

Notes from the Editor

Although my most recent annual editorial report was published in the January issue of *PS: Political Science & Politics*, it seems unsafe to assume that everyone who may be interested in how things are going at the *APSR* will have ventured into the nether regions of *PS* and there chanced upon my report. Therefore, I summarize here its most salient points.

Submissions. During 2001–2, my first year as editor of the *APSR*, we experienced an extraordinary surge in submissions—a rise of either 44% or 56%, depending on how submissions are counted, in a single year. As we entered Year 2, we didn’t know whether that greatly enhanced manuscript flow would prove to be a one-year “spike” or would become the new norm. As it turned out, submissions showed no sign of abating during 2002–3. Indeed, they rose again, though by “only” about 8% over 2001–2. Obviously, then, the dramatic increase in submissions that we had experienced the year before wasn’t a one-time occurrence. A reversion to lower submission levels would have been disappointing, but a continuation of such explosive growth would have been too much of a good thing. So I interpret the submission trend as good news.

Turnaround. Our review process continued to move at a good pace. The median elapsed time from the day we received a paper until the day I signed the decision letter to the author was 39 working days. Only rarely (certainly less than 5% of the time) did the process drag on for a period that could fairly be considered problematic.

Intellectual diversity. One of my major goals as editor has been to attract a greater variety of submissions, so that the *APSR*’s pages are open in fact as well as in form to work representing the substantive and analytical diversity of our discipline. In this regard, what has happened can be seen from either a “half empty” or a “half full” perspective. As indicated by the relative stability of the distribution of submissions across analytical approaches and substantive fields, progress has been slow. On the other hand, consider, as a case in point, papers reporting “small-N” analyses. From 1995 through 2000, such papers accounted, on average, for just 2% of *APSR* submissions. In 2002–3, they constituted 5%. That probably doesn’t sound like much of a change, but bear in mind that the number of submissions was much larger in 2002–3 than it had been in earlier years, so “small-N” submissions became, in effect, a larger proportion of a much larger pie. In raw numbers, whereas the *APSR* received, on average, only about a half-dozen “small-N” submissions per year during the 1995–2000 period, in 2002–3 we received two dozen. In terms of the likelihood that “small-N” papers would actually be published in the *APSR* (and they were), that is a difference that matters. More generally, given our very substantial increase in submissions across approaches and fields, we have actually made considerable progress in attracting papers that represent approaches and/or fields previously under-

represented in terms of submission to, and publication in, the *APSR*.

Rejection rates. Of every 100 first-round decisions that I made during 2002–3, 88 were rejections based on the recommendations of reviewers and, of course, my own assessment. Two of every 100 first-round decisions took the form of notifying the author that I was unwilling to open the review process because the authorship of the paper had not been rendered sufficiently anonymous, because the paper far exceeded our length limit, or because its formatting was wildly at variance with our guidelines; in every such instance, I invited the author to fix the problem and submit a corrected version of the paper, and that invitation invariably was accepted. Less than one out of every 100 decision letters informed the author that in my judgment the paper was so inappropriate for the *APSR* that no purpose would be served by sending it out for review; for the 671 submissions we received, I wrote only five such letters. The remaining eight of every 100 of my first-round decisions were “positive,” in the sense of inviting the author to revise the paper for further consideration, accepting it subject to some final conditions, or accepting it unconditionally. Obviously, I spent a great deal of my time conveying bad news to authors.

I continued to make sparing use of “revise and resubmit” invitations and to resist the temptation to pile one such invitation on top of another. I never offered a second “revise and resubmit” invitation, and it was not at all common for me to reject a revised resubmission. Of all the revised resubmissions on which we completed the review process during 2002–3, more than 85% were accepted.

Compared to the distribution of submissions, the distribution of accepted papers underrepresented purely quantitative submissions while overrepresenting interpretive/conceptual ones, and it underrepresented American politics submissions while overrepresenting international relations and normative theory ones. I have no ready explanation for this pattern, but I do caution against attributing it to editorial bias against quantitative work or research on American politics—for those are precisely the categories into which most of my own work falls. Rather, I tend to regard these as one-time blips that are unlikely to recur in years to come.

IN THIS ISSUE

That brings me to the current issue, the first one to appear during 2004. We do not publish “theme” issues. Occasionally, though, several of the articles that appear in a given issue prove, more or less serendipitously, to speak to the same broad theme. This is such an occasion. I hope it is not unduly procrustean to suggest that *cooperation* is a prominent focus of the articles in this issue (and hence the theme of this issue’s cover graphic

as well), for a recurrent theme of these articles is the acting out of shared values, goals, and policies through rules, procedures, and institutions.

Cooperation is a vital element of human endeavors that involve more than one person—necessary to forming sustainable societies, choosing leaders, sustaining good citizenship, and maintaining peaceful relations with other societies. It involves more than the absence of overt conflict, which could be a product of coercion or lack of opportunity. Rather, it involves a desire to get along with others. In contrast to views of human nature that emphasize competitive and aggressive instincts, John Orbell, Tomonori Morikawa, Jason Hartwig, James Hanley, and Nicholas Allen think that getting along with others may, in effect, have been bred into us. In “‘Machiavellian’ Intelligence as a Basis for the Evolution of Cooperative Dispositions,” Orbell and his colleagues suggest that cooperative traits may be selected for in evolutionary processes based on certain cognitive mechanisms. These mechanisms underlie “Machiavellian intelligence”—the capacity to negotiate complex, competitive social environments. A fascinating simulation analysis shows how this capacity can provide an evolutionary foundation predisposing later generations to act cooperatively in ostensibly competitive settings. This evolutionary account reconciles payoff structures that seem to discourage cooperation, on the one hand, and empirical findings that indicate widespread cooperation, on the other.

Next comes an extreme case of the need for cooperation in moving a country from civil war to domestic tranquility. Political thinkers from Hobbes and Machiavelli to Huntington have deemed an authoritarian transition to be a necessary stage in the transformation from civil war to democracy. In “The Paradox of ‘Warlord’ Democracy: A Theoretical Investigation,” though, Leonard Wantchekon argues that popular government can arise more or less directly from the chaos of civil war *if* the warring factions depend on the citizenry for economic growth, permit elections to arbitrate the new balance of power, and defer to a neutral third party to oversee the transition. Wantchekon’s multi-faceted analysis should help readers understand why, among other things, countries like El Salvador and Mozambique have been able to create new democracies, while the Sierra Leones of the world still find themselves mired in conflict.

Cooperation can be especially difficult if the parties in question cannot readily identify common grounds or find a joint stake in mutually beneficial outcomes. In an age of global immigration into formerly homogeneous European societies, Paul M. Sniderman, Louk Hagendoorn, and Markus Prior investigate the factors that provoke animosity toward ethnic minorities. Such animosities have manifested themselves in popular support for nativist political parties and policies on immigration, jobs, and crime. In “Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities,” Sniderman and his associates use an experimental component embedded within an otherwise-conventional opinion survey to explore the impacts of economic hardship, fear of crime, and inter-

cultural differences on tension between native-born Dutch and newly arrived immigrant groups. Although this study focuses on the Netherlands, its findings seem broadly applicable to other settings where once-homogeneous populations are becoming more diversified and multicultural.

As joint endeavors in which citizens collectively choose their leaders, elections are prime political mechanisms of cooperative behavior. Three articles in this issue focus on electoral politics from various analytical perspectives. In an analysis that combines empirical, normative, and prescriptive elements, Dennis F. Thompson considers the oft-overlooked matter of timing. In “Election Time: Normative Implications of Temporal Properties of the Election Process in the United States,” Thompson highlights three characteristics of the timing of American elections that promote popular sovereignty: elections occur at regular intervals (periodicity), voters cast their ballots at the same time (simultaneity), and the outcome conclusively determines who will govern until the next election (finality). Thompson then uses these properties as standards to assess various electoral institutions. Do partisan redistricting, the use of absentee ballots, or the regulation of campaign-related spending enhance or detract from the democratic character of elections? Thompson’s answers to these questions seem certain to lead readers to rethink the relationship between America’s civic values and its public practices.

Continuing this focus on elections as an integral component of democratic governance, Matt A. Barreto, Gary M. Segura, and Nathan D. Woods investigate the impact of minority-majority districts. The issue motivating “The Mobilizing Effect of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout” is whether majority-minority districts, while enhancing the representation of minorities, also depress minority turnout. The idea here is that majority-minority districts may produce uncompetitive districts in which the motivation to vote wanes and may also produce political disenchantment when representation gains fail to pay off in terms of policy. If majority-minority districts actually undermine minority turnout, then minority influence on the outcome of “up-ballot” contests would be affected deleteriously. Focusing on turnout in five Southern California counties, Barreto and his colleagues show that Latinos who live in majority-minority districts are actually more likely to vote than Latinos who live elsewhere, especially as the number of embedded layers of majority-minority districts increase. This study makes a significant contribution to our understanding of this politically volatile set of issues by focusing on non-African American minority voters, and in so doing provides a firmer empirical base for policy advocates and policy makers to take into account when Congress considers reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act in 2007.

A common criticism of formal modeling is that much of it betrays little immersion in the “real world” of politics and, correspondingly, that notwithstanding their internal rigor, it is often difficult even to imagine how such models might be applied empirically or tested. Encouragingly, though, more and more attention is

being devoted to empirical applications and tests of formal models. A case in point is Enriqueta Aragonés and Thomas R. Palfrey's experimental analysis of how candidate quality affects election outcomes. In "The Effect of Candidate Quality on Electoral Equilibrium: An Experimental Study," Aragonés and Palfrey put their prior theoretical work to the test, and in so doing provide evidence for the striking proposition that the indirect equilibrium effects of candidate quality may be more important in determining candidates' policy positions than in producing more votes for a particular candidate.

We then turn to a panel of great political thinkers for enlightenment about how individuals do and should cooperate with others. According to Aristotle, one is a citizen when one acts as a citizen. One's status as free or slave does not depend on birth, accident, decree, or force, and is not immutable. Rather, it stems from the active and regular use of reason to make choices. Such a deliberative, active political life is the key to what Jill Frank, in "Citizens, Slaves, and Foreigners: Aristotle on Human Nature," deems necessary to avoid the Scylla (slavery) and Charybdis (despotism) of living in a free democracy. Rethinking several assumptions about the relationship between nature and politics, Frank interprets Aristotle as holding that political institutions and norms can produce people accustomed to, and fit for, either freedom and democracy, on the one hand, or slavery and despotism, on the other. This admonition reminds modern-day democrats to be vigilant for outside threats to a vigorous and reasoned democracy, and for the internal lethargy that can undermine it.

The idea of action also runs through Laurence D. Cooper's "Between Eros and the Will to Power: Rousseau and 'The Desire to Extend Our Being.'" According to Rousseau, the fundamental desire of, and highest good for, humans is to feel existence as much as possible. Cooper identifies this under-noticed concept of desire as central to Rousseau's moral and political philosophy. Rousseau's relevance to the ongoing debate between liberals and communitarians makes Cooper's analysis important reading for more than the relatively narrow circle of Rousseau scholars or even the broader community of political theorists.

Cooperation of a different sort than considered in the other articles in this issue is Thomas Heilke's concern in "Realism, Narrative, and Happenstance: Thucydides' Tale of Brasidas." Heilke's point of departure is the frequently frustrating quest of scholars of international relations to develop law-like axioms and structural theories from which practically useful policy prescriptions can be generated. The key, Heilke holds, to bridging the gap and reconciling these two often-contradictory aspirations lies in constructive use of narrative. Taking his cue from Hobbes that "the narration itself doth secretly instruct the reader, and more effectually than can possibly be done by precept," Heilke uses the Spartan general Brasidas to illustrate not just how a practitioner was affected by "vaguely defined forces," but also how "speech and actions" of individuals come into play in a "complex contextual interaction of luck and excellence."

Like individuals, institutions and governments must find ways to reach common goals with one another. How do they do it? In an analysis that is sure to raise eyebrows, authors Pauline Jones Luong and Erika Weinthal counterpose the contractarian view, fathered by Hobbes and more recently championed by rational choice advocates, and a coercion-based perspective that depicts strong leaders and force as the engine of change. In "Contra Coercion: Russian Tax Reform, Exogenous Shocks and Negotiated Institutional Change," Jones Luong and Weinthal argue that Russia's new tax regime was the product of a new social contract between its largest businesses and the central government. The economic crisis that began in 1998 and crippled the Russian economy led both groups to recognize a mutuality of interests and thus to negotiate an agreement that addressed the government's needs for greater revenue streams and business' needs for tax reasonableness, simplicity, transparency and regularity. The negotiations were not "captured" by any group, nor were the outcomes dictated by a coercive leader or by concerns for international aid and investment. Rather, goaded by their earlier failures and a desire for economic recovery, bolstered on either side by the confidence-building acts, Russia's major oil concerns and its political leaders cooperated to achieve key goals.

Some similar themes recur in Christina L. Davis's "International Institutions and Issue Linkage: Building Support for Agricultural Trade Liberalization." Why do international trade negotiations turn out the way they do? Interests and power, the usual suspects, tell only part of the story, and Davis argues that much of the action lies in the agenda, rules, and procedures that structure the negotiation. Linking agricultural and industrial issues in a supportive institutional environment, Davis finds, can effectively surmount domestic political opposition. Though specifically focused on international trade, Davis's analysis should be of interest to political scientists interested in preference aggregation, agenda setting, and the relationship between institutions and policy outcomes. For issues ranging from the price of wheat to the size of the federal budget, the ways in which agendas are shaped, rules are manipulated, and procedures formed, profoundly affect policy outcomes.

Davis's focus on trade liberalization provides a superb lead-in to Beth A. Simmons and Zachary Elkin's analysis of "The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy." Liberal economic ideas and policies have spread unevenly over time, in fits and starts, and across the globe, skipping over some areas and concentrating in others. What accounts for this clustering? Exploring an array of geographical, sociological, and political influences, Simmons and Elkins identify competition for capital (indicative of altered economic payoffs) and shared culture (indicative of cross-cultural learning and borrowing) as especially important factors in nations' decisions to follow the lead of their liberalizing neighbors. The implication of the "shared culture" factor in particular is that the scope of theory and research on comparative

and international political economy must remain broad enough to encompass underlying cultural as well as more traditional economic considerations.

Finally, let me assure readers who experience a sensation of *déjà vu* when they encounter the final article in this issue that they are not hallucinating. Gary King, Christopher J.L. Murray, Joshua Salomon, and Ajay Tandon's "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" was published in our November 2003 issue. Unfortunately, through no fault of the authors, that version of the article contained several important printing errors. Consequently, with apologies to Messrs. King, Murray, Salomon, and Tandon, we print the corrected version of the article in this issue. This should be regarded as the definitive version of the article, and future references to it should cite this version rather than the one printed in our last issue.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

General Considerations

The *APSR* strives to publish scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience of scholars and practitioners, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates a significant research problem, or answers an important research question, of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive for a presentation that will be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Therefore, authors should not submit articles containing tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that have already been published or are forthcoming in other places, or that have been included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including on-line journals). In many such cases, subsequent publication of this material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review by other journals or duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts that have been submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Submission of manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or as part of a book or other larger work, is also strongly discouraged. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss any such publications related to a submission in a cover letter to the Editor. You should also notify the Editor of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review by the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. The Editor may request copies of related publications.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and, in the event that the article is accepted for publication, to permit other scholars to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. For example, for surveys, at the least, sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings should be given; you should calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys* (Ann Arbor, MI: AAPOR, 2000). This document is available on the Internet at <http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/standards_and_best_practices/standard_definitions>. For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, subject payments and debriefing procedures, and so on. Articles should be self-contained, so you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by capitalizing the first letter in the variable name and italicizing the entire variable name the first time each is mentioned in the text. You should also use the same names for variables in text and tables and, wherever possible, should avoid the use of acronyms and computer abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables appearing in tables should have been mentioned in the text and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

As part of the review process, you may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear; the review process works most efficiently if such information is given in the initial submission. If you advise readers that additional information is available, you should submit printed copies of that information with the manuscript. If the amount of this supplementary information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing anonymous copies in the Specific Procedures section below.

Manuscripts that are largely or entirely critiques or commentaries on previously published *APSR* articles will be reviewed using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts, with one exception. In addition to the usual number of reviewers, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being criticized, in the same anonymous form that they are sent to reviewers. Comments from the original author(s) to the Editor will be invited as a supplement to the advice of reviewers. This notice to the original author(s) is intended (1) to encourage review of the details of analyses or research procedures that might escape the notice of disinterested reviewers; (2) to enable prompt publication of critiques by supplying criticized authors with early notice of their existence and, therefore, more adequate time to reply; and (3) as a courtesy to criticized authors. If you submit such a manuscript,

you should therefore send as many additional copies of their manuscripts as will be required for this purpose.

Manuscripts being submitted for publication should be sent to Lee Sigelman, Editor, *American Political Science Review*, Department of Political Science, The George Washington University, 2201 G Street N.W., Room 507, Washington, DC 20052. Correspondence concerning manuscripts under review may be sent to the same address or e-mailed to apsr@gwu.edu.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should not be longer than 45 pages including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices. This page size guideline is based on the U.S. standard 8.5 × 11-inch paper; if you are submitting a manuscript printed on longer paper, you must adjust accordingly. The font size must be at least 11 points for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including notes and references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception of tables for which double-spacing would require a second page otherwise not needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6.5 inches, as is typical for manuscripts (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*), and printed on one side of the page only. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. The *APSR* style of embedded citations should be used, and there must be a separate list of references at the end of the manuscript. Do not use notes for simple citations. These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers. Papers not adhering to these guidelines are subject to being rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may place footnotes at the bottom of the pages instead of using endnotes, and you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text. However, manuscripts accepted for publication must be submitted with endnotes, and with tables and figures on separate pages at the back of the manuscript with standard indications of text placement, e.g., [Table 3 about here]. In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If your paper is accepted for publication, you will also be required to submit camera-ready copy of graphs or other types of figures. Instructions will be provided.

For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. For unusual style or formatting issues, you should consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. For review purposes, citations and references need not be in specific *APSR* format, although some generally accepted format should be used, and all citation and reference information should be provided.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. You are invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. The Editor will refer to this list in selecting reviewers, though there obviously can be no guarantee that those you suggest will actually be chosen. Do not list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it, or any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends.
2. Submit five copies of manuscripts *and* a diskette containing a pdf file of the anonymous version of the manuscript. If you cannot save the manuscript as a pdf, just send in the diskette with the word-processed version. Please ensure that the paper and diskette versions you submit are identical; the diskette version should be of the **anonymous** copy (see below). Please review all pages of all copies to make sure that all copies contain all tables, figures, appendices, and bibliography mentioned in the manuscript and that all pages are legible. Label the diskette clearly with the (first) author's name and the title of the manuscript (in abridged form if need be), and identify the word processing program and operating system.
3. To comply with the *APSR*'s procedure of double-blind peer reviews, only one of the five copies submitted should be fully identified as to authorship and four should be in anonymous format.
4. For anonymous copies, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in the list of references. In no circumstances should your prior publications be included in the bibliography in their normal alphabetical location but with your name deleted. Assuming that text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should include full citations as usual in the bibliography. Please discuss the use of other procedures to render manuscripts anonymous with the Editor prior to submission. You should not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information. *All acknowledgments must appear on the title page of the identified copy only.* Manuscripts that are judged not anonymous will not be reviewed.
5. The first page of the four anonymous copies should contain only the title and an abstract of no more than 150 words. The first page of the identified copy should contain (a) the name, academic rank, institutional affiliation, and contact information (mailing address, telephone,

fax, e-mail address) for all authors; (b) in the case of multiple authors, an indication of the author who will receive correspondence; (c) any relevant citations to your previous work that have been omitted from the anonymous copies; and (d) acknowledgments, including the names of anyone who has provided comments on the manuscript. If the identified copy contains any unique references or is worded differently in any way, please mark this copy with "Contains author citations" at the top of the first page.

No copies of submitted manuscripts can be returned.

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually "moving wall"), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available on-line through JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/>). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR* and *PS* through the APSA website (www.apsanet.org) with their username and password. Individual non-member access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of both the *APSR* and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datastar (Datastar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

BOOK REVIEWS

The *APSR* no longer contains book reviews. As of 2003, book reviews have moved to *Perspectives on Politics*. All books for review should be sent directly to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Susan Bickford and Greg McAvoy. The address is Susan Bickford and Gregory McAvoy, *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB No. 3265, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265. E-mail: bookreviews@unc.edu.

If you are the author of a book you wish to be considered for review, please ask your publisher to send a copy to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors per the mailing instructions above. If you are interested in reviewing books for *Perspectives on Politics*, please send your vita to the Book Review Editors; you should not ask to review a specific book.

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association's address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512 (voice), and (202) 483-2657 (fax). E-mail: apsa@apsanet.org. Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*
E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for nonreceipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Elizabeth Weaver Engel,
Director of Member Services
E-mail: membership@apsanet.org

Reprint permissions:
E-mail: reprints@apsanet.org

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,
Cambridge University Press
E-mail: journals_advertising@cup.org

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING *APSR* AND *PS* ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no

fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials

without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci; America, History and Life 1954-*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; Econ-Lit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (www.umi.com). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969-95, is available through the APSA.