

# Minutes of February 12, 2011 Council Meeting

**Time and Place:** February 12, 2011, APSA Council Meeting La Ventana Room—Embassy Suites, Albuquerque, New Mexico

**Present:** Larry Bartels, Cristina Beltrán, Jeffery Berry, Michael Brintnall, Michael Desch, Luis Fraga, Christopher Gelpi, Frances Hagopian, Simon Hix, Mala Htun, Evelyne Huber, Jeffrey Isaac, Arthur Lupia, Thomas Mann, Joseph McCormick, Anne Norton, Julie Novkov, Laura Olson, Carole Pateman, Sue Peterson, Bingham Powell, Ronald Rogowski, and Dara Strolovitch

**Absent:** Yun-han Chu, Mark Graber, and Laurel Weldon

**APSA Staff:** Jeffrey Biggs, Regina Chavis, Jennifer Diascro, Robert Hauck, Michael Marriott, and Kimberly Mealy

**Guests:** Kirstie McClure, Art Stein, and Lynn Vavreck

## I. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the American Political Science Association Council was held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, on February 12, 2011. The meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m. by President Pateman. President Pateman declared a quorum present.

## II. WELCOME AND REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

President Pateman welcomed everyone to Albuquerque and extended a special welcome to the new council members. She noted this was the first time that the council had met in conjunction with the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference.

President Pateman also commented on the outcome of the council resolution that the 2011 annual meeting be moved from San Francisco hotels if labor issues were not resolved, and she said how pleased she was that the APSA staff was able to change the 2011 site without great costs to the association. She also updated the council on recent activities such as the 2011 nominating committee slate and on her visits to other associations on behalf of the APSA council, including the first APSA presidential visit to the conference of the Association for Political Theory.

## III. COUNCIL ORIENTATION

Dr. Brintnall presented an orientation on the council's role in the association as its corporate board of directors. He explained the duties of care, loyalty, obedience, and recusal are customary for boards, and how they are caretakers of the association's finances. He noted that the association is a very complex organization with many committees and organized sections and other groups and partnerships, and he provided a brief overview of this structure.

## IV. SEPTEMBER 1, 2010, COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

The minutes from the September 4, 2010, Council meeting were read and approved.

## V. SEPTEMBER 4, 2010, GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MINUTES

The minutes from the September 4, 2010, general membership meeting were read and approved.

## VI. COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

President Pateman moved that Drs. Novkov and Strolovitch with Bartels, as chair, compose the Committee on Elections; Drs. Mann and Norton with Lupia, as chair ex officio, compose the Committee on Finance; Drs. McCormick and Rosenblum with Berry, as chair, compose the Committee on Rules; and Drs. Desch and Dale Rogers Marshall with Graber as chair, compose the Audit Committee

President Pateman moved "that the council approve the appointments to the council committees." The motion was adopted.

## VII. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dr. Brintnall gave the report of the executive director. He acknowledged the APSA staff members who were present. He reported that the association is strong, building renovation continues, and that it has an excellent staff. When asked if the association has a strategic plan, he said that it does not, but that he has discussed with the council steps to begin this process and will provide materials about it for the council in August.

## VIII. APSA FINANCE REPORT

Ms. Chavis gave the finance report. She noted that, because of the conservative investment strategy, the investments have rebounded to levels before the market crash. There were no major changes or issues to single out in this year's financials. As of December 31, 2010, revenues and expenses were largely in line with expected levels as of this time last year. The FY2012 budget will be proposed at the council's September meeting. She presented the operating statement and noted that there is an estimated net profit due primarily due to investment draws.

She concluded by informing the council that the APSA's draft IRS 990 will be posted for their review, and the FY2012 budget will be proposed at the council's September meeting.

## IX. TRUST AND DEVELOPMENT (T&D) COMMITTEE REPORT

Dr. Lupia presented the current investment portfolio of the Trust and Development and the Congressional Fellowship fund. APSA endowments have returned to levels before the market crash. The Trust and Development and the Congressional Fellowship funds portfolio are currently allocated to funds that invest in domestic equities, international equities, government bonds, and inflation-protected bonds. The T&D committee noted that it is focused on principle preservation and long term growth, with less concern with short term volatility, though it has taken steps to reduce down-side risk with the addition of a bond component.

## X. AUDIT REPORT

Ms. Chavis noted that an independent auditing firm, McGladrey & Pullen, LLP, reported a clean audit for FY2010. An inquiry was raised about the association's rating on GuideStar and similar agencies; Ms. Chavis said she would look into such ratings and report later. The audit report was received and placed on file.

## XI. PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICS EDITOR REPORT

Dr. Isaac presented the editor's report. He started by acknowledging his terrific staff,

and his good relationships with the APSA staff, printers, publisher, and authors.

He said he is very excited about the directions that *Perspectives* and the book reviews are headed, and appreciates the opportunity to serve as editor. In response to questions about submissions processed, he explained that he carefully selects manuscripts to move forward, and that most manuscripts are rejected after internal review and are not sent out for external review, which he believes, is consistent with the principles on which *Perspectives* was founded, and which helps to prevent reviewer fatigue. He will send a decline letter within seven to 10 business days that also includes information on other journals that may accept the manuscript or ways to improve the manuscript. He said he welcomes feedback on his procedures and would welcome an independent review.

The council discussed the role of the editor and its independent authority in running the journal. It was noted that while there currently is no institutional requirement for soliciting advice and consent from the journal's board; Isaac was urged to work closely with his board on direction setting and policy.

## **XII. AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW EDITOR UPDATE**

Drs. Rogowski, McClure, and Stein presented an update on the *APSR*. Dr. McClure noted that the journals citation ranking has rebounded, after a recent abrupt decline. She also noted that in spite of continuing high numbers of submissions, numbers of those based on qualitative research methods continue to be low. It is a priority for the journal to increase these numbers, and they have taken a variety of steps, including adding associate editors and coordinating closely with editorial board members who are well known for work of this character.

The council discussed the ways that submissions are categorized, and asked the publications committee to review the categories APSA uses, both to identify substantive research areas and to identify research methods and the character of studies, so that more reliable indicators of what is submitted and published can be developed. President Pateman moved "that the council charge the publications committee with reviewing the issue of manuscript categories." The motion was adopted.

The council also raised the question of whether members should have the option of opting-out of receiving a print copy of the journal. Presently, members receive all journals as a package in their membership,

and receive a print copy of one or the other monthly. President Pateman moved "that the council charge the APSA staff to study the *APSR* opt-out option and its effects on the other journals, costs to the association, et cetera." The motion was adopted.

Dr. Lupia described a concept to create an interactive, online based journal, that has a working title of *APSR Prime*, and the council expressed interest in exploring this addition to APSA sponsored publication options. President Pateman asked him to draft a concept paper for the next council meeting.

Council members asked that the *APSR* search committee question the candidates about their view of methodological and substantive diversity. It was noted that the charge to the committee included similar language: "The search committee seeks an editor or editorial team that has a commitment to publishing articles that represent the methodological and substantive diversity of the discipline including qualitative and multimethod research."

## **XIII. JOURNAL UPDATES**

Dr. Brintnall noted that the *APSR* editor search committee is finalizing the list of candidates and expects to make its recommendation to the president by the start of the summer. APSA by-laws call for the committee to make its recommendations to the president, who in turn is to present one candidate to the council consideration. He also noted that the contract with Cambridge University Press is expiring, and the APSA staff has sought competitive bids from a number of publishing companies as well as from Cambridge.

## **XIV. 2011 ANNUAL MEETING**

Dr. Hagopian reported that there were more than 10,500 submissions, and there will be about 34 theme panels that will cover many subfields. The annual meeting program co-chairs are also working in cooperation with the siting and engagement committee to highlight the history of the labor movement in the city.

## **XV. 2011 TEACHING AND LEARNING CONFERENCE**

Dr. Mealy reported that the 2011 Teaching and Learning conference was underway as she spoke. There are 256 attendees participating in 13 working group tracks. The conference is still very favorably received and is producing many spin-off products including track reports in *PS* and two forth-

coming edited books on assessment and on civic education.

## **XVI. 2012 ANNUAL MEETING**

Dr. Vavreck presented the program theme of the 2012 annual meeting titled, "Representation and Renewal." John Carey and she are finalizing the program chair committee and will present the nominees to the council soon. She highlighted that the theme will present many options for discussion; such as, representation against the odds, what political science can do for legislatures, media and the public, and the future of the UN Security Council.

## **XVII. ANNUAL MEETING SITING QUESTION AND ANSWERS**

Dr. Brintnall referred to a draft document describing the association wide discussion and council action on 2012 Annual Meeting siting. He solicited advice on this document, which will be made available online for the membership as we approach the 2012 meeting. The council responded that it was very clear and informative.

Dr. Brintnall informed the council that as a part of the 2012 siting discussions, the council at that time had been clear that individuals or groups in APSA should not be penalized for choices they make about attendance. A direct application of this refers to allocation of panels for future meetings that are based on attendance at the 2012 meeting. Dr. Novkov moved "that an average of the 2010 and 2011 annual meeting panel participation count will determine the 2013 panel allocation and that organized sections with fewer than 250 members will not be removed from the program committee for the 2013 or 2014 annual meetings because of membership levels." The motion was adopted.

It was recognized that the 2013 Program Chairs will retain their discretion to address concerns about accuracy and equity in allocation of panels—rather than using the attendance at the 2012 meeting.

## **XVIII. ANNUAL MEETING TECHNOLOGY**

Dr. Brintnall presented an idea to allow virtual participation at the annual meeting, regarding broadcasting presentations, discussions, and the possibility for active participation and presentations, such as through virtual poster sessions. While council members noted that virtual participation in general sounds like an interesting idea, there were questions regarding feasibility, cost, and appropriateness, President Pateman

asked the APSA staff to explore it further and report to the council later. Council members asked that the 2012 Siting and Engagement speech by Urvashi Vaid be available for Internet streaming.

#### **XIX. APSA DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY**

Dr. Brintnall referred the council to the memo outlining recent development activity and no action from the council was needed at this time, but he solicited advice for increasing funds for the association and various awards.

#### **XX. FRANK J. GOODNOW AWARD**

Dr. Brintnall reported that the development committee is currently charged with naming the recipient of the Goodnow award, reflecting the origin of this award in conjunction with the APSA Centennial Campaign. The objective and reach of the award is now more established, and the development committee has suggested that another committee be formed for the purpose of naming the recipient.

Dr. Novkov moved “that an award committee be formed for the purpose of naming the recipient of the Goodnow Award.” The motion was adopted.

#### **XXI. MEMBERSHIP UPDATE**

Dr. Brintnall presented APSA’s membership update. He noted that membership in various categories is showing small declines, but he expects it to stabilize as the year progresses. APSA sees a good bit of “churning” in membership as individuals opt to renew depending on their plans for the annual meeting.

#### **XXII. THREATS AGAINST POLITICAL SCIENTISTS**

President Pateman explained that the association has been invited to co-sign a letter written by the American Sociological Association concerning recent threats against professor Frances Fox Piven. Council members noted that the association shares in the distress about the personal attacks on Professor Piven, and in the importance of expressing the responsibility of the media and commentators to uphold conditions necessary for democratic free expression, represented in that letter. However, many council members stated that since the association had issued its own letter after careful discussion of the issues, it seemed best to stand with our statement there.

Dr. Berry moved “that the association should sign the letter.” The motion failed.

#### **XXIII. UPDATE ON ADVOCACY EFFORTS**

Dr. Brintnall reported that the association has greatly improved its ability to notify members when there is an attack on political scientist and social science and humanities research funding. At present there are signals, but not clear actions, that political science funding might be reduced by Congress. He said that there is a very real challenge to funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the staff will monitor the situation.

#### **XXIV. PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AD HOC COMMITTEE UPDATE**

Dr. Brintnall reported that the committee is at work on ideas for improving the public understanding of political science, with an eye to ways that students and their parents, policy makers, members of Congress, and the general public understand and appreciate the contributions of the field. The committee will report to the council in August.

#### **XXV. PROPOSAL TO MODIFY NON-DISCRIMINATION STATEMENTS AND POLICES**

Dr. Brintnall noted that a proposal to modify the ethics guide and relevant documents to specify that antidiscrimination policy related to specific groups applies explicitly to “real or perceived” identification with the named groups. The ethics committee is at work, in consultation with other committees, on a recommendation on this topic, and they will report at the next council meeting on the proposal.

#### **XXVI. SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY IN POLITICAL SCIENCE**

Dr. Novkov informed the council that the National Research Council, a ranking organization, did not consider books as scholarly publications for the purpose of assessing productivity for political science faculty.

Dr. Mann moved “that the council should approve the following steps: (1) Publicly advise the NRC that books and monographs published through a peer review process that present original empirical or theoretical research in political science are and always have been considered a valuable form of research activity in the discipline. (2) Publicly advise the NRC and any other commercial ranking systems that articles placed in peer-reviewed journals published by the organized sections of the American Political Science Association are and always have

been considered a valuable form of research activity in the discipline. (3) Establish a task force to develop discipline-specific guidelines for the NRC and any other public or private institution that conducts evaluations of scholarly productivity in political science.” The motion was approved.

#### **XXVII. DATA ACCESS AND RESEARCH TRANSPARENCY AD HOC COMMITTEE UPDATE**

Dr. Lupia noted that the committee has been formed and will have a full report at the next meeting.

#### **XXVIII. PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON COMPETITIVE ELECTIONS**

President Pateman reported that APSA has been advised that a member, Dr. Greg Kasza, will propose a constitutional amendment for consideration by the membership to institute fully competitive elections for APSA officers. Dr. Kasza has indicated that he is open to considering any changes to his proposal if the council endorses the overall approach. On behalf of the administrative committee, Dr. Lupia has reviewed the proposed election system, and President Pateman asked him to present his observations. He concluded that elections tended to reduce the council’s diversity—noting that in nine of the 10 cases in which a petition-supported candidate defeated an APSA nominating committee’s candidate, the effect was to replace a potential non-white or non-American council member with a white American in their place.

Following council discussion on the issues raised by competitive elections in general, and the proposal in particular, Dr. Rogowski moved “that Dr. Lupia should ask Dr. Greg Kasza to withdraw the three vote provision from the proposed amendment; if Dr. Kasza fails to remove the provision, the council will oppose the entire proposal; the president will appoint a task force or council subcommittee, composed of her choosing that will report to the council a plan for competitive elections by May 1; and the council will propose an amendment to the constitution to add a diversity directive to the nominating committee that reads, ‘it shall select candidates with due regard to geographical distribution, fields of professional interest, types of institution, race, gender, ethnicity, methodological orientation, and other important forms of diversity.’”

Dr. Novkov moved “that the question should be divided into three.” The motion



was adopted.

After amendment and further debate, the motion read “that the council will propose an amendment to the constitution to add a diversity directive to the nominating committee that reads, ‘it shall select candidates with due regard to geographical distribution, fields of professional interest, types of institution, race, gender, ethnicity, methodological orientation, gender identity, sexuality, and other important forms of diversity.’” The motion was adopted.

After amendment and further debate, the motion read “that Dr. Lupia will speak with Dr. Kasza about his proposal.” The motion was adopted.

The third main motion read “that the president will appoint a task force or council subcommittee, composed of her choosing, that will report to the council a plan for competitive elections by May 1.” The third motion was approved. President Pateman called for volunteers. Drs. Bartels, Hix, Htun, Norton, Rogowski, Strolovitch, with Lupia, as chairperson, volunteered to serve on the committee, and President Pateman approved the membership of the committee.

#### XXIX. CONSENT AGENDA

The reports on the Africa workshop, Japan-American Women Political Scientists Symposium, APSA diversity programs, and

advancing women in the profession ad hoc committee, institutional programs, and council planning were received.

#### XXX. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was brought to the attention of the council.

#### XXXI. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:48 p.m. ■

## APSA Awards Presented at the 2011 Annual Meeting

Recognizing excellence in the profession is one of the most important activities of the American Political Science Association. The association's Annual Awards Ceremony and Luncheon was held Thursday, September 1, 2011 at the Annual Meeting in Seattle, Washington.

#### CAREER AWARDS

##### Frank J. Goodnow Award for Distinguished Service

The Frank J. Goodnow Award, created by the APSA Council in 1996, honors the contributions of individuals to the development of the political science profession and the building of the American Political Science Association. APSA's first president, Frank J. Goodnow, exemplified the public service and volunteerism that this award recognizes. Goodnow was the first of many who voluntarily contributed an extraordinary amount of time, energy, and attention to building our dynamic and learned profession.

*Award Committee:* Alan S. Alexandroff, Strategic Policy Initiatives, Inc.; Meredith Jung-En Woo, University of Virginia; Larry M. Bartels, Princeton University (Chair); Pradeep Chhibber, University of California, Berkeley; Jennifer L. Hochschild, Harvard University; Michael B. Preston, University of Southern California

##### Recipient: Anthony D. Affigne

*Citation:* As a scholar, mentor and leader, your effect on the development of the American Political Science Association and the political science community is far reaching. You have tirelessly advocated for the advancement of underrepresented populations in the profession and served as an architect of systems encouraging students to consider graduate education in political science.

Among your contributions to the Association and to political science, none is more emblematic than your central and indispensable role in the founding of APSA's Organized Section on Race, Ethnicity, and Politics in 1995. You mapped out the course for its success by leading a group that created its organizational structure, including provisions to ensure gender equality and inclusiveness among its various constituencies. In return you were honored by being the first co-chair of the Section in 1995–1996.

You continue to find new ways to be of service to APSA and its various constituencies. You are a long time leader of the APSA's Committee on the Status of Latinos y Latinas in the profession and played a key role in the organization of the Latino Caucus in Political Science, serving as Caucus president in 2009. You were one of the principal leaders during the Association's Centennial Campaign, helping to develop the Fund for Latino Scholarship and have worked assidu-

ously to increase donations and develop the guidelines for its grant-making processes.

Your service extends to the highest level of the Association's leadership, where you have served as Treasurer of the Association, on the Executive Council, on the Annual Meeting Program Committee, the Ralph Bunche Award Committee, and various standing committees.

Your commitment to advancing and enriching the discipline comes through in all of the contributions to the Association. It is with deep appreciation and pleasure to present to Anthony Affigne the Frank J. Goodnow Award for Distinguished Service.

Recipient: Robert J-P. Hauck

*Citation:* Your service and contributions have made an indelible impact on American political science, and the APSA. In your 30 years of service to the Association, your influence was evident in every program; your talents enhanced every project. Your voice was always one of reason, and your mentorship launched the careers of numerous colleagues.

Your vision and creativity transformed *PS: Political Science and Politics* from a newsletter to a highly valuable and respected quarterly professional journal. Under your editorial leadership from 1988 to the present, *PS* evolved into a lively and wide-ranging forum for high-quality analyses of contemporary politics. You expanded its coverage of all APSA activities and controversies within the profession to promote both transparency

in the Association's work and frank but civil discussions about issues affecting the discipline. You masterfully chose timely topics and identified scholars to write about them, showing a wide-ranging grasp of the discipline and its "talent pool." At the same time, you made creative advancements to the PS design and artwork.

Your efforts significantly expanded the Association's international programs. Ongoing bilateral exchanges with political science associations and political scientists from around the world grew under your leadership. You oversaw the hosting of the 1988 Triennial World Congress of International Political Science Association, the expansion of travel grants for international scholars, and the creation of APSA's Journal Donation project to provide access to APSA journals to universities and colleges in the developing world. Your work created a lasting impact on the Association and its engagement and cooperation around the globe.

To summarize your contribution and legacy to the Association in these few words is impossible. It is with deep appreciation for your dedication to scholarship, research, the Association, and the profession that we present to Dr. Hauck the Frank J. Goodnow Award for Distinguished Service.

### John Gaus Award and Lectureship

The John Gaus Award and Lectureship is given to honor the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration. The recipient delivers the Gaus Lecture at the Annual Meeting.

*Award Committee:* Sally Coleman Selden, Lynchburg College (Chair); Dan Balfour, Grand Valley State University; Joan E. Pynes, University of South Florida

*Recipient:* **Hal Rainey**, University of Georgia

*Citation:* The American Political Science Association confers the 2011 John Gaus award on Hal Rainey in recognition of a "lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration." Professor Rainey, according to one of his former students, "is best known for his good nature, humor, and exceptional scholarly work."

Professor Rainey is the Alumni Foundation Distinguished Professor of Public Administration in the School of Public and International Affairs at the University

of Georgia. In the course of his distinguished career at the University of Georgia, he has served on governmental commissions at the state and local levels, and in a variety of training, consulting and practical research roles with federal, state, and local agencies.

As a premier scholar in public management and organizational theory, Professor Rainey has played a leading role in the development of theory and research on public management and organizations. His seminal book *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, now in its fourth edition, is perhaps the most comprehensive and well-documented book on public sector management that currently exists. Since the first edition of his book won the Best Book Award from the Public Sector Division of the Academy of Management, students and faculty in the field have come to rely upon his careful and precise inventory, review and synthesis of research in public management. Professor Rainey's work has shaped how a generation of scholars understand and research public organizations—their operations and effectiveness.

Professor Rainey's most influential work comes from his early quantitative research on public and private management, which has formed a cornerstone of public administration scholarship. This work set in motion several decades of sustained study by researchers who have sought to better understand what makes the management of government and nonprofit activities different from that of business. From Rainey's early work on sector differences came a number of studies examining goal ambiguity, leadership, incentives and motivation, red tape, and reform and change. One of the nominators wrote that Professor Rainey "is a scholar's scholar; his work is always careful in design and execution, rigorous in methodology, quick to recognize the contributions of others, and modest in making claims about the significance of his work."

For his research contributions to the field of public administration, Professor Rainey has received numerous awards, including the Charles Levine Award for Excellence in Public Administration, conferred jointly by the American Society for Public Administration and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, as well as the Dwight Waldo Award for career contributions to scholarship in public administration. Professor Rainey is an Elected Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. He has served as chair of the Public Administration Section of the American Political

Science Association and chair of the Public and Nonprofit Division of the Academy of Management. During his exceptional career, Professor Rainey has served on more than 100 doctoral dissertation committees and 12 editorial boards.

### Hubert H. Humphrey Award

The Hubert H. Humphrey Award is given in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

*Award Committee:* Donald G Tannenbaum, Gettysburg College (Chair); Page Fortna, Columbia University; Joe Soss, University of Minnesota

*Recipient:* **Michael Doyle**, Columbia University

*Citation:* We are pleased to award APSA's Hubert H. Humphrey Award for "notable public service by a political scientist" to Michael Doyle of Columbia University.

Doyle is the Harold Brown Professor of U.S. Foreign and Security Policy, which is a three-fold appointment in the School of International and Public Affairs, the Department of Political Science, and the Law School.

He is well known as a political scientist for his writing and research on international relations theory, the liberal peace, international law, and international history; civil wars and international peace-building; and the United Nations. He is the author of numerous scholarly works, including *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (W.W. Norton); *Empires* (Cornell University Press); *UN Peacekeeping in Cambodia: UNTAC's Civil Mandate* (Lynne Rienner Publishers); *Striking First: Preemption and Prevention in International Conflict* (Princeton University Press); and, with Nicholas Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace* (Princeton University Press).

In 2009, Doyle received the Charles E. Merriam Award from the American Political Science Association. The award is given biennially "to a person whose published work and career represent a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research." That award recognized the impact of his scholarly work on issues of public policy. In awarding him the H.H. Humphrey Award, APSA acknowledges Doyle's own public service, in particular to the United Nations and affiliated organizations.

From 1993 to 1994, Doyle was Vice President and Senior Fellow of the International Peace Academy (now known as the International Peace Institute), on whose board

he continues to sit. Most notably, Doyle served as Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser to United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan from 2001 to 2003. His responsibilities included strategic planning on progress toward meeting the UN's Millennium Development Goals: the commitment of member states to reach eight goals, including progress to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger (for example by halving the number of people living on less than \$1 a day), to achieve universal primary education, to promote gender equality and empower women, to reduce child mortality rates, and improve maternal health, to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases, to ensure environmental stability, and to develop a global partnership for development. During his tenure as Assistant Secretary-General, Doyle also worked on relations with Washington, and on outreach to the international corporate sector through the "Global Compact," a UN initiative to encourage businesses worldwide to adopt sustainable and socially responsible policies in the areas of human rights, labor, the environment, and anti-corruption; and to report on their implementation.

More recently, Doyle has continued his work with the UN by serving as an individual member of the UN Democracy Fund, which was established in 2005 by the UN General Assembly to promote grass-roots democratization around the world. Doyle currently serves as the organization's chair. He has also served as a member of the External Research Advisory Committee of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); the Advisory Committee of the Lessons-Learned Unit of the UN's Department of Peace-Keeping Operations (UNDPKO); and as Chair of Academic Council on the United Nations System.

The nominating committee applauds his rare combination of distinguished scholarship on, and dedicated public service to, the international community. He serves as an inspiring example for political scientists everywhere, of every subfield, as well as for those who would join our ranks. And those who know him speak of him as one of the smartest, nicest, most responsible and modest people; in other words, a great guy to have on your team.

### Benjamin E. Lippincott Award

The Benjamin E. Lippincott Award honors 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.

*Award Committee:* Simone Chambers, University of Toronto (Chair); Virginia Sapiro, Boston University; Ian Shapiro, Yale University

*Recipient:* Alasdair MacIntyre, University of Notre Dame

*Title:* *After Virtue* (1981), University of Notre Dame Press

*Citation:* *After Virtue* has made a lasting contribution to the discipline of political philosophy. It was one of the books that shaped the liberal-communitarian debate of the 1980s. However, MacIntyre's book raised problems and articulated themes that have outlived that debate. In common with several previous distinguished winners of this prize – Hannah Arendt in 1975, Eric Voegelin in 1978, Sheldon Wolin in 1985 – Alasdair MacIntyre has presented himself as a resolute critic of modernity. What distinguishes his theorizing from other critiques of modernity is his relentless focus on whether modern liberal society can vindicate itself with respect to its provision of moral resources, resources for the building of character and coherent moral identity, or what one may also call "narrative resources." All societies individuate themselves, and give themselves moral and existential coherence, by enabling their members to tell stories that teach meaning, deepen experience, and supply exemplars. What stories do modern liberal societies teach to liberal selves? This is not an easy question to answer, and in a series of powerful and penetrating books, starting with *After Virtue* but pursued in a set of forceful sequels, MacIntyre poses challenges that modern liberal society has to confront if it is to redeem its own self-understanding and that of all those educated within its horizons. In doing so, MacIntyre has highlighted more effectively than any other contemporary theorist the perennial importance of virtue ethics, as articulated particularly in Aristotle and the Aristotelian tradition.

One of MacIntyre's distinctive themes is that philosophy promises not just debate and disagreement but the possibility of rational adjudication of these disagreements. Defenders of liberalism often see disagreement as such as a good or at least as a sign of health and not as a source of moral incoherence in need of being transcended. But again, MacIntyre challenges liberal self-understanding with respect to its most cherished or core presuppositions. The purpose of philosophy, on MacIntyre's view, is not just to let our disagreements play out to all eternity but rather to build rational bases of shared

moral and philosophical understanding. By highlighting moral, political, and intellectual diversity as a problem rather than as an assumed liberal virtue, MacIntyre himself (in some respects in tension with his own deepest intention) actually helps broaden and enliven this diversity.

### James Madison Award

The James Madison Award is given to an American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science.

*Award Committee:* Judith H. Stiehm, Florida International University (Chair); Simon D. Jackman, Stanford University; Gretchen Ritter, University of Texas at Austin

*Recipient:* Jane Mansbridge, Harvard University

*Citation:* Many superb scholars were nominated for this award, but the committee has selected Jane Mansbridge for the 2011 James Madison Award because of the breadth, the depth, the quality, and the variety of her scholarship.

Mansbridge is a political theorist whose work integrates that approach with both political practice and empirical analysis. Her subjects range from representation to conflict resolution, deliberative democracy and a case study of the non-ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Her work is innovative, important, and interesting too!

Perhaps her best known books are *Beyond Adversary Democracy* (1980), *Why We Lost the ERA* (1986), and *Beyond Self-Interest* (1990). Each has had a profound influence on scholarship in democratic and in feminist theory, influence that continues decades after publication.

Her recent work continues to set the agenda for scholars in a variety of subfields. It should be noted, also, that she has consistently investigated normative concerns, particularly concerns related to gender, racialized minorities, and working class and poor citizens.

Similarly, Mansbridge has always been generous in mentoring young scholars and in offering support to fellow investigators who were exploring issues not yet included in mainstream political science.

One nominator described Mansbridge as having a "dogged dual self-consciousness—as a moral and political agent and as a scholar committed to seeking the truth even when it may be unpalatable." Perhaps equally crucial to her achievements is the fact that she is (apparently) "fearless."



Her Madison lecture is sure to yield further original insight and to set an agenda for further exploration of our political world.

### Carey McWilliams Award

The Carey McWilliams Award honors a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

*Award Committee:* Shanto Iyengar, Stanford University (Chair); Lilian A. Barria, Eastern Illinois University; Mahmood Mamdani, Columbia University

*Recipient:* **Robert Fisk**, *The Independent*

*Citation:* The recipient of the McWilliams Award for 2011 is Robert Fisk, the Middle East correspondent for *The Independent* (London). Fisk received a PhD in political science from Trinity College, Dublin University. He is based in Beirut and, most recently, covered the unrest in Bahrain, Yemen and Syria. He has covered every significant event in the Middle East since the early 1980s including the Algerian and Lebanese Civil Wars, the American hostage crisis, the Iranian revolution, the Iran-Iraq War, the Gulf War and the 2003 invasion of Iraq. He is among a handful of Western journalists to have interviewed Osama bin Laden (on three different occasions).

Fisk is the author of numerous books, most recently, *The Great War for Civilization* (Vintage, 2007). He holds more international journalism awards than any other working foreign correspondent. In June 2011, he was named the winner of the International Prize at the prestigious Amalfi Coast Media Awards in Italy. In naming Mr. Fisk, the jury noted that his reporting epitomized “objectivity and a desire to bring the news, whatever the cost.”

### Charles Merriam Award

The Charles Merriam Award recognizes a person whose published work and career represent a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research.

*Award Committee:* Katherine Tate, University of California, Irvine (Chair); Michael S. Lewis-Beck, University of Iowa; B. Dan Wood, Texas A&M University

*Recipient:* **Robert Axelrod**, University of Michigan

*Citation:* The Charles E. Merriam Award was established by the American Political Science Association to recognize a person whose published work and career represent a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social

science research. Robert Axelrod’s career exemplifies what was intended for the award.

He has made huge contributions toward our understanding of conflict, the evolution of cooperation, and the management of complexity. His work has been published not only in top political science journals and presses, but also in multidisciplinary and scientific outlets, such as *Scientific American*, *Discover*, *Science*, and *Nature*. He is among the most cited political scientists in the world.

For his many scholarly contributions, Professor Axelrod has been elected to the National Academy of Sciences. A paper he coauthored with the famous biologist William Hamilton won the Newcomb Cleveland Prize for the most outstanding paper published in 1981. He was elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1985 and the American Philosophical Society in 2004. He was named the MacArthur Prize Fellow in 1987. The list goes on.

As intended for the award, Professor Axelrod’s research has also made major contributions to the applied world. His application of tit-for-tat games were used to explain why soldiers at various points along the trenches between France and Germany during World War I progressively modified their behavior in response to actions of their adversaries in ways that led to the coordinated cessation of fighting during meals and holidays, and to understand the willingness to shoot to miss rather than shoot to kill despite the consternation of commanding officers. Professor Axelrod’s insights have been used to assist the United Nations, the World Bank, the U.S. Department of Defense, and various organizations servicing health care professionals, business leaders, and K-12 educators in more contemporary and less turbulent settings. Two of his articles on cooperation take on enormously important substantive problems: governing the Internet and cooperation among cancer cells. His book *The Complexity of Cooperation* proposed a mechanism of differential attachment to explain thick cultural boundaries. The model proposed in this book has influenced work in sociology and computer science.

Like Charles Merriam, Robert Axelrod has had a career that combined “innovative political and social science scholarship and practical service to the community and nation.” For example, he has worked for some time behind the scenes to help the Israeli and Syrian governments toward signing a comprehensive peace accord. He has also worked for years to facilitate cooperation between feuding parties in the Middle East.

Professor Axelrod has also served on three National Academy of Sciences panels: one on energy consumption and production; a second on preventing nuclear war; and a third on international security and arms control. He is also an associate of the Council for a Community of Democracies.

And this service to the nation and world fails even to consider his exemplary service to the discipline of political science, where he has been Secretary, Vice-President, and President of the APSA.

In the view of the Merriam Award Committee consisting of Katherine Tate, Michael S. Lewis-Beck, and myself, there is currently no one more deserving of this award than Professor Axelrod. Thus, it is with great pleasure that we present it to him.

### BOOK AWARDS

#### Ralph J. Bunche Award

The Ralph J. Bunche Award is given for the best scholarly work in political science published in the previous calendar year which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

*Award Committee:* Lisa Garcia Bedolla, University of California, Berkeley (Chair); Geeta Chowdhry, Northern Arizona University; Michael G. Hanchard, Johns Hopkins University

*Recipient:* **Cristina Beltrán**, Haverford College

*Title:* *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity*, Oxford University Press

*Citation:* In *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity*, Cristina Beltrán cogently argues for a new conceptualization of Latinidad, one that does not see unity (and therefore the absence of discord and dissent) as its foundation. Beltrán makes this powerful argument by carefully and artfully weaving together the work of political theorists such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Iris Marion Young, Judith Butler, and Hannah Arendt, among others, with the historical documents and performances of the Chicano and Puerto Rican movements in order to create a new vision and understanding this critical, foundational moment within Latino political development in the United States. She then explores how popular interpretations of the “Latino vote” and 2006 immigration marches are in many ways reflections of these foundational constructions. In her analysis, Beltrán characterizes (p. 126) the Latino electorate as an aggregate rather than as an electorate, reminding read-

ers that the construction of that aggregate into an electorate is a political process that cannot be taken for granted and that must remain, by definition, incomplete. Similarly, she argues (on p. 157) that we need to conceptualize Latino politics as something subjects do, rather than a set of attitudes and interests they already share, bringing to light an ontological and epistemological flaw that underlies much Latino politics research. Conceptualizing Latino identity as a site of “permanent political contest” (p. 161) fundamentally alters the types of questions Latino politics scholars should ask and the types of data they would need to elicit in order to answer those questions. As Beltrán (p. 167) states, such a reading of Latino pan-ethnicity “finds value in its capacity to be decentered, opportunistic, and expansive.” This constitutes an altogether new conception of *Latinidad*, one that runs counter, as Beltrán points out, to the dominant public discourses about Latinos in United States academics and politics. Yet, this reading of *Latinidad* has significantly more democratic and emancipatory potential than one that imposes a false unity upon a diverse and increasingly complex racialized group within American society.

In *Trouble with Unity*, Beltrán develops a new paradigm with which to conceptualize and consider Latino political identification, expression, and movement making. This paradigm comprises a creative fusion of theoretical analysis, historical institutionalism, literary critique, and feminist epistemology. The result is a rich and remarkably insightful reading of why the Chicano and Puerto Rican movements, along with the political incorporation they fostered, have been unable to achieve their democratic or inclusionary potentials. In this way, Beltrán uses the tools of political theory in order to draw profound insights into how the politics of community, race, gender, affect constructions and understandings of *Latinidad*. The result is a deeply powerful book that is certain to have a significant impact within political science, sociology, Latino studies, American studies, and ethnic studies.

#### Gladys M. Kammerer Award

The Gladys M. Kammerer Award is given for the best political science publication in the previous calendar year in the field of US national policy.

*Award Committee:* Daniel A. Mazmanian, University of Southern California (Chair); John G. Geer, Vanderbilt University; Melinda

Gann Hall, Michigan State University

*Recipient:* Sean Farhang, University of California, Berkeley

*Title:* *The Litigation State: Public Regulation and Private Lawsuits in the U.S.*, Princeton University Press

*Citation:* In *The Litigation State*, Sean Farhang presents a path-breaking account of the power of Congress to shape fundamental civil rights by relying on private litigation as an enforcement mechanism and as an effective alternative to reliance on the administrative power of the bureaucracy. Among numerous aspects of a compelling analysis, Professor Farhang expands the concept of state to include private enforcement regimes as a strategic instrument utilized by Congress to achieve policy goals when faced with politically incongruent Presidents. He also describes how private enforcement regimes work and why Congress adopts them, and presents a rich contextual analysis of the origins and development of important civil rights laws starting with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

*The Litigation State* represents the best of public policy analysis and political science by combining a rigorous theoretical framework with a fascinating blend of investigative tools, including empirical analysis grounded largely in rational choice institutionalism and historical qualitative analysis. This innovative work informs numerous areas of inquiry in political science, including studies of Congress, separation of powers, civil rights, public policy, the regulatory process, and American political development.

#### Victoria Schuck Award

The Victoria Schuck Award is given for the best book published in the previous calendar year on women and politics.

*Award Committee:* Wendy Gunther-Canada, University of Alabama, Birmingham (Chair); Kimberly J. Morgan, George Washington University; Vanita Seth, University of California, Santa Cruz

*Recipients:* Torben Iversen, Harvard University; Frances Rosenbluth, Yale University

*Title:* *Women, Work & Politics: The Political Economy of Gender Inequality*, Yale University Press

*Citation:* In *Women, Work & Politics: The Political Economy of Gender Inequality* (Yale University Press 2010), Torben Iversen and Frances Rosenbluth advance a sophisticated and provocative set of arguments the transformation of gender roles in both the private and public spheres. The authors bring

together macro-level arguments about large-scale structural forces – such as rising rates of female work force participation – together with a micro-level bargaining model to help make sense of cross-national differences in phenomena such as the gender gap in voting, the prevalence of divorce, fertility rates, the representation of women in public office, and the division of household labor. Iversen and Rosenbluth thus tackle some of the biggest questions that have been debated by scholars of women and politics. In so doing, they develop an original perspective, one that applies insights from political economy and the varieties of capitalism to break new ground in longstanding scholarly debates. This is a timely and important study that is worthy of the Victoria Schuck Award.

#### Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award

The Woodrow Wilson Award is given for the best book published in the U.S. during the previous calendar year on government, politics, or international affairs (supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation).

*Award Committee:* Stephen Macedo, Princeton University (Chair); Lee Epstein, Northwestern University; James A. Morone, Brown University

*Recipients:* Robert D. Putnam, Harvard University; David E. Campbell, University of Notre Dame

*Title:* *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*, Simon and Schuster

*Citation:* *American Grace* provides an impressively rigorous and remarkably lucid account of religion’s impact on the cleavages that animate American politics, and that commonalities that hold us together.

The book chronicles the increasing polarization along religious lines that began after the 1950s, as the most and least religious Americans moving to opposite ends of the partisan spectrum, and the moderate religious middle shrank. Today’s landscape is the result of this seismic shift and two aftershocks. The initial quake coincided with the sweeping social changes of the “long 1960’s,” including the challenges to traditional authorities and changing attitudes on family and sexuality, epitomized by a sharp increase in the number of those taking a more permissive attitude to premarital sex. The manifold changes of this era were accompanied by declines in religious observance and Americans’ sense of religion’s importance. The first aftershock, in the 1970s and 80s, witnessed an upturn in religiosity and an increasing association of religion with



social conservatism and the Republican Party. A second aftershock is still being felt, as a growing number of Americans—the young in particular—disavow organized religion (though not a personal religious faith) based on their unease with its close association with conservative politics. As Putnam and Campbell show, these religiously unaffiliated “nones” now outnumber Mainline Protestants to compose the third largest “religious” group in the United States.

And yet, in spite of the much-remarked upon partisan divisions, religion also, and more profoundly, unites Americans. Putnam and Campbell’s findings confirm that Americans are, with some notable exceptions, remarkably tolerant – indeed warm – to those of other faiths and no faith. Americans in large numbers change their religious affiliations, and while this allows them to congregate with the like-minded, as the authors report “these clusters are not bunkers.” Mutual acceptance is greatly facilitated by the increasing tendency of Americans to have social ties with persons of other faiths, as neighbors, friends, and family members. One telling consequence is that, while much of the clergy adheres to doctrines that rule out admission to heaven for those outside the true church, Americans overwhelmingly believe that all good people go to heaven. So polarization has generally not been accompanied by faith-based segregation or hostility.

Among the most impressive discussions in this book, we single out one that illuminates the microfoundations of religion’s apparent contributions to civic life. Religious Americans are more civically active and trusting of others, and more apt to give their time and money to charities, including secular charities. Putnam and Campbell furnish evidence suggesting that the increased civic activity is not the result of increased religiosity as such (in the sense of belief or intensity of belief), rather, what matters are religious social networks: having friends from church. So the positive civic effects apply to those religious doubters who nevertheless attend church—perhaps with a more devout spouse – and participate in its social affairs. What seems to matter are the church-based friendships and activities, not the intensity or character of religious belief. In addition, making friends at what may seem like the secular equivalents of churches – such as the PTA or Rotary Club – does not have the same pro-civic effects.

The news is not all good. Deeply observant religious people are more generous with their own time and money than their less

religious fellows, but they are less supportive of government policies to address the structural causes of poverty. Religious Americans are less tolerant of dissent, and Americans’ warmth toward people of other faiths chills with respect to Mormons and especially Muslims. The reason that the authors suggest is that Americans are less likely to know personally people of these faiths.

While many of the findings of *American Grace* are confirmatory rather than revisionist, the book deepens our understanding in a wide variety of ways. Its analysis brings richness of detail and social scientific rigor to some of our most important and enduring political questions. The authors conducted two large surveys, and drew on a wide range of other publicly available data sets, testing their own finding against others and seeking convergent validation. Their study is further enriched and enlivened by its broad historical overview and by a series of congregational vignettes at various places of worship across the country which both vivify the findings and enliven the narrative. We applaud the authors’ painstaking diligence in so thoroughly cross-checking their findings, and also their capacity to present the results of their work in such readable prose and clear graphic form.

In short, we think this impressive book is exemplary in its combining the highest standards of social scientific rigor, with a clarity and accessibility that is too rare in the social sciences. The authors have produced a major work of political science that illuminates some of the most important questions of our time, and in a form that is fully accessible to the attentive reader.

#### PAPER AND ARTICLE

##### Franklin L. Burdette Award

The Franklin L. Burdette Award is awarded for the best paper presented at the previous annual meeting.

*Award Committee:* Alastair Smith, New York University (Chair); Peter D. Breiner, University at Albany, SUNY; Caroline J. Tolbert, University of Iowa

*Recipients:* Dennis Chong, Northwestern University; James N. Druckman, Northwestern University

*Title:* “Dynamic Public Opinion: Communication Effects Over Time”

*Citation:* The committee has unanimously chosen the paper by Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman, entitled “Dynamic Public Opinion: Communication Effects Over

Time” for the Burdette Award. Unlike much work in public opinion research that focuses on the short run effects of mass communications on citizens, this paper seeks to test the durability of political messages over time with a particular focus on how individuals process messages on controversial issues. Employing two experimental studies, Chong and Druckman find an innovative way of testing whether it is true that controversial political messages fade over time, as is so often argued, or whether the sequence of messages effects both which message will be adhered to and whether all individuals react to the sequence of political messages in the same way. What they find is a complex series of effects depending on whether an individual has had prior exposure to a political message, say regarding aid to the poor or abortion or civil liberties, and on whether the message is followed by a conflicting one. While they show a one time exposure washes out, they also show that different kinds of people will react differently to the same sequence of conflicting messages over time. Indeed one of their more significant findings is that we can distinguish the durability of political frameworks within which messages are sent according to the type of person receiving the message: one kind of person critically evaluates principles and thus will often adhere to one of the conflicting principles over time; a second kind of person gathers information about an issue and then draws an overall evaluation that hardens over time, and this person surprisingly will be most influenced by the first frame in which messages are presented while those individuals who rely only on information from their memory but never form an evaluation will tend to stick to the last frame to which they have been exposed. While the authors are aware of the limitations of their experimental method, given that it applies better to issues where there is not a strong substantive partisan divide, they have found a most innovative way of explaining the complex process by which political messages influence public opinion over time. And their conclusions will force students of public opinion to rethink the way they have studied this problem up to now.

##### Heinz I. Eulau Award (*American Political Science Review*)

The Heinz I. Eulau Award is given for the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during the previous calendar year.

*Award Committee:* Carol C. Gould, Temple

University (Chair); Catherine Boone, University of Texas at Austin; Dean P. Lacy, Dartmouth University

**Recipient:** **Michael A. Neblo**, Ohio State University; **Kevin M. Esterling**, University of California, Riverside; **Ryan P. Kennedy**, University of Houston; **David M.J. Lazer**, Northeastern University; **Anand E. Sokhey**, University of Colorado, Boulder

**Title:** "Who Wants to Deliberate--And Why?" *American Political Science Review* 104(3): 566-83.

**Citation:** "Who Wants to Deliberate – And Why?" offers a theoretical advance, a sharp turn, and a methodological innovation in the literature on deliberative democracy. The theoretical advance is the authors' introduction of the idea that people's preferences for deliberating political issues may depend on their beliefs about whether politicians are self-serving and government is run by special interests. Using an innovative survey experiment, Neblo, Esterling, Kennedy, Lazar, and Sokhey find that most people support more deliberation when they believe that politicians and the political process are less corrupt. Few people prefer the stealth democracy model of more deliberation when self-serving politicians and special interests have greater influence in government. Prior evidence that people do not want to deliberate may say less about the public's preferences for deliberation and more about their perceptions of the current political process. This theoretical advance leads to a sharp turn in our understanding of public support for deliberative democracy. Where many previous studies conclude that most people dislike politics and avoid deliberating political issues, the authors find significant proportions of the public are willing to deliberate. The people who most want to deliberate are those often left out of conventional electoral and interest group politics: the young, lower income groups, and racial minorities. The authors base their conclusions on an innovative set of large-scale, nationwide survey experiments, including one that allowed people to enter an on-line deliberative session with their Member of Congress. Neblo, Esterling, Kennedy, Lazar, and Sokhey's research moves the important literature on deliberative democracy forward in new and exciting ways by showing us that support for deliberative democracy is more widespread than we once believed. Citizens are very willing to discuss politics when given incentives or opportunities for real deliberation.

### Heinz I. Eulau Award (*Perspectives on Politics*)

The Heinz I. Eulau Award is given for the best article published in *Perspectives on Politics* during the previous calendar year.

**Award Committee:** Carol C. Gould, Temple University (Chair); Pradeep Chhibber, University of California, Berkeley; Karen M. Kaufmann, University of Maryland, College Park

**Recipient:** **Mary Fainsod Katzenstein**, Cornell University; **Leila Mohsen Ibrahim**, Cornell University; **Katherine D. Rubin**, The Bronx Defenders

**Title:** "The Dark Side of American Liberalism and Felony Disenfranchisement." (*Perspectives on Politics*, December 2010, Vol. 8/No. 4, pp. 1035-1054).

**Citation:** "The Dark Side of American Liberalism and Felony Disenfranchisement" extends a growing body of academic inquiry into liberalism in innovative directions that insightfully connect political theory, the history of American political thought, and public policy. Katzenstein, Ibrahim, and Rubin argue that the history of racialized felony disenfranchisement in the United States betrays an exclusionary politics that is embedded in American liberalism. The article discerns in concrete judicial, legislative, and policy debates three strands of liberalism that variously appeal to purportedly universal and impartial notions of intentional discrimination, social contract, and individual responsibility but that in fact paradoxically function to buttress exclusionary notions of citizenship. This article provides a trenchant and original analysis that serves to deepen our understanding of American liberalism as both theory and practice.

### DISSERTATION AWARDS

#### Gabriel A. Almond Award

The Gabriel A. Almond Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of comparative politics.

**Award Committee:** Cynthia McClintock, George Washington University (Chair); Todd Landman, University of Essex; Scott Straus, University of Wisconsin, Madison

**Recipient:** **Brian Min**, University of Michigan

**Title:** "Democracy and Light: Public Service Provision in the Developing World" (University of California, Los Angeles)

**Citation:** "Democracy and Light" is a highly original and innovative study of the relationship between democracy and public goods. The tangible benefits of democracy

have been a mainstay interest of comparative politics since Seymour Martin Lipset's seminal work *Political Man*. Large-N, small-N and single country studies have all sought to examine different dimensions of this core research question and have included variables such as the level and quality of economic development, inter-state and intra-state conflict, environmental protection, trade, and the protection of human rights to name a few. Min follows on from the Large-N tradition and presents a hugely impressive analysis of the relationship between democracy and public goods using standard measures of democracy combined with satellite image data on the provision of electrical light sources. The satellite data provide a uniquely objective source of information on the global distribution of light provision in ways that have simply not been done before. Grounded in a institutional rational set of arguments, the thesis examines the conditions under which public good provision responds to demand. In addition to the large-N analysis, the thesis also contains an in depth analysis of the relationship in India, the world's largest and arguably poorest democracy. The thesis finds that democracy's requirement to win popular support for governing elites means that on balance democracies will provide more public goods in ways that leader in authoritarian regimes do not. These findings are upheld across a global sample, non-OECD countries, and lesser developed countries, even after controlling for other explanatory variables typical of the economic development literature. The complementary analysis on India (as well as China in parts) shows that not only are democracies better at providing light, but that they are better at providing light to the poorest sections of the population. The findings are in some ways lateral to Sen's observation that there has never been a famine in a democracy, and does so in political survival terms (electoral accountability).

The committee is very impressed with the uniqueness of this study and its very clever use of data. While it fits squarely in the tradition of comparative politics and the spirit of Gabriel Almond, it also shows a creative advance that draws on the changing access to technology that scholars have today. We are confident that this thesis will go down as a significant achievement in the field of comparative politics to which numerous references will now be made.

#### William Anderson Award

The William Anderson Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of

state and local politics, federalism, or inter-governmental relations.

*Award Committee:* Barbara Norrand-er, University of Arizona (Chair); Lilliard E. Richardson, Jr., University of Missouri, Columbia; Frank J. Thompson, Rutgers University

*Recipient:* Michael Callaghan Pisapia, Elizabethtown College

*Title:* "Public Education and the Role of Women in American Political Development, 1852–1979" (University of Wisconsin, Madison)

*Citation:* The members of the William Andersen Award Committee have selected Michael Callaghan Pisapia as the 2011 winner. He received his PhD from the University of Wisconsin-Madison under the direction of John Coleman (chair), Benjamin Marquez, John White, Howard Schweber and William Reese.

Professor Pisapia's dissertation, "Public Education and the Role of Women in American Political Development, 1852–1979," traces the increasingly inter-governmental structure of American public education as the state and federal governments moved into the traditional territory of local entities. Pisapia further demonstrates how through their increasing role in education state governments expanded their fiscal and administrative authority. He also shows how women found dramatically greater opportunities for civic and political involvement in the public debates over education reform and in its implementation. Pisapia draws on variety of data sources and analytic techniques. He adroitly blends historical and quantitative methods and his arguments always include a depiction of variations across regions and states. Thus, Pisapia's has written a theoretically rich, analytically sound dissertation that casts new light on the interaction between all three levels of the federal system and the role of women in American political development.

**Edward S. Corwin Award**

The Edward S. Corwin Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public law.

*Award Committee:* Jennifer Nedelsky, University of Toronto (Chair); Kristin Bumiller, Amherst College; Michael W. McCann, University Of Washington, Seattle

*Recipient:* Emily Zackin, Hunter College (CUNY)

*Title:* "Positive Constitutional Rights in

the United States" (Princeton University)

*Citation:* Emily Zackin's dissertation, "Positive Constitutional Rights in the United States," provides a fresh examination of positive lawmaking through state constitutional change. She challenges the notion that the United States lacks positive constitutional rights by showing how mandates in state constitutions reflect serious commitments to an active state. The dissertation offers compelling evidence establishing the importance of state constitutional action throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century. Her argument is adroitly presented by examining state action regarding education reform, labor regulation, and environmental protection. In these case studies, Zackin demonstrates how social movements have instigated state constitutional change as part of a larger strategy for policy reform. The analysis highlights how these constitutional provisions were designed not solely to provide avenues for individual litigants in the courts, but to set a moral direction for lasting reform. Her path breaking research has profound implications for how we understand political innovation in a federal system and illuminates the often under recognized significance of how social movements shape state constitutional rights.

**Harold D. Lasswell Award**

The Harold D. Lasswell Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of policy studies (supported by the Policy Studies Organization).

*Award Committee:* Michael E. Kraft, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay; Isabela Mares, Columbia University; Emma R. Norman, University of the Americas

*Recipient:* Jennifer Kavanagh, RAND Corporation

*Title:* "The Dynamics of Protracted Terror Campaigns: Domestic Politics, Terrorist Violence, and Counterterror Responses" (University of Michigan)

*Citation:* The Harold K. Lasswell Award for 2011 goes to Jennifer Kavanagh for her dissertation "The Dynamics of Protracted Terror Campaigns: Domestic Politics, Terrorist Violence, and Counterterror Responses." Her thesis was completed at the University of Michigan in 2011 under the direction of Professors James D. Morrow and Melvyn Levitsky. Additional members of the dissertation committee were Professors Robert J. Franzese, Jr. and Allan C. Stam.

The award committee noted with great pleasure that Kavanagh's dissertation is very much in the spirit of Harold Lasswell's path-

breaking work in fostering the study of public policy. She confronts one of the most critical of contemporary political challenges worldwide: terrorist movements and counterterror policy. Using a variety of creative research methods, Kavanagh's remarkably original, thorough, and persuasive analysis breaks new ground in explaining the rise of terrorism and the range and likely effects of policies available to governments seeking to respond to terrorist attacks.

Kavanagh begins with an astute analysis of the problem of terrorism and its determinants, and also the kinds of responses, both violent and nonviolent, that governments have made to terrorist campaigns. She is particularly attuned to how domestic constituency expectations and demands affect the choice of policy responses that governments have at their disposal, where conflicts can be escalated or deescalated, with dramatically differing short- and long-term results.

The exhaustive, critical, and yet fair, literature review details important gaps in existing research, anachronisms that surprisingly prevail, and previous arguments that have been advanced but without supporting empirical evidence. Kavanagh thereby defines exactly and logically what research questions should be posed today, how they can be studied, how her work stands on the shoulders of what others have done, and precisely where her contribution lies. She offers two highly detailed case studies of Northern Ireland's conflicts with Britain and the Second Intifada involving Israel and Palestinian forces. These are supplemented with four qualitative cases—Sri Lanka, Chechnya, Iraq, and Pakistan—that she hopes will permit greater generalization from her findings.

Using vector autoregression, Kavanagh identifies typical responses to distinct types of attacks and shows how divergent reactions reflect the way each government framed the conflict and viewed the terrorist challenge. Britain, for example, saw IRA supporters as British citizens whereas Israel viewed Palestinians quite differently and therefore was less inclined to be restrained in its responses to terrorist attacks.

The cases demonstrate effectively that state and non-state constituents tend to form expectations about the efficacy of violent, non-violent, or political approaches to protracted conflicts. They do this through what Kavanagh calls "retrospective projection," which combines evaluations of the past, present, and anticipated future. She finds that demands for violence are most likely when the expected benefits of a military-based



strategy exceed the prevailing confidence in existing political alternatives. In cases like this, demands for retaliation by various local constituencies create incentives for both state and non-state actors to use violence to meet public expectations.

Based on this conceptual framework and the elaborate case studies and quantitative analysis, Kavanagh argues that effective counter-terror policies are those that shift the balance between the expected military efficacy and the more optimistic alternative of constraining violence by reducing demands for violence. There is a place for military-based counterterrorism, she notes, but considerable benefits are also yielded by strategies that encourage confidence in political alternatives and help to build public support for them.

Kavanagh emphasizes in conclusion that there are specific types of counterterror strategies that are most likely to encourage significant, lasting de-escalation in protracted conflict violence. She offers well considered policy prescriptions for how to manage conflicts of certain kinds and details how her findings might apply to current U.S. counterterror responses.

This policy analysis is solidly supported by sound, effective, and comprehensive empirical examination. The result is the most thorough and careful analysis of the dynamics of terror attacks and responses to date, and an important and unique contribution to the literature on terrorism and policy responses to it.

### Helen Dwight Reid Award

The Helen Dwight Reid Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of international relations, law and politics (supported by the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation).

*Award Committee:* J. Ann Tickner, University of Southern California (Chair); Robert Henry Cox, University of Oklahoma; Neta C. Crawford, Boston University

*Recipient:* **Daniel Levine**, Colgate University

*Title:* "Critical Wrestlings: The Problem of Sustainable Critique in International Theory" (Johns Hopkins University)

*Citation:* In a thought-provoking and wide-ranging analysis of a multiplicity of international relations and political theory literatures, Daniel Levine challenges International Relations scholars to rethink the artificial division between "normative" and

"value-free" international theory. Challenging the assertion that theory can ever be ethically neutral, Levine claims that normative commitments are almost always present in international theory. To support this claim, he takes us on a far-reaching historical journey through the writings of a broad array of leading theorists, showing that many of them make explicit their normative commitments. However, he proceeds to demonstrate that these normative commitments are rarely sustained throughout the process of theory-building which, in most cases, falls prey to the pitfalls of reification that do not serve to help us better understand our diverse and dangerous world. To construct an International Relations that is dynamic and that can take account of the multiple histories and lived experiences of all peoples in this diverse world, Levine calls upon the discipline to open itself up to critical self-reflection. Drawing on the scholarship of the early Frankfurt School, in particular Theodor Adorno's idea of Negative Dialectics, Levine lays out a methodological framework that he calls "sustainable critique" which, in his words, would hold the theorist of world politics to a high standard of ethical reflexivity.

Besides commending Daniel Levine for such a careful, comprehensive and thoughtful analysis of a vast array of literatures, (the bibliography alone is thirty pages long), the Committee would especially like to congratulate Levine for his courage in challenging all of us, whatever our normative and scientific commitments, to ask ourselves to be critically reflective of our own scholarship and to reexamine our own ethical commitments.

### E.E. Schattschneider Award

The E. E. Schattschneider Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of American government.

*Award Committee:* Eileen McDonagh, Northeastern University (Chair); Timothy R. Johnson, University of Minnesota; S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, University of California, Riverside

*Recipient:* **Adam Seth Levine**, Cornell University

*Title:* "Strategic Solicitation: Explaining When Requests for Political Donations Are Persuasive" (University of Michigan)

*Citation:* In this innovative and rigorous dissertation, Adam Seth Levine employs an experimental design to test the conditions under which people participate in politics. In particular, he explores the relationship between economic resources and political

contributions. His findings that economic troubles increase rather than depress volunteerism contribute crucial insights central to a broad range of fields, including political behavior, political psychology, behavioral economics, and American politics.

### Leo Strauss Award

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of political philosophy.

*Award Committee:* Keith Topper, University of California, Irvine (Chair); Margaret Kohn, University of Toronto; Jacob T. Levy, McGill University

*Recipient:* **Daniel Lee**, University of Toronto

*Title:* "Popular Sovereignty, Roman Law and the Civilian Foundations of the Constitutional State in Early Modern Political Thought" (Princeton University)

*Citation:* We are delighted to present the Leo Strauss Award for the best dissertation in political philosophy to Daniel Lee. Lee's outstanding dissertation, "Popular Sovereignty, Roman Law and the Civilian Foundations of the Constitutional State in Early Modern Political Thought," explores a question of great importance to historians of political thought and contemporary political theorists alike: what are the intellectual origins and conceptual contours of the idea of popular sovereignty? Drawing on and distilling an immense range of historical material, Lee provides an answer to this question that is both strikingly original and convincingly defended. He contends that concepts of Roman private law, such as ownership, usufruct, and guardianship, were appropriated by early modern legists for the purposes of rethinking the relationship between the people, their government, and the state. In short, it is from these largely neglected materials that the doctrine of popular sovereignty is forged.

While other authors have emphasized the importance of Roman public law as a building-block of notions of popular sovereignty, Lee holds that the language of Roman private law is most crucial. Starting from an analysis of key concepts of Roman property law, such as the concept of *dominium*, Lee tells a story about the development of a proprietary theory of Royal power in the work of early modern jurists and various responses to it. While this story includes analyses of familiar figures like Grotius and Bodin, it also emphasizes the contributions of lesser known thinkers such as the French Huguénot *Monarchomachs*, the Calvinist jurist Johannes

Althusias, the German *Reichspublizisten*, and the English Civilians. The result is an absorbing and innovative account of the critical role of Roman private and property law in conceptualizing ideas of popular sovereignty, one that emphasizes the “moments of contingency, crisis, and conflict” that punctuate the origins and development of popular sovereignty doctrine.

Lee’s impressive mastery of Roman law materials and concepts allows the dissertation to bridge numerous intellectual divides: not only between public and private law and between legal and political thought, but also between medieval and early modern ideas. The dissertation reaches outside the canon of works of political theory to recover one of the most important sources drawn on by those works, and in so doing he is able to explain and clarify many particular arguments as well as broad intellectual trends. This is

exemplary work in the history of political thought, and in its restoration of Roman private law to a central place it is likely to be widely influential on the study of a whole range of political ideas that developed in early modernity.

#### **Leonard D. White Award**

The Leonard D. White Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public administration.

*Award Committee:* Mary E. Guy, University of Colorado, Denver (Chair); Carl W. Stenberg, III, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Neal Woods, University of South Carolina

*Recipient:* **Amanda M. Girth**, Ohio State University

*Title:* “Accountability and Discretion in the Age of Contracting: When and Why Do Public Managers Implement Sanctions

for Unsatisfactory Contract Performance?” (American University)

*Citation:* This research is extraordinarily germane to the theory and practice of public management. Girth tackles the subject of accountability in contracting relationships with a focused, well-designed study. Her results illuminate managers’ decisions surrounding if, when, and why contractors are sanctioned for noncompliance. These decisions have a profound impact on the quality of services delivered to citizens and on the accountability of contractors to the public interest. The dissertation contributes to our understanding of how managerial discretion, burdensome sanctioning processes, and dependence on poor performing contractors combine to create complexities in accountability in third party governance. ■

---

## Censure List

---

# Censure List from the American Association of University Professors and Canadian Association of University Teachers

*The following is from the AAUP's website, <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/censureadmins/>. A more detailed explanation and history of the censure list can also be found at this site.*

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the institutions listed below show that, as evidenced by a past violation, they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure approved by this Association, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and more than two hundred other professional and educational organizations which have endorsed the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

This list is published for the purpose of informing Association members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censure list by vote of the Association's annual meeting.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of members at the institution in question.

Members of the Association have often considered it to be their duty, in order to indicate their support of the principles violated, to refrain from accepting appointment to an institution so long as it remains on the censure list. Since circumstances differ widely from case to case, the Association does not assert that such an unqualified obligation exists for its members; it does urge that, before accepting appointments, they seek information on present conditions of academic freedom and tenure from the Association's Washington office and prospective departmental colleagues. The Association leaves it to the discretion of the individual, possessed of the facts, to make the proper decision.

The following list contains the institution name, state, and year censured:

- Grove City College (Pennsylvania), 1963
- Frank Phillips College (Texas), 1969
- Concordia Seminary (Missouri), 1975
- Murray State University (Kentucky), 1976
- State University of New York (New York), 1978
- Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas (Arkansas), 1978
- Nichols College (Massachusetts), 1980
- Yeshiva University (New York), 1982
- American International College (Massachusetts), 1983
- Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri), 1984
- Talladega College (Alabama), 1986
- Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico (Puerto Rico), 1987
- Husson University (Maine), 1987
- Hillsdale College (Michigan), 1988
- Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary (North Carolina), 1989
- The Catholic University of America (Washington, DC), 1990
- Dean College (Massachusetts), 1992
- Baltimore City Community College (Maryland), 1992
- Loma Linda University (California), 1992
- Clarkson College (Nebraska), 1993
- North Greenville College (South Carolina), 1993
- Savannah College of Art and Design (Georgia), 1993
- University of Bridgeport (Connecticut), 1994
- Benedict College (South Carolina), 1994
- Bennington College (Vermont), 1995
- Alaska Pacific University (Alaska), 1995
- St. Bonaventure University (New York), 1996
- National Park Community College (Arkansas), 1996
- Saint Meinrad School of Theology (Indiana), 1997
- Minneapolis College of Art and Design (Minnesota), 1997
- Brigham Young University (Utah), 1998
- University of the District of Columbia (Washington, DC), 1998
- Lawrence Technological University (Michigan), 1998
- Johnson & Wales (Rhode Island), 1999
- Albertus Magnus College (Connecticut), 2000
- Charleston Southern University (South Carolina), 2001
- University of Dubuque (Iowa), 2002
- Meharry Medical College (Tennessee), 2005
- University of the Cumberland (Kentucky), 2005
- Virginia State University (Virginia), 2005
- Our Lady of Holy Cross College (Louisiana), 2007
- Bastyr University (Washington), 2007
- University of New Orleans (Louisiana), 2007
- Loyola University New Orleans (Louisiana), 2007
- Cedarville University (Ohio), 2009
- Nicholls State University (Louisiana), 2009
- North Idaho College (Idaho), 2009
- Stillman College (Alabama), 2009
- Clark Atlanta University (Georgia), 2010
- University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (Texas), 2010
- Bethune Cookman University (Florida), 2011

### CAUT CENSURE LIST

For information on the censure policy from the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), please visit <http://www.caut.org>.

No institutions censured at this time ■