

PS Appendix

APSA Awards Presented at the 1982 Annual Meeting

DISSERTATION AWARDS

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

Gabriel A. Almond Award for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1980 or 1981 in the field of comparative politics.

Recipient: **David G. Becker**, University of California, Los Angeles. "The New Bourgeoisie and the Limits of Dependency: The Social and Political Impact of the Mining Industry in Peru since 1968."

Selection Committee: Samuel Barnes, University of Michigan, Chair; Mark Huddleston, University of Delaware; Susan L. Shirk, University of California, San Diego.

Dissertation Chair: **Edward Gonzalez.**

Citation: This dissertation is an excellent blend of theory, empirical research, and imaginative analysis. It tests propositions derived from dependency theory and demonstrates that in the mining industry of Peru indigenous managers and technicians were able to chart an independent course when they assumed leadership of the industry under a change-oriented regime. Professor Becker's dissertation corrects and refines existing theory while it presents a thorough analysis of an important historical transition. It is written with clarity and style. The Almond Award Committee congratulates Professor Becker on his outstanding achievement.

William Anderson Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1980 or 1981 in the field of inter-governmental relations in the U.S.

Recipient: **Andrew B. Dunham**, University of Chicago. "Health and Politics: Cost Control and State Certificate of Need Regulation."

Selection Committee: A Lee Fritschler, The Brookings Institution, Chair; Diane Kincaid Blair, University of Arkansas; Frank J. Thompson, University of Georgia.

Dissertation Chair: **J. David Greenstone.**

Citation: Andrew Dunham perceptively explores one of the major regulatory initiatives of the last two decades that involved federal, state, and local levels of government, namely, certificate-of-need regulation. Such regulation typically seeks to dampen increases in health care costs and to "rationalize" the allocation of medical resources by requiring providers of medical care to obtain approval from government for facilities expansion or modification. This initiative gained momentum when Congress incorporated a provision in the National Health Planning and Resources Development Act of 1974 which required states to establish and implement certificate-of-need programs.

Dunham's study manifests conceptual and methodological sophistication. It places certificate-of-need initiatives in the context of three major theories of regulation—public interest, producer interest and regulator interest explanations. Dunham dissects the strengths and weaknesses of these theories in illuminating the processes that characterized certificate-of-need programs and caused them to have a limited impact on facilities development in the medical sector. In his study Dunham successfully exploits qualitative methods which draw heavily on the use of secondary sources of information as well as a range of statistical techniques useful in impact analysis. His study demonstrates how well crafted research can simultaneously address the concerns of the substantive policy specialist and the more general student of intergovernmental relations, regulatory policy and American politics.

Edward S. Corwin Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1980 or 1981 in the field of public law.

Recipient: **Timothy O'Neill**, University of California, Berkeley. "The Politics of Equality: Democratic Theory and Litigation Politics in Bakke."

Selection Committee: Carol Greenwald, Public Agenda Foundation, Chair; C. Neal Tate, North Texas State University; S. Sidney Ulmer, University of Kentucky.

Dissertation Chair: William Muir.

Citation: O'Neill begins from the premise that the Supreme Court acts as a forum for political education, and that amici briefs provide a vehicle for implementing this activity in instances where members of the amici organizations are participants in the learning process. To test this "outreach" hypothesis, O'Neill studies the advocacy politics of the 117 organizations that submitted briefs in the controversial equal protection/affirmative discrimination case, *Regents of the University of California vs. Bakke*. His original research involved a series of interviews with 450 of the key decision-makers who worked on those briefs.

His analysis imaginatively integrates theories of political education, issues of law and the structural framework of organizational decision-making. He concludes that most members of amici organizations were not "educated" politically by their groups' participation in *Bakke*, because the parameters of ideal, open, educational debate were narrowed by organizational survival needs and impoverished by reliance on lawyers as discussion leaders and legal argument as the language of debate. However, for the minority of groups that were democratically led, value choices were made in the informed manner that is the hallmark of political education.

O'Neill's systematic and well-written integration of the material, and his skillful creation of new categories for the analysis of organizational dynamics gives his conclusions significance beyond this single case. We offer our congratulations to him.

Helen Dwight Reid Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1980 or 1981 in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

Recipient: **Timothy Lomperis**, Duke University. "A Conceptual Framework for Deriving the 'Lessons of History': The U.S. Involvement in Viet Nam (1960-1975) as a Case Study."

Selection Committee: Edward Kolodziej, University of Illinois, Chair; Linda P. Brady, U.S. Department of Defense; Morton Kaplan, University of Chicago.

Dissertation Chair: Ole Holsti.

Citation: The Helen Dwight Reid Committee is pleased to select the doctoral dissertation of Professor Timothy John Lomperis, "A Conceptual Framework for Deriving the 'Lessons of History': The U.S. Involvement in Viet Nam (1960-1975) as a Case Study" as the outstanding dissertation in international relations written in 1981.

Professor Lomperis's study warrants this award for at least three reasons. First, the subject matter is important for serious students and practitioners in international relations. The Vietnam war has much to tell us about the evolution of international relations, the role of revolutionary war in guiding that evolution, and the political impact and moral significance of the American intervention. Professor Lomperis addresses all of these tough, empirical, slippery and normatively charged questions with clarity, rigor, and sensitivity.

Second, Professor Lomperis's findings challenge conventional wisdom and urge a rethinking of the Vietnam experience. After careful analysis of the Hanoi government's behavior Lomperis reaches the unsettling and ironic conclusion that, in his words, "In losing a people's war, the Communists went on to win the war itself. But in adopting a conventional war strategy, they won by a means they should have lost. The U.S., on the other hand, won a war it thought it lost, and lost by default what it could have won."

Third, Professor Lomperis's clear thinking, plain expression, methodological precision, sound and comprehensive scholarship, and subtle treatment of politically volatile and morally contested issues serve as an example for others to follow.

A word of praise should also be extended to the Department of Political Science at Duke University, to Professor Lomperis's dissertation committee and, especially, to his principal advisor, Professor Ole Holsti, for providing the stimulation and guidance necessary to the production of so noteworthy a scholarly effort.

Professor Lomperis's success should not detract from the high quality of the 16 other dissertations which were submitted for review. Several were outstanding; all were competitive. Indeed, the Committee would like to cite three other dissertations for honorable mention to assure that these scholarly works are brought before this assemblage for special notice:

"Soviet Threats to Intervene in the Middle East, 1956-1973," Frank Fukuyama, Harvard University;

"The Theory and Practice of Conventional Deterrence," John J. Mearsheimer, Cornell University; and

"Interdependence, Regimes, and International Cooperation," Duncan Snidal, Yale University.

We also wish to extend our thanks to President Seymour Lipset and Thomas Mann for providing this opportunity to select a candi-

APSA Awards Presented at Annual Meeting

date for the Reid award and all of the dissertation writers and their advisors for their assistance in making this competition possible.

E. E. Schattschneider Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1980 or 1981 in the field of American government.

Recipient: **Paul Light**, University of Michigan. "The President's Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Carter."

Selection Committee: Herbert B. Asher, Ohio State University, Chair; Karl Kurtz, National Conference of State Legislatures; Linda L. Fowler, Syracuse University.

Dissertation Chair: **John Kingdon**.

Citation: From a very large number of worthy nominations, the committee selected as recipient of the Schattschneider Award the dissertation of Paul Charles Light, "The President's Agenda: Domestic Policy Choices from Kennedy to Carter," written at the University of Michigan. "The President's Agenda" is an impressive piece of scholarship which teaches important lessons about the domestic policy priorities and performance of presidential administrations. It is one of those rare dissertations that speaks effectively to multiple, diverse audiences such as academic political scientists and governmental decision makers. In many instances, Light convincingly challenges the conventional wisdom about presidential power and offers thoughtful re-interpretations well supported by evidence. "The President's Agenda" is a dissertation to be read early on by an incoming presidential administration.

"The President's Agenda" demonstrates that systematic research informed by sound political insight can be conducted on the executive branch. Light's skillful use of extensive elite interviews, OMB legislative clearance records, and the extant literature represents a thoughtful and effective weaving together of evidence to fashion a compelling description and explanation of presidential administration behavior. The analysis of five presidential administrations gives Light's work an historical and comparative dimension infrequently found in the literature on the executive branch. Undoubtedly, "The President's Agenda" will inspire further analyses of the policy choices and performance of presidential administrations.

The 1982 E. E. Schattschneider Award Committee is delighted to present to Dr. Paul Charles Light the Schattschneider Award for the outstanding dissertation in American government.

Leo Strauss Award, for the best doctoral dis-

sertation completed and accepted in 1980 or 1981 in the field of political philosophy.

Recipient: **Michael A. Gillespie**, University of Chicago. "Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ontological Ground of History."

Selection Committee: Murray Dry, Middlebury College, Chair; Eugene F. Miller, University of Georgia; Ellen Paul, Bowling Green State University.

Dissertation Chair: **Joseph Cropsey**.

Citation: This dissertation is distinguished by its skillful treatment of fundamental issues of political philosophy, its sensitive analysis of important texts, and its orderly and convincing exposition. Its point of departure is the challenge raised by modern conceptions of history to the traditional understanding of the nature of political philosophy. Gillespie poses the fundamental question, What is history? and then proceeds to show how this question is resolved in the philosophical tradition that stretches from Rousseau to Heidegger. The connections of Kant to Rousseau, of Hegel to Kant, and of Nietzsche and Heidegger to Hegelian philosophy are exhibited with great clarity. Gillespie is thoroughly familiar with the appropriate German texts as well as with pertinent secondary literature. This work exhibits a maturity of thought and a comprehensiveness of vision that are rare in a dissertation.

Leonard D. White Award, for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1980 or 1981 in the general field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory.

Recipient: **Judith Gruber**, Yale University. "Democracy versus Bureaucracy: The Problem of Democratic Control."

Selection Committee: Frederic Bergerson, Whittier College, Chair; Walter Broadnax, Harvard University; Dennis Dresang, University of Wisconsin.

Dissertation Chair: **Douglas Rae**.

Citation: "How can we reconcile the growth of decision making in powerful government bureaucracies with our ideas of democracy and popular control?" Judith Gruber's efforts to answer this classic question have gone well beyond speculation as she creates an analytic framework within which to compare and evaluate the costs and normative assumptions involved in various control strategies and analyzes the attitudes of bureaucrats themselves. The mixture of empirical techniques, normative questions, and organized theory makes a delightful brew.

Using a map of proposed methods of con-

straining bureaucratic behavior, Professor Gruber captures the reader's imagination and holds it throughout her exceptionally well-written dissertation. She moves easily from considerations of organizational technology and environment to a lively presentation of the viewpoints of the 39 bureaucrats she interviewed in the fields of public housing, fire protection, and education. Their "perceptual filters," she makes clear, lead bureaucrats to reject some controls and accept others.

A major value of this study is the finding that would-be controllers of bureaucratic behavior have limited, but nevertheless real, opportunities to exercise constraint. By taking into account bureaucratic values or by restricting the technologies or environments of bureaucrats, it is possible to encourage the coincidence of bureaucratic interest with democratic control. Because "Democracy Versus Bureaucracy: The Problem of Democratic Control" adeptly melds public management expertise with an understanding of modern democracy, the committee finds Professor Gruber to be an especially appropriate recipient of the award which honors Leonard D. White.

BOOK AND PAPER AWARDS

Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award (\$250), for the best paper presented at the 1981 Annual Meeting.

Recipient: **Sylvia Snowiss**, California State University, Northridge. "From Fundamental Law to the Supreme Law of the Land: A Re-interpretation of the Origins of Judicial Review in the United States."

Selection Committee: James L. Sundquist, Brookings Institution, Chair; Charles W. Anderson, University of Wisconsin; Morris Fiorina, California Institute of Technology.

Citation: In a paper of exhaustive and exemplary historical depth, Sylvia Snowiss has traced the evolution over a 60-year period—from Independence to the end of John Marshall's tenure as Chief Justice—of the doctrine and practice of judicial review of the constitutionality of legislation. The ground has been covered before, but not with such thoroughness, insight, and comprehension. Clearly written, convincingly argued, and elaborately documented, Snowiss' paper is likely to win acceptance as the definitive interpretation of an important strand of American history—one that led, at the end of the 60 years, to the firm establishment of judicial review as one of the great checks and balances in the country's constitutional system.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award (\$500), for the best political science publication in 1981 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Recipient: **M. Elizabeth Sanders**, Rice University. *The Regulation of Natural Gas* (Temple University Press).

Selection Committee: Randall B. Ripley, Ohio State University, Chair; John Ferejohn, California Institute of Technology; Virginia Gray, University of Minnesota.

Citation: In her book, *The Regulation of Natural Gas* (Temple University Press), Professor Sanders enriches the literature on national public policy in the United States by examining one complicated policy area—the regulation of natural gas—for a period of 40 years, from the beginning of national regulation in 1938 through the passage of the Natural Gas Policy Act in 1978.

She explicates a complicated and technical history well and makes it clear that political considerations are inextricably interwoven with the ceaseless policy-making—statutory, regulatory, and judicial—in this arena. Individuals, institutions, and producer and consumer interests are analyzed so that patterns and changes in those patterns can be discerned. Her analysis enriches our understanding of the politics of regulation in general. She skillfully portrays and explains the roles of presidents, members of Congress, bureaucrats, judges, lobbyists, and local officials, all of whom get involved in the policy decisions that are made about natural gas regulation. She makes us realize that some issues, this one included, generate competing interests divided along clear geographical lines.

The Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$2,000), for the best book published in the U.S. during 1981 on government, politics, or international affairs.

Recipient: **Paul E. Peterson**, University of Chicago. *City Limits* (University of Chicago Press).

Selection Committee: Dean Donald E. Stokes, Princeton University; Chalmers Johnson, University of California, Berkeley; Robert O. Keohane.

Citation: This work radically reinterprets urban politics by deriving its dominant forces from the logic of the American federal structure. It is thereby able to explain some pervasive tendencies of urban political outcomes that are puzzling or scarcely noticed at all when cities are viewed as autonomous units, outside the federal framework. Professor Peterson's analysis is imaginatively conceived and skillfully carried through. His beautifully

finished volume will lastingly alter our understanding of urban affairs in America.

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

Recipient: **Michael Oakeshott**, Professor Emeritus, London School of Economics. *Experience and Its Modes*; "The Voice of Poetry"; and "Introduction" to Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*.

Selection Committee: Dante Germino, University of Virginia, Chair; George W. Carey; Jane Mansbridge, Northwestern University.

Citation: Among the many writings of Professor Oakeshott published at least 15 years ago, the committee has chosen to single out his book *Experience and Its Modes* (1st edition, 1933), and two of his essays published in 1946 and 1959 respectively. The essays are the famous "Introduction" to the Blackwell's edition of Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan*, and "The Voice of Poetry in the Conversation of Mankind," reprinted in *Rationalism and Politics* (1962).

In *Experience and Its Modes*, Oakeshott provided, within the idealist tradition stemming most immediately from F. H. Bradley, an original philosophical account of both the wholeness and the multidimensionality of human experience. In the luminous prose that has become his trademark, Oakeshott argues in effect that any political theory worthy of the name must make explicit its epistemological foundation, and that this epistemology must be open to experience in its entirety rather than arbitrarily confining itself to a conveniently manageable segment of experience.

According to Oakeshott, the principal modes of, or "arrests" in, the concrete whole that is experience are practice, science, history, and poetry. "Practice" is concerned with desiring and obtaining, as well as with tending to the arrangements necessary for such activity in society. "Science" has to do with measurement and predictability. *History* is the activity of understanding "past conduct and happening in a manner in which they were never understood at the time," and poetry is the activity of "contemplating and delighting." Poetry is concerned neither with ("scientific") truth, nor with utility, but rather with the creation of images in which one takes delight, simply for their own sake, whether those images be conveyed in words, painting, sculpture, or architecture. "Poetry," Oakeshott maintains, "is a sort of truancy, a dream within the dream of life, a wild flower planted amongst our wheat."

Finally, *philosophy* is the activity of listening to the conversation and of identifying the voices in it. Although in Oakeshott's view, philosophy contributes nothing directly to the conversation, it can help prevent its turning into a monologue. Science and practice have a tendency to drown out the voices of history and poet. Philosophy can and must call attention to this danger.

In his Introduction to the *Leviathan*, which brings Hobbes alive in a manner recalling his famous lectures at the LSE, Oakeshott discusses *political philosophy*, or rather, the activity of philosophizing about politics. As he puts it:

Reflections about political life may take place at a variety of levels. It may remain on the level of the determination of means, or it may strike out for the consideration of ends. Its inspiration may be directly practical, the modification of the arrangements of a political order in accordance with the perception of an immediate benefit; or it may be practical, but less directly so, guided by general ideas. Or again, springing from an experience of political life, it may seek a generalization of that experience in a doctrine. And reflection is apt to flow from one level to another. . . . Political philosophy may be understood to be what occurs when this movement of reflection takes a certain direction and achieves a certain level, its characteristic being the relation of political life . . . to the entire conception of the world that belongs to a civilization. That is to say, at all other levels of reflection on political life, we have before us a single world of political activity . . . but in political philosophy we have in our minds that world and another world, and our endeavor is to explore the coherence of the two worlds together.

If we explore "the coherence of the two worlds"—that of theoretical reflection inspired by the history of a culture and that of immediate practical benefit—"together," we will neither trivialize our endeavor by confining it to generalizations from empirical data, nor lose sight of the real political world on which all political thinking must be based. In this undogmatic formulation, Michael Oakeshott offers a characterization of political philosophy of such urbanity and civility as is likely to be acceptable to a wide spectrum of political theorists. It is a formulation which is in keeping with its author's central metaphor of political life as a "conversation." However heated it may be at times, the conversation is of many voices; it is inclusive rather than exclu-

sive. Such is the Oakeshottian conception of political theory, a conception which is miles removed from unthinking fanaticism of whatever variety.

Whether or not we agree with his philosophical conclusions, it is certain that Professor Oakeshott's work will be important to political theorists for a long time to come. It is a great pleasure, on behalf of the Committee composed of George Carey, Jane Mansbridge and myself to award him the Benjamin E. Lippincott prize in political theory for 1982.

CAREER AWARDS

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

Recipient: **Richard E. Neustadt**, Harvard University.

Selection Committee: Nelson W. Polsby, Berkeley, Chair; Matthew Holden, David B. Truman.

Citation: The deliberations of the 1982 committee on the Charles E. Merriam Award were enriched by an awareness that a goodly number of political scientists known to one or more of us could be considered strong candidates for recognition going "to a person whose published work and career represents a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research." The tradition of theory in the service of practice that Charles E. Merriam so brilliantly exemplified today animates the work of many of our most gifted contemporaries, and the contemplation of this work made service on the committee a great pleasure, as we daresay, it will be for our successors for many years to come. It is moreover, a pleasure and a privilege to make the 1982 Charles E. Merriam Award to Richard E. Neustadt, political scientist, counselor to presidents and cabinet members, careful listener to the music of politics, teacher of policy analysts and policy-makers, shrewd diagnostician of bureaucratic error, and friend of democratic government.

Students of political science no doubt know Dick Neustadt best for his enduring, and occasionally updated, classic *Presidential Power*, the first edition of which in 1960 was discovered to be bedside reading for the incoming President of the United States. This book raised a central issue of presidential politics: what resources does a president have at his disposal that he may use to discharge his responsibilities? How might these resources be conserved, and how are they dissipated?

In addition, among other works Neustadt has written a series of definitive articles on the early evolution of the Bureau of the Budget as an instrument of presidential power, and two important books on the lessons of policy failure. The first of these, *Alliance Politics*, explores the difficulties that allies have in appreciating the organizational constraints inherent in different political systems. The second, on the swine flu vaccine affair, discusses ways in which error in policy-making can result from the biases of organizational structure and bureaucratic routine.

As a public figure Dick Neustadt has emerged into the limelight only once, when he was chairman of the platform committee at the 1972 Democratic National Convention. As a public servant, however, his contributions have been numerous, and spread over his entire career, earliest as a staff member in the Truman White House and Budget Bureau, later on special assignment for Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Carter. He is the founding director of The Institute of Politics at the Kennedy School at Harvard, and before that served with distinction on the political science faculties at Cornell and Columbia.

Perhaps no political scientist of his generation has more devotedly pursued the study of the politics of governing as an art and craft. No one has observed politics at the highest levels more carefully than Richard Neustadt, and written more shrewdly of the inner grammar, tacit rules, of the behavior of political leaders trying to exercise their constitutional responsibilities. It is, then, to our leading student of statecraft that we award the Charles E. Merriam Prize for 1982.

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

Recipient: **Richard Strout**, *Christian Science Monitor*.

Selection Committee: Irving Louis Horowitz, Rutgers University, Chair; Norman Ornstein, Catholic University of America; E. J. Dionne, *New York Times*.

Citation: Because this is the first year of the Carey McWilliams Award, it might be appropriate to begin with a statement of the criteria for selection of candidates. It will be clearly seen that our first choice meets each of the five points with admirable ease.

First, the individual chosen should have a distinguished public service career in newspaper, magazine or broadcast media.

Second, the individual chosen should, in his or her work, illumine some broad general principles of the social and political sciences.

Third, the individual chosen may have a background in editorial activities and not necessarily be a working journalist or writer.

Fourth, the individual chosen should illumine certain key elements identified with McWilliams: intellectual forthrightness and political independence.

Fifth, the individual chosen should be alive and able to enjoy the fruits of the award.

The recipient of our first Carey McWilliams Award is Richard L. Strout. He has a way of speaking in the third person singular; as if "T.R.B." will provide him with the necessary distance to make sound judgments. In a recent column in *The New Republic*, for which he writes his "TRB From Washington" column, it is noted: "The question that baffles him is, 'What makes the American government work?' He can't decide and turns to something more profitable. But of course, he has done no such thing. Instead, like his favorites, Lord Bryce and Walter Lippmann, he has spent his time studying how and why the country survives. Not that any definitive answer is forthcoming. TRB would scarcely know what to do with the definitive. He is intrigued by the process of government, and also by 'the little flame of indignation' to make that process a little better. 'No door is ever finally closed in Washington.' And as long as that is the case, what goes on behind will never fail to be explored by him.

Richard L. Strout is in his sixty-second year as a Washington reporter. Since 1921 he has written three to four news stories a week and regular editorial page articles for the *Christian Science Monitor*. For the past 37 years he has also written the "TRB" column of opinion in *The New Republic*. He is now 83 years old. He has received a George Polk Award for journalism, and a Pulitzer citation. Mr. Strout is not quite sure of the difference between an award and a citation—nor for that matter am I. One can only hope that future APSA McWilliams Awards—by virtue of their selections—will reach the Polk and Pulitzer levels. (If the recipient of the first Award is any indication, it will.)

Selecting the first recipient of an ongoing award is something akin to choosing a Model of models, or Idea of ideas. The committee wanted very much to honor the memory of Carey McWilliams by a choice of someone embodying not just the formal criteria provided in the award; but an individual who, in his or her own right, embodies the highest qualities of honest and courageous political analysis and opinion; and in so doing lends distinction to the vocation of journalism and the art of political science alike. In Richard L. Strout we feel we have satisfied all of these

criteria—subjective and objective—that make him a noteworthy recipient of the first McWilliams Award.

APSA Council Minutes September 1, 1982

The Council was called to order by President Lipset at 8:00 a.m. on September 1, 1982 in the Denver Hilton. In attendance were Paul Allen Beck, David Braybrooke, Bernard C. Cohen, M. Margaret Conway, William Daniels, Ada Finifter, Harold Jacobson, Dorothy James, Samuel Kirkpatrick, Seymour Martin Lipset, Naomi Lynn, Thomas E. Mann, Harvey Mansfield, Jr., E. Wally Miles, Frances Fox Piven, William Riker, Allen Schick, Barbara Sinclair, Susan Welch, Raymond E. Wolfinger and Dina Zinnes.

Minutes. The minutes of the May 7, 1982 Council meeting were approved.

Committee Appointments. The Council considered President-Elect Riker's appointments to committees. Riker, noting that several people had declined appointment, made five substitutions for names listed in his August 5, 1982 memorandum to the Council and indicated that several additional changes might have to be made. Kirkpatrick moved to approve the appointments as revised. The motion was adopted without objection.

Membership. Mann summarized recent trends in Association membership and presented a preliminary report on the research projects that were launched this summer. He reported that the Association had been awarded a \$24,110 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities for a project entitled "Learned Societies: Self-Study and Institutional Planning." This grant will finance a thorough analysis of data generated by these research projects; a report should be ready for consideration by the Council at its next meeting.

Mann also reported on the status of other steps which were initiated to halt the decline in membership: the journal discount brochure, articles on contemporary issues of politics and policy in *PS*, the increased difference between members and nonmembers in hotel rates and registration fees, and promotional activities.

Sections. At its September 1981 meeting the Council approved in principle the establishment of sections or organized subfields within the Association and instructed the Administrative Committee and staff to develop