

PS Appendix

APSA Awards Presented at the 1981 Annual Meeting

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the field of comparative politics.

Recipient: **Thomas M. Callaghy**, University of California, Berkeley.

Selection Committee: Peter Katzenstein, Cornell University, Chair; John Logue, Kent State University; Eric Nordlinger, Brown University.

Dissertation Chairman: Carl G. Rosberg.

Citation: Among a relatively large number of dissertations submitted, this year's committee voted unanimously to award the Gabriel Almond Award for the best doctoral dissertation in Comparative Politics to Dr. Thomas M. Callaghy of the Political Science Department, University of California, Berkeley. His dissertation on "State Formation and Absolutism in Comparative Perspective: Seventeenth Century France and Mobutu Sese Seko's Zaire," is an imaginative and mature piece of scholarship. Informed by contemporary theoretical debates about the state, this bold dissertation offers some sharply etched similarities between 17th century France and contemporary Zaire, along with a fully developed argument why the similarities are more important than the differences between these two seemingly disparate states. Politics and economics as well as domestic and external affairs are woven together in a convincing analysis of the emergence and consolidation of the absolutist state. The dissertation develops sensibly and sensitively Weberian categories of analysis with the help of diverse data, including primary data collected in Africa. Moving gracefully across time and space the dissertation informs us about the interrelationships among power, culture and economy in two different settings which are illuminated in both their characteristic and distinctive features. Through use of the comparative method this dissertation makes us appreciate familiar facts in unfamiliar contexts. In doing so it helps to establish a new approach which has been taken to the study of European history—one that relies upon the colonial Third World model to read back and into an interpretation of the European past.

Edward S. Corwin Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the field of public law.

Recipient: **Stanley Charles Brubaker**, University of Virginia.

Selection Committee: Charles V. Hamilton, Columbia University, Chair; Mary Cornelia Porter, Barat College; Austin Sarat, Amherst College.

Dissertation Chairman: Henry J. Abraham.

Citation: The award for 1981 is presented to Professor Stanley Charles Brubaker for his doctoral dissertation, "Benjamin Nathan Cardozo: An Intellectual Biography." This study was done at the University of Virginia, completed in August, 1979.

Professor Brubaker (now in the Department of Political Science at Colgate University) examined two critical elements of

Cardozo's jurisprudence: pragmatism and perfection. Cardozo was concerned with the inevitable, but complimentary, tension between the two. Brubaker consulted Cardozo's judicial opinions, extra-judicial writings, unpublished papers, including college notebooks and essays, as well as exhaustive secondary sources.

Brubaker carefully analyzed Cardozo's intellectual efforts to reconcile what is with what ought to be. The judicial function should always be sensitive to the former, but it should also be mindful of the higher ends of society, to foster "some notion of the 'good life.'" The "social mind" was an important concept to Cardozo, and Brubaker's study explored the difficulties faced in utilizing this standard. Brubaker was not entirely convinced that Cardozo was as complete as he could (or should) have been in this regard, but the Supreme Court Justice engaged the intellectual challenge in a way still as (perhaps more so) valuable than ever. "Rules of law," Brubaker reminds, "do benefit from a functional evaluation and moral criteria are necessary for that evaluation."

Brubaker's dissertation is a superior study, easily and eminently worthy of the Association's Edward S. Corwin Award.

Helen Dwight Reid Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the field of international relations, law and politics.

Recipient: **Margaret Scranton**, University of Pittsburgh.

Selection Committee: Thomas Biersteker, Yale University, Chair; Robert Gray, Franklin & Marshall College; Ernst Haas, University of California, Berkeley.

Dissertation Chairman: Charles O. Jones.

Citation: Margaret Scranton exhibited an impressive grasp of the U.S. foreign policy decision-making literature and used it to develop an original, analytical framework to evaluate successive attempts to negotiate a Panama Canal Treaty. Beginning with the Eisenhower Administration's canal policy initiatives in 1958, she systematically applied her framework to four successive negotiation efforts in an attempt to understand both why U.S. initiatives changed and why the first four attempts failed, while the last succeeded in producing two new treaties.

She concluded that perceived threats to U.S. interests and pre-existing policy initiatives had the greatest impact on U.S. initiatives. The 1978 success in negotiating a new treaty was attributed to a combination of re-defined U.S. intentions, the joint U.S.-Panamanian formulation of objectives, consensus on these objectives among key U.S. actors, and strong commitments by both the U.S. and Panama to a negotiations process.

Throughout the dissertation, Ms. Scranton displayed considerable ingenuity in looking for sources of information, as well as an ability to make exhaustive use of them. As a result, she provided complete coverage of an interesting and important episode in U.S. foreign policy that touches on all major themes in international relations. The skillful and systematic design of her thesis gives her conclusions significance well beyond the single foreign policy episode examined in her dissertation.

(Scranton's dissertation is entitled "Changing United States Foreign Policy: Negotiating New Panama Canal Treaties, 1958-1978.")

E. E. Schattschneider Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the field of American government.

Recipient: **Byron E. Shafer**, University of California, Berkeley.

Selection Committee: Richard F. Fenno, University of Rochester, Chair; Everett C. Ladd, University of Connecticut; James Lengle, Georgetown University.

Dissertation Chairman: Nelson W. Polsby.

Citation: The winner of the 1980 E. E. Schattschneider Award for the best Ph.D. dissertation in the field of American government is Byron E. Shafer, for his study "The Party Reformed: Reform Politics in the Democratic Party, 1968-1972," written at the University of California, Berkeley.

The Party Reformed is the work of a skilled political observer, interviewer, diarist and analyst. It is a meticulous, encyclopedic reconstruction of decision making inside the Democratic party from its convention of 1968 to its convention of 1972. It is an authoritative analysis of the way in which substantial and consequential changes (a "revolution" says Shafer) were wrought by the Democrats in the presidential nominating process. Nominally, the study chronicles the life and times of the party's Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection. As political science, it is a richly rewarding study of elite political activity in the context of a central institution of democratic government.

The dissertation challenges much conventional political science wisdom about the decentralization of our national parties—by delineating the conditions under which the centralizing efforts of a national party dominated the decentralizing tendencies of the state parties. It challenges much common journalistic wisdom (as reflected in its coverage) about the insignificance of institutional devices to political change—by presenting a case where changes in delegate selection methods had important effects on the makeup, resources, issues and leadership of at least one political party. It challenges those among us who shy away from combining the study of rule making politics with the study of implementation politics by enveloping the two processes within a framework that highlights both interaction effects and sequence effects.

As pure political history, the dissertation is a fascinating case study of the organizational confrontation between the old politics and the new politics—between what Shafer calls the structural reformers and the structural conservatives at the recommendation stage of the Commission's work and what he calls the volunteer party states and the organization party states at the compliance stage of the Commission's work. But it is mostly a significant contribution to the political science study of internal party politics, of the organizational party in both its national and its state dimensions. It is also an encouragement to others to match our hand wringing over the impotence of our national parties with some careful analysis of their activities.

Shafer demonstrates an unusually mature grasp of political maneuver. An intellectual, he is nonetheless comfortable in the world about which he writes. And so he has given us a set of persuasive generalizations about our politicians—first, in terms of their backgrounds, goals, allegiances, perceptions, resources and strategies as individuals and, second, in terms of the varied contexts in which they must operate, like the McGovern-Fraser Commission, the Democratic National Committee, several of the state parties and several of the presidential campaigns. For students of political processes the study is packed with wise descriptions of such phenomena as: staff dominance of high level committees, the importance of agenda manipulation for policy making, the conditions for successful political leadership, the impact of formal rules on outcomes, the importance of differences in intensity and attentiveness among political actors, the impact of personal ambition and personal networks on organizational behavior. Students of political calculation will learn much from immersing themselves in this study—as Shafer, himself, has obviously immersed himself in the cost-benefit analyses of so many working politicians.

The Party Reformed was the unanimous, enthusiastic choice of a committee composed of Professor Everett Carll Ladd of the University of Connecticut, James Lengle of Georgetown University and Richard Fenno of the University of Rochester, Chairman. We offer our warm congratulations to Dr. Shafer.

Leo Strauss Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the field of political philosophy.

Recipient: **James Leake**, Boston College.

Selection Committee: Terence Ball, University of Minnesota, Chair; Thomas Pangle, University of Toronto; Delba Winthrop, Harvard University.

Dissertation Chairman: Christopher J. Bruell.

Citation: The only thing men learn from history, Hegel once remarked, is that men learn nothing from history. This is lamentably true, and nowhere is it truer than in present-day America. Ours is supposedly a land of fresh starts and new beginnings. We are admonished, therefore, to forget the past—to forget Watergate, to put Vietnam behind us, and the rest of it. In this setting history—understood as the study of the past—becomes a specialized scholarly enterprise having little to do with the cares and concerns of laymen and citizens. History, said Henry Ford, is bunk. This ahistorical, nay anti-historical, attitude contrasts sharply with the older view that history has lessons to teach us: histories are twice-told tales, and all tales have morals. To draw out and develop these morals is the task of the historian.

Perhaps the preeminent practitioner of the historian's craft, thus conceived, was the Roman Cornelius Tacitus. In his dissertation "Tacitus' Teaching and the Decline of Liberty at Rome" (Boston College), Dr. James Leake recovers and reiterates Tacitus' morals and his method. In documenting the decline of Roman liberty, Tacitus analyzed the causes and consequences of tyranny in its various forms and guises, and its effects upon public and private virtue. If liberty and virtue are ever to be restored they must, Tacitus believed, be set on a firmer foundation. This foundation must consist not merely of constitutional edifices—for these can be perverted and subverted by ambitious and cunning men—but of a wise and virtuous citizenry. Wisdom comes, in part, from understanding history and its lessons; virtue consists in applying these lessons to one's conduct in the present. By these standards a society priding itself upon its purportedly practical present-mindedness can be neither wise nor virtuous. This is one of the lessons that Tacitus teaches us, if we will but heed his words. The importance of heeding his words is, in turn, the lesson that Dr. Leake teaches us.

The 1981 Leo Strauss Award Committee is pleased to present this year's award for the most outstanding dissertation in political theory to Dr. James Leake.

Leonard D. White Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the general field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory.

Recipient: **J. Serge Taylor**, University of California, Berkeley.

Selection Committee: Donald Haider, Northwestern University, Chair; Dorothy B. James, American University; Harold Orlans, National Academy of Public Administration.

Dissertation Chairman: Todd La Porte.

Citation: In memory of an exceptional scholar, the Leonard D. White Award is presented for the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1979 or 1980 in the field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory. Three committee members read seven dissertations that were nominated for the award, ranking them on the basis of criteria that included design, execution, thoroughness, clarity of writing, and originality. They were unanimous in choosing the dissertation of John Serge Taylor of the University of California at Berkeley. His work, "Environmentalists in the Bureaucracy," is an outstanding comparative study of bureaucratic response to

PS Appendix

environmentalists and regulation. It is a fine beginning to a career that should further the scholarly tradition and standards for which Leonard White stood.

(Taylor's dissertation is entitled "Environmentalists in the Bureaucracy: Environmental Impact Analysis in the Forest Service and the Army Corps of Engineers.")

BOOK AND PAPER AWARDS

Ethnic and Cultural Pluralism Award

For the best scholarly work in political science published within the previous five years exploring the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Recipient: **Marguerite Ross Barnett**, Teachers College.

Selection Committee: Hanes Walton, Jr., Savannah State College, Chair; Harry Pachon, Administrative Assistant to Representative Roybal; Pauline Stone, University of Michigan.

Citation: The 1981 Ethnic and Cultural Pluralism Award Committee would like to cite Professor Marguerite Ross Barnett for writing the best scholarly work in political science exploring the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

This is a pioneering work because it returns to an old and well studied area—nationalism—and brings forth new insights, new departures, new thoughts and new perspectives. Simply put, this is an excellent innovative treatment of an old subject matter.

The genius of this study lies in its conceptualization. It sees the concept of nationalism in two forms—territorial and cultural. And most importantly it re-examines the latter by first challenging the old definitions of it, rejecting the cavalier commendations of it by politicians and the false dichotomies and dismissal theories of it developed by social scientists. Professor Barnett starts anew and ends with a unique vision, a new concept and new knowledge about cultural nationalism which broadens the perspective and scope of the modern scholar working in the area. This work is a significant signpost pointing to the future.

To achieve her goal, that is, to permit the reader to see cultural nationalism not only anew but as a force in and of itself, Professor Barnett employed multiple methodologies and research techniques to develop a coherent and systematic portrait of an ideology, which moves from a mass movement to a political party to finally a political state in South India. The journey through these different stages can be clearly perceived because of the careful formulation and alignment of sundry methodologies. This book is a striking example of how a scholar can employ numerous research techniques in an exceptional manner.

The findings of the study like the unique conceptualization and the outstanding deployment of methodologies, are simply unexcelled. They transcend the time and place of the study to provide students of ethnic and cultural pluralism with an understanding of how an ideology—cultural nationalism—emerges, develops and transforms itself into political impact and public policy. Both the area, and the discipline of political science as well as the social sciences in general are now wiser and more advanced because of professor Barnett's study. For this, we the Committee, salute you and your work. Congratulations.

(Barnett's book is entitled *The Politics of Cultural Nationalism in South India* (Princeton University Press).)

Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award

For the best paper presented at the 1980 Annual Meeting.

Recipient: **Trudi C. Miller**, Division of Applied Research, National Science Foundation.

Selection Committee: Robert H. Salisbury, Washington University, St. Louis, Chair; Harry Eckstein, University of California, Irvine; Grant McConnell, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Citation: An incisive analysis of a central issue of our time, Dr. Miller's paper explains the failure of social scientists to

understand properly the nature of their own findings regarding black-white differences in educational achievement, and goes on to show how dynamic models, explicitly incorporating normative expectations, can help us analyze complex issues of public policy. It is a stylish combination of mathematical method and political substance that indeed provides a model for the discipline.

(Miller's paper is entitled "Toward a Normative Dynamic Model of Educational Equity.")

Gladys M. Kammerer Award

For the best political science publication in 1980 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Recipients: **Gary C. Jacobson**, University of California, San Diego; and **Michael Lipsky**, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Selection Committee: Samuel P. Huntington, Harvard University, Chair; Robert Engler, City University of New York; Paul E. Peterson, University of Chicago.

Citation: The American Political Science Association annually awards the Gladys M. Kammerer Award for the best political science publication in the field of U.S. national policy. The Committee on the Award for 1980 consists of Professor Robert Engler of the City University of New York, Professor Paul E. Peterson of the University of Chicago, and Professor Samuel P. Huntington of Harvard University, as chairman. The Committee unanimously voted to give the Award jointly to the authors of two outstanding works of political science dealing with U.S. national policy: to Gary C. Jacobson for his book, *Money in Congressional Elections*, published by the Yale University Press, and to Michael Lipsky, for his volume, *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*, published by the Russell Sage Foundation.

In his volume, Professor Jacobson brings together in a well-conceived and successful combination the traditionally very different streams of political science research concerned with electoral behavior, statistical modeling, and public policy analysis. Effectively exploiting newly available sources of data on the financing of congressional elections, he develops his hypotheses and marshals the relevant evidence with exemplary clarity and precision. In demonstrating the critical role that fund-raising plays for the challenger but not for the incumbent in congressional elections, Professor Jacobson persuasively suggests that if democracy involves competitive elections, democracy will be strengthened if more rather than less money is spent in congressional campaigns. All-in-all, this volume is a masterful analysis of one of the most important and yet least well-understood issues involved in the operation of American democracy.

While Professor Jacobson's book deals with the electoral or "input" side of the political system, Professor Lipsky's volume focuses on the far reaches of the "output" side of the system: the relations between those public servants supposed to deliver services to the public and their clients who are supposed to receive them. With sensitivity and insight, Professor Lipsky probes the conflicts and dilemmas, trials, tribulations, and frustrations of street-level bureaucrats. In particular he highlights the difficulties they face in attempting to reconcile idealistic aspirations, resource shortages, and conflicts of interest with both clients and bureaucratic superiors. Professor Lipsky draws upon a wide variety of theoretical analyses, case studies, and personal observations to illuminate a bureaucratic scene in which no one is at fault and no one wins. Out of an analysis that is depressing because it is so penetratingly realistic, he manages to elicit reforms that are hopeful because they are discriminatingly eclectic. His is a landmark work on how and why public services are and are not delivered to the publics for whom they are designed.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award

For the best book published in the United States during 1980 on government, politics or international affairs.

Recipient: **John P. Gaventa**, Highlander Center, New Market, Tennessee.

Selection Committee: Robert E. Lane, Yale University, Chair; Ira Katznelson, University of Chicago; Hanna Pitkin, University of California, Berkeley.

Citation: Aware that the anonymous power of distant authority is experienced in some communities as the controlling force in people's daily lives, John Gaventa has explored the nature of power in an Appalachian coal community. With the empathic resourcefulness of an anthropologist, and the dogged determination and skill of a historian, Gaventa has illuminated the central concept of political science, power, and its obverse, powerlessness. These abstractions, and their related theories, come to life in *Power and Powerlessness*. Made vivid in cool prose, made memorable by the mastery of intimate detail of the lives of those whose experiences of powerlessness mask a rebellious spirit, this book conveys an understanding of the uses of power which enriches an already rich literature. Not content with the local setting of the powerless, Gaventa takes us to London, where corporate ownership exercises its distant control, to county seats and state capitals, where regulatory decisions and appeals have their venue. From the exploration of this larger field of power, there emerges a complex portrait of the course, the incidence, the machinery of power in some important fragments of the post-colonial and the modern world.

(Gaventa's book is entitled *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley* (University of Illinois Press).)

Benjamin E. Lippincott Award

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: Simone de Beauvoir.

Selection Committee: Andrew Hacker, Queens College, Chair; Alisdair MacIntyre, Boston University; Judith Shklar, Harvard University.

Citation: On behalf of the Lippincott Award Committee, I am pleased to announce our selection for 1981: Mme. Simone de Beauvoir, for her book *The Second Sex*, which was first published in Paris in 1949.

The citation, which I shall now present to you, was prepared by my colleagues on the Committee, Judith Shklar and Alisdair MacIntyre.

Simone de Beauvoir set herself the task of understanding from a woman's point of view the world in which women live, and to describe the ways they might take "to aspire to full membership in the human race."

The Second Sex is both one of the most original works of existentialist political theory and the most profound philosophical foundation of the contemporary movement to achieve the intellectual and political liberation of women.

This book constitutes the first systematic and, to this date, unsurpassed statement of the causes and consequences of the roles allocated to the sexes. It has been impossible since its publication not to recognize most social and political relations as structured—sometimes to an extraordinary and usually to a highly significant degree—by that allocation.

Political theory was thereby set new tasks, and we confidently expect that 20 years from now Lippincott Awards will be given for work that would not have been written but for the influence of *The Second Sex*.

CAREER AWARDS

Charles E. Merriam Award

Presented to the person whose published work and career represents a significant contribution to the art of government through the application of social science research.

Recipient: Harold Gosnell.

Selection Committee: Pendleton Herring, Chair; Martha Derthick, Brookings Institution; Don C. Price, Harvard University.

Citation: The art of government has been approached over

the ages in many ways. In our time Charles Merriam early championed the distinctive contribution that social science research could make. To his former student and collaborator in writing and research, Harold Foote Gosnell, it is eminently fitting that the Charles E. Merriam Award be presented this year.

In 1920-21 Gosnell was the sole fellow in the newly organized Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago and there he became the first Ph.D. to represent the behavioral approach. Over the next 20 years there he exemplified in his teaching and research the essence of the "Chicago School." His first book, entitled *Boss Platt and His N. Y. Machine* (1924) blazed a new trail and Merriam called it "a novel attempt at closer analysis" and "a pioneer work of the very greatest value and significance to every student of party phenomena." In 1927 his *Getting Out the Vote* was hailed as "the only significant experiment yet run by an American political scientist."

Gosnell has ever been concerned in his extensive research with probing into the nature of the art of government: the attitudes, behavior and the nature of leaders and followers. Systematically and empirically he has examined voters and non-voters; racial elements in politics; political parties and bosses and great leaders. The application of rigorous analysis to this protean and all-too-human subject matter was the challenge he sought to meet and in doing so forged tools that others have striven to develop further.

By the 1930s his teaching brought mathematical formulation to bear on public opinion and parties in a fashion worthy of efforts today and his concerns in comparative government with classification, the framing of hypotheses, and the relating of structure and theory anticipated later trends.

His *Grass Roots Politics* (1942) is the first factor analytic voting study and, as a former student remembers, "He did his calculations by hand, there being no large computers then—I know this for I was his student and assistant while he was working on the volume."

Whether dealing with *Why Europe Votes* (1930) or *Machine Politics: Chicago Model* (1937), Gosnell focused on the actualities of politics and applied the light of social science research to the often dark and artful ways of governance.

Time and again he participated in both politics and administration. He early served as a campaign manager and engaged in several local campaigns. He was involved with Hoover's Committee on Recent Social Trends and later with the National Resources Committee. He served in various capacities during the 1940s in the Bureau of the Budget, OPA and the State Department and was a U.S. government research consultant in 1950-60. For nearly 10 years he was a professor at Howard University.

During the past decade he has worked on a monumental biography of Harry S. Truman entitled *Truman Crises* (published by the Greenwood Press, 1980). In Truman, Gosnell found a practitioner of the art of government worthy of the deepest probing of social science research. In the completion of this massive task, Gosnell again displays the originality, tenacity and integrity that have marked his career as a student of political behavior. We honor him today as a founder of modern American political science.

James Madison Award

Presented to an American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science.

Recipient: Gabriel A. Almond, Stanford University.

Selection Committee: Robert A. Dahl, Yale University, Chair; Alexander George, Stanford University; William Keetch, University of North Carolina.

Citation: The work of Gabriel Almond is distinguished by its originality, its range, and its impact. In looking back over his career of some 40 years as a professional political scientist, one is bound to be struck by the number of instances in which his innovative contributions have fundamentally shaped methods of research, substance and controversies in a fundamental way and in a variety of subjects. He combined his

PS Appendix

torical and survey research to describe the relation between American opinion and foreign policy. To account for the appeals of Communism he used in-depth interviews with persons who were members of the Communist party. In collaboration with James Coleman, he helped us understand how the essential functions of a political system may be performed in developing countries by different structures, while seemingly similar structures may actually perform quite different functions. He was with Sidney Verba, the first to show us how cross-national research can reveal crucial variations in the political cultures of democratic countries. No other scholar has had more influence on the field of comparative politics, to which he has contributed decisively not only through a half dozen major books and many articles but also through his active participation on the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council, of

which he was a member for 18 years of pathbreaking work, including more than a decade when he was its chairman. The hallmark of all his work is a profound concern for real problems in the real world, the advance of theory, and humane values.

As a scholar, Gabriel Almond is known and respected throughout the worldwide community of political science. As a human being he is admired by a smaller but nonetheless worldwide fellowship that includes everyone who has known him personally. Although little can be added to the honors, esteem, and recognition he has already received, we are happy to present to him the highest accolade of this Association, the James Madison Award to a living American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science.