

APSA Awards Presented at 1990 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 1988 or 1989 in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: Joyce K. Kallgren, University of California, Davis, chair; Lisa Anderson, Columbia University; Peter A. Hall, Harvard University.

Recipient: **Brian M. Downing**, University of Chicago.

Dissertation: "The Military Revolution and Political Change in Early Modern Europe," submitted by the University of Chicago.

Dissertation Chair: Lloyd Rudolph.

Citation: This is a highly ambitious effort to reevaluate the roles of pre-modernization constitutionalism and of military development in the rise of liberal democracy in Europe. It is an effort to assess the factors most significant in explaining the development of the nation-state and the different paths to democracy in Western Europe.

Drawing on detailed examinations of cases ranging from Prussia and Poland to England, France, and Sweden, Downing attributes different outcomes in the various states of Europe to the relationship between the local constitutional traditions of the Middle Ages and the imperatives of state formation brought on by military development in the seventeenth century. In contrast to Barrington Moore Jr., whose work inspires this dissertation, Downing argues that the proto-representative institutions of the late medieval period and the distinctive response of each kingdom to the military pressures of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had a major impact on the trajectory of the regimes.

Downing situates his work well in the literature, marshals an impressive range of secondary materials in three languages to support it, and makes good use of comparative leverage across six nations.

He interrogates the empirical materials in a judicious and imaginative way that represents some of the finest traditions of comparative politics. His work is thorough, intellectually creative, and provocative, even controversial. Indeed, in the tradition of scholarly debate, several committee members differed with the conclusions while admiring the broad command of relevant literatures, the thoughtful and perceptive analysis, and the admirable willingness to engage "big questions."

William Anderson Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of intergovernmental relations.

Award Committee: Clifton McCleskey, University of Virginia, chair; Diane D. Blair, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; David Lowery, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Recipient: **Jeffrey J. Anderson**, Brown University.

Dissertation: "Territorial Networks of Interest in Britain and Germany: Regions and the Politics of Economic Decline," submitted by Yale University.

Dissertation Chair: Joseph LaPalombara.

Citation: Jeffrey Anderson's "Territorial Networks of Interest in Britain and Germany: Regions and the Politics of Economic Decline" addresses the conduct of industrial policy under the alternative institutional structures of unitary and federal government by comparing two regions in Britain with two in the Federal Republic of Germany. The carefully selected cases enable Anderson to assess the impact of institutional arrangements on the evolution and play of industrial policy using concepts developed in the study of territorial networks while controlling for level of decline and a host of other economic and social factors. He finds compelling evidence that institutions do matter in that very different patterns of political behavior emerge as a result of the structural arrangement of local-national relations. In the two British regions, he finds a prevalence of institutionalized networks of public and private actors, networks that are largely absent in the German cases. Moreover, Anderson finds extensive links between territorial interests and parties in Germany, ties

largely missing in the British cases. This unique combination of a compelling comparative research design, a focus on an institutional structure of long-standing concern to political scientists, a skillful application of the concepts of organizational analysis, and attention to the important policy problems of industrial decline insures that Anderson's work will be of major importance to the cross-national analysis of intergovernmental relations.

Edward S. Corwin Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of public law.

Award Committee: Austin Sarat, Amherst College, chair; Jennifer Nedelsky, University of Toronto; Roger Smith, Yale University.

Recipient: **James W. Tubbs**, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Dissertation: "Roman Law Mind, Common Law Mind: A Study in the Comparative History of English and Continental Jurisprudence Before 1700," submitted by Johns Hopkins University.

Dissertation Chair: J. Woodford Howard, Jr.

Citation: James Tubbs provides an inclusive examination of one of the most commonly discussed, and least well understood, issues in the study of comparative law and civil law. Legal theorists and legal historians regularly make reference to the way the common law, with its emphasis on custom and precedent, differs from the supposedly more centralized, rational and unified civil law tradition. Rarely, however, do they do the hard work of carefully inspecting common and civil law systems to verify these points of comparison. Tubbs has done that work. His dissertation keeps alive an old and venerable tradition of public law scholarship, a tradition associated with Corwin himself, a tradition of breaking the boundaries of genres by combining careful empirical work and a great range of learning and scholarship. Indeed, Tubbs provides a dazzling intellectual history, a history not content to rest its claims on even his own very careful reworking of classic scholarship on this subject, from Maine, Maitland and Pound to Pocock and Skinner. Tubbs'

curiosity drives him to a groundbreaking new examination of primary source materials. He has read thousands of cases in an effort to understand the sources of particular legal doctrines and has sampled 1,600 cases reported in the *English Yearbooks*. The Corwin Award Committee was quite taken with the care as well as the intellectual sophistication with which Tubbs has analyzed those materials.

Tubbs' dissertation explores a variety of issues central to current debates in public law and legal theory. His treatment of interpretation and intention in both the Roman and common law shows interesting connections to current debates; his treatment of the imperial relation to law illuminates important contemporary issues about law's contribution to state legitimacy. But, most importantly, Tubbs' work suggests that scholarly distinctions between civil and common law may be too sharply drawn. As he sees it, those traditions are not sharply differentiated. This is in part the case because Roman law jurisprudence played an important role in shaping common law thinking. Both looked to reason and custom; both display an ambivalent relation to precedent. Moreover, Tubbs argues that the Roman and common law traditions are less internally consistent and uniform than is often argued. The Corwin Award Committee thinks that Tubbs has proved a more than adequate demonstration of these claims and that his work will stand as a necessary benchmark for all future discussions of these important legal traditions.

Harold D. Lasswell Award

For the best dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of policy studies (supported by the Policy Studies Organization).

Award Committee: Fred Holborn, Johns Hopkins University, chair; Loch K. Johnson, University of Georgia; Huey Perry, Southern University.

Recipient: Daniel J. Wirls, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Dissertation: "Defense as Domestic Politics: National Security Policy and Political Power in the 1980s," submitted by Cornell University.

Dissertation Chair: Benjamin Ginsberg.

Citation: The 1990 Lasswell award competition in a strong field has been won by Daniel Wirls, now at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Under the guidance of a Cornell University dissertation committee chaired by Professor Benjamin Ginsberg, Dr. Wirls has written with insight and with thematic force on the relationship and interplay of defense policy

and domestic politics during the 1980s. It succeeds in portraying and analyzing systematically the interactive relationship between domestic political competition and national security policy. The role of defense policy in domestic politics has rarely been explored. Dr. Wirls does so by drawing on a blend of theoretical perspectives and empirical examples from both the fields of international relations and American politics. In addition the dissertation reflects a talent for stylistic control and felicity of expression rarely encountered in the arduous adventure of writing of a dissertation.

Dr. Wirls pivots his narrative and analysis around three case studies of policy innovation—the nuclear weapons freeze proposal, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and the military reform lobby's effort to recast procurement practices in the Pentagon. But the close study of these cases never detracts from the larger landscape of domestic institutions and political alignments which are important for the understanding of national security policy during the Cold War and after. He orchestrates a variety of empirical and data sources together with a sure knowledge of the broader panorama of the theoretical issues and historical circumstances which underlie the subject.

Helen Dwight Reid Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of international relations, law and politics.

Award Committee: Harry Eckstein, University of California, Irvine, chair; Sylvia Maxfield, Yale University; Linda B. Miller, Wellesley College.

Recipient: Steven Weber, University of California, Berkeley.

Dissertation: "Cooperation and Discord in Security Relationships: Toward a Theory of U.S.-Soviet Arms Control," submitted by Stanford University.

Dissertation Chair: Alexander L. George.

Citation: The committee was unanimous in its judgment that Steven Weber's massive study was a model of its kind: well-designed and well-argued, well-written and well-documented. As he promises in his introduction, Weber successfully bridges the gap between game-theoretic conceptions and empirical description through the skillful analysis of focused case studies.

By insisting on "real world tests" of deductive frameworks, Weber generates new hypotheses about reciprocity, learning, and other elements of superpower cooperation. By rejecting sterile formulas, he opens the door to conclusions valid

for periods of superpower detente and entente, as well as eras of strained relations.

In sum, this dissertation is distinguished in ways more established scholars could emulate.

E. E. Schattschneider Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of American government.

Award Committee: Gerald C. Wright, Indiana University, chair; Joseph Cooper, Rice University; Jeffrey Tulis, University of Texas at Austin.

Recipient: Laura Stoker, University of California, Berkeley.

Dissertation: "Morality and the Study of Political Behavior," submitted by the University of Michigan.

Dissertation Chairs: Kent Jennings and John Kingdon.

Citation: This well-written dissertation addresses important questions that have been largely ignored in empirical studies of American politics. What role do ethics play in contemporary political life? And can conceptions of moral philosophy be usefully incorporated into studies of mass political behavior? Ms. Stoker provides an insightful survey of the controversies in modern moral philosophy, and she skillfully draws on this literature to guide her empirical analysis of the role of moral evaluations on policy preferences for a set of four New Right issues. She convincingly demonstrates that a sophisticated consideration of people's normative evaluations helps us to understand policy preferences on social issues. Her work provides a needed counterweight to current views of citizens as simple creatures of socialized long-term attitudes or as calculating self-interested utility maximizers.

Ms. Stoker's effort to tie empirical work to issues of importance in political theory rests on her analysis of a set of theoretical distinctions and controversies in ethics. Her treatment of utilitarianism as the underlying basis for rational choice models is particularly insightful. She finds two threads particularly important as bases for her later empirical work: objectivism—whether people believe their moral evaluations derive from objective external standards, and consequentialism—what are the effects of a behavior or practice?

Because existing public opinion polls do not consider the role of moral reasoning in preference formation, Ms. Stoker first did her own student survey and then, based on the results from the study, succeeded in having some of her questions included on the 1987 National Election

Studies pilot study. She finds that a mix of religiosity, moral evaluations, perceptions of harm, and concerns for moral autonomy interact to provide a highly intelligible structure to citizen policy preferences on the issues of homosexuality, abortion, pornography and euthanasia. She finds that a high regard for personal autonomy, a traditional value of liberal democracy, acts as a buffer between religiously derived moral evaluations and preferences for restrictive government action; however, this buffer is less effective for evangelical Protestants than religious groups.

Adopting an ethical standpoint for assessing public opinion, Ms. Stoker demonstrates that political attitudes can be structured, coherent, and predictable without being ideological and without being conditioned affective responses. Her study offers a different point of departure for studying political behavior; by viewing citizens as ethical beings our attention is directed to new measures and to different questions about politics. We are reminded that politics is not just about coalition formation of self-interested citizens, but about differences over what is right, fair, or justified within the context of community and group values. Stoker does the field a real service in her convincing argument that social scientists err in avoiding normative issues and in her lucid demonstration that we can incorporate profitably into empirical work the discussions of moral and political theorists. This work should help to establish an exciting new line of research on citizen political preferences in American politics.

Leo Strauss Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Don Herzog, University of Michigan, chair; Seyla Ben-Habib, State University of New York, Stony Brook; Michael Gillespie, Duke University.

Recipient: Alan Houston, University of California, San Diego.

Dissertation: "Algernon Sidney and the Republican Heritage in England and America," submitted by Harvard University.

Dissertation Chair: Judith N. Shklar.

Citation: Alan Houston's "Algernon Sidney and the Republican Heritage in England and America" is a scholarly accomplishment a writer of any age would be proud of, let alone someone just earning a Ph.D. Deftly executed, scrupulously careful, exhaustively re-

searched, and through it all a great read: this thesis immediately struck the disparate members of this year's Leo Strauss Award Committee as the winner.

Houston's research took him through political histories of seventeenth-century England, dozens of contemporary pamphlets, and manuscript collections around Britain and France. He locates Sidney's republicanism in the intellectual context of his day, but nowhere does Sidney become reduced to a pallid reflection of his day. Indeed, Sidney's ponderous and badly organized prose takes on new life and vigor in Houston's contextualization. Houston persuasively argues that we don't really understand what "slavery" or "corruption" or "mercenary army" means until we grasp what was at stake in contemporary debates.

Nor does Houston lose sight of big conceptual points in maintaining his historical rigor. Among other points, the thesis advances a surprising claim about a recent dispute. Far from being any sort of rivals, Houston suggests, republicanism and liberalism meet—once we notice what concrete uses Sidney actually puts the language of virtue to.

Had Houston stopped with Sidney's death at the hands of Charles II, he would have had a first-rate dissertation. But he chose to press on to an exploration of Sidney's influence in revolutionary America. Here the heroic martyr matters at least as much as any textual arguments, and here Houston advances some striking claims about the limits of intentionalism in the history of political thought. Here again the research is exhaustive, the prose bristling with insight, the erudition lightly worn. It is a bravura close to a masterly performance.

Leonard D. White Award

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted during 1988 or 1989 in the field of public administration, including broadly related problems of policy formation and administrative theory.

Award Committee: James Q. Wilson, University of California, Los Angeles, chair; Jonathan Bendor, Stanford University; Woodrow Jones, Texas A&M University.

Recipient: Shui Yan Tang, University of Southern California.

Dissertation: "Institutions and Collective Action in Irrigation Systems," submitted by Indiana University.

Dissertation Chair: Elinor Ostrom.

Citation: Dr. Tang explains how coordinating the behavior of cultivators who draw water from large-scale irrigation sys-

tems is affected by the institutional arrangements, physical attributes, and communal environments of those systems. Using organization theory and transaction-cost economics. Dr. Tang predicts how the incentives created by differing arrangements will affect the willingness of participants to follow rules and maintain the systems; he then tests those predictions with data drawn from detailed case studies of forty-seven irrigation systems operating in several countries.

Given the diverse circumstances confronting these systems, no single set of operational rules is optimal. However, much of the variation in rules and behavior can be reduced to one of two types—decentralized community systems and centrally managed bureaucratic ones. In the community systems, irrigators are much more likely to obey the operational rules and to maintain the irrigation system than in bureaucratic systems.

Dr. Tang's dissertation combines sophisticated theorizing with careful attention to empirical detail in an impressive effort to explain the real-world consequences of using different ways of solving problems of collective choice. His findings provide valuable lessons for both academic theorists and governments making policy decisions, two qualities that would have commended this dissertation to Leonard White.

PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award (\$250)

For the best paper presented at the 1989 Annual Meeting.

Award Committee: Nancy Rosenblum, Brown University, chair; Alan Ryan, Princeton University; Nathan Tarcov, University of Chicago.

Recipient: Byron E. Shafer, Nuffield College.

Paper: "The Notion of an Electoral Order: The Structure of Electoral Politics at the Accession of George Bush."

Citation: The Burdette Prize Committee had thirteen interesting and original papers to consider. All of them were warmly recommended by their sponsoring chairs, and all of them had many virtues. Nonetheless, Professor Shafer's paper was the unanimous first choice of each of the committee. For the writer of the citation this has the slight drawback that he cannot be absolutely certain that his reasons for so liking the paper are exactly those that moved the rest of the committee. However, Professor Shafer's paper is so rich in good things that this is of no great moment.

As its subtitle—"The Structure of Electoral Politics at the Accession of George Bush"—suggests, Professor Shafer has been reading Sir Lewis Namier's masterpiece on the structure of English politics at the accession of George III. The deeper connection is that Professor Shafer is an anti-Namierite in thinking that there is more to structure than chronicling the careers of individual politicians in Namier's meticulous way, but Namierite in thinking that apparently contradictory elements in a political system may endure indefinitely and for good reason.

The context that provokes these thoughts is the politically stable but intellectually disquieting condition of current U.S. politics. The Democratic Party is chronically incapable of capturing the presidency; the Republican Party is chronically incapable of capturing Congress. A stunningly popular Republican president, Ronald Reagan, has exceeded—by short coattails; a huge Democratic majority in the House provides no basis for challenging the president of the day. Shafer complains that political scientists' obsession with the concept of 'realignment' has made all this harder to explain than it ought to be. Many have spent too long looking out for some new realignment which will change all this; others have spent too long writing about de-alignment, as though 'alignment' was the natural order of things.

All this he repudiates in favor of the idea of an electoral order. The idea of an electoral order is simple, and once understood, irresistible. The structure of the electoral order is a matter of popular opinion at the base, institutions at the top and party organization linking the two levels. Since popular opinion provides majorities for nationalism in foreign policy, conservatism in cultural matters, and liberalism on economic and welfare concerns, it is unsurprising that Republicans capture the institution most apt to represent the first two of these, and Democrats the institutions most apt to represent the last. Since these majorities are stable, coherent and persistent, there is nothing surprising about the endurance of the seemingly anomalous state of affairs that has excited so much commentary over the past two decades.

Something will doubtless happen to break the mold; in particular, Republicans must beware of an economic slump. Still, there is nothing intrinsic to the structure to promote drastic change. Party activists cannot readily alter their natures, and unless they do, the present structure will persist. For Republican activists cannot easily change their economic spots and embrace the liberal welfare state, while Democratic activists can

hardly change their cultural stripes and become xenophobic conservatives. The discussion provokes many reflections on other issues—one suspects the British audiences whom Professor Shafer thanks for pressing him to develop his first tentative ideas went off to brood on the local implications of a conceptual structure and a set of hypotheses that have application far beyond the context that provoked them.

It remains only to say that Professor Shafer's paper is written with a lightness of touch, and a teasingness of style that are attractive in themselves, and never more so than in the unlikely context of such a solid and well read contribution to political science.

Heinz Eulau Award (\$500)

For the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* during 1989.

Award Committee: James Alt, Harvard University, chair; William A. Galston, University of Maryland; Peter Lange, Duke University.

Recipients: **John H. Aldrich**, Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Science; **Eugene Borgida**, University of Minnesota; **John L. Sullivan**, University of Minnesota.

Article: "Foreign Affairs and Issue Voting: Do Presidential Candidates 'Waltz before a Blind Audience'?"

Citation: The Committee considered all the articles published in Volume 83 of the *American Political Science Review* and found much to commend many of them. It unanimously selected the winning article for its skillful blending of theory and empirical research directed toward a question which is both interesting and important.

The authors begin by noting that scholarly study of the electoral impact of political issues has been largely confined to matters of domestic policy. They therefore ask why, if issues of foreign policy are unimportant to the public, presidential candidates would place as much emphasis on them in campaigning as they do. Are the candidates wasting their time, or have students of electoral behavior devoted too little attention to issues of foreign policy?

The authors clearly believe the latter, and offer much evidence for their view. According to their data analysis, the public met the necessary criteria for foreign policy issue voting apart from the period between 1973 and 1980 which was dominated by domestic and largely economic issues. The American electorate saw clear differences between candidates

on foreign policy. Their perceptions displayed both knowledge and recognition of candidates' different positions, and foreign policy was generally perceived as important. Foreign policy issues had an impact on voting comparable in size to that of domestic issues, independent of party loyalties and candidate evaluations.

Like many others in the *Review*, the article by Aldrich, Sullivan, and Borgida uses modern analytic tools on traditional political subject matter in a way that results in startling new insights into voting processes. They offer compelling evidence for conclusions which go against the grain of the conventional wisdom enough to make a difference in the way scholars will think about aspects of electoral behavior. In all these ways it seemed entirely appropriate to bestow on their article the prize whose existence honors Heinz Eulau.

BOOK AWARDS

Ralph J. Bunche Award (\$500)

For the best scholarly work in political science published in 1989 which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Paul Peterson, Harvard University, chair; Rufus P. Browning, San Francisco State University; Carlos Munoz, Jr., University of California, Berkeley.

Recipient: **Clarence N. Stone**, University of Maryland.

Book: *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*, published by the University Press of Kansas.

Citation: One year ago the American Political Science Association met in Atlanta for the first time. Since convention site selections by professional associations seem to be a lagging indicator of a city's national prestige, the event was still another sign of the post-war transformation of Atlanta from a sleepy southern town into the region's foremost financial and trading center.

Clarence Stone's careful, thorough account of Atlanta's political life during these forty years explicates the way in which this transformation was dependent upon Atlanta's political regime, a regime that was marked by a close and enduring relationship between Atlanta's business community and its increasingly large and politically active black community. Incorporating and going beyond the debate over community power between elitists and pluralists (itself begun with Floyd Hunter's study of Atlanta in the late 1940s), Stone argues that the main problem in urban politics is not social control but social production: the achievement of

community-wide objectives in a political and social order marked by incohesiveness and fragmentation.

Stone's illustration of his thesis explicates the symbiotic relationship between the city's black community and its business leaders. The cohesive, politically active black community has had a strong middle class leadership and lots of votes—as many as one-third in the early years, eventually a clear majority. Business leaders have had legitimacy, economic resources, and access to the news media. Business has wanted large-scale, planned restructuring of the city's transportation system and downtown business centers. Blacks have wanted respect, integration, affirmative action, and better housing. Both have feared an aroused white working class that could undermine Atlanta's national image for racial tolerance and economic progress.

In the early years business was clearly dominant—mainly because blacks were fewer in numbers, faced strong opposition from state politicians, and had little help from the national government. But blacks gradually exploited the new opportunities provided by a steadily growing black community and an increasingly favorable national civil rights climate. Even in the 1960s when the city was still too segregated to be an apt APSA convention site, its mayor, Ivan Allen, was the only southern mayor to testify in favor of the 1965 civil rights bill.

In the early 1970s the regime faced its greatest challenge: blacks had the votes to control citywide elections, and the black mayor, Maynard Jackson, was elected with very little business support. Would the political and business leadership of the South's most dynamic city turn against one another? Would the ambitious efforts to redesign downtown Atlanta and revamp the city's transportation system come to an end? The estrangement between city officials and business leaders was only a temporary one, Stone tells us. During the latter years of the Jackson administration and, even more, during the Andrew Young years, the *modus vivendi* between uncomfortable but mutually dependent partners was restored.

Stone's thoughtful, persuasive account of Atlanta's changing, yet persistent political regime is balanced: while it documents the remarkable political progress blacks have made, it also identifies the limits black leaders could achieve within a coalition committed to making Atlanta the dominant economic center in the South.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award (\$1,000)

For the best political science publication in 1989 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Award Committee: Michael Mandelbaum, Council on Foreign Relations, chair; Henry Brady, University of Chicago; Arlene Saxonhouse, University of Michigan.

Recipient: Donald Alexander Downs, University of Wisconsin.

Book: *The New Politics of Pornography*, published by the University of Chicago Press.

Recipients: Edward G. Carmines, Indiana University; James A. Stimson, University of Iowa.

Book: *Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics*, published by Princeton University Press.

Citation: Donald Downs' *The New Politics of Pornography* tackles with great sensitivity the highly controversial debate about the grounds for controlling pornographic materials. Through a case study of the passage of the anti-pornography ordinances written by Catharine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin, Downs deftly leads the reader through the constitutional issues at the heart of the debate and then describes how a coalition of conservative and radical interest groups led to the passage of the ordinance in Minneapolis and, in modified form, in Indianapolis. Downs' interviews with participants and observers, his careful study of city council transcripts and newspaper reports, all enable him to recreate in sharp and vivid detail the political battles that raged about the passage of the ordinances. As he captures the passions and the vitriol that these debates aroused, he uncovers the threats of a political process marked by extremes and one-sidedness to the values of a liberal democratic society.

While unabashedly critical of the constitutional grounds of civil protection for women as a class on which the MacKinnon-Dworkin proposals were based and of the techniques employed to seek their passage, Downs nevertheless reveals the tensions that all reformist groups must face: to what degree do the reforms ameliorate or, in the process of attempting to bring out those reforms, destroy the existing system? From his study of the new politics of pornography Downs warns us about reforms that draw on anti-liberal principles. At the same time, though, he engages in the debate, attending to a wide array of literature on constitutional theory and on the psychological effects of pornography. He concludes with moderate proposals for controlling pornography, but strongly defends, *contra* MacKinnon and Dworkin, keeping the debate within the context of the First, and not the Fourteenth, Amendment. Downs' book moves us powerfully from a case study of the pas-

sage of specific ordinances in local governments to the broad theoretical questions that must engage us as citizens of a liberal democracy.

Citation: In *Issue Evolution*, Edward G. Carmines and James A. Stimson show how serendipity and intention have combined to reverse the positions of Democratic and Republican party elites on racial issues and to increase the salience of race in American politics. Carmines and Stimson show how the serendipity of Sputnik and recession in 1958 provided the first shock to the party coalitions by replacing liberal and moderate Republicans in the Senate and House with liberal Democrats. The Republican nomination of Barry Goldwater in 1964 facilitated the reelection of the liberal Democratic Senators of the class of 1958, provided Southern Democrats with a conservative Republican option, and resulted in the election of Lyndon Johnson who continued to pursue a liberal agenda on racial policy. Finally, the elections of 1968 and 1972 solidified these changes when Richard Nixon's "Southern Strategy" won against the liberalism of Hubert Humphrey and George McGovern.

Carmines and Stimson show how micro-level data can be used to grasp the magnitude and extent of these changes in American public policy and the American party system. Using carefully constructed measures of racial attitudes based upon party platforms, roll-call votes, and survey data, Carmines and Stimson show how the positions of the parties, the members of the House and Senate, political activists, and the mass electorate changed in tandem over the past fifty years. By focusing on evolutionary change in issues rather than on critical realignments, Carmines and Stimson provide a new theoretical perspective which leads them to employ a novel statistical technique, Box-Tiao intervention analysis, for thinking about change. Most impressively, Carmines and Stimson demonstrate how changes in the attitudes and policy positions of Democratic and Republican party elites during the late 1950s and the early 1960s preceded and fostered the increased salience of racial issues for the mass electorate in America. Their argument that elites are responsible for the growing centrality of racial politics in America must surely be at the center of any debate about the present and future course of American politics.

Victoria Schuck Award (\$500)

For the best book published in 1989 on women and politics.

Award Committee: Jennifer Hochschild, Princeton University, chair; Nancy Hart-

sock, University of Washington; Marian Palley, University of Delaware.

Recipient: Susan Moller Okin, Brandeis University.

Book: *Justice, Gender and the Family*, published by Basic Books.

Recipient: Judith H. Stiehm, Florida International University.

Book: *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*, published by Temple University Press.

Citations: In considering the 18 books submitted to us, the members of the committee independently realized that the field of women and politics has matured into two dominant types of analysis. The first is primarily empirical, focusing mainly on practical politics and policy questions of special importance to women. The second is primarily normative, focusing mainly on the role of gender in political philosophy and in the construction of politics. Each type of analysis is important and both are thriving. Our inclination, therefore, was to honor both kinds of books.

Luckily we found two books that were equally outstanding but quite different in their approach to the issue of women and politics. Susan Okin's *Justice, Gender, and the Family* is primarily philosophical, asking how well contemporary theories of justice stand up in the face of a feminist critique. Judith Stiehm's *Arms and the Enlisted Woman* is primarily empirical, asking how well the American armed forces have integrated women into their enlisted ranks, and why the particular patterns of success and failure that she finds obtain. A distinguishing feature of both books, however, is that they successfully encroach on the other type of analysis of women and politics. Susan Okin examines the actual economic situation of female-headed households in the United States and proposes concrete policy solutions to the too-frequent poverty and powerlessness she finds therein. Judith Stiehm uses the case of the armed forces to examine normative questions of the meaning of masculinity and femininity, the appropriate role of citizens in the defense of their nation, and the virtue and defects of hierarchically- and democratically-controlled institutions. Both offer fundamental challenges to institutions, assumptions, and procedures that are central to modern liberal democratic polities.

Susan Okin systematically examines the arguments, and lacunae, in virtually all important contemporary theories of distributive justice. Ranging from the work of Robert Nozick on the libertarian right and Alasdair MacIntyre on the communitarian right, through the writings of John Rawls and Bruce Ackerman in the liberal

center, to those of Michael Sandel and Michael Walzer on the communitarian left, Okin shows how contemporary theories fall short of true justice when viewed from the perspective of feminism and the family. All of these theories, in one way or another, are predicated on assumed and unexamined divisions between public and private spheres, between paid work (usually done by men) and unpaid work (usually done by women), and between the norm of individualism and the norms of altruism or community. When Okin brings these hidden assumptions into the light and examines them, it becomes blindingly clear that the theories work only for men, or for women who behave like men, in societies in which relations within the family contain no hint of power, domination, and sacrifice. But such societies do not exist, and most women do not behave like men (or want to). Thus, Okin shows, these theories of distributive justice fail by their own criteria; to follow their rules of justice is to produce or perpetuate an unjust society by their own standards of justice.

Okin's analysis is not merely destructive. Toward the end, she combines careful empirical analysis and elements of the theories most conducive to true justice to begin constructing a theory of distributive justice and concrete policy proposals that would provide justice for everyone. This theoretical and political program is necessarily incomplete in this book; we look forward to the next one, in the hopes that the project begun here is brought to completion.

Judith Stiehm begins, in some ways, where Susan Okin stops—by examining the implementation and consequences of an important policy at least partly intended to make gender relations more equal. Of course the policy differs in important ways from Okin's proposals, chiefly because women are not permitted to participate in combat roles and to partake of the benefits that derive from that status. Stiehm examines the ironies and paradoxes that result from the unwilling, partial incorporation of women into the quintessentially male role of protecting the nation from its enemies. She finds, perhaps not surprisingly, that this partial incorporation works only fairly well for the armed forces and often very poorly for the female soldiers. Two aspects of the analysis are especially impressive. First, this is a courageous book for a feminist to write, since Stiehm seeks to convey (and succeeds in conveying) the outlooks of both enlisted women and male officers—neither of whom much resemble most academics, feminist and nonfeminist alike. Nevertheless, her portrayals are always insightful and empathetic, never sentimentalizing or hostile. Second, Stiehm's criticisms of the armed

forces are not only explicit, sharp, and persuasive, but also fair, since her demands on the armed forces are only to do what they themselves claim to want to do. Her conclusions are dramatic—for example, give the Air Force to women—as well as analytically provocative—for example, why does research anticipate bad news about women but ignore bad news for them? And the book is, like Susan Okin's, a good read.

Both of these books take a major step toward moving academic work on women and politics out of the feminist ghetto and into the realm in which nonfeminist readers must take account of them. Theorists of distributive justice no longer have the slightest excuse for ignoring over half the population or settling for false gender neutrality in their theorizing; policy makers no longer have the slightest excuse for pretending to incorporate women but actually treating them in a way that they would never permit men to be treated. Women are not a special interest group; gender is not an analytic category of importance only to a few people on the margins. These two books take on nonfeminists on their own turf, and win.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award (\$5,000)

For the best book published in the U.S. during 1989 on government, political or international affairs.

Award Committee: Stanley Hoffmann, Harvard University, chair; Benjamin Barber, Rutgers University; David Mayhew, Yale University.

Recipient: Robert A. Dahl, Yale University.

Book: *Democracy and Its Critics*, published by Yale University Press.

Citation: The name Robert Dahl has become synonymous with the critical study of democracy. From his eloquently concise encapsulation of the American democratic debate that constituted *A Preface to Democratic Theory* through his comparative studies of polyarchy, opposition, scale, political economy, and participation, down to his recent work in economic democracy, Dahl has been a cautious and critical yet nevertheless ardent celebrant of democracy's many forms.

In his *Democracy and Its Critics*, published by Yale University Press, he has written a book that authoritatively captures forty years of work on democracy, yet a book as fresh and undogmatic as a young man's first publication—one that addresses the historical tradition of democracy in ancient Greece with the same verve that it ponders the possibilities

of polyarchy and participation in tomorrow's post-totalitarian world.

This is magisterial political science in which the artificial distinctions between soft theory and hard social science, the normative and behavioral persuasions, history and analytic philosophy, are blown away by clear prose, vivid ideas, and careful argument.

"Best book" is a tough call in a field with so many excellent books in any given year—over one hundred were submitted to us. *Democracy and Its Critics* is the best book of the year in the compelling sense that it gives "best" meaning and resonance; just as Robert Dahl is a political scientist whose distinguished career has helped us define, at its best, our profession.

Editor's Note: Professor Benjamin Barber, who made the presentation for the Committee, prefaced his reading of the citation with these remarks:

Before presenting the 1990 Woodrow Wilson award on behalf of a committee made up of Stanley Hoffman of Harvard University, David Mayhew of Yale University, and myself to Robert Dahl, I need to direct a personal aside to the APSA Council. The APSA limits program participation in conventions to no more than two panel appearances, and the American Constitution limits Presidents to no more than two terms. Surely the same should apply to APSA awards.

But Bob Dahl, with a 1962 Woodrow Wilson Award for *Who Governs*, last year's Lippincott Award for *A Preface to Democratic Theory*, 1983's Kammerer Award for *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy*, and this year's precedent-shattering second Woodrow Wilson Award, this for *Democracy and Its Critics*, now has four. We obviously can't stop Bob from writing superb books, but isn't it time to fix an APSA award quota? It might be called the Dahl Quota, as long as this is not construed as still another award, which would defeat the whole purpose of the amendment.

CAREER AWARDS

John Gaus Award

The John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer is to honor the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and, more generally, to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration.

Award Committee: Dennis Thompson, Harvard University, chair; Donald F. Kettl, University of Wisconsin; Barbara Romzek, University of Kansas.

Recipient: Frederick C. Mosher, University of Virginia, posthumously.

Citation: Throughout a remarkable academic career that spanned forty years, Frederick C. Mosher consistently demonstrated the talent for identifying and exploring important administrative issues long before the rest of the profession even recognized them. His *Democracy and the Public Service* became the dominant book on the civil service for a generation. In it, he developed a twin-edged argument. The search for a competent civil service, Fritz contended, produced administration increasingly dominated by highly skilled professionals; ironically, the rising skill of these professionals posed an important challenge to democratic control of administration. The book proved to be even more than a definitive study of personnel policy. It emphasized the themes to which Fritz devoted his career: the search for superior governmental performance through a competent administration; and the enduring quest for responsiveness in the democratic system.

His exploration of these issues covered an unusual range of problems. He edited a study by leading experts of the issues posed by the Watergate scandal. He combed the shifting trends of public finance to identify important changes in governmental programs, and he picked up one thread of those trends in a pioneering study of third parties in managing governmental programs. Fritz was, as well, an unparalleled chronicler of the behavior of governmental agencies. He wrote definitive studies of personnel reform in the Department of State and of the comparative roles that the Office of Management and Budget and the General Accounting Office play in ensuring financial accountability for public funds. He studied with John Gaus while on a Ford Foundation fellowship at Harvard in 1951-52, as he wrote his dissertation, *Program Budgeting*, a pioneering study of budget reform in the Pentagon.

Fritz led the field of public administration by more than his scholarship. He served as editor of *Public Administration Review*. He taught at Syracuse University, the University of Bologna, the University of California-Berkeley, and the University of Virginia, and after his retirement from teaching devoted much energy at the University of Virginia's White Burkett Miller Center to the reform of foreign policy making and presidential transitions. Throughout all the phases of his exceptional career, Fritz was singularly devoted to the goal of focusing the functions of government continually toward serving the public interest. Few scholars have carried on John Gaus's traditions so faithfully.

In May 1990, Fritz tragically died*

after a long bout with emphysema. At the time of his death, he was at work on the lecture to accompany this award. We are all poorer for not having the chance to hear what he would have had to say, but we are immeasurably richer for the contributions he has made in shaping the modern study of public administration. The American Political Science Association is proud to name Frederick C. Mosher the recipient of the 1990 John Gaus Award. His son, Jim, accepted the award at the annual meeting in San Francisco, on behalf of the Mosher family.

*See "In Memoriam" on p. 631.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award (\$500)

Presented each year in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Award Committee: Joseph Nye, Harvard University, chair; James Ceaser, University of Virginia; Raymond Wolfinger, University of California, Berkeley.

Recipient: David E. Price, U.S. House of Representatives.

Citation: David Price amply fills the two criteria of the Hubert H. Humphrey Award. First, he is a notable scholar of political science, contributing importantly to our understanding of political parties and the Congress in the American political system. A professor of political science and public policy at Duke University since 1973, David Price is the author of numerous articles and of three books: *Bringing Back the Parties*, *The Commerce Committees*, and *Who Makes the Laws?* Participating in scholarly conferences and serving on the Congressional Fellowship Program's Advisory Committee, he continues to be actively involved in the profession.

Second, David Price's career has been marked by exceptional public service. Elected to Congress by the Fourth District of North Carolina in 1986, Representative Price serves on two challenging committees: Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Science, Space, and Technology, which is the authorizing committee for the National Science Foundation. He is a leading congressional advocate for the value of social science research to society. As a member of Congress, he has a reputation for fairness, honesty, hard work and good judgment.

Before his election to Congress, David was actively engaged in Democratic Party politics, a natural extension of his belief in the importance of political parties. He served the North Carolina Democratic Party as Chairman from 1983-84 and as Executive Director from 1979-80. He was also Staff Director of the Hunt Commission of the National Democratic Party in 1981-82.

David Price is a political scientist of whom Hubert Humphrey would be proud, and we are delighted to recognize his achievement.

Carey McWilliams Award (\$500)

Presented each year to honor a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

Award Committee: John Kingdon, University of Michigan, chair; Hoyt Purvis, University of Arkansas; Robert Putnam, Harvard University.

Recipient: *National Journal*.

Citation: The Carey McWilliams Award was established to recognize "a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics." This year's recipient is *The National Journal*. The *Journal* is known throughout the discipline of political science as an indispensable resource for research and teaching in public policy

and in national government and politics. Scholars routinely turn to its pages every time they need case studies of policy-making or background information on various public policies. Professors routinely direct their students to its outstanding coverage as they write dissertations, theses, or term papers. Its *Almanac of American Politics* is a central sourcebook. Its general coverage of national government and politics instructs students and researchers alike. For all of its contributions to the political science community, *The National Journal* is an outstanding recipient of the McWilliams Award.

James Madison Award (\$2,000)

Presented triennially to recognize a career of scholarly excellence rather than a particular piece of scholarship.

Award Committee: Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., Harvard University, chair; John J. DiIulio, Jr., Princeton University; R.

Shep Melnick, Brandeis University; Catherine Zuckert, Carleton College.

Recipient: **James Q. Wilson**, University of California, Los Angeles.

Citation: Inspired by James Madison, America's greatest political scientist, James Q. Wilson has shown a lifelong devotion to the study of political behavior. His study has been Madisonian in quality and character. He has never written a book less than excellent; he has enriched the traditional topics beyond measure and led political science into fields where it was hesitant or reluctant to go. His studies are scientifically rigorous in the best sense that gives due weight to necessities, patterns of choice, modes of human character, and happenstance. He has been a teacher to the profession, a profound and prudent adviser to his students, and a treasure to his friends.

APSA Awards and Recipients

Compiled by **Jean Walen**

One of the most important activities of the Association is the promotion and recognition of scholarly excellence in political science. Listed below are the recipients of each APSA award who were honored for the high quality of their work and their contributions to the discipline. A cumulative list of the award winners will be published every three years in conjunction with the Madison Award.

*"Affiliation" indicates the recipient's affiliation at the time of receiving the award.

Career Awards

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AWARD

Presented each year in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Year	Recipient	Affiliation*
1983	Daniel Patrick Moynihan	U.S. Senate
1984	John Brademas	New York University
1985	Robert C. Wood	Wesleyan University
1986	—	
1987	Max M. Kampelman	Head, U.S. Delegation, Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms
1988	Jeane J. Kirkpatrick	Georgetown University
1989	Brent Scowcroft	Special Assistant to the President, National Security Affairs
1990	David E. Price	U.S. House of Representatives

JAMES MADISON AWARD

This award is given to an American political scientist who has made a distinguished scholarly contribution to political science. The award is given triennially.

Year	Recipient	Affiliation*
1978	Robert A. Dahl	Yale University
1981	Gabriel A. Almond	Stanford University
1984	Herbert Simon	Carnegie-Mellon University
1987	E. Pendleton Herring	President Emeritus, Social Science Research Council
1990	James Q. Wilson	University of California, Los Angeles