

## 1998 PROGRAM CALL FOR PAPERS: COMMUNITY, COMMUNITIES, AND POLITICS

Program Chair: Virginia Sapiro, Department of Political Science, 1050 Bascom Mall, University of Wisconsin - Madison. Madison, WI 53706. 608-263-2024; 608-265-2663 (fax); [apsa98@polisci.wisc.edu](mailto:apsa98@polisci.wisc.edu).

### The Conference Theme: Community, Communities, and Politics.

The growing preoccupation with *community* in politics and political science is remarkable. Certainly arguments about "communitarianism" have dominated important segments of political philosophy and some other parts of the discipline. But these define only one of many centers of scholarly activity on community; the 1998 meeting will focus on a rich variety. What are the connections between specific types of psychological, social, cultural, or institutional ties among people and the workings of political systems and governments? What are the impacts of changes in the underpinnings and definitions of human communities on politics and government? What are the effects of political processes and institutions or law and policy on the nature of human communities?

The community and politics theme permeates political analysis at all levels of inquiry, from behavioral studies of identity and participation at the individual level to the governance structures of international communities. *Community* draws our attention to all political arenas from the local, where "community politics" is a venerable field of inquiry, to the international, the site of grand efforts at community building.

A wealth of research explores the creation, establishment, or institutionalization of political community, especially in democratizing political systems and others undergoing profound transformation, severe ethnic conflict, or changes in the political identity of key social groups. In some polities widely presumed to have been based significantly on "community" or active "civil societies," such as the United States, arguments rage about the loss of community, social capital, or plain old interest in politics. What are the conditions under which a political community weakens or fragments?

Boundaries have special importance in research on community and politics. What are the implications of alternative definitions of community boundaries for politics and government? What are the dynamics of competing demands caused by overlapping community boundaries? Consider a couple of

examples from different fields: Recent preoccupation with identity politics has stimulated considerable research on the politics of community *within* groups defined, e.g. on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, language, religion, or sexuality, but it also suggests important problems of community *across* these groups within the larger society. Certainly the overlap *among* different international communities and *between* international institutions and individual member states engenders critical political problems.

The approaches and methods used to investigate these problems are as eclectic as the discipline itself, including, among others, conceptual and analytical delineation of theoretical questions; cultural studies of "imagined communities"; psychological research on the nature of identification and group consciousness or political trust; sociological investigations of voluntary organizations, political participation, and civic society; exploration of the institutionalization of community boundaries or norms; the variety of theories of public interest, collective choice, and coalition behavior; and of course the perennial normative issues bearing on community.

Finally, this theme may be used reflexively to examine important questions about our own professional communities. Consider ubiquitous claims that the discipline of political science is overly fragmented; that some approaches, methods, or subfields dominate the discipline or its parts in less-than-constructive fashion; that scholarly practices of political science are too divorced from "real world" politics; or that our research and teaching missions not well enough integrated.

There is no division as such devoted to the conference theme. Relevant proposals should be directed to the appropriate division. The Program Chair also welcomes proposals of particular cross-cutting interest, or those that may require special efforts or resources to execute.

NOTA BENE: The division heads ask that proposals follow the APSA format, including *all* requested contact information, format preferences, and a clear exposition of the proposal. All divisions welcome proposals relating to the general conference theme as well as those representing the many questions and approaches found in each corner of the discipline. Most welcome proposals that may be co-sponsored by different divisions. Please consider the variety of available formats. All divisions welcome volunteers for chairs and discussants; offering these forms of contribution to "professional community" will not affect the treatment of your paper, panel, or poster session proposal.

☆Denotes APSA Organized Section

**Division 1. Political Thought and Philosophy:  
Historical Approaches. Isaac Kramnick,  
Cornell University.**

To be human, according to Aristotle, is to live in a community -- one whose telos is not the mere sustenance of life, but the realization of a good and moral life. So it was, too, that the agenda was set for much of the history of political philosophy by the linking of the very word politics to the ancient Greek community, the Polis. The theme of "Community, Communities, and Politics" should elicit papers, then, from scholars working in every historical period of political thought, which may engage the notion of community from a variety of approaches and perspectives.

Just as Greek politics emphasized the importance of community, so, too, the Middle Ages had the universal community of Christian believers, even as specific urban republics kept alive civic humanism's privileging of communal "public things." One can also structure the developments of early modern political theory around the theme of community, with the emphasis on the individual in liberal writers Hobbes and Locke in turn answered by Rousseau and Burke, each with their different conceptions of community. In the nineteenth century, the debate over community dominates social and political thought, whether it be in Bentham's tortured ambivalence on the subject, Hegel's resurrection of the state as medieval "*communitas communitatum*" or in social theorists' lamentation that an impersonal civil society was destroying the affective connections of the traditional community.

Anarchist and socialist writers explored the idea of community as did the pluralists and syndicalists at the turn of the twentieth century with their urge to replace the abstract state with more meaningful functional communities. In recent political thought one sees community everywhere. Identity politics focuses on new configurations of community, and recent writings on nationalism explore the rhetoric and reality of community. Meanwhile, the communitarian assault on individualist preoccupations with rights and the vigorous rebuttal by unashamed liberals dominates the discourse of contemporary political theory. Although "Community, Communities, and Politics" is the very heart of inquiry for students of political philosophy, we welcome engaging papers and panels on all themes.

**☆Division 2. Foundations of Political Theory.  
Jeremy Waldron, Columbia University.**

The Foundations division continues its traditional search for proposals promising participants and audiences a chance to reflect on new ideas, insights and controversies.

However, the "Community and Politics" theme also provides us with an opportunity in this division to take our rubric unusually seriously. I therefore encourage proposals to explore the various ways in which community and communality are foundational to politics. Examples follow, though I hope also that prospective participants will surprise us with innovative and disconcerting ways of thinking about this relation.

- (1) Are politics and political organization possible among people who do not share strong communal bonds of affection, trust, culture, and kinship? Or should we accept the Hobbesian view that politics is necessary precisely among those who, not bound together by community, distrust one another?
- (2) Is *community* helpful in theorizing territoriality, boundaries, citizenship and immigration issues? How uncomfortably does it sit with globalism, cosmopolitanism, and the emergence of multi-state institutions like the EU?
- (3) Do notions like *community of interest* and *the common good* have any role to play in modern political theory, or have they been superseded by aggregative and utilitarian ideas?
- (4) How much are we in thrall to outdated notions of community? Should we stick with small-scale ideas organized around *gemeinschaft*, ethnicity, and town meetings, or should we examine alternative notions such as the international community of scientists, the sense of community that characterizes large scale social movements, the global sense of community or catholicity that pervades major world religions, and senses of community that are bound up more with the infrastructures of civilizations than with infrastructures of neighborhoods?

Although some proposals will surely revisit the debate between liberalism and communitarianism, I hope the majority of panels will address topics like those above or others loosely related to the conference theme in ways that go beyond that well-worked antithesis, and offer fresh ways of thinking about the place of community in the foundations of political theory.

**Division 3. Normative Political Theory. Marion Smiley, University of Wisconsin - Madison.**

The nature and scope of community membership, as well as the means of overcoming communal conflict, have changed in important ways during recent decades. They have done so as the result of political developments both local and global in scope. The theme "Community and Communities" provides an excellent opportunity to address the normative questions raised by these changes, as well as the variety of concerns associated with the legitimacy of particular institutions and the appropriateness of existing theoretical approaches to understanding them. I welcome proposals on all topics in normative political theory but will give preference to proposals that focus on the following aspects of the topic "Community and Communities."

(1) Normative Theories of Political Community. Do liberal, communitarian, or social democratic theories provide us with an adequate framework for developing political institutions in late 20th Century communities? What sorts of theories might enable us to deal with the overlapping and frequently conflicting communities associated with both liberal and non-liberal states? How, if at all, might various normative theories of politics, e.g. those associated with communicative ethics, pragmatism, or natural law, be translated into practice?

(2) Citizenship and Group Membership. Are conservatives right to claim that the practice of rights has undermined the value of citizenship in contemporary U.S. society? How, if at all, are our understandings of citizenship gendered and racialized? Does the modern notion of citizenship rest on a particular understanding of independence or autonomy? What, if anything, is the relationship between ethnic and civic nationalism? How might notions of citizenship be reformulated with the breakdown of communal boundaries in a global context?

(3) Practices and Policies. How, if at all, can we incorporate the cultural and religious commitments of particular groups into a democratic polity? What distributional policies follow from a commitment to political democracy? Are existing notions of equality, justice or empowerment adequate to conceptualizing the welfare state? If not, how might they be reformulated? Finally, are normative claims such as those associated with human rights appropriate in an international context, e.g. when made by one community about another community's politics?

**Division 4. Formal Political Theory. Thomas Hammond, Michigan State University.**

Formal theory helps us convert our intuitive hunches about how the political world works into rigorous efforts to determine whether these hunches are correct. For example, it helps us clarify our premises, characterize complex political processes, deduce outcomes, specify statistical tests for empirical evaluation, and generate further hypotheses.

Among the different kinds of formal theory are game theory, social choice theory, spatial models, and evolutionary models; each may be useful for addressing topics on the conference theme, "Community, Communities, and Politics." For example,

- \* What insights can evolutionary models provide into the development and sustainability of different community political cultures?
- \* What can axiomatic social choice theory tell us about the logical coherence of communitarian philosophies and their implications for public policy?
- \* Can formal theory provide insights into the development of personal and collective identities within communities structured by different kinds of electoral and legislative institutions?

In addition to such theme-related topics, proposals may engage substantive issues from any political science subfield. Questions like the following might be considered:

- \* Legal systems revolve around judges who make decisions in legal disputes, but in the formal literature on the interaction of judges with other institutions, there is not yet agreement on how judges should be modeled. Can formal theory make a further contribution?
- \* An informal literature on issue framing and agenda setting in the policymaking process coexists with a formal literature on agenda control in voting bodies, but it is difficult to apply the formal results to the informal literature. Can formal theory do more to illuminate issue framing and agenda setting?
- \* Municipal governments in the U.S. have greater institutional variety than other levels of government, yet formal theorists have largely ignored them. Can formal models of municipal governments provide a useful way of testing theories of political institutions?

Finally, proposals may involve theoretical or

experimental issues arising from within formal theory itself. For example,

\* In game-theoretic approaches to political institutions, what are the benefits and costs of models based on noncooperative games as compared to cooperative games?

\* Models based on persons with perfect rationality sometimes produce the same results as models based on persons with limited rationality; when will results from the two classes of models be the same and when will they differ?

#### ☆Division 5. Political Psychology. Diana Owen, Georgetown University

The theme of "Community, Communities, and Politics" offers significant opportunities to examine central issues of concern to the field of political psychology. Submissions related to the following areas of inquiry are encouraged:

(1) Issues related to the motivations for forming and becoming involved in political communities long have been important to theorists and political psychologists. Some questions that might be addressed in this regard include: What are the linkages between personality structure and the dynamics of community relationships? What is the relationship between the psychological connections among individuals and the functioning of governmental institutions and political systems?

(2) The psychology of leadership and followership in political communities is another fertile area for investigation. Research might focus on the motivations for leadership, the relationship between leadership and personality, and the interaction between leaders and followers. Issues surrounding the dilemmas faced by leaders and followers in communitarian relationships also might be addressed.

(3) The psychological underpinnings of political identity and their influence on political community is a domain ripe for investigation. Research in this area might focus on the nature and formation of individual and group consciousness in the community context.

(4) Technological advancements historically have worked to alter and broaden the definition of community. In the present era, for example, communications technologies have fostered the creation of virtual political communities. Some related questions include: Does talk radio foster communitarian bonds among hosts, listeners, and

callers? What are the psychological aspects of cybercommunities?

The field of political psychology invites questions that cross disciplinary boundaries. International and crosscultural perspectives are welcome. Studies which employ creative theoretical frameworks and methodologies are encouraged.

#### ☆Division 6. Political Economy. Kathleen Bawn, University of California, Los Angeles.

The conference's general theme of community and communities highlights the most salient feature of the Political Economy Section. That is, we are a diverse group who manage to jointly benefit from our ongoing interactions. The political economy community can generally be divided into two smaller communities. The first consists of scholars who use economic approaches to study political problems of all sorts; the second consists of scholars who use approaches of all sorts to study the politics of economic issues. I believe that this diversity is our section's greatest strength and thus encourage proposals in each of these broad categories, as well as those that span both.

In particular, I invite proposals in the following areas. First, in keeping with the theme of community, I welcome proposals for papers and panels that attempt to extend the powerful tools of microeconomic analysis and game theory to incorporate "fuzzier" concepts such as community, identity, ideology, ideas and morals. Second, I welcome panels and papers that promote gains from trade between different methodological perspectives. Third, I believe that an enduring strength of political economy in all its variants is its insistence that politics is not just about politics per se, but that political processes matter because they determine policy choices that in turn determine who in society wins and loses. For this reason, I particularly welcome panels and papers which focus on policy outcomes as the dependent variable.

#### ☆Division 7. Politics and History, David Vogel, U. of California, Berkeley and Amy Bridges, U. of California, San Diego.

The Politics and History Section promotes research that links the disciplines of political science and history. We are interested in studies of the history of politics, the historical development of political institutions and the use of historical case-studies as analytic narratives. Such studies can either focus on

particular political systems or be cross-national in focus.

This year, we are particularly interested in proposals for papers or panels that critically examine alternative or competing approaches to the study of politics and history, especially those that promote dialogue among different sub-fields and political and methodological perspectives.

Such papers or panels might critically examine such topics as difference approaches to the study of politics, alternative conceptions of the historical meaning of community in the United States and other societies, the distinctiveness of the understanding of political community in the United States, debates over approaches to and the significance of the study of race, gender, ethnicity and religion in political history, the historical development of political and economic institutions, the relative role of political culture, institutions and interests in explaining cross-national differences, and books that have significantly influenced our understanding of the history of politics. We also encourage panels that span sub-fields within political science and/or are cross-listed with other divisions.

#### ☆Division 8. Political Methodology. Jonathan Nagler, U. of California, Riverside.

Political methodology is a necessary component of most subfields of political science; without it a large part of political science research would be impossible. Once a research question is formed political methodology comes into play: when a hypothesis is to be tested, the question of how to do it is a question of political methodology. Thus political methodology welcomes proposals covering a broad range of topics.

Some topics of special interest include: graphical analysis of data, graphical *presentation* of information, simulation estimators, bayesian approaches, and bootstrapping. As always, the section welcomes papers demonstrating examples of empirical tests of formal theories.

Papers developing new methodological techniques or testing the properties of existing techniques are welcome. But papers submitted to the political methodology panels do *not* need to develop a new estimator or apply a technique developed within the last six months. We welcome papers applying a methodological technique to a problem where the methodological technique allows for the discovery of new information, or calls into question previously discovered 'truths.' This could be a new

methodological technique whose use requires half the Greek alphabet, or it could be a simple and straightforward technique that has simply never been applied to the problem at hand before.

In short, we welcome proposals from the entire community of scholars interested in problems of political methodology.

#### Division 9. Teaching & Learning in Political Science. Kristi Andersen, Syracuse University.

Declining enrollments and increased scrutiny of the "value added" of higher education have prompted many institutions to re-focus on the quality of the undergraduate education they provide. Many colleges and universities are trying hard to create "communities of learning" where undergraduate students take an active role in acquiring and processing political knowledge. Meanwhile, a number of programs have been initiated which work to better prepare graduate students both for the teaching duties they assume during their graduate education and for their later responsibilities and roles as faculty members. We often see graduate education and undergraduate education as two very separate spheres, but I am interested in keeping with the program theme "community, communities, and politics" -- in looking at the ways that these spheres intersect.

I encourage papers, roundtables and panels which examine the ways that graduate and undergraduate education in political science are carried out in conflicting or compatible ways. Does graduate education today adequately prepare Ph.D. students to take an active role in disciplinary, departmental and institutional communities? Does it prepare them to understand and productively work with the undergraduate students from a variety of communities and backgrounds? Are there ways that we can focus on and learn from what happens in the sites where graduate and undergraduate students interact e.g. discussion sections, introductory courses, internship programs? Can we use graduate students, for example, effectively to communicate the excitement of research to undergraduates for whom the "disciplinary community" may be fairly irrelevant? What aspects of their roles as teachers of undergraduates do young faculty members wish their Ph.D. programs had prepared them for? These questions are meant to stimulate proposals addressing a wide range of issues in graduate and undergraduate education.

☆Division 10. Undergraduate Education.  
Richard Battistoni, Providence College.

This year's theme raises a number of provocative questions for our teaching. The subject matter of our teaching and research may be increasingly preoccupied with questions of community, but what about our pedagogy? Should we be concerned about the creation of community within our classrooms, between students and teachers, between our campuses and the larger communities of which they are a part? If so, what undergraduate teaching strategies are most conducive to building "social capital," especially for those who teach large numbers of students? As we know, traditional approaches to teaching and learning about politics and community tend to isolate student learners, through individualized research and writing assignments and through evaluation. Even some forms of experiential learning (e.g., individualized internship placements) do this. Proposals which address ways of overcoming this individualization of undergraduate learning--and of assessing this seemingly intangible element of community building--are strongly encouraged.

Experiential and service-learning, increasingly popular among political scientists, is often associated with a more communitarian theory of politics and of classroom pedagogy. Proposals that address this association would also be welcome. How is community-based learning a more "communitarian" pedagogy? Are there tensions between the goals of socializing students into patterns of responsible community and developing critical thinking skills? How do political science courses that employ community-based learning strategies respond to criticisms about the way campuses relate to the larger communities in which their students "serve" or work?

Finally, this year's theme raises questions for our discipline as a whole. Do declining enrollments in political science courses and majors say something about our own community? Do we have a problem with fragmentation within our undergraduate curriculum in political science? Can new efforts in integrating our curriculum, in developing residential learning opportunities or first-year and capstone seminars, lead to greater community and more effective teaching and learning within our discipline? As always, we welcome a wide variety of proposals for panels, workshops, roundtables, or other innovative presentations dealing with the question of effective undergraduate education.

☆Division 11. Comparative Politics. George Tsebelis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Within the general theme of the conference, special attention will be paid to political institutions. We welcome proposals of papers and panels focusing on the reasons for the adoption of or the effects of different political and social institutions.

Institutions can be studied as independent variables, focusing on their effects on the composition of different bodies, on prevalent beliefs, norms or behaviors, or on specific outcomes (or mixtures of the above). Examples would include effects of electoral systems on the composition of parliaments, effects of internal party rules on party factionalization, or effects of legislative rules on qualitative characteristics of legislation.

Institutions can also be studied as the consequences of political interactions, either promoting the interests of one group at the expense of another or promoting the interests of all actors in a society (or mixtures of the two). Examples of the first are electoral systems and of the second, solutions to coordination games.

Preference will be given to panels which try to address some specific *question*, as opposed to covering the same *topic*.

Division 12. Comparative Politics of Developing Nations. Jennifer Widner, University of Michigan.

This division encourages panels and papers on topics related to the theme of community, communities, and politics. There are five areas of special concern, although the Division is open to a wide range of subjects.

(1) Citizenship rules, delineated in law as well as through informal, popular norms about the characteristics a good citizen displays define membership in political communities. Comparative studies of citizenship and the re-negotiation of citizenship rules are an appropriate focus.

(2) How do communities define the rights and duties of members? How and why do they vary across societies, as embodied in legislation, court decisions, or public opinion? In different countries, who is winning the debates between those who believe there are universal rights and duties and those who argue that these are culturally specific -- and why?

(3) The effects of community characteristics on political life is a third focus. This category embraces studies of the effects of social capital on political behavior and institutional performance, and comparative analysis of social learning as a cause of changing patterns of political participation or institutional design.

(4) Priority will also be accorded analysis of tolerance and intolerance, the status of the individual and the group; and the public and the private. The emergence of civiness or civil societies, as opposed to sectarian forms of political organization, would fall under this heading, as would studies of the evolution of the norms that surround public debate of policy issues.

(5) Also welcome are topics on the frontier of comparative politics and international relations -- for example, the effect of foreign media and non-governmental organizations on local conceptions of community boundaries, character, or duties; the implications of assimilation v. camp life for the identities of refugees; and analysis of genocide.

**Division 13. Politics of Communist and Post-Communist Countries. Sharon Wolchik, George Washington University.**

In societies previously ruled by communist governments as well as communist countries currently in transition, issues related to community are particularly salient. Restrictions on the formation of independent groups coupled with an ideology that gave very little legitimacy to the demands of subgroups of the population led to the atrophying of citizens' tendencies to band together in informal associations and eroded trust among members of different social groups. With the retreat of the state, citizens have gained opportunities to organize with others for many purposes, including those with decidedly negative impacts such as criminal mafias and protection schemes.

As political elites and citizens take part in challenging existing institutions in communist states and in creating and relating to new political institutions in post-communist states, questions about who is to be seen as a legitimate member of the political community, relations among different communities within states, and the rights of different communities have become critical political issues. These questions have been posed most sharply in terms of ethnicity; but gender, region, age, class, and political orientation, are also salient.

Other important issues include the impact of the communist and pre-communist legacies on definitions

of community in theory, policy, and mass and elite opinion; the institutionalization of different conceptions of community in electoral systems and parties, governmental institutions, and voluntary associations; and the opportunities members of different communities have to raise issues of particular concern to them at the local, regional, and national level and on definitions of community. These definitions have important consequences for the development of democratic values as well as for efforts to recreate civil and political society.

Domestic political debates and decisions regarding these issues are also influenced by outside actors, such as the broader European and Atlantic institutions in the case of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Outside actors and international organizations have also used trade and other incentives to try to influence the treatment of members of various communities in communist states. Papers are welcome on these and other aspects of the topic in communist and post-communist societies. Submissions that focus on the local or regional levels, and on the activities and political impact of voluntary associations and informal groups are particularly encouraged.

**Division 14. Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies. Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University.**

The 1980s was a decade of rapid progress in the comparative analysis of formal political institutions, relations between economy and polity, and strategic interaction in the electoral and the policy-making process. While promising work has continued in this area, the 1990s have witnessed a renaissance of interest in the communitarian foundations of advanced industrial democracies. This avenue of investigation explores how democratic institutions and citizens' political participation rest on tacit assumptions about collective identities ("group") and appropriate conduct among its members ("grid"). The new emphasis on community has not displaced the concern with interests, institutions and strategies, but has created new terms on which comparativists can explore the complementarity or conflict between rational, self-interest based conduct and the normative and cognitive foundations of modern politics. For example, group identifications and "grid" norms may contribute to overcoming problems of collective action and lowering transaction costs in politics. In contrast to self-interest based conventions and institutions, however, the associational-communitarian moorings of contemporary politics may not lend themselves to purposive construction.

The Division on the Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies will incorporate panels representing a wide range of cutting-edge theoretical and empirical studies situated on the research frontier of comparative politics. In the spirit of the conference theme, however, I wish to place particular emphasis on the interface between communitarian group conceptions and the strategic pursuit of political interests in advanced industrial democracies.

Within this broad area, the following themes come to mind:

- \* relations of conflict and collaboration among ethno-cultural groups and their implications for political-economy arrangements (social policy, income distribution, regional conflicts);
- \* communitarian foundations of advanced capitalist political-economic institutions ("cooperative market capitalism") and their transformation under the impact of new technologies and globalized markets;
- \* the mobilization of communitarian identities in electoral competition and party politics;
- \* transnational migration and the changing bases of communitarian group identifications in advanced democracies; and
- \* the choice, revision, or maintenance of democratic institutions in the face of changing communitarian group bases.

**☆Division 15. Politics and Society in Western Europe. Frank Baumgartner, Texas A&M University.**

This division is open to paper and panel proposals on any topic of theoretically driven research on Western Europe. This year's theme of "Community, Communities, and Politics" fits well with many current research topics related to politics in Western Europe, and those proposals that fit well with the theme are certainly encouraged. However Papers and panels on any relevant intellectual and substantive topics using any appropriate methods are welcome. Proposals will be selected primarily based on their potential contribution to important theoretical and empirical questions of interest to those in the profession.

I particularly welcome proposals that seek to address theoretical questions drawn from other areas of political science or from other disciplines, those that address important social, institutional, and political issues with substantial new theories or evidence, those that cover a range of geographic applications, and those that address the themes of community by

focusing on communities at one or more of their various levels: local, regional, national, and European.

Many social, institutional, and political transformations have been affecting politics and society in Western Europe in recent decades, including, most obviously, immigration, de-industrialization, internationalization, and the development of the institutions of the European Union. Proposals offering interpretations of these and other important substantive issues from novel theoretical perspectives and with important new empirical evidence will be especially favored.

The format of panels will vary in order to encourage the greatest amount of scholarly and intellectual exchange during the meetings. They include the traditional presenters-and-discussant format, but also round-tables, meet-the-author sessions, panels where the discussants present the papers, offering both a summary and a set of comments, and other formats. The idea will be to use the appropriate format to ensure a maximum amount of exchange rather than merely the presentation of a series of papers. Proposals for entire panels are encouraged to think of alternative formats.

**Division 16. International Political Economy. Ethan Kapstein, University of Minnesota.**

"Community, Communities and Politics," provides a thought-provoking starting-point for organizing IPE-related panels. Around the world, communities are confronting the effects of an increasingly global economy on their traditional ways of life, and in some cases they do not like what they see. From France to Korea, working people are beginning to associate the global economy with such problems in the labor market as unemployment, job insecurity, wage stagnation, and income inequality. Politicians in many countries are taking advantage of this perception to question whether increasing openness is good for social welfare. At the same time, more and more countries are jumping on the bandwagon of economic reform as they seek to participate in the international division of labor. The costs and benefits associated with greater economic integration are thus central to ongoing political, policy, and theoretical debates in communities everywhere.

I invite panels that examine issues on the interface of international and comparative political economy, and that explore the systemic pressures being placed on societies and communities by increasing levels of trade, investment, and financial flows. I would also welcome proposals on such themes as international economic justice and issues of redistribution. The evolving role of international economic institutions will



hopefully be treated in some sessions. Further, panels that present significant research on non-state actors, including multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations, are also encouraged.

The theme of community also refers to the community of scholars and participants engaged in debates over the international political economy. I encourage panels that bring together scholars from different fields, including economics, history, and philosophy, in order to enrich our discussions. In addition, efforts should be made to include practitioners from the policy, business, and NGO worlds on our panels. Finally, proposals which assess the field of IPE, including its record of contributions and future directions, are also acceptable.

#### **Division 17. International Collaboration. George Downs, Princeton University.**

The politics surrounding events such as the ongoing evolution of multilateral institutions like the EU and WTO have combined with an ever-increasing appreciation of the link between domestic and international politics continue to inspire an astonishing amount of research on the determinants, character, and impact of international cooperation. The Division on International Collaboration has traditionally celebrated this diversity, and I invite proposals for individual papers, panels, and roundtables that explore any aspect of international cooperation. Some productive possibilities include topics such as: the growing connection between domestic and international law; the potential of regional peacekeeping; the design of multilateral institutions; the potential of trade-environment linkage strategies; the impact of democratization on the growth and effectiveness of multilateral institutions; the proliferation of international institutions and its consequences; the potential of compensation strategies as tools for promoting cooperation; and the evolving role of nonstate actors.

In keeping with the overall theme of the convention, research on the role of community is particularly encouraged. Since cooperation is potentially both promoted by a sense of community among states and operates to increase it, this research might take any number of forms. One could, for example, continue the tradition of trying to quantitatively assess the extent to which a common culture, economic system, or type of government increases the likelihood of meaningful interstate cooperation. Alternatively, one could investigate the extent to which regional and subregional communities inhibit the evolution of global cooperation. Research on the extent to which policy cooperation tends to "spill over" to promote the

development of community, however conceptualized, would be equally attractive.

#### **Division 18. International Security. Charles Kupchan, Georgetown University.**

Debate rages over the nature of the emerging international system. More optimistic assessments contend that the spread of democracy and shared norms should lead to unprecedented peace and stability. More pessimistic accounts suggest that the current period represents only a hiatus; rivalry among major powers will soon return.

Advancing this debate entails theorizing about and examining empirically the notion of community at the inter-state level. Has the spread of shared norms and identity succeeded in carving out a pocket of nonanarchic space -- a community of states no longer playing by Hobbesian rules? Can the language and variables used to study community *inside* states also be used to study community *among* them? What insights can different intellectual traditions within the field bring to the study of transnational community?

Globalism is also central to debates about the emerging landscape, but for *globalism* to have analytic utility, we must unpack its component parts. Is economic interdependence different quantitatively or qualitatively than in previous historical periods? Are global markets and international capital flows having consequential effects on domestic politics? Does economic regionalism have important spillover effects in the security realm? What discrete propositions about peace and war can we derive from the rapid spread of information technology?

By definition communities include some actors and exclude others. At the level of national politics, exclusion produces conflict between both majority and minority groups and between winners and losers in socio-economic terms. At the level of international politics, it produces new dividing lines. How can rising powers be peacefully integrated into the international community? What role should international institutions play in overcoming dividing lines or regulating relations across them? What can be done to alleviate widening gaps between the haves and the have-nots in the international system?

The answers to these questions will contribute to both analytic and prescriptive debate about the emerging structure of international politics and the appropriate grand strategies of major actors. Contentious argument about the clash of civilization, the end of history, and the rest against the West notwithstanding, this debate has been disappointingly thin. New

paradigms and fresh perspectives will enrich not only the field of international security, but efforts to fashion a more peaceful international order.

☆**Division 19. International Security and Arms Control. James J. Wirtz, Naval Postgraduate School.**

Arms Control is no longer just a bilateral enterprise. Increasingly, arms control initiatives, such as the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions, are intended to serve global humanitarian interests. But is this multilateral perspective, which hints at the existence of an international community sharing fundamental security concerns, adept at easing specific bilateral rivalries that often produce armed conflict? Is an epistemic community of arms control advocates succeeding in influencing the defense policies that animate a score of enduring rivalries across the globe, or will an arms control philosophy that emphasizes communitarian objectives come into conflict with foreign and defense policies that have a bilateral focus? By contrast, are global trends like the proliferation of ballistic missiles threatening to overwhelm bilateral treaties like the longstanding Russian-American agreement to deemphasize missile defense? Are regional developments, for example the process and prospects of NATO enlargement, making Cold-War arms control agreements superfluous? For that matter, is the increasing commercialization of defense related technology, reflected in nascent interest in information warfare and the military-technical revolution, threatening to undermine arms control as an instrument of 21st century statecraft? In sum, do current arms control initiatives respond to next century's nascent security threats, or does multilateral arms control only represent a least common denominator approach to international security? Proposals that address these and related questions would be especially welcome.

☆**Division 20. Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy/Foreign Policy Analysis. Kurt Taylor Gaubatz, Stanford University.**

The Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy and Foreign Policy Analysis section brings together theoretical and policy oriented work with a common focus on foreign policy issues. I will be looking this year for both policy oriented and theoretical papers and panels, and particularly for work that brings the theory and policy communities together and that cuts across traditional methodological lines.

While I am open to the range of subject matter that can fall under this broad rubric, I am particularly interested in work addressing the changing nature of foreign policy communities in the post-cold war environment. How is foreign policy changing in an era of both integration and disintegration of political communities?

On the theoretical side, the study of foreign policy sits somewhat awkwardly between work in international relations and work in domestic politics. There has, however, been a recent increase in interest among International Relations specialists in the connections between domestic politics and international relations. At the same time there has been an increase in work on foreign policy issues within the American and comparative politics subfields. This year I particularly encourage proposals making explicit theoretical connections between international relations theory and those traditionally used to explain domestic politics. Particular attention might be given to the question of what, if anything, makes foreign policy systematically different from other policy arenas, and thus what kinds of changes will be required in drawing on domestic political models in this area.

Finally, the study of foreign policy has been largely dominated by a focus on single states and on the United States and Western Europe. I hope to see interesting proposals that are explicitly comparative or that look beyond the American and European cases.

☆**Division 21. Conflict Processes. Allan Stam, Yale University.**

Following the general theme for this year's meeting, we would like to solicit proposals for papers, posters and panels that address the intersections of individuals and communities and in turn, how these intersections affect conflict processes. While papers and panels dealing with all aspects of conflict are appropriate for this division, we are particularly interested in receiving proposals that address the problems associated with the resolution, termination, outcomes and durations of conflicts.

We encourage potential presenters to consider the notion of community broadly, and to consider how the politics within and across communities may influence individuals' choices that in turn affect the nature of conflict. For example, how might variations in communities' preferences for outcomes or stakes affect the processes by which conflict between communities are prosecuted? How do individuals interact with the communities of which they are a part to determine the outcomes, durations and resolutions of conflicts that arise within various communities or

between them? What roles can individuals or institutions outside of communities play in conflict processes?

From our perspective communities may be local or global with potential sources of identity ranging from ethnicity or religion to nationalism. Similarly, individuals may be states or people. Proposals addressing the role that institutions play in regulating or moderating conflicts between communities are also welcome.

Because the notions of community and communities are potentially quite amorphous, we particularly want to encourage work that is both theoretically rigorous and empirically grounded. Complete panels (three papers, chair and discussant) or individual paper and poster proposals are appropriate.

**☆Division 22. Legislative Studies. C. Lawrence Evans, College of William and Mary.**

Recognizing the richness and diversity of the field of legislative studies, I encourage proposals for papers and panels (consisting of three or four papers) from the entire range of significant and enduring topics associated with the subfield. Examples of appropriate topics include legislative campaigns and elections, lobbying and coalition building, committee and floor decision making, party leadership, and bicameral and interbranch relations.

Proposals should primarily reflect the ongoing research agendas of legislative scholars, but I particularly encourage submissions in four areas. First, I invite proposals that feature research about legislative bodies other than the U.S. House or Senate. Second, I hope to see submissions that meaningfully apply rational choice or other rigorous models to legislative behavior and organization. Third, within U.S. politics, papers comparing the electoral environment, internal politics, and initial policy performance of the 105th Congress with the 104th Congress and prior Democratic Congresses are very welcome.

Fourth, in keeping with the 1998 theme of "community, communities, and politics," I seek submissions that address the core questions of representation. For instance, how effectively do the groups, constituencies, and communities within a polity shape deliberation and policy making within the relevant legislative bodies? What are the mechanisms through which the interests of these communities get articulated? Of what consequence are public attitudes toward a legislature for the quality of the representative process?

**☆Division 23. Presidency Research. Shirley Anne Warshaw, Gettysburg College**

The conference theme offers a wealth of opportunity for presidency scholars to address the broader issues of diverse political communities which affect presidential elections, rhetoric, leadership, coalition-building, institutional relations, and organizational behavior. Such diverse political communities might include, for example, the spectrum of special interest groups which affect presidential decisions, bureaucratic organizational behavior, electoral coalitions, and executive-legislative relations.

Another approach to this year's theme on community and politics involves the nationalization of public policy and the ebbs and flow of the new federalism. How have recent presidents approached the federal government's relationship with communities (state and local) at the sub-national level? How different, for example, is the Clinton administration's approach to new federalism than that of the Nixon or Reagan administrations?

Our perception of community is clearly not limited to the national community, as presidential decisions affect the entire international community.

These suggestions are not meant to narrow the field of inquiry, only to stimulate the proposals and ideas around the theme of the conference. I encourage proposals for complete panels, roundtables, or thematic discussions.

**☆Division 24. Public Administration. Camilla Stivers, Cleveland State University.**

Public administration has long been concerned about community. Progressive reformers who first studied administrative agencies and trained professional administrators saw the need for an informed citizenry to back the quest for scientific public management. In their view, what government owed the community was results rather than involvement.

Public administration's community has since been variously defined as clients, taxpayers, agency constituencies, or a rather diffuse and abstract "public." In practice and theory, a public-regarding impulse toward responsiveness, citizen participation, human development, and the public interest has been in tension with administrative norms such as hierarchy, expertise, and rationality.

Much of the empirical and theoretical work in public administration reflects this tension. Does accountability proceed up through the chain of command to a political official or can/should agencies and administrators be accountable directly to citizens? To what extent is due process exercised in terms of universalized, abstract selves versus embodied, situated selves, including those for whom race, gender, ethnicity, economic class, or other factors are central aspects of identity? Is the notion of responsiveness irremediably corrupted or is there a way in which administrators can be ethnically responsive to citizens? How much is administrative professionalism grounded, in practice or theory, in expert knowledge? Can expertise co-exist with, or even give way to, ideas of service to and covenant with citizens?

More recently, who populated the agency's community? Customers, as the reinventing government movement would have it? Owners, as critics of that movement maintain? Given the evident level of citizen skepticism and distrust of government, especially bureaucracy, how are relationships between bureaucrats and citizens working? Is the involvement of communities, or the community, in administrative affairs an avenue towards rebuilding trust, a hopeless pipe dream, or a risky compromise of agency effectiveness? How do new technologies affect agency re-engineering efforts aimed at more effective community interface? And, in a post-modern era of proliferating perspectives, what redeems the administrative insistence on the systematic and the orderly? If there is really "no best way," in what does the coherence of public administration lie?

**☆Division 25. Public Policy. Ann O'M. Bowman, University of South Carolina and David M. Hedge, University of Florida.**

If government is what transforms communities into polities, then community and public policy are fundamentally intertwined. Public policies represent the resolution of conflicts among competing interests within a community. Those policies in turn shape and reshape communities in important and often unpredictable ways. Consequently, the "Community, Communities, and Politics" theme is a comfortable fit for public policy scholars. The co-chairs of the division welcome proposals that creatively link the "communities" theme with public policy.

More specifically, we encourage proposals that offer broad theoretical approaches or analytical tools for understanding, designing, or assessing public policies. In addition, proposals that address the formulation, implementation, or impact of recent policy initiatives

and issues (e.g., welfare reform, immigration policy, gay rights, environmental justice, emerging information technologies, etc.) are encouraged. Given the theme, we are particularly interested in proposals that consider the role of community-based organizations in the formation and delivery of public policies. Similarly, analyses of the way in which the broader community context influences the policy process and policy outcomes are sought. Finally, proposals that offer a comparative perspective on a substantive question are especially welcomed. As always, this listing is intended to be suggestive, not exhaustive.

The co-chairs are committed to assembling a division program that reflects not only the diversity but also the vitality of the public policy subfield. While this commitment is primarily substantive, it extends to format, also. Alternatives to traditional panel formats, e.g., roundtables, "meet the author" sessions, scholar-practitioner events, and poster sessions are solicited.

**☆Division 26. Law and Courts. Jeffrey Segal, SUNY, Stony Brook.**

Community and communities are crucial to the study of law and courts. The legal community plays an extraordinary role in providing the inputs to judicial decisions, but so might various other communities, such as the mass public, interest groups, and public officials. Needless to say, these communities might also influence the outputs of courts -- their decisions, judgments, and rules of law. And of course, legal rules and judicial decisions differentially affect different communities. I hope we can use the 1998 meetings to investigate thoroughly courts (and other fora for resolving legal disputes) and their communities.

Beyond the sort of examples that have guided our research over the past decades (e.g., do interest groups influence judicial decisions), we might examine a variety of understudied subjects, e.g., whether judges identify with various communities; how norms that influence the legal community have developed; whether deliberative processes, either in collegial courts, jury rooms, or other small groups, foster community. To all of these questions I would add, "and with what effect?"

Of course I do not expect scholars to force fit their proposals into these categories. The program will be open to those with a wide array of substantive and theoretical interests. I particularly wish to encourage those working with psychological or economic theories of law and courts to propose papers of interest.

Finally, scholars who believe that their works can

better be presented in one-on-one discussions with interested parties than in traditional speaker/discussant formats should identify themselves.

**Division 27. Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence. Barbara Perry, Sweet Briar College.**

The constitutional law and jurisprudence division readily encompasses the theme of "Community, Communities, and Politics." Using professional, societal, and geographic communities as a starting point, scholars have examined issues, personalities, and processes in constitutional and jurisprudential studies. The rubric of professional communities, for example, can embrace the impact of jurists, lawyers, law clerks, media, and jurisprudential schools of thought on the outcome of cases. Likewise, societal communities, which may include gender, racial, ethnic, socio-economic, and religious groups, can influence, and be influenced by, judicial rulings and those who make them. More specifically, there is no doubt that the politics of judicial selection -- often guided by the lobbying of such communities -- inform case resolutions.

In the geographic realm, communities on the state level are utilizing popular referenda to address constitutional concerns, as illustrated by California's recent adoption of an anti-affirmative action proposition. Another nettlesome judicial/political issue -- racial gerrymandering -- invokes (and provokes) both geographic and societal communities. Moreover, as Justice Lewis Powell, among other thoughtful jurists, has acknowledged, perceptions of community mores play a major role in applied jurisprudence. Obviously, these conceptualizations of communities as they relate to constitutional law and jurisprudence can also be applied in comparative political contexts. The above examples, however, are not intended to be exhaustive. Different interpretations of communities and politics, as relate to this division, are welcomed.

In addition, I encourage proposals in the full range of public law topics in the categories of constitutional interpretation, litigation history, judicial biography, and judicial process, so that our sessions represent the diversity of interests and approaches extant in the subfield.

**☆ Division 28. Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations. Carol S. Weissert, Michigan State University.**

The recent interest in devolution, dubbed by some the Devolution Revolution, has highlighted an area that has always been central in the study of federalism and intergovernmental relations -- the role of communities in defining, shaping, and implementing public policy. Proposals that highlight the theme of the conference -- particularly how recent rhetoric and action in Washington have really engendered change in the community's intergovernmental role -- are encouraged.

I welcome proposals dealing with both new and emerging federalism issues and those that concern issues of long-standing interest to students of federalism and intergovernmental relations. For example, the popularity and degree of success of the devolution approach in European and Latin American countries would be an appropriate topic for discussion. Trends in judicial decisions, the intergovernmental implications of implementing welfare reform, the impact of the unfunded mandates legislation, continued federal preemption, state-local fiscal relationships, and changing political roles of institutions and actors are examples of emerging issues. Given the overall convention theme, papers addressing the role communities play as actors in the intergovernmental system are also welcome.

Proposals applying inventive analytical methods are encouraged as are those that can be generalized across issues and jurisdictions.

**☆ Division 29. State Politics, Rodney Hero, University of Colorado, Boulder.**

The state politics section will be open to a variety of ideas and approaches. While papers and panels addressing "conventional" issues/questions and using common approaches are welcome, I also particularly encourage works that break new theoretical ground. Also, papers that use approaches common in other subfields of the discipline, but less evident in the state politics literature are encouraged. These include, but are not limited to, qualitative/interpretive, rational choice, historical/institutional, and others. I am especially interested in proposals that focus systematically on the "big picture" of state politics and states in the context of broader U.S. politics, in contrast to the common "compartmentalized" mode discussed in Paul Brace's recent field essay.

Studies might address the conference theme of community and politics as affected by or mediated through the context(s) of state politics. States as *polities* may have particular social, institutional (formal or informal) and policy responsibilities or orientations that shape the definitions and understanding of community. States also “define” communities through their authority over legislative districting, local government authority, and the like. Proposals on these issues are encouraged.

Finally, it has been about 50 years since V.O. Key's *Southern Politics* (1949) was published. (And the 1998 meeting is, after all, in the city where Key wrote up his research). The South was notorious for defining “community” in terms of race and color. How has the South and other states and regions responded to the continuing and the changing nature of their racial/ethnic populations? What are the implications for understanding states as communities?

**☆Division 30. Urban Politics. Michael A. Pagano, Miami University.**

The conference theme this year celebrates communities and politics (an affirmation that all politics is local!) -- the heart and soul of the Urban Politics division. The discipline is encouraged to rediscover and analyze various meanings of communities in part due to the disintegration or fragmentation of states and nation-states, the rising voices for local democracy, mass movements to secede, increasing demands on local governments and services, concerns about equity and efficiency, and debates over fragmentation and metropolitan governance. As federal and state governments continue to be encouraged, or forced, to devolve, decentralize, and share powers with cities and other local governments, place matters as the locus of politics and the laboratory of policy experimentation.

I welcome proposals addressing the diverse array of themes and innovative approaches to our understanding of urban politics, problems, and policies and encourage proposals that develop a theoretical and conceptual understanding of emerging communities and politics, solutions, and institutions, not only in the U.S. but round the world. Proposals might employ single case-studies or especially comparative case study methods. Proposals should clearly delineate the frameworks guiding the case studies, comparative case studies, or quantitative studies, identify the database, and explain the methodology. Papers and panels in this division should represent the varied and diverse nature of contemporary urban politics.

**☆Division 31. Women and Politics. Pippa Norris, Harvard University.**

The general theme of “Community, Community and Politics” offers rich opportunities for women and politics scholars. For example:

(1) Many recent arguments about the decline of communities have focussed on ‘communities of space’, meaning concern about the weakening of ‘small town America’, and its equivalent elsewhere. But were, and are, ‘communities of space’ fully inclusive of all women? And are more permeable and non-spatial ‘communities of identity’, such as informal networks of women on the internet, viable alternatives to the older conception? Newer networking forms raise theoretical issues about what it means to belong to a community, the obligations and rights of membership, and that political, psychological and institutional ties underlying communities of women.

(2) What are the implications of communities for women's participation in public life? Women's political activities have often been tied to civic society through grassroots activism in voluntary organizations and the non-profit sector, such as PTAs, housing associations, environmental initiatives, and NGOs. Do women have distinctive visions of community which encourage their participation in these groups, and/or simultaneously discourage their involvement in national-level politics?

(3) Women's movements can be regarded as alternative communities, with their own networks, values, and organizational structures. How far have women succeeded in developing their own local, national, and international communities, and what are barriers and opportunities for community-building? How far has the development of stronger networks *within* groups of women (such as by race, class, language, or sexuality) fragmented the broader community of women?

Contributions addressing these issues, from an American and comparative perspective, are welcome, as are proposals from any area within the field of women and politics which may not be covered by the these suggestions. We strongly encourage co-sponsored panels.

☆Division 32. Race, Ethnicity, and Politics. Carol Hardy-Fanta, Boston University and Don T. Nakanishi, University of California, Los Angeles.

Perspectives on community and communities have been central to the study of ethnicity, race, and politics through topics such as elections, community organizing, redistricting, protest politics, transnational linkages, and inter-ethnic conflict and coalition building.

We seek proposals providing new insights, data and analyses on these topics and others including (but not limited to): What is the relationship between physical/geographical boundaries and felt community for different racial/ethnic groups? What are the political implications of how racial/ethnic identities and communities are constructed? What are the implications for political participation among Latinos, African-Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, and Native Americans in the U.S. of the simultaneous trends of continued residential segregation and (in some areas at least) of increasing diversity within certain racial/ethnic groups? How do Latinos and Asians from different countries of origin, as well as other potentially pan-ethnic or pan-racial populations, build community in the U.S. and translate their shared interests into political involvement and influence? Have recent changes in welfare, immigration, and affirmative action policies affected mobilization in communities of color in the United States?

We welcome proposals on the international aspects of race, ethnicity and politics. What lessons can be learned from the political experiences of minority groups in different countries? What effect does transnationalism have on the political participation of new immigrant communities? To what extent can racial/ethnic tensions in the U.S. or other countries be transformed into political coalitions or institutions that contribute to a sense of community?

How do race and ethnicity interact with gender and class in the political participation of Latino, Asian, Black and Native American communities in the U.S. or in the political life of immigrant and minority groups in other countries? Finally, how does race and ethnicity affect the "academic community" within the discipline of political science?

We encourage participation by a broad range of scholars and subfields, including (but not limited to): American politics, urban politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory.

☆Division 33: Religion and Politics. Michael Lienesch, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

"Community, Communities, and Politics" is a particularly appealing to religion and politics scholars. From the civic activities of local congregations to political conflicts between international religious identities, community is a central characteristic of religious and political life. It is also a problematic one, raising important questions for scholars in the field, including: Who creates religious and political communities? What is their distinctive character? When and how do they change? Where do they come into conflict with other communities, institutions, and states, and how do they deal with conflicts among their own members? How do they succeed or fail in achieving their goals and objectives, and how do they and we measure their successes and failures? And why does community matter so much anyway when it comes to the way that people govern themselves religiously and politically?

These and other related questions are best addressed from a variety of scholarly perspectives. In keeping with the broad representation of fields within the religion and politics section, proposals are welcome from all scholarly subfields and all relevant topics, including those not necessarily related to the conference theme. Also in keeping with our character, I encourage proposals suggesting cross-field and interdisciplinary approaches.

☆Division 34. Representative and Electoral Systems. Henry Flores, St. Mary's University.

The papers and panels for this division will focus, as they traditionally do, on the broad spectrum of issues underlying representation and electoral systems in the United States and throughout the world. This year's theme will provide the flavor and direction for presentations. It emphasizes the ties among people that define communities in "all political arenas from the local to the international."

One especially relevant aspect of community or communities includes the effects of the changing faces of communities on a local government's electoral systems and structures. I welcome papers, or a panel or roundtable on the meaning of federal courts' statements about "communities of interests" with regard to the area of voting rights and districting. Although these examples are drawn from local political levels, I also encourage proposals focusing on the national and international levels. For instance,

community building in Europe and the changing face of the democratization movements in Africa, Latin America, and Asia are also having dramatic effects on the representational and electoral systems in those and other areas of the world. I seek proposals on "grand efforts at community building" and representations structures based on national and international definitions of community.

Of course proposals from throughout the entire field of representative and electoral systems are welcome, as are all methodological approaches. We will continue last year's trend toward increased use of poster sessions as well.

**☆Division 35. Political Organizations and Parties. Anthony Corrado, Colby College.**

"Community, Communities, and Politics" is a conference theme particularly appropriate to the research questions that inform our area of the discipline. I look forward to proposals for individual papers, entire panels, or roundtables that consider its diverse aspects with respect to the theory and practice of political parties, interests groups, and other political organizations at all levels of government.

Parties and organized groups have been viewed traditionally as the primary means by which individuals are mobilized into the broader communities or collectives that facilitate political activity. Do they still perform this function effectively? Do parties and organized interests encourage citizen participation and collective identities? Do they contribute to the building of political communities, however defined, or do they tend to divide communities and undermine communitarian attitudes?

These questions are especially relevant given the changes taking place in the political system. Have these changes made elections less community oriented? Are we witnessing the growing nationalization of electoral politics at the expense of state and local organization? Or are local and civic organizations adapting to meet community needs? Do elections provide opportunities to develop communities? For example, do campaigns promote grass-roots organization, and if so, is such activity meaningful? Do minor parties represent the potential for new forms of community? Or must we move beyond our current political organizations to revive our sense of community? If so, what should these new political organizations look like?

These suggested avenues of inquiry are not intended to be exclusive. Proposals for topics that explore other issues related to the conference theme or that present

new organizational and social behavior are also welcome. Comparative studies are especially encouraged.

**☆Division 36. Elections and Voting Behavior. George Rabinowitz, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.**

Elections represent the definitive communal activity in democracies, as voters collectively select their leaders. Consistent with the theme of the 1998 meetings, paper proposals that deal with the intersection between community and elections will be given special consideration. Especially relevant to community themes are questions of participation, societal versus self-interest motivations in voting behavior, trust in institutions as a mediating factor in electoral behavior, and the role of elections themselves in stimulating or discouraging communitarian sentiments.

Papers need not, however, fall within the community theme in order to be considered. Any paper relevant to the general topic of elections and voting is potentially appropriate. There are no methodological or epistemological constraints on what represents interesting work; similarly, the substance of a proposed paper can deal with any topic that fits within the broad theme of elections and voting.

**☆Division 37. Public Opinion and Participation. John Garcia, University of Arizona.**

I would like to form panels that complement the "Community, Communities and Politics" theme. Inclusive within this theme are such topics and concerns: (1) psychological, social, and cultural and institutional ties than individuals and groups have with political institutions and processes; (2) how these processes and policies affect communities of interest and culture; (3) what are the behavioral manifestations of sense of self and community on actions to effect governmental action; (4) psychological research on the nature of identification and group consciousness; and (5) focused examination of voluntary organizations, political participation and civic society.

Public opinion research is characterized as the attitudes that include the cognitive link of object to information, an affective tie to the object to an evaluation, and a cognitive element that links the object to actual behavior. As a result, research on the content of opinions, its connections to political



behavior, beliefs, values, identity, and political institutions are critical areas. In addition, the sources of public opinion (i.e. demographic characteristics, social groups, community, etc.) can bring a direct bearing on the theme of "community, communities, and politics".

Similarly, the concept of political participation focuses upon the opportunities to communicate information, preferences, and concerns to influence governmental actions. This voluntary activity is conducted by individuals or within a group context. There exists a variety of options for participation as well as a range for the volume of activities possible. Thus, such themes as the dynamics of competing demands due to overlapping communities, the politics of community within defined groups, as well as across groups, and the variety of theories regarding public choice, collective choice, mobilization, and coalitional behavior are quite relevant for this program division.

The areas of public opinion and political participation are well established in our discipline with a continual need for further theoretical development, refinement of prevailing models and theories, and explorations of under-researched groups and issues. This section will reviewed all proposals in terms of the theoretical clarity and contributions to these fields.

**☆Division 38. Political Communication. Holli Semetko, University of Amsterdam.**

Communication is central to the concept of community. The division welcomes paper and panel proposals that identify the ways in which (old and new) media influence public and elite understandings of community and identity. The interplay of communication and community, in the context of three areas are especially welcome.

\* The political and economic. While the concept of community in the US has found a resurgence by moving from the national to the local level, in Europe the more immediate shift must be from national to European governance. The tendency for news to frame issues in simple, conflictual, terms has potentially disastrous consequences for public understanding of the complexities of many political and economic issues in the coming years.

\* The social, cultural and ethnic. Audiences in North and South America, Europe, and Asia are becoming increasingly segregated (by culture or ethnicity). And news may encourage a certain interpretation of recurring social problems, as is the case with the

reporting of crime in the US, for example. The presentation of ethnic and cultural groups in the media and what consequences follow from this for public opinion is of interest.

\* Innovations in science and technology and how these may affect political life. Scientific discoveries are of profound importance to the quality of life. A wide range of issues and innovations in biotechnology, medicine, digital technology are relevant here. But we know little about the actual presentation of science and technology issues in the news, and how this translates into public understanding or action.

**☆Division 39. Science, Technology, and Environmental Politics. J. P. Singh, University of Mississippi.**

The conference theme "community, communities, and politics" provides an opportunity for analysts of science, technology and environmental politics (STEP) to not only lend insight to the conference theme, but also to help place STEP scholarship in an important context. While regularly writing about "scientific communities" and "environmental communities," we have been less successful at conceptualizing and substantiating what we mean by "community" especially as we also often write of "lonely" and "independent" researchers and isolated environmental movements? Papers dealing with the characteristics, role and importance of these communities vis-a-vis politics are encouraged.

Furthermore, our very own STEP sub-community has a peculiar relationship with the "political science community." It deals with issues which are important to every sub-field of political science and draws together a group of scholars from various facets of political enquiry. But the contributions of STEP scholars are still somewhat stand-alone efforts and are yet to be fully appreciated, critiqued/debunked and/or integrated by scholars in other sub-fields. We will welcome proposals which help evaluate the context of STEP practice and scholarship and its relationship to the study of political science at large. Proposals which defy traditional disciplinary/sub-field and issue area boundaries will be especially welcome.

We also encourage proposals identifying central questions in STEP and building on prior scholarship. STEP section includes scholars and practitioners working at various levels of analysis ranging from local to international, using methodological approaches which are theoretical and/or empirical, and making conceptual contributions to political philosophy as well as public policy. We are very interested in co-sponsoring panels with other divisions to highlight

issues discussed here by bringing them before STEP as well as non-STEP scholars and practitioners.

As always, we will sponsor a workshop on the Wednesday prior to the APSA meetings; feel free to send suggestions for topics. The workshop provides opportunities to discuss important topics and for STEP scholars to get to know each other's work and build professional ties.

☆Division 40. Computers and Multimedia.  
Gary Klass, Illinois State University.

The Computers and Multimedia division welcomes paper, panel and roundtable proposals which disseminate research on the use of technologies in both research and teaching. We will also invite proposals for short-course workshops on specific Internet and multimedia applications.

In the past, many of the section's papers have addressed the impact of recent developments in Internet communications for local, national and global communities and politics. Further explorations in this area would most appropriate for the conference theme.

Also appropriate would be analyses of the impact of current and potential information technologies on the either political science profession or the scholarly community as a whole. These might include assessments of how new technologies might better serve the needs of the discipline and its constituencies. Presentations may address new approaches to scholarly publication and communication and the use of the Internet as a research tool for collecting, archiving and displaying data.

We anticipate many presentations on innovative instructional applications of computers and multimedia. Hard data on the effectiveness of instructional technology is often hard to come by. Comparative or experimental evaluations of the effectiveness of instructional technology on what students learn, drawing on and contributing to an existing theory base, are strongly encouraged. Papers may also address the issue of the criteria and standards that are appropriate to use in assessing effective applications of instructional technology. Demonstrations of new and innovative instructional applications of the Internet and other instructional technologies, such as course web sites, CD-Rom and multimedia instructional applications and discussion forums, are generally excellent candidates for poster sessions.

We also encourage presenters to make some use of instructional technology in their presentations and to archive their papers (or links to their own web sites) on the Computer and Multimedia web site <<http://www.apsanet.org/~cms/>> in advance of the conference.

☆Division 41. Politics and Literature. Peter A. Lawler, Berry College.

Proposals are welcome that concern either literary treatments of political questions or prosaic treatments of the relationship between politics and literature. Prosaic treatment of the political responsibilities of the artist include Faulkner's or Solzhenitsyn's Nobel Lectures, Aristotle's *Poetics*, or Havel's reflections as dissident or president. Also relevant would be Rousseau's or Tocqueville's observations on the effects of modern democracy on literature and poetry, or Heidegger's or Rorty's turn to poetry from philosophy.

The theme of community, for the artist today, calls to mind the tendency of modern, secular regimes, either liberal or socialist, to dissolve communal ties and produce isolated individuals. In America, the defense of community has been undertaken by African-American, Southern, religious, and ethnic writers, and panels will be devoted to their "countercultural" efforts. But this theme of moral dissolution is not, of course, limited to either contemporary or American writers. Consider, for example, the place of the theme in both dissident and postcommunist literature and in the great Latin American novels and poems.

From one point of view, the conflict between community and liberty is between love and justice. Tocqueville observed that the greatness of American women was their endurance of injustice in the name of love, on behalf of the formation of families and communities. But women could not be expected to make that sacrifice forever. Proposals might present unfashionable views into the conflict in the hearts of modern women, perhaps particularly American women, through analyses of the work, say, of Willa Cather or Flannery O'Connor. Panels devoted to feminist political criticism of literature are also welcome.

I hope that at least a panel or two can be devoted to film. Proposals might address the political thought of contemporary film makers, the treatment of a specific theme (such as ethnicity, religion, justice, or the family) in several films, or ways in which the works of classic writers (such as Shakespeare or Jane Austen) have been treated in film.

☆ **Division 42. New Political Science. Elizabeth Kelly, DePaul University.**

The purpose of this division -- bringing together those sharing a critical and activist approach to political science -- is itself reflective of the theme, "Community, Communities, and Politics." Proposals for this division, while covering a broad spectrum of the discipline, should thus reflect a conviction that the study of politics is never value-free, and that political scientists, regardless of field or focus, have an active responsibility to connect their understanding of political ideas, issues, and events to human betterment and social justice.

Historically, how have concept of community, in theory and/or praxis, developed in contexts of social change? What is the relationship of particular community structures, or constellations of structures, to broad-based struggles for change? How can communities be configured compatibly with the historic goals of social equality and democratic participation? In what ways do specific concepts or instances of community enhance or block the flow of information, decision-making, and popular involvement central to human betterment and social justice? And how do questions of gender, race, and class affect such processes?

Consider also the relationships between distinctly political structures and other types of institutions that, to varying degrees, have evolved outside of or even against the state, such as local assemblies, trade unions, workers' councils and committees, cooperatives, grassroots movements, and some types of parties. What is the impact of these forces on political structures, and vice versa? Can the potentially symbiotic relationships which emerge from such interaction tell us anything new about communities? To what extent have these extragovernmental "communities" generated and sustained deep social change and furthered democratic participation? What political strategies linked to specific communities and practices have been most viable and which hold the best promise for the future?

These and related questions framed by critical, irreverent approaches to conventional modes of analysis open up avenues of inquiry that may encourage us to revisit the many historical and more contemporary traditions of political theory, from the Greeks to neo-Marxism, Critical Theory, feminisms, ecology, and postmodernism. We welcome proposals addressing the above themes as well as others. We especially encourage contributions from junior colleagues and others submitting to New Political Science for the first time.

**Division 43. Ecological and Transformational Politics. Richard A. Couto, University of Richmond.**

The Ecological and Transformational Politics Section promotes praxis of teaching, scholarship, and action around five forms of politics: participation; social justice; conflict resolution and healing; human growth; and a holistic ecological consciousness. This goal assumes that political transformation entails personal transformation and vice versa.

Although among the newest and smallest of the APSA's sections, our Section's concerns reside at the heart of the 1998 theme, "Community, Communities, and Politics." However, proposals for papers, poster presentations, and round table discussions that incorporate praxis and one or more of the forms of politics that the Section promotes are more likely to be selected than general treatments of the theme.

We are looking for work that embraces the daunting ambiguities of interdependence and portrays multiple and conflicting roles in community. Such work will portray the personal as political and the political as personal. This may be done by looking at others engaged in the process of change as well as by looking at ourselves, as Paulo Freire suggested.. We especially welcome topics that explore the politics of the communities of political science our departments, classrooms, journals, professional meetings, methods of graduate training, and our colleges and universities.

This is not an invitation for "warm fuzzies," personal diatribes, nor critiques without alternatives. It is an invitation to use our "political imaginations" and to do the difficult analytical work of examining the politics of everyday life; the political ecology and hidden spaces of community; and our personal/professional efforts to establish community, from the personal to the international level, and to support the efforts of others to do the same.

The section welcomes participatory formats and co-sponsorship with other sections.