomenon known to influence information processing, Larson demonstrates through case study and content analysis how these processes affected the ways in which the leaders reconciled domestic and international pressures in the years immediately following World War II. She has examined a vast array of documents in arriving at her descriptions of the leaders' beliefs and the international situations they perceived themselves to be confronting and has presented her material in a highly readable fashion. Although focused on American leaders at the beginning of the Cold War, Larson's insights have important implications for how current American leaders are perceiving, understanding, and dealing with East-West relations.

We congratulate Deborah Larson on her dissertation and this award.

**E. E. Schattschneider Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1981 or 1982 in the field of American government.

*Recipient: Thomas W. Wolf*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *Congressional Sea Change: Conflict and Organizational Accommodation in the House of Representatives 1878-1921*.

*Selection Committee:* David Koehler, American University, Chair; Kristi Anderson, Ohio State University; Harmon Zeigler, University of Oregon.

*Dissertation Chair: Walter Dean Burnham*.

*Citation:* From a number of outstanding dissertations submitted for the 1983 E. E. Schattschneider Award, the committee selected Thomas W. Wolf's, *Congressional Sea Change: Conflict and Organizational Accommodation in the House of Representatives, 1878-1921*.

Dr. Wolf argues that neither the internal, systems development model nor the external, evolutionary model adequately explain changes in the House of Representatives dating from the turn of the century. Rather he shows that the transformation from a centralized, leadership oriented institution to the decentralized, member oriented House which we know today was a function of the "changes in the nature of the conflict it has been forced to confront." None of those changes was more important than the decline of strong national parties and partisanship. This was the outcome of efforts of reform movements whose members viewed the patronage based parties, which exercised substantial control over House candidate selection, as corrupt closed systems. Thus the scope of political conflict was altered:

House members could begin to influence their reelection chances and careers by responding to the interests of their constituents, rather than the interests of party bureaucrats.

Wolf supports his hypotheses with an impressive array of qualitative and quantitative data. He convincingly demonstrates that historical analysis need not be methodologically dated, and further, that such work can be presented in a lucid, elegant style.

**Leo Strauss Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 1981 or 1982 in the field of political philosophy.

*Recipient:* **Wayne Ambler**, Boston College. *Aristotle on the Naturalness of the City.*

*Selection Committee:* Thomas Pangle, University of Toronto, Chair; Jacob Carruthers, Northeastern Illinois University; Nancy Rosenblum, Brown University.

*Dissertation Chair:* **Christopher J. Bruell.**

*Citation:* Wayne Ambler's dissertation, *Aristotle on the Naturalness of the City*, is a model of careful textual interpretation aimed at resolving a theoretical question of capital significance. Ambler begins from a deceptively simple but incisive pair of questions: What can Aristotle mean when he says the city or *polis* is *natural* and that man is "by nature a political animal"? And what argument can possibly establish this assertion? Deeply perplexed by what appears to be Aristotle's elliptical argument and wholly unsatisfied with traditional scholarship's claims about what the so-called "teleologist" Aristotle "must have meant to say," Ambler decided to start over again from the beginning: to look for himself with a maximum of attention and a minimum of preconceptions. What resulted is a dialogue with Aristotle that is truly illuminating. Ambler pauses over, and presses at, every obscure or puzzling feature of Aristotle's presentation. By thus highlighting Aristotle's paradoxes or contradictions, by doggedly pursuing Aristotle's every suggestion and thinking through his every implication, Ambler painstakingly rediscovers and reconstructs key stretches of the coherent pathway of thinking—of questioning and investigation—that Aristotle as educator left behind for his alert and open-minded readers. While Ambler has not by any means clarified the whole of the argument in the *Politics*, he has demonstrated that the book must be understood in new terms. He has proven that a number of basic, familiar or traditional assumptions about the *Politics* are in error, and that therefore much of what passes for Aristotle's doctrine is in fact a serious distortion. If Ambler's work is heeded and attended to—and in this chattering age and busy profession there is no guarantee it

will be—a major rethinking will be performed: a rethinking that will involve not only a new inquiry into the authentic teaching of Aristotle and of those subsequent thinkers who claim to follow him, but also a reconsideration of those thinkers who define their positions as over and against Aristotle. The importance of Ambler's dissertation must be judged accordingly.

**Leonard D. White Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1981 or 1982 in the general field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory.

*Recipient:* **John W. Swain**, Northern Illinois University. *An Evaluation of the Public Choice Approach to Structuring Local Government in Metropolitan Areas.*

*Selection Committee:* Peter Aranson, Emory University, Chair; Jeanne Nienaber Clark, University of Arizona; Carol Uhlener, University of California, Irvine.

*Dissertation Chair:* **James M. Banovetz.**

*Citation:* John W. Swain's work provides a masterful and comprehensive integration of literature, theory, and evidence concerning the optimal size of local governments. Swain finds the prevailing belief in metropolitan consolidation to be without theoretical or empirical foundation. By contrast, the public choice approach, which rests on a consideration of citizens' preferences, reflects a wide and comprehensive variety of theoretical and empirical issues in discerning optimal size. These issues concern efficiency, economies of scale, external economies and diseconomies, interpolity competition, and consumer choice by voting and by "exit."

Swain's principal conclusion is that because of its superior applicability and utility, the public choice approach dominates all other approaches for deciding central questions about structuring local governments. Swain's secondary conclusion is that there is no *a priori* theoretical or empirical case for metropolitan consolidation. Instead, smaller, competing units often prove to be closer to optimal size.

## BOOK AND PAPER AWARDS

**Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award** (\$250), for the best paper presented at the 1982 annual meeting.

*Recipients:* **Jennifer Hochschild**, Princeton University. "Incrementalism, Pluralism and the Failure of School Desegregation." **Kaare**

**Strom, Stanford University.** "Minority Government and Majority Rule."

*Selection Committee:* Peter Bachrach, Temple University, Chair; Nicholas Miller, University of Maryland, Baltimore; Lynda Powell, University of North Carolina.

*Citation:* Owing to the equally outstanding papers by Professors Jennifer Hochschild and Kaare Strom, the Committee wishes to make two awards this year.

Professor Hochschild's paper, "Incrementalism, Majoritarianism, and the Failures of School Desegregation," is conceptually bold, thoroughly documented and rich in insight. Based on her analysis of school desegregation during the past 30 years, Hochschild concludes that democratic procedures yield less desirable outcomes for both racial minorities and white majorities than either sweeping, authoritative desegregation policies or no imposed effort at all. More specifically, she argues that both participatory and incremental approaches to desegregation are ineffectual and usually cause more harm than good. It is the least democratic arm of government—the federal courts and bureaucrats—that has been most successful in initiating and sustaining desegregation. "If desegregation requires remediation of past wrongs," Hochschild declares, "history shows that we simply cannot leave it up to the people to desegregate our schools."

Important theoretical inferences which can be drawn from her paper will undoubtedly challenge democratic theorists from both the left and the right.

Professor Kaare Strom's paper, "Minority Government and Majority Rule," provides an admirable example of political research that is empirically founded and, at the same time, theoretically guided. Strom first demonstrates that genuine minority governments are both prevalent and durable and thus constitute an anomalous phenomenon in light of established theories of coalition formation and maintenance. Next, Strom sets out an explanation for minority governments as rational solutions to government formation under certain conditions. This explanation entails significant modification of the straightforward power-maximization postulate common to rational-choice theories of elite political behavior. Finally, Strom constructs a variety of empirical tests of his explanation and demonstrates that it is persuasively sustained.

**Ralph J. Bunche Award** (\$500), for the best scholarly work in political science published in 1981 or 1982 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Recipients: John A. Armstrong, Nations Before Nationalism*, University of North Carolina Press. **Orlando Patterson, Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study**, Harvard University Press.

*Selection Committee:* Matthew Holden, Jr., University of Virginia, Chair; Arend Lijphart, University of California, San Diego; M. Crawford Young, University of Wisconsin.

*Citation:* In *Nations Before Nationalism*, a work of dazzlingly brilliant scholarship, John A. Armstrong deals with the most fundamental question of ethnic and cultural pluralism—how do ethnic and national identities come into existence?—and he does so in a comparative examination of extremely impressive historical, geographical, cultural, and disciplinary scope.

The theoretical literature on nationalism in its broadest sense, including ethnic and cultural pluralism, has generally insisted on the modern character of these forms of consciousness, originating in the nineteenth century. Without denying the validity of these claims, Armstrong nonetheless transcends the shallow time depth of the present debate by tracing the lineages of ethnicity back a couple of millennia to the Islamic and Christian cultures of antiquity. Another great strength of his work is that he overcomes the normal division of intellectual labor between Western historians and Orientalists. He makes telling use of the differential impact of Islamic and Christian world views in the emergence of ethnicity in the area from Western Europe to the Middle East. Armstrong is a professor of political science and the Bunche Award is an award of the American Political Science Association. However, *Nations Before Nationalism* is clearly not just a work in political science but a truly multidisciplinary effort—also grounded in and contributing to anthropology, sociology, and history.

By means of systematic diachronic and cross-cultural comparisons, Armstrong shows that ethnic identity is an attitude created and shaped in a complex interaction with a variety of forces, such as religious organizations, political structure, and mythomoteurs or constitutive myths. He contributes greatly to our understanding of ethnicity and nationalism by demonstrating not only the complexity of their origins but also the clear patterns and regularities that can be discerned within this complexity. *Nations Before Nationalism* is a work of great intellectual and theoretical force. To combine such depth and breadth in a single volume of modest physical proportions is a rare achievement.

Patterson traces the institution of slavery back to the dawn of human history, and with

remarkable erudition proposes a general comparative framework by which its essence may be grasped, through the many specific manifestations in which it is embodied. Only in its later stages, as a set of power relationships, did it become largely associated with race. Its essence, argues Patterson, is not primarily in the legal aspect of property relationships, but in the "natal alienation" through which the slave is denied ancestry and membership in any human community. The slave, thus, is "socially dead." Armed with this illuminating concept, Patterson explores the common themes of slavery, both as a set of personal relationships, and as an institutional system. He roams freely from the classical to the early modern world in constructing his analysis; this masterful study of the socially dishonored could as well be honored in the fields of history, anthropology, or sociology as in political science. It joins quantitative and qualitative methods in producing a study which will long stand as the benchmark work in this field.

**Gladys M. Kammerer Award** (\$1,000), for the best political science publication in 1982 in the field of U.S. national policy.

*Recipients: Robert A. Dahl, Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control*, Yale University Press. **Mancur Olson, The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities**, Yale University Press.

*Selection Committee:* Kristin Monroe, Princeton University, Chair; Nathaniel Beck, University of California, San Diego; Gordon Tullock, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

*Citation:* The Kammerer prize was established in 1970 in honor of Gladys Marie Kammerer, professor of political science and director of the Public Administration Clearing Service at the University of Florida at Gainesville. It is awarded for the best study concerning U.S. domestic policy in the field of political science.

This year the Committee, consisting also of Neal Beck and Gordon Tullock, is pleased to have two recipients of this award: Robert Dahl, Sterling Professor of Political Science at Yale University, for *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy versus Control*, and Mancur Olson, Distinguished Professor of Economics at the University of Maryland, for *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation and Social Rigidities*.

Both books are published by Yale University Press.

While both books are quite different in approach, each considers an issue central to na-

tional policy: the role of groups in democratic societies and the implications of regulation of these groups, either for economic growth (Olson) or for democratic values (Dahl). Each rises above the descriptive level of most books and directs our attention to theoretical concerns in a way which gives the work a broader scope and the richness we have come to associate with the classic texts.

*The Rise and Decline of Nations*, by Mancur Olson, considers the relationship between individual and group behavior, with special attention given to the question of how the pursuit of self-interest relates to group or collective interests and behavior. Olson builds on the theory advanced in *The Logic of Collective Action* to explain rapid shifts in the positions, both economic and political, of different countries. His central thesis holds that both individuals and firms in stable societies behave in ways which lead to the formation of what he terms "dense networks of collusive, cartelistic and lobbying organizations." These organizations reduce the efficiency of economies and make it more difficult to govern. The stronger these groups grow, the more they will retard growth. Olson's historical examples point to societies in which these narrow interest groups have been destroyed, either by war or revolution. These societies, Olson claims, are the ones which experience the greatest gains in growth.

The potential for further empirical examination of Olson's basic hypothesis is great. While Olson cautions against applying his theory as a monocausal explanation, the theory is one which will certainly spur future scholars to supplement and modify existing explanations for a wide variety of historical phenomena.

*Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy*, by Robert Dahl, is also concerned with the role of groups in modern democratic societies. But this view of groups is quite different from the one contained in Olson's work. Dahl accepts the existence of independent organizations as a given in democratic countries. Indeed, his analysis extends the problem of democratic pluralism into a rich discussion of political theory by his careful exposition and statement of a series of critical questions: Do special interest groups make democracy impossible at a national level? How much autonomy should these groups be allowed? How much should they be controlled? In what areas and in relation to what other actors, including the state, should their power be limited?

The answer, Dahl argues, involves a paradox. Organized interest groups are inevitable. They are desirable insofar as they act to limit government coercion and encourage political liberty. Yet their very autonomy gives them

the power to do harm by promoting the various interests of their members at the expense of the collective good, by perpetuating existing inequalities, by distorting the public agenda, and by essentially encouraging private control of public affairs. While Dahl's discussions of the solutions to this paradox reveal the difficulties in democratic government, the clarity of his analysis advances our understanding of modern democracy and focuses our attention on questions central to the discipline.

**Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award** (\$2,000), for the best book published in the U.S. during 1982 on government, politics, or international affairs.

*Recipient:* **G. Bingham Powell**, *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability, and Violence*, Harvard University Press.

*Selection Committee:* George Quester, University of Maryland, Chair; Charles Jones, University of Virginia; Richard McKelvey, California Institute of Technology.

*Citation:* In *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability, and Violence*, Professor G. Bingham Powell, Jr., studies 29 nations over a period of 18 years. Undertaking such a monumental task is itself worthy of recognition. To produce a clear and concise comparative analysis of the effectiveness of democracy in these many nations is a contribution deserving of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award.

Professor Powell asks the question: "Why does the political process work more successfully in some democracies than others?" His research focuses on three dimensions of political performance: citizen electoral participation, government stability, and political order. He carefully formulates performance tests to apply to each nation. Political parties are examined as significant links between the social, constitutional, and political environment and the dimensions of political performance. The Committee was particularly impressed with the careful development of measures at each stage of the research and the consistent integration of results.

Professor Powell's findings are important for two reasons. First, his comparative method demonstrates that the problems of generalizing for all democracies are even greater than we imagined. Second, his analysis shows us how to cope with these problems. Thus, for example, he develops performance requirements for three types of constitutional arrangements: presidential constitutions, majoritarian parliamentary systems, and representational parliamentary systems. Both

scholars and practitioners will find his conclusions realistic, relevant, and useful.

*Contemporary Democracies* ends on a cautionary note: "There are many ways to organize a working democracy." Future research on these many ways for making democracy work will build on Professor Powell's impressive effort. His book joins the other classics in comparative politics.

**Benjamin E. Lippincott Award** (\$1,500), for a work of exceptional quality by a living political theorist that is still considered significant after a time span of at least 15 years since the original publication.

*Recipient:* **Duncan Black**, Cambridge, England, *The Theory of Committees and Elections*.

*Selection Committee:* Bernard Grofman, University of California, Irvine, Chair; Steven Brams, New York University; Gerald Kramer, California Institute of Technology.

*Citation:* The Lippincott Prize Committee is pleased to announce its unanimous decision to award the 1983 Lippincott Award for lasting achievement in political theory to the noted British economist, Duncan Black, whose *Theory of Committees and Elections* (Cambridge University Press, 1958) is both a pathbreaking contribution to our understanding of the link between collective representation and individual preferences, and a remarkable voyage of discovery in the history of ideas.

The Lippincott Award in Political Theory whose previous recipients have included Karl Popper, Louis Hartz, and Simone de Beauvoir is not restricted to contributions to political theory made by "official" political scientists, and its definition of political theory is a very broad one. As indicated in the award description, what is called empirical political theory shall not be excluded nor shall the writing in the history of political ideas and related fields, such as philosophy, economics and literature." It is thus particularly fitting that Duncan Black receive this award, since few individuals have so well demonstrated the arbitrariness of disciplinary labels, and few have made a greater contribution to reinterpreting and reconstructing long neglected works to show their intellectual significance and contemporary relevance.

Roughly 200 years ago Condorcet demonstrated that majority rule need not yield a stable outcome when there are more than two alternatives to be considered. Although periodically rediscovered or reinvented by succeeding generations of scholars, the "paradox of cyclical majorities" was, for all practical

purposes, unknown to modern students of democratic theory until called to their attention by Duncan Black (see especially Black 1948a). In the *Theory of Committees and Elections*, Black demonstrated that the "paradox" was not just a mathematical curiosity but rather was connected to important political issues such as manipulability of voting schemes (1958:44; see also 1948a: 29) and the absence of strong similarity of citizen preferences structures (Black, 1958: 10-14).

Although Black was not the first to discover this phenomenon, his work is the foundation of all subsequent research on the problem. The investigations in this field of his principal predecessors, Condorcet and Lewis Carroll, had made no impact on the intellectual community of their day and had been completely forgotten. Their work is known today only because Black, after discovering the phenomenon himself, discovered his predecessors (Campbell and Tullock, 1965(b):853).

Duncan Black's vision of the 1940s was a grand, yet simple one: to develop a "pure science of politics" as a "ramified theory of committees" (Black, 1972:3). Black's aim was to place political science on the same kind of theoretical footing as economics. Because many of the basic ideas in his 1958 classic *The Theory of Committees and Elections* appear so "obvious" in retrospect that it is hard to believe that they have not always been part of the stock of general human knowledge, and because he is modest about the originality of his own work, the magnitude of Black's contributions is often underappreciated. Black's great strength is that he has served both as synthesizer and pioneer. He rediscovered and reinterpreted for contemporary social science the strikingly modern probabilistic and game theoretic insights of long dead theorists such as Dodgson (Lewis Carroll), Borda, and Condorcet (e.g., the paradox of cyclical majorities, the Condorcet criterion, the Borda criterion, optimizing strategies under the limited vote, results on manipulability of voting schemes, the Condorcet jury theorem); while himself developing such seminal ideas as single-peakedness, and equilibrium in a spatial voting game. Underpinning all of his work was the deceptively simple insight of modelling political phenomena "in terms of the preferences of a given set of individuals in relation to a given set of motions, the same motions appearing on the preference schedule of each individual" (Black, 1972:3); where motions can be represented as points on a real line of an N-dimensional space.

Black's work on what (after him) has come to

be called "the theory of committees and elections" is one of the pillars on which rests the theory of public choice and the "new" political economy.

With no more than simple arithmetic Duncan Black (1958) suggested effects and properties of various voting schemes, e.g., pairwise voting (exhaustive and not), rank-order voting, and extraordinary majorities. He also clarified and carried forward the analysis of single-member district, multi-member district, plurality winner, and proportional representation systems (Fiorina, 1975:147).

Indeed, the *Theory of Committees and Elections* is one of the most cited works in modern social science, being cited dozens of times each year in the published economics and political science literature. However, like any classic work, its most important effects are indirect, in terms of the literature which it inspired and which now has an independent life of its own.

## CAREER AWARDS

**Charles E. Merriam Award** (\$500), for the person whose published work and career represent a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research.

*Recipient:* **Jack Peltason**, American Council on Education.

*Selection Committee:* Thomas Dye, Florida State University, Chair; Samuel Krislov, University of Minnesota; Robert Salisbury, Washington University in St. Louis.

*Citation:* In *New Aspects of Politics* in 1925 Charles E. Merriam urged that we combine the scientific study of politics with a prudent concern for public policy and the practice of democratic government.

The contributions of Jack Walter Peltason to politics, government, and public policy truly exemplify the hopes of Charles E. Merriam for the emerging discipline of political science. From his earliest scholarly work on the Missouri Plan for the selection of judges, through his sensitive description of the difficult role of the federal judiciary in the desegregation of the American South in *Fifty-Eight Lonely Men*, Jack Peltason has provided us with political insight, analysis, and understanding. Generations of students have benefited from his clarity of thought and comprehensive knowledge of American democracy in the most popular of American government textbooks, *Government by the People*.

Jack Peltason's contributions to American higher education extend beyond his excel-

lence in teaching and scholarship. He demonstrated his academic leadership as Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois, Vice Chancellor at the University of California-Irvine, and for a turbulent decade (1967-1977) in American university life, as Chancellor of the University of Illinois. Since 1977 Jack Peltason has skillfully represented American higher education at the national level as President of the American Council of Education. In his role, he has improved the nation's understanding of, and support for, the institutions and purposes of higher education. More importantly he has helped higher education to understand itself and to reaffirm the values of academic freedom and integrity.

We enhance the Charles E. Merriam Award of the American Political Science Association by including among its recipients Jack Walter Peltason.

**Carey McWilliams Award** (\$500), to honor a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

*Recipient: David S. Broder, Washington Post.*

*Selection Committee:* Francis Carney, University of California, Riverside, Chair; Martha Derthick, Brookings Institution; Fred Greenstein, Princeton University.

*Citation:* David S. Broder of the *Washington Post* is the recipient of our second annual Carey McWilliams Award. We believe that his selection honors the high standard for this award set by last year's inaugural choice, Richard L. Strout. Mr. Broder is an Associate Editor of the *Post*, a syndicated columnist, and the author of a number of notable books on American national politics. In 1973 he received the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished political commentary. He began his career on the *Bloomington* (Ill.) *Pantagraph*. He arrived in Washington in 1955 to work for *Congressional Quarterly* and quickly began to specialize on the inner workings of the political parties. Before going to the *Post* as a national politics reporter in 1966, he also worked for the *Washington Star* and in the Washington bureau of the *New York Times*.

Although Mr. Broder is best known for his coverage of presidential nominating and election campaigns, he has been a major source of information about and analysis of all aspects of the American political system. He likes hard facts and digs deeply to get them. His judgments and syntheses are lucid and penetrating. As Carey McWilliams did, he writes in the direct, spare style of one seeking to tell the truth. As one of the many political scientists

who urged us to honor Mr. Broder put it, "His straight reports of political events and developments are invariably complete, accurate and insightful, and reported without any coloring by his own personal preferences. More than those of any journalist I know I would rely upon the reports of David Broder."

But David Broder is not simply a camera, taking accurate and arresting snapshots of the processes of American politics. He has become a guardian of the integrity of the major political institutions of this land—the presidency, Congress, interest groups, media, and political parties. He knows how they are working and cares about how they ought to work. It is not hard, despite his measured language, to sense his alarm when the institutions falter and fail and permit themselves to be warped, as when, for example, he raised his voice against the party nominating and financing reforms of the early 1970s and warned of the political fragmentation and incoherence which has come to pass. Yet he also has been alert to promising changes as in his optimistic assessment of the rising generation of political leaders in *Changing of the Guard*.

When we make this award to Mr. Broder we honor a journalist who is one of our own. It is not simply that Mr. Broder has an advanced degree in political science, or that he is a long-time active member of this association who attends our meetings and reads our scholarly papers. It is not simply that those of us who teach American politics regularly make use of *The Party's Over* and *Changing of the Guard*, and rely on his reporting. He is part of our community. We read his work and know that we can trust it. He reads our work and uses it with skill and sophistication. In short, David Broder provides us with invaluable knowledge and, at the same time, helps to distill and disseminate what we have learned.

David Broder exemplifies all of those qualities the APSA wished to commemorate in establishing the Carey McWilliams Award. In accepting the award, Mr. Broder has our admiration and our gratitude.

**Hubert H. Humphrey Award** (\$500), in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

*Recipient: Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY).*

*Selection Committee:* Adam Ulam, Harvard University, Chair; John H. Kessel, Ohio State University; Frank J. Sorauf, University of Minnesota.



*Citation:* This is the first time the Association has given the Hubert Humphrey Award. It was established to recognize "notable public service by a political scientist." In addition to myself the award committee was composed of Adam Ulam of Harvard University, the chairman, and John Kessel of the Ohio State University. Professor Ulam regrets very much that he cannot be here this evening.

We are pleased to present the Humphrey Award to the senior senator from New York, Daniel Patrick Moynihan. His career is, in our judgment, a remarkable combination of service to the academy and to the nation. To his public service he has brought a freshness of thought and an intellectual independence that best exemplifies the uses of knowledge in the public service. He has also brought both to the academy and to the public life a wit and exuberance that are rare in both.

Senator Moynihan received the Ph.D. from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. He held academic appointments at Harvard University between 1966 and 1976 in education, urban politics, and government, and from 1966 to 1969 he served as director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies. He is the coauthor of *Beyond the Melting Pot* (with Nathan Glazer) and the author of *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding* (1969) and *The Politics of a Guaranteed Income* (1973), as well as many other books, essays, and articles. Since this is a reward for "notable public service," let me remind you briefly of the Senator's record. He began it as a secretary to the governor of New York, and in the 1960s and 1970s he served the administrations of four different presidents in various capacities, including two which carried Cabinet status. Between 1973 and 1976 he was the U.S. Ambassador to India and then to the United Nations. He was elected to the Senate in 1976 and reelected in 1982.

In making this award we have not sought a replica or approximation of Hubert Humphrey, but we are nonetheless pleased that this first award goes to a colleague who shares so many of the Humphrey qualities—a deeply felt social concern, a belief that the public's problems can be solved by the intelligent use of public policy, and even that gift for abundant eloquence. Senator Moynihan also shares with Hubert Humphrey an extraordinary breadth of public experience: executive and legislative, national and local.

Senator Moynihan, you honor us by your presence this evening. It is a very great pleasure to present this award to you in memory of a great American and on behalf of a grateful Association.

## **APSA Council Minutes August 31, 1983, Chicago**

The Council met at the Palmer House at 8:00 a.m., on August 31, 1983 in Chicago. Present: Twiley Barker, Walter Dean Burnham, Philip Converse, M. Margaret Conway, Doris Graber, Ole R. Holsti, Harold Jacobson, Ira Katznelson, Gerald Kramer, Thomas E. Mann, E. Wally Miles, William Riker, Philippe C. Schmitter, Judith N. Shklar, Roberta Sigel, Barbara Sinclair, Sidney Tarrow, Michael Walzer, Ronald Weber, Herbert Weisberg, Susan Welch, Philip Williams and Dina A. Zinnes.

### **President's Report**

President Riker opened the meeting by asking for any additions to the agenda. There were none suggested, and he then reported briefly on his activities as president of the Association.

### **Council Minutes: Dual Participation Rule at Annual Meeting**

Riker noted that the draft March 10-11 Council minutes, printed in the Spring *PS*, had a typographical error. The Council unanimously approved the minutes as amended by the Administrative Committee to read "An individual may serve on *no* more than two panels of the official program (that organized by the Program Committee). He/she may serve as an author of a paper on only one panel."

### **Committee Appointments**

Burnham moved that the Council approve the Committee appointments submitted by President-Elect Philip E. Converse, reauthorize the *APSR* Search Committee with Converse as its chair and with the new President-Elect added to its membership, and authorize Converse to make substitutions for any committee nominees who are unable to accept their appointments. Kramer seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

### **1983 Program Committee**

Weisberg reported briefly on the 1983 Program and Riker told the Council that *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* had been printed and would be displayed at the APSA's new exhibit booth. Weisberg also informed the Council of his efforts to find a publisher for a similar book on "The Science of Politics."