

# PS Appendix

## APSA Awards Presented at the 1987 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 1985 or 1986 in the field of comparative politics.

*Recipient:* **Frances Hagopian**, Harvard University, "The Politics of Oligarchy: The Persistence of Traditional Elites in Contemporary Brazil," submitted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

*Selection Committee:* Timothy Colton, University of Toronto; Russell Dalton, Florida State University; Joel S. Migdal, University of Washington, chair.

*Dissertation Chair:* **Suzanne Berger**.

*Citation:* Frances Hagopian's outstanding dissertation deals with the continuing domination of the old regional political elite in Minas Gerais, Brazil, even after the tremendous centralization of authority in Brazil following the military coup in 1964. The reshaping of the Brazilian state undertaken by the military aimed to build a governmental apparatus staffed by technocrats. Much of the rich literature on Brazil suggests that these technocrats established close ties to domestic economic elites and foreign capital, displacing the traditional regional oligarchies. These old elites had played an important role in regional politics prior to the coup.

Hagopian's carefully executed study suggests that this displacement did not occur. Even as the old elite's power base in land was being eroded by the rapid industrial and technical growth in Brazil, the old oligarchy transformed itself into a new political class whose political dominance now depended on the use of resources coming from the state itself. The dissertation gives new insight into state-society relations, suggesting that the tremendous concentration of resources by the post-coup state and its monopoly over decision-making in the public sphere had their limits in terms of

exercising authority. In fact, this concentration of resources and decision-making power afforded the opportunity to the traditional elite to transform itself in order to distribute important state resources. The old elite became the new switchmen in the track between the centralized state and the dispersed society.

To understand the state, Hagopian's dissertation implies, political scientists must look at the regional peripheries as much as they must look at the capital city. The study succeeds in putting regional politics into a national context. Through a careful analysis of elite office-holding from 1956 to 1982, Hagopian draws a detailed picture of the niches within which autonomous political power could be built in a seemingly highly centralized polity.

At a time when the study of the state and its relationship to society has blossomed into a major concern of comparative politics, this dissertation adds an important corrective to the prevailing literature. It integrates clientelistic politics and the dynamics of regional politics into the study of the centralized state.

**William Anderson Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1985 or 1986 in the field of inter-governmental relations.

*Recipient:* **Barry Rabe**, University of Michigan, "Functional Federalism and the Management of Federal Programs in Health Care and Education," submitted by the University of Chicago.

*Selection Committee:* Earl Black, University of South Carolina, chair; Stephen Schechter, Russell Sage College; Carl E. Van Horn, Rutgers University.

*Dissertation Chair:* **Paul Peterson**.

*Citation:* Based on analyses of the evolution of six federal programs (vocational education, compensatory education, special education, hospital construction, medicaid, and health maintenance organizations), Rabe argues that a system of functional federalism has emerged in which federal programs have become more manageable and more effective than commonly believed. Rabe's topic is both

ambitious and significant; his field research is impressive; his study is well-organized and clearly written; and his conclusions are likely to stimulate considerable scholarly debate over the nature of contemporary American federalism.

**Edward S. Corwin Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1985 or 1986 in the field of public law.

*Recipient: H. W. Perry, Jr.*, Harvard University, "Deciding to Decide: The Agenda-Setting Process in the United States Supreme Court," submitted by the University of Michigan.

*Selection Committee:* Ward Elliott, Claremont Graduate School, chair; Austin Sarat, Amherst College; Frances Zemans, American Judicature Society.

*Dissertation Chairs:* **Milton Heumann** and **John Kingdon**.

*Citation:* This dissertation considers case selection by the Supreme Court. The author has interviewed five sitting Justices and a number of former clerks and has presented his findings with statistical and documentary evidence. He writes with a lively, conversational style and gives his readers careful description of the Court's processes, in an ample theoretical setting. His dissertation was a pleasure to read and will doubtless make a notable contribution to the literature.

**Harold D. Lasswell Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1985 or 1986 in the field of policy studies (supported by the Policy Studies Organization).

*Recipient: James D. Savage*, University of California, Berkeley, "Balanced Budgets and American Politics," submitted by the University of California, Berkeley.

*Selection Committee:* Lawrence Brown, University of Michigan; Christopher Leman, University of Washington; R. Shep Melnick, Brandeis University, chair.

*Dissertation Chair:* **Nelson W. Polsby**.

*Citation:* But for a handful of well known exceptions, most studies of budgeting stimulate the MEGO (my eyes glaze over) response among undergraduates, graduate students, and presidents alike. This makes all the more remarkable the fact that James D. Savage has produced a fascinating 600-page dissertation on "Balanced Budgets and American Politics." Savage's work provides compelling evidence that students of public policy can use economic and historical analysis to enrich

rather than abandon the study of politics.

The starting point of Savage's research is the following observation:

The balanced budget principle that influenced American politics [until 1981] and that developed into a 'tradition' was uniquely an American concern, one that emerged from a strikingly coherent interpretation of political economy that had little to do with views that budgets corresponded to personal finance or that all public sector deficits and debts were inherently evil.

He buttresses this claim with an impressive review of the extensive literature on the economic consequences of deficit spending. He finds that at least until the 1980s, "The economy's astonishing capacity to accommodate the government's deficit spending overwhelms the position that balanced budgets are required for a healthy economy."

How, then, does one explain the strength of the balanced budget tradition? Roaming from the Constitutional Convention to Keynes, from the Gilded Age to Gramm-Latta, Savage traces the origin of the tradition to Jefferson's attack on a Hamiltonian system based on "corruption." Following the Jeffersonian lead, Jacksonian Democrats saw the balanced budget principle as a way to oppose the Bank and protect states rights; they objected only to federal not state deficits. "A balanced budget symbolized the preservation of republican government in a post-revolutionary world, not merely a distribution of resources or simple administrative efficiency."

Ironically, after the Civil War Republicans used this symbol to justify high tariffs and centralized banking, precisely the policies abhorred by the original balanced budget proponents. Savage artfully weaves together analysis of political symbols, institutional incentives, and financial structures to provide a detailed picture not just of the nineteenth century, but of the Progressive, New Deal, and Reagan eras as well.

The committee believes that once the author shortens the work and provides a more concise summary of his argument, the resulting book will constitute a major contribution to both the literature on budgeting and the current debate over the rapidly growing federal deficit. The committee also believes that James Savage's dissertation demonstrates that a work need not be narrow, technocratic, nor exclusively quantitative to add to our understanding of public policy.

**Helen Dwight Reid Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted

## PS Appendix

during 1985 or 1986 in the field of international relations, law and politics.

**Recipient: Douglas J. Macdonald**, Colgate University, "Adventures in Chaos: Reformism in American Foreign Policy," submitted by Columbia University.

**Selection Committee:** Mark Amstutz, Wheaton College; David A. Baldwin, Columbia University, chair; Eliot A. Cohen, Naval War College.

**Dissertation Chairs: David A. Baldwin and Robert Jervis.**

**Citation:** Since World War II the United States has often embroiled itself in the internal politics of "strategically important," though domestically unstable, client states. In "'Adventures in Chaos': Reformism in U.S. Foreign Policy," Douglas Macdonald analyzes how and why the United States gets into such situations and how and why some policies work better than others in coping with such situations. Macdonald describes the dilemma of American policy makers faced with the choice of abandoning a faltering ally or attempting to bolster or reform it.

Focusing on the inherent tension between the "bargaining leverage for reform" and the commitment to the client government demonstrated by attempts to use such leverage, Macdonald explores the conditions under which American support can be exchanged for reforms by the client government. With the cautious optimism that typifies his argument, he concludes that such exchanges can be made and that they have been made more frequently than is generally recognized by the historical and social science literature.

Three carefully chosen and thoroughly researched historical case studies buttress the author's argument. These include American intervention in China (1945-1948), in the Philippines (1949-1953), and in Vietnam (1960-1963). Macdonald blends historical materials with international relations theory in an impressive systematic study with both theoretical and policy significance.

Writing on the emotionally charged issue of American intervention in the affairs of other countries is a difficult scholarly challenge. Macdonald's work is characterized by balanced judgment, dispassionate analysis, and intellectual humility. The selection committee is pleased to recognize this scholarly achievement with the presentation of the Helen Dwight Reid Award.

**E. E. Schattschneider Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1985 or 1986 in the field of American government.

**Recipient: Lawrence Rothenberg**, California Institute of Technology, "The Politics and Economics of Regulation and Deregulation: Motor Freight Policy at the Interstate Commerce Commission," submitted by Stanford University.

**Selection Committee:** Thomas Cronin, Colorado College; Ruth Jones, Arizona State University, chair; Lyn Ragsdale, University of Arizona.

**Dissertation Chair: Terry M. Moe.**

**Citation:** This dissertation makes a dual contribution by the presentation of a broad theoretical framework for understanding regulatory policies and by a sophisticated quantitative and qualitative analysis of three major areas of motor carrier regulation. Rothenberg rigorously reevaluates two dominant theories of regulatory politics—the economic or capture theory and the new institutionalism perspective—and synthesizes the two to develop a framework "that will allow us to determine if, when and to what extent groups are influential and to identify in greater detail the conditions governing group influence." This framework is then used to test the economic theory of group dominance, to identify constraints on the role of groups in the policy-making process and to devise a model of bureaucratic behavior that advances our understanding of regulatory agencies' policy making.

The work then moves to a case study of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the agency's role in three areas of motor carrier regulation—entry, mergers and rates. Drawing upon a comprehensive and carefully constructed data-base and skillfully blending quantitative and qualitative analyses, Rothenberg shows that large motor common carriers dominated the internal politics of the American Trucking Association and thus exercised considerable influence over regulatory activities; that contrary to popular wisdom, small motor contract carriers have not fared well under Commission regulation and that organized labor, for the most part, operates as a free rider. The case study suggests that although the impact of formal institutions on group control is generally incremental, it is nevertheless possible for "determined political actors [to] undermine even a seemingly captured regulatory agency."

This dissertation is an example of work that makes a substantive contribution to the professional literature of regulatory politics in particular yet American politics more broadly. It is an example, also, of quality research instructed by an overarching framework that links different traditions of scholarship and enlightens our interpretation of seemingly

contradictory findings. In so doing it underscores the importance of recognizing that the roles of competing actors shift over time, across agencies as well as within the same agency, and that contextual dimensions are central to understanding the host of factors that influence interest group impact on the policy process.

**Leo Strauss Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1985 or 1986 in the field of political philosophy.

*Recipient:* **Richard C. Sinopoli**, Twentieth Century Fund, "Liberalism, Republicanism and the Constitution: American Citizenship Viewed from the Founding," submitted by New York University.

*Selection Committee:* Benjamin R. Barber, Rutgers University; George Kateb, Princeton University, chair; Nathan Tarcov, University of Chicago.

*Dissertation Chair:* **H. Mark Roelofs**.

*Citation:* The leading question posed in the excellent dissertation by Richard C. Sinopoli, "Liberalism, Republicanism and the Constitution: American Citizenship Viewed from the Founding," is "the founders' conception of man and citizen." In his exploration of this question, Sinopoli tries to avoid the rigidity that so commonly weakens much thinking about it. He refuses to be trapped by the idea that the founding situation in America is adequately covered by the pair of opposing theses that have been put forth in recent times; namely, that the founding generation subscribed to the idealism of European republicanism with an emphasis on the virtues that sustain self-sacrifice for the common good, or, alternatively, that it abandoned all concern for right conduct and placed its trust in the expectation that justice would emerge through the struggles of equally unjust adversaries battling each other to a standstill. To the contrary, Sinopoli shows that this categorization fails, and fails because both alternatives take their eye off the phenomenon and, instead, look at the New World as if it were still, in every relevant respect, the Old World. Without pressing the claims of American exceptionalism too hard, Sinopoli restores the sense that a great experiment was taking place in the founding, and that it would be dull-spirited not to try to see it for what it was, and to understand it as it tried to understand itself.

What emerges from this work is a third position that does not strike a balance between the usual two; it does not really, on the other hand, select good elements from one and combine them with good elements from the

other. Rather, the newness of the conception of citizenship in America is emphasized. This conception the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists shared. It does not require virtue, and it does not posit unmitigated selfishness. Nor is it quite based on what Tocqueville later calls "self-interest, rightly understood"—that is, a prudential mimesis of virtue. It is based, in fact, on a mingling in the soul of considerations of self-regard, a sense of shame, a training in modesty and moderation, and an attachment insensibly elicited from a benign set of arrangements. American citizens are expected to be good natured, not austere. The heart of the culture is democratic.

Sinopoli makes his case convincingly, and with literary tact and a sense of justice towards those he disagrees with. His dissertation is a subtle combination of substantive and historical argument, and is written in a direct, yet elegant way. It makes a genuine contribution to learning.

**Leonard D. White Award**, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1985 or 1986 in the field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory.

*Recipient:* **John Dilulio**, Princeton University, "Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management," submitted by Harvard University.

*Selection Committee:* Bruce Jacobs, University of Rochester; Paula D. McClain, Arizona State University Susan J. Tolchin, George Washington University, chair.

*Dissertation Chair:* **James Q. Wilson**.

*Citation:* Dilulio's thesis, that the quality of life in prisons depends on the character of prison government, represents a major contribution to the literature. The study is documented with a wealth of data, drawn from interviews as well as secondary sources from a wide-ranging array of disciplines, including: history, constitutional law, sociology, and management science. The analysis is impressive, and demonstrates the author's insight, analytical depth and respect for relevance.

The study compares three different state prison systems, representing different governing models: "Texas control," "Michigan responsibility," and "California consensual." The material led the author to findings which debunk several widely accepted conventional wisdoms about correctional systems. The most striking conclusion is that overcrowding, levels of funding, prisoner-staff ratios, and training of prison staff appear to have no correlation to the level of order in prisons. In other

## PS Appendix

words, increased resources do not necessarily lead to decreased violence. Instead, the key factor is governance: stable leadership, accountability of prison administrators, checks and balances within the system, strong internal controls, consistency of policy, legislative and judicial oversight, media scrutiny and regular evaluation by outsiders. This work should be read and absorbed by policy makers and academics in the field, as well as the increasing number of officials who are operating prison systems under court orders.

The study's approach is humanistic, empirically-based, and an important piece of work in view of its implications for future problem-solving in the field. It takes an optimistic view of integrating the philosophy of leadership with individual responsibility in public service, and is a welcome addition to the practice of government.

### BOOK AND PAPER AWARDS

**Franklin L. Burdette PI Sigma Alpha Award** (\$250), for the best paper presented at the 1986 annual meeting.

*Recipient:* **James L. Gibson**, University of Houston, "The Policy Consequences of Political Tolerance."

*Selection Committee:* Robert H. Dix, Rice University, chair; Miles Kahler, University of California, San Diego; Leroy Rieselbach, Indiana University.

*Citation:* This paper tackles an important question in empirical democratic theory by examining the relationships between mass opinion and repressive policies toward political minorities adopted by the American states during the McCarthy and Vietnam eras. The author finds little support for the elitist theory of democracy that posits that the political intolerance of governments is a response to the mass public.

The hypotheses of the paper are explicit, the methods appropriate and clearly explained, the findings carefully stated, and the normative implications duly noted. Not least, the paper is well-argued and lucidly written. In combining relevance for both normative and empirical theory, public opinion, and public policy the Gibson paper seems especially appropriate for a "best paper of the convention" award.

**Ralph J. Bunche Award** (\$500), for the best scholarly work in political science published in 1985 or 1986 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Recipients:* **Rasma Karklins**, University of

Illinois at Chicago, *Ethnic Relations in the USSR: The Perspective from Below*, Allen & Unwin.

**D. Garth Taylor**, University of Chicago, *Public Opinion and Collective Action: The Boston School Desegregation Conflict*, University of Chicago Press.

*Selection Committee:* Michael Hudson, Georgetown University; Nelson Kasfir, Dartmouth College, chair; Ernest Wilson, University of Michigan.

*Citation:* The Bunche Award Committee is delighted to present this year's award to Rasma Karklins and D. Garth Taylor. Though the books they have written approach quite different subjects in dissimilar ways, the ingenuity with which they both make focused concepts of social science applicable to hard-won data are triumphs of a high order. Race relations and ethnicity in American as well as comparative perspective, the subjects of these two books, were significant academic and practical concerns for Ralph Bunche.

Despite the immense difficulties in the research climate that restrict investigation of nonelite ethnic attitudes and relations within the USSR, Karklins manages to open new areas of research and to present a persuasive analysis of differences among primary ethnic groups, particularly state-defined nationalities at the level of the republics. Relying on both Soviet ethnosociological studies and her own survey of Soviet German emigrants to the West, she provides a dense interpretation of variations in popular ethnic attitudes toward other ethnic groups concerning politics, education, work and marriage. She is able to show that ethnic identification within groups frequently varies depending on which of these situations structures interethnic contact. She also provides an extremely useful portrait of contemporary Soviet Islam as a communal identity.

She demonstrates that notwithstanding the official position that Soviet citizenship is displacing nationality, strong, and particularly among Islamic groups increasing, ethnic loyalties continue to shape government policies. Official assimilationist policies are frequently interpreted as "Russian" by the almost 50% of the population that is made up of other ethnic groups. She concludes that government efforts to eliminate ethnicity are likely to exacerbate it.

Taylor develops a convincing explanation of the formation and mobilization of public opinion that produces collective protest by analyzing white response to court-ordered mandatory school integration in Boston. The book discusses the impulse to public action of



whites caught up in the dilemma between racial justice and private choice. By weaving together many kinds of evidence, he is able to move beyond the correlations made possible by his skillful handling of survey data and provide convincing causal inferences showing why resistance in Boston was so unexpectedly bitter. Each section of his book is theory-driven, elegantly combining legal analysis and moral theory, as well as concepts of attitude formation and collective action.

Through insightful use of public opinion data, he distinguishes between attitudes toward racial doctrine and toward voluntary compliance in order to show that in Boston the majority of participants opposed racial separation but became involved in antibusing protests. The survey data also permit him to show how particular structural features of religious and political organization in Boston weakened moderate leaders who attempted to oppose antibusing forces. He demonstrates how perception of widespread public opposition increased the incentive to participate in protests. Nonetheless, the direct rewards for the individual protestor were sufficiently remote that only by conceiving costs and benefits as relatively indefinite can theories of collective action be applied to these protests.

**Gladys M. Kammerer Award** (\$1,000), for the best political science publication in 1985 or 1986 in the field of U.S. national policy.

*Recipients:* **I. M. Destler**, University of Maryland, *American Trade Politics: System Under Stress*, Institute for International Economics and Twentieth Century Fund.

**Jane Mansbridge**, Northwestern University, *Why We Lost the ERA*, University of Chicago Press.

*Selection Committee:* Morris Fiorina, Harvard University; John Jackson, University of Michigan, chair; Theodore H. Moran, Georgetown University.

*Citation:* The two co-winning books have several impressive characteristics in common. Both offer important controversial interpretations and arguments about major substantive issues in American politics. These arguments will be debated among academics and advocates alike for some time, and should lead to better policy as a consequence. Secondly, both books offer and empirically illustrate significant hypotheses about the nature and workings of American political institutions. Again, these hypotheses will surely stimulate substantial debate, but they provide important insights for scholars working in other areas of American politics. We feel this combination of substantive and conceptual contributions

illustrates the best of our discipline. In alphabetical order, we want to honor the two authors and their work.

*American Trade Politics* makes a strong case for the need for continued openness of the international economy, for the United States' role in that economy, and against increased protectionist policies. In the past, trade policy was developed and implemented through an elaborate set of arrangements between the legislative and executive branches that protected the interests of members of each branch yet allowed the pursuit of free trade. However, significant changes in the international economic system, in U.S. industries, and in our own political institutions combined with recent macro-economic policies have restructured the political and economic environment that supported free trade policies. These changes, and their consequences, have led to the current protectionist demands. Mr. Destler concludes with some recommendations on how to accommodate these demands while at the same time maintaining an open international economy.

*American Trade Politics* also raises important questions about legislative-executive relations, about how to manage both the collective and the particularistic interests inherent in public policy areas, and about how institutional reform alters the response to these demands. Although illustrated with the history of trade policy, Mr. Destler's arguments are applicable to policy making in many areas and should be debated by political scientists in many fields.

*Why We Lost the ERA* offers some provocative arguments about equality between women and men in the United States and about how the proposed Equal Rights Amendment might have altered these relationships in light of its legislative history and likely Supreme Court interpretations. Although pessimistic about the likelihood of the ERA achieving equality in the short run, Ms. Mansbridge makes a case for why passage of the ERA would be beneficial in the long run. Debate about how to improve equality in the United States and about the role of the ERA will be enhanced by the arguments and evidence provided here.

*Why We Lost the ERA* also provides important hypotheses about the nature, behavior, and long-term weaknesses of an important set of political organizations. Ms. Mansbridge argues that interest groups formed to pursue strictly purposive objectives face a dilemma between political effectiveness and organizational strength. Issues must be stated in polarized ways to attract and maintain the

commitment of the activist members essential for organizational strength, yet this polarization severely limits the group's political appeal and likelihood of success. *Why We Lost the ERA* explores and illustrates this dilemma through the strategies and actions of the pro and anti-ERA forces, but the predictions and consequences of the argument are broadly applicable. Ms. Mansbridge's conclusions suggest that interest groups active in these areas have inherent weaknesses that limit their long-term political influence. The natural consequence of such weaknesses is an agenda and policies that more closely reflect the interests of groups organized around policies with material consequences.

**Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award** (\$2,000), for the best book published in the U.S. during 1986 on government, politics or international affairs.

*Recipients: Phillip E. Converse* and *Roy Pierce*, University of Michigan, *Political Representation in France*, Harvard University Press.

**Peter Hall**, Harvard University, *Governing the Economy*, Oxford University Press.

*Selection Committee: Robert Gilpin*, Princeton University; *Marjorie Hershey*, Indiana University; *Eric Nordlinger*, Brown University.

*Citation:* The Committee is pleased to announce its unanimous decision to present the award to two books.

*Political Representation in France* must surely rank as one of the discipline's most eagerly awaited volumes. Professors Converse and Pierce point out that it relies upon a complex, multi-dimension research design that was developed some time ago by Warren Miller and Donald Stokes. The concept of representation has been operationalized to capture the most important relations between the French public and the members of (and aspirants to) the National Assembly. This ambitious study relies upon three surveys of the electorates in randomly chosen districts, two sets of interviews with the major candidates in these districts, and data on roll-call votes in the National Assembly. The authors' intelligent handling of fortuitous circumstances allowed the research design to be maintained and extended to incorporate the "disorders" of 1968. The book is a model of rigorous research and systematic analysis bound together by sociological generalizations and democratic theory.

*Governing the Economy* asks this overarching question: How can we explain the economic policies adopted by post-war British and French governments? Of the various

possible answers, Professor Hall focuses upon institutions within the state, the polity, and the market. In a lucid and comprehensive manner he shows how institutions have prominently shaped the relevant ideas, interests, and power distributions, and then mediated their translation into policy. Among the many studies in political economy, this book stands out for its insightfulness and sensitive handling of cross-national comparisons. The Committee was especially impressed with the consistent thoughtfulness with which the case study materials were analyzed and continuously brought to bear upon the central question.

**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: John Rawls*, Harvard University, *A Theory of Justice*.

*Selection Committee: Stephen Holmes*, University of Chicago; *David Rapoport*, University of California, Los Angeles, chair; *Nancy Rosenblum*, Brown University.

*Citation:* A half century ago A. N. Whitehead wrote that all of Western philosophy consists of footnotes to Plato. But last year a publisher believed that the best advertisement to a new worthy treatise on Plato was that it was the answer to John Rawls! The striking difference represented by the juxtaposition of these two statements may help explain why our committee quickly agreed that *A Theory of Justice*, published in 1971, should be honored in its first year of eligibility to receive the Benjamin E. Lippincott Award.

*A Theory of Justice* emerged at a time when liberal thought was at an impasse unable to cope with the conflicting demands of liberty and equality. The conventional wisdom, moreover, was that it was impossible to continue doing influential political theory in the grand traditional style. Knowledge had become too specialized and the chasm between fact and value unbridgeable. Political theorists believed their task was restricted to evaluating methods, clarifying concepts and historical issues—matters interesting only to theorists and to a steadily diminishing number at that. *A Theory of Justice* showed how unwarranted these views were. In the most important statement of liberal theory since John Stuart Mill this extraordinarily unpolemical work exhibited one way to reconcile liberty and equality, and it offered a view to bridge fact and value by providing a considered moral basis for making all sorts of collective decisions especially those dealing with distributive

justice. This book gave theorists confidence to return to the classic questions of justice, consent, contract, punishment and civil disobedience.

One measure of the richness and power of a text in theory is its ability to inspire different kinds of interpretation and application, and *A Theory of Justice* has already produced several distinctive and persistent streams. The importance of the work for decision making—for rational choice theory and for a wide application of the “difference principle”—was recognized immediately in many of the social sciences and their major subfields. A second theme attracting many was Kantianism and the limits of utilitarianism. Subsequently, the work has been seen as central to the current literature on communitarianism or those who deal with shared moral values, or the political meanings of the fact that we share one another’s fate. More recently, Rawls has been discovered as a pluralist thinker as some have mined his discussions of secondary associations as useful mechanisms for individuals to gain self respect and develop their moral and political faculties.

Truly, this book has had staggering influence. At least one national conference, eight books, and 103 articles have been devoted to it. *The Social Science Citation Index*, a crude but sometimes useful measure, lists some 3,000 references. The number for separate years continues to grow, and presently, in the Social Science index it exceeds by several times that of Plato’s *Republic*. In *The Arts and Humanities Index*, *The Republic* and *A Theory of Justice* draw equal attention.

The range of interests represented by these citations is even more important than the number of citations. The book is cited in virtually all the leading journals of philosophy, political science, law, sociology, economics, psychology and education. And citations appear in such practical and unlikely periodicals as *Nursing Clinics of North America*, *American Journal of Community Counseling*, *National Tax Journal*, *Elementary School Studies*, *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, *Gerontology*, *Environmental Policy*, *Crime and Delinquency*.

Those who read only non-academic journals and newspapers know who John Rawls is. *A Theory of Justice* has made him the most widely discussed living political philosopher, and that is in spite of the fact that its language is austere and professional. The book is largely responsible for the renaissance in political philosophy and it accomplishes what Plato thought a political theory should do—namely articulate principles which could penetrate and influence every branch of social

knowledge. There is no doubt that this work will continue to have a major impact on political theory and every field of political science for generations to come.

## CAREER AWARDS

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

*Recipient:* **Richard Nathan**, Princeton University.

*Selection Committee:* Graham Allison, Harvard University, chair; Lawrence M. Mead, New York University; and Carole Uhlaner, University of California, Irvine.

*Citation:* The Charles E. Merriam Award is given to a person whose published work and career represents a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research. This year’s winner is Richard P. Nathan, Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. Dick Nathan exemplifies the achievement honored by this award: he has been unusually influential both in the academy and in government, and his success in each sphere reflects what he has learned and taught in the other.

Since his early service in the Nixon Administration (as Assistant Director of OMB and then as Deputy Undersecretary of HEW), Richard Nathan has been at the center of federal policymaking on welfare. An architect of the Family Assistance Plan, he has been a successful advocate of subsequent incremental improvements in welfare policy. Recently, as chairman of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, he helped to plan and fund MDRC’s path-breaking studies of recent experience with “workfare” programs in various states. This research provides a foundation of evidence and analysis for welfare reforms that focus on employment strategies—a hot topic in Washington and many states today.

At the Brookings Institution and Princeton, Dick has led a series of collaborative studies of major intergovernmental grant programs, among them revenue sharing, the Community Development Block Grant, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and most recently the local impact of the Reagan cuts in grant programs. These studies provide a rich sense of the effects and politics of federal grants at the local level. Their message—that Washington cannot achieve its purposes through grants unless the programs also serve the needs of state and local officials—has



increasingly been heeded in recent federal welfare grants policy.

Richard Nathan has also authored two studies of problems of presidential leadership in the bureaucracy, one of them with the arresting title *The Plot That Failed*. In these, he criticizes the Nixon Administration's attempts to *bypass* the bureaucracy, but he endorses presidential *control* of the Executive branch as essential to democracy. His prescriptive model of the "administrative presidency" pointed in directions taken by the Reagan Administration—and perhaps merits reconsideration in the light of that experience.

In all these areas, Richard Nathan's thinking has been both prescient and influential. With a foot in both camps, he has stood his ground more assuredly in each, pressing both academics and practitioners to think more deeply and to face more squarely the realities of the political process.

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

**Recipient:** *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* (Rhodes Cook accepted on behalf of the *CQ* staff).

**Selection Committee:** Holbert N. Carroll, University of Pittsburgh, chair; Gary Orren, Harvard University; John Rielly, Chicago Council on Foreign Relations.

**Citation:** The *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* has been selected to receive the sixth annual Carey McWilliams Award of the American Political Science Association for a "major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics." This year the Award honors the entire staff that produces the *Weekly Report* rather than an individual journalist.

For more than four decades, the *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*—*CQ* for most of us—has been a dependable source of clear, thorough, and accurate information on American politics. It is a staple of our profession. We have come to rely upon the *Weekly Report* for our teaching, our research, and our knowledge.

From the first issues to the present, *CQ*'s central purpose each week has been to tell the story about what went on in the Congress. Over the years the reporting has been expanded to cover broader matters of politics and aspects of the work of the Supreme Court and the executive branch.

Thus, the reader today is offered narratives about what went on in the committees and on the floors of the House and the Senate. Also one finds excellent analyses of major issues of

public policy and of politics, especially campaigns and elections. From time to time, insightful political commentary is presented. And finally, *CQ* contains a rich variety of accurate data such as votes on major bills, national and state election results, texts of important presidential messages, succinct summaries of the decisions of the Supreme Court and excerpts from major opinions, the membership of committees and subcommittees, and current lobby registrations. The data often are enhanced by charts and tables. As a bonus, *CQ* is indexed each quarter and then annually.

In sum, it is a pleasure to honor the team of editors, reporters, and researchers that each week produces the *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*. It is, as the Carey McWilliams Award provides, a "major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics." For many of us *CQ* is indispensable political journalism.

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

**Recipient:** **Max M. Kampelman**, Head, U.S. Delegation, Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms.

**Selection Committee:** Madelleine Albright, Washington, D.C.; Richard Betts, Brookings Institution, chair; John Bunzel, Belmont, CA.

**Citation:** Max M. Kampelman is an especially worthy recipient of the Humphrey Award for two reasons. First, he amply fulfills the award's established criteria of "notable public service by a political scientist." Second, his long-standing professional and personal relationship with Hubert Humphrey particularly distinguishes him as a candidate for the honor.

Max Kampelman has combined careers in law, political science, and politics. With a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota, he taught there and at Bennington, the School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin, Howard University, and Claremont College. His publications include *The Communist Party vs. the CIO: A Study in Power Politics*, *The Strategy of Deception* (with Evron Kirkpatrick), and articles in professional journals and edited volumes. He was treasurer and counsel of the APSA, and president of the Washington, D.C. chapter of the association.

Ambassador Kampelman has served administrations of both parties, in both domestic and foreign policy. His many contributions include six years as legislative counsel to Senator Humphrey, service as senior adviser in the U.S. mission to the United Nations, vigorous promotion of international human

rights in his capacity as head of the U.S. delegation to the CSCE review conference in Madrid, and, most recently, leadership of the U.S. delegation to the Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms.

Hubert Humphrey himself was an associate of Kampelman for three decades, and began using his talents while Mayor of Minneapolis. In his memoirs Humphrey devoted substantial space to Kampelman's influence on his career, noting, for example, that Kampelman was "active on his own and alongside me in the formative days of the Americans for Democratic Action and later, through his efforts, I became a vice president of the American Political Science Association. It was through him and these groups that I met many liberal intellectuals, particularly in economics and political science." It could hardly be more fitting that a man of Ambassador Max Kampelman's accomplishments should receive the award named for his friend, Hubert H. Humphrey.

**John Gaus Lecture** (\$1,500), presented each year to honor a scholar who best embodies the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration.

**Recipient:** **Dwight Waldo**, Professor Emeritus, Maxwell School, Syracuse University (Waldo delivered the Gaus Lecture, "A Theory of Public Administration Means in Our Time a Theory of Politics Also," at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, September 3, State Ballroom, Palmer House).

**Selection Committee:** Naomi B. Lynn, Georgia State University, chair; Arthur Maass, Harvard University; Richard Stillman, George Mason University.

**Citation:** The John Gaus Lecture was established by the Association to honor a scholar who embodies the joint tradition of political science and public administration. In addition, the lecture series was established to stimulate interest and to encourage scholarship in public administration. We know of no one whose contributions to public administration have been as original, provocative, and lasting as those of Dwight Waldo.

For more than half a century Dwight Waldo has been continuously a member of the American Political Science Association; he has been one of those rare APSA members who proudly and clearly always identified himself with the study of public administration. For those of us in public administration he has served as an intellectual spokesperson and defender against the few who attempted to minimize the legitimacy of our field within the larger discipline of political science.

During a long and distinguished career Dwight Waldo established the intellectual parameters of public administration. He has written more than fifty books and essays, and continues to be a major contributor and interpreter of the field of public administration.

Dwight Waldo's contributions have been eclectic, rather than specialized. He has chosen to take a holistic view of public administration, and then relate his analyses and conclusions to democratic theory and practice. Never doctrinaire, Waldo examines and re-examines his own premises as well as those of others. He constantly seeks to refine our understanding of the complexities that make up the administrative state. This search for new approaches and new perspectives was evident in his first book, *The Administrative State* (1948) in which he viewed American public administration from the vantage point of political theory. He sought then, as he does now, to open and extend our understanding of public administration. Reflecting on his earliest writing, Waldo characterizes himself as an "upstart"—telling the public administration academic establishment they were theorists, but that because they did not realize they were theorizing, they were not doing it well. He iconoclastically challenged the orthodox premise that democracy and efficiency were synonymous and suggested that public administration had gone too far in rejecting principles in favor of empiricism. Thirty-two years later in *The Enterprise of Public Administration* (1980) he continued to work toward public administration's professional advancement. He stressed the need for public administration to recognize its limitations and clarify its area of responsibility. In 1985 in a *Public Administration Review* interview he observed that the great challenge facing public administration today is determining what to do first—setting priorities in an environment characterized by confusion, conflict and contradictions. Dwight Waldo has offered many valuable insights and answers; perhaps even more valuable are his skills at posing the relevant questions and questioning the easy answers.

It would be almost impossible to list the many scholars who must credit Waldo for the contributions he has made to their intellectual and professional understanding of the field of public administration. It would be as difficult to list the books and journals that cite his works. There have been many attempts to honor this man. Each year the American Society for Public Administration offers the Dwight Waldo Award to the person who has made an outstanding contribution to the professional literature of public administration during his/her career. In a 1983 reputational

survey in the *Public Administration Quarterly* (Summer 1983) Waldo was identified as the top contributor to the field of public administration. He has served as editor of the *Public Administration Review* and as Vice President of both the American Political Science Association and the American Society for Public Administration.

For those of us who know Dwight Waldo well, these accolades only minimally capture the essence of the man. He is a respected and valued colleague and friend. It has been a rare privilege for those of us who serve on the John Gaus Award Committee to have the opportunity to acknowledge his contributions. The granting of this award is especially appropriate because Dwight Waldo and John Gaus shared a strong professional friendship.

**James Madison Award** (\$2,000), presented every three years to an American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science.

**Recipient: E. Pendleton Herring**, President Emeritus, Social Science Research Council (Herring delivered the Madison Lecture, "The Ultimate Asset," at 5:30 p.m., Friday, September 4, Red Lacquer Room, Palmer House).

**Selection Committee:** Martha Derthick, University of Virginia, chair; Stephen Krasner, Stanford University; Robert Putnam, Harvard University.

**Citation:** In urging the Madison Award committee to consider E. Pendleton Herring, a well-known member of the profession reminded us that "he's very special." It would have been fair to say "unique." No other career contribution to political science is comparable to that which he made.

Of Herring's several careers, two in combination entitle him to the award. As a graduate student at Johns Hopkins in the late 1920s and then a member of the Harvard Government Department until 1946, Herring wrote six books that covered in an original and influential way most of the subjects of American national government. Thereafter the author became entrepreneur, and was president of the Social Science Research Council for twenty years during which it importantly influenced the nature of research in political science generally.

Herring began research on American government in Washington in the summer of 1927, at the age of 24. He wanted to interview lobbyists. There had been some discussion among his mentors at Johns Hopkins—an awesomely eminent group that included the two Willoughbys (W. W. and W. F.), James Hart, and Frank Goodnow—as to whether

interviewing was an acceptable method of inquiry. Encouraged to proceed, Herring talked to representatives of labor unions, business groups, farmers, veterans, the DAR, *et cetera*, and produced *Group Representation before Congress*, which Brookings published in 1929 and which, along with contemporaneous work by Peter Odegard and E. E. Schattschneider, laid the foundation for the empirical study of pressure groups.

There were pioneers as well among Herring's five succeeding books:

- *Public Administration and the Public Interest* in 1936, which analyzed interactions between government agencies and their clientele.
- *Federal Commissioners: A Study of Their Careers and Qualifications*, also in 1936, which examined the relation between administrators' backgrounds and their behavior in office.
- *Presidential Leadership: The Political Relations of Congress and the Chief Executive* in 1940, which, holding its own in a crowded field, remains in print.
- *The Politics of Democracy: American Parties in Action*, also in 1940, probably his most important work, which defended the decentralized, pragmatic parties of American tradition against the advocates of greater discipline and ideological purity.
- *The Impact of War: Our American Democracy Under Arms* in 1941, an analysis of war mobilization that was at least a pioneer in the field of national security studies and arguably of policy studies more generally.

His journal articles ranged even more widely. He contributed to the *APSR* articles on the Czechoslovakian legislature and French chambers of commerce and to *Public Opinion Quarterly* an article on how voters make up their minds. He was a pioneer in the preparation and use of case studies for graduate instruction in public administration.

His published work was informed by sensitivity to the relations among society, ideas, and government institutions, and to the interplay of interests as a source of freedom.

At the SSRC, Herring used the entrepreneur's tools—imagination, discernment, money, and wide personal acquaintance—to assemble and sustain a series of committees that helped lead the behavioral revolution in political science. The Committee on Political Behavior (1949 to 1963), the Committee on Comparative Politics (1954 to 1970), and the Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes (1964-1972) were the leading instruments, involving such eminent members of the pro-

fession as Almond, Dahl, Key, Truman, and Ward. Under Herring's direction, the SSRC sought generally to improve the quality of social science knowledge by encouraging the gathering of more and better data, the application of more rigorous analytic methods, and the development of systematic theories with predictive power.

There was at least one other career, for which Herring has already been honored by this Association. He was a public servant both for the United States and the United Nations, and in 1979 received the Merriam Award for his contribution to the application of political science to problems of public policy. Here his contributions ranged from advice to the War Department on how to manage the official histories of World War II to service as head of the secretariat of the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission during the attempt in 1946 to negotiate an international control agreement to a role in the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue and the founding of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at the Smithsonian Institution.

A merchant mariner in his youth, a writer of sonnets all his life, Herring is a humanist

whose chief work, the book on parties, is illustrated not with charts and graphs, but with American political art: a political meeting portrayed by Thomas Hart Benton in a New Deal-era mural in the State House at Jefferson City, Missouri; four paintings—*Stump Speaking*, *County Election*, *Canvassing for a Vote*, and *Verdict of the People*—by George Caleb Bingham from the 1850s; and *Election Night* by John Sloan, among others. The fine collection of American political art housed at APSA headquarters came from him as a gift to the Association.

Yet if Herring was not a user of quantitative methods, he did a great deal to spread their use. His was a career of astonishing eclecticism, spanning science and literature; government, academe, and the big foundations; all of the disciplines of social science; and the generations, methods and fields of political science. Distinguished Americans of the eighteenth century, including the one for whom this prize is named, would be at home in his sitting room in Princeton and in the adjacent garden; and they would agree that he merits this recognition from his colleagues.

## APSA Awards and Recipients

Compiled by **Jean Walen**

One of the most important activities of the Association is the promotion and recognition of scholarly excellence in political science. Listed below are the recipients of each APSA award who were honored for the high quality of their work and their contributions to the discipline. A cumulative list of the award winners will be published every three years in conjunction with the Madison Award.

\*"Affiliation" indicates the recipient's affiliation at the time of receiving the award.

### Career Awards

#### HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AWARD

Presented each year in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Year	Recipient	Affiliation*
1983	Daniel Patrick Moynihan	U.S. Senate
1984	John Brademas	New York University
1985	Robert C. Wood	Wesleyan University
1986	—	
1987	Max M. Kampelman	Head, U.S. Delegation, Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms