

## Notes from the Editor

Readers of a certain age who are still able to summon up memories of those thrilling days of yesteryear may recall that the previews for Hollywood movies used to feature such come-ons as “Years in the making!,” “With a cast of thousands!,” and “In living color!” The articles in this issue of the *APSR* may or may not have been years in the making, though I am pleased to attest that the review and production phases of their creation fell well short of epic proportions. Nor, although some of these articles are co-authored, did their *dramatis personae* ever exceed a sub-DeMillean three. As Louis B. Mayer might have said, though, color we’ve got. As usual, our cover shimmers. But this time the color comes in multiple hues rather than the normal monochrome, and the color can be found not just on the cover but in our lead article as well, where the cover graphic reappears along with several multi-color accompaniments. Where, the traditionalists among us may wonder, will it all end? Brightly colored covers were bad enough—but when the next issue of the *APSR* arrives, should three-dimensional scattergrams be expected to pop up out of its pages? Will question-wording appendixes be intoned in the *basso profundo* of James Earl Jones? Will the textual analyses self-deconstruct? The mind boggles; the slope is slippery; a little color is a dangerous thing.

Because my job as editor consists in large measure—though, thankfully, by no means exclusively—of delivering bad news to 90 percent or so of those who submit their work for consideration here, I hope I can be forgiven for what may appear to be an unnatural fixation on bright colors and striking graphics. That is a “fun” part of the job. A source of far greater pleasure, however, is the intellectual diversity of the papers that we publish, and this issue is an excellent case in point. Geographically and temporally, this issue ranges from ancient Athens to the NeverNeverLand of Beita. Methodologically, we have simulation, textual analysis, policy analysis, formal modeling, case studies, symbolic interactionism, high-powered statistical analysis, constructivism—you name it and it’s likely to be here, or forthcoming in our pages. Please stay tuned.

### IN THIS ISSUE

Our lead article, the colorful “Secessionism in Multicultural States: Does Sharing Power Prevent or Encourage It?” has a dual agenda. Substantively, Ian S. Lustick, Dan Miodownik, and Roy J. Eidelson’s point of departure is the often-contradictory array of results that have been reported by “small-n” and “large-n” researchers interested in ethnic mobilization and secession. Methodologically, in their attempt to bring some order to this field in disarray, Lustick and his associates pursue an analytic approach—agent-based modeling—that is simultaneously high-tech and highly

compatible with a perspective—constructivism—that is not ordinarily associated with high-tech approaches. This article, featuring one of the first forays of agent-based modeling into a mainstream social science journal, should be of interest to an unusually broad spectrum of readers, and not just for its colorful graphics.

In “The Inefficient Use of Power: Costly Conflict with Complete Information,” Robert Powell maintains Lustick et al.’s (and our discipline’s) focus on power, but sets out in a different direction. Powell wonders why, when players bargain over the costly “pie” of conflict, their use of power fails to achieve a Pareto optimal outcome. Rather than treating asymmetric information as the cause, Powell argues that commitment problems are to blame for inefficient uses of power. Identifying a rapidly shifting environment as a condition of inefficiency, Powell demonstrates how all equilibria of a two-actor stochastic game will be inefficient despite the perceived advantage of having complete information. Powell’s analysis not only promises to provide a starting point for explaining why the use of power produces unintended consequences in various contexts, but also signals the need for additional research to clarify why rapid environmental shifts occur in the first place.

Conventional wisdom about public policy in the United States, especially as it bears on the welfare state, centers on its inertial character—its bias toward the status quo and the difficulty of changing directions once they have been established. However, in an important new analysis, Jacob S. Hacker challenges the conventional view of inertia and what is required to overcome it. In “Privatizing Risk without Privatizing the Welfare State: The Hidden Politics of Social Policy Retrenchment in the United States,” Hacker argues that even in the absence of visible, legislated policy change, substantial alterations to welfare policy can occur through the mechanisms of drift, conversion, and layering—strategies that are used to sidestep political and institutional barriers to outright policy change. This model of policy change, both overt and hidden, has the potential to guide analyses not only of social policy in the United States, but more broadly of policy processes, institutional politics, and political change in a wide array of settings.

“Remodeling the Competition for Capital: How Domestic Politics Erases the Race to the Bottom,” by Scott J. Basinger and Mark Hallerberg, provides an excellent companion piece to the Hacker article. Basinger and Hallerberg want to know why the outcome that would have been expected based on the “race to the bottom” model of interstate competition for capital has not materialized. Based on their analysis of tax policy choices in 20 OECD countries, they conclude that the answer lies in domestic politics. Analyzing policy decisions from a “tournament” perspective, they argue that states take into account not only the tax reforms that their competitors have instituted, but also such

domestic political considerations as ideological resistance to the reforms and the operation of domestic veto players. This analysis, then, turns our attention toward the domestic factors that shape policies resulting from interstate competition for capital and make tax reforms possible.

In “Diverging Orbits: Situation Definitions in Creation of Regimes for Broadcast and Remote Sensing Satellites,” M.J. Peterson operates from an analytical perspective seldom seen in political science, symbolic interactionism, which spotlights interactions among those involved in a particular situation. Peterson’s analysis centers on two simultaneous sets of negotiations concerning cross-border information flows that took place during the 1960s and ended with different results. Rather than simply looking at the immediate interests of the involved states, Peterson (echoing the domestic politics emphasis of the Basinger-Hallerberg analysis) focuses on how domestic actors who were not immediately involved in the international arena came to influence national policies and the international negotiation process. Peterson’s symbolic interactionist approach is the key element in her explanation of the development of a state’s preferences and its behavior in the international arena.

From space in Peterson’s (remote sensing satellites) sense we turn to space in the very different sense of Jonathan Bendor and Adam Meirowitz’s “Spatial Models of Delegation.” Bendor and Meirowitz expand our understanding of when and to whom delegation occurs by modeling delegation in ways that go beyond the assumption of risk-aversion. Especially because their nested family of models helps pinpoint conditions responsible for various outcomes, Bendor and Meirowitz’s approach combines simplicity, rigor, and generality in a model that promises to be a fertile source for future research on a wide-ranging set of issues.

Ancient Athens has long been held up as an exemplar of classical and direct democracy for the modern age. Given Athens’ special importance in Western political traditions, its political arrangements should be of widespread interest, but most political scientists’ understandings of how Athenian democracy functioned are rudimentary at best, and their attempts to use the Athenian case to bolster their arguments about current issues accordingly fall short. In “Athenian Democracy and Legal Change,” Melissa Schwartzberg unearths evidence that the ease of modifying institutions and laws was a defining characteristic of Athenian democracy. Schwartzberg’s underlying premise is that by examining the balance that was struck in ancient Athens between flexibility and innovation and between legal continuity and predictability, contemporary democrats can draw important insights about the merits of their own attempts to balance responsiveness and stability.

The next three articles in this issue all fall into the “methodological” category, and in so doing demonstrate the extraordinary scope of that subfield, which extends all the way from highly abstract treatises about ways of knowing to extremely concrete developments in data analysis technology. In the first of these contributions, Ryan Patrick Hanley reintroduces

Isaiah Berlin’s oft-overlooked consideration of political inquiry. In “Political Science and Political Understanding: Isaiah Berlin on the Nature of Political Inquiry,” Hanley points to the need for moral excellence and “humanism” when solving contemporary political problems, two important points that often fall victim to the pressures of scientific rigor. Hanley’s analysis re-establishes the priority of one of Berlin’s important messages: that social scientists must continue to act responsibly in formulating their questions. As Hanley puts it, “More necessary than method . . . is what comes before method, namely the judgment that enables us to determine which ideas are worth our attention and efforts, and which are—to use a favorite locution of Berlin’s—‘justly forgotten.’”

John Gerring asks and answers two key methodological questions in “What is a Case Study and What is it Good For?” By assessing the virtues and limitations of the case study approach to social science research, Gerring advances our understanding of social science methodology and the trade-offs that confront researchers. Preferences differ: Some political scientists would prefer to explain 10 percent of the variance in 100 cases, while others would prefer to explain 90 percent of the variance in a few cases. Gerring finds value in both types of analysis. Rather than disparaging case studies as a lesser or even primitive mode of inquiry, he argues that they should be accepted as integral components of social science research, complementary to the full range of other social science methodologies.

Closer to the technical end of the methodological continuum is Joshua Clinton, Simon Jackman, and Douglas Rivers’s “The Statistical Analysis of Roll Call Data.” The ability to estimate spatial parameters from roll call voting data has produced a burgeoning literature in the past two decades, originally among students of Congress but with important spillovers into other research subfields as well. Continuing to develop these methodological tools, Clinton, Jackman, and Rivers use a Bayesian procedure to “revise and extend” the statistical underpinnings of the now-familiar NOMINATE scores, which have become a key component in quantitative analyses of legislative politics. Their findings demonstrate, among other things, how others can innovate in developing models that are attuned to specific formal and other theories.

In an article that was published in the March 2000 issue of the *APSR*, Nathaniel Beck, Gary King, and Langche Zeng asserted that the widely used and accepted logit statistical model was not the best tool for deriving good forecasts of militarized disputes in the international arena. Instead, they suggested that neural network models are superior for this purpose. However, in “Untangling Neural Nets,” which appears in our “Forum” section, Scott de Marchi, Christopher Gelpi, and Jeffrey Grynviski take issue with Beck, King, and Zeng’s characterization of the logit model and argue that logit models compare favorably to neural network models in terms of parsimony, interpretation, and model fit. Their critique and the accompanying response by Beck, King, and Zeng (“Theory and Evidence in International Conflict: A Response to

de Marchi, Gelpi, and Grynaviski”) shed new light on the relative merits and demerits of these statistical techniques and, in so doing, promise to inform quantitative modeling methods efforts for some time to come.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

### General Considerations

The *APSR* strives to publish scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience of scholars and practitioners, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates a significant research problem, or answers an important research question, of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive for a presentation that will be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Therefore, authors should not submit articles containing tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that have already been published or are forthcoming in other places, or that have been included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including on-line journals). In many such cases, subsequent publication of this material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review by other journals or duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts that have been submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Submission of manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or as part of a book or other larger work, is also strongly discouraged. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss any such publications related to a submission in a cover letter to the Editor. You should also notify the Editor of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review by the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. The Editor may request copies of related publications.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and, in the event that the article is accepted for publication, to permit other scholars to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. For example, for surveys, at the least, sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings should be given; you should calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys* (Ann Arbor, MI: AAPOR, 2000). This document is available on the Internet at <<http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?>

page = survey\_methods/standards\_and\_best\_practices/standard\_definitions>. For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, subject payments and debriefing procedures, and so on. Articles should be self-contained, so you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by capitalizing the first letter in the variable name and italicizing the entire variable name the first time each is mentioned in the text. You should also use the same names for variables in text and tables and, wherever possible, should avoid the use of acronyms and computer abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables appearing in tables should have been mentioned in the text and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

As part of the review process, you may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear; the review process works most efficiently if such information is given in the initial submission. If you advise readers that additional information is available, you should submit printed copies of that information with the manuscript. If the amount of this supplementary information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing anonymous copies in the Specific Procedures section below.

Manuscripts that are largely or entirely critiques or commentaries on previously published *APSR* articles will be reviewed using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts, with one exception. In addition to the usual number of reviewers, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being criticized, in the same anonymous form that they are sent to reviewers. Comments from the original author(s) to the Editor will be invited as a supplement to the advice of reviewers. This notice to the original author(s) is intended (1) to encourage review of the details of analyses or research procedures that might escape the notice of disinterested reviewers; (2) to enable prompt publication of critiques by supplying criticized authors with early notice of their existence and, therefore, more adequate time to reply; and (3) as a courtesy to criticized authors. If you submit such a manuscript, you should therefore send as many additional copies of their manuscripts as will be required for this purpose.

Manuscripts being submitted for publication should be sent to Lee Sigelman, Editor, *American Political Science Review*, Department of Political Science, The George Washington University, 2201 G Street N.W., Room 507, Washington, DC 20052. Correspondence concerning manuscripts under review may be sent to the same address or e-mailed to [apsr@gwu.edu](mailto:apsr@gwu.edu).

### Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should not be longer than 45 pages including text, all tables and figures, notes, references,

and appendices. This page size guideline is based on the U.S. standard 8.5 × 11-inch paper; if you are submitting a manuscript printed on longer paper, you must adjust accordingly. The font size must be at least 11 points for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including notes and references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception of tables for which double-spacing would require a second page otherwise not needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6.5 inches, as is typical for manuscripts (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*), and printed on one side of the page only. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. The *APSR* style of embedded citations should be used, and there must be a separate list of references at the end of the manuscript. Do not use notes for simple citations. These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers. Papers not adhering to these guidelines are subject to being rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may place footnotes at the bottom of the pages instead of using endnotes, and you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text. However, manuscripts accepted for publication must be submitted with endnotes, and with tables and figures on separate pages at the back of the manuscript with standard indications of text placement, e.g., [Table 3 about here]. In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If your paper is accepted for publication, you will also be required to submit camera-ready copy of graphs or other types of figures. Instructions will be provided.

For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. For unusual style or formatting issues, you should consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. For review purposes, citations and references need not be in specific *APSR* format, although some generally accepted format should be used, and all citation and reference information should be provided.

## Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. You are invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. The Editor will refer to this list in selecting reviewers, though there obviously can be no guarantee that those you suggest will actually be chosen. Do not list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it, or any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends.
2. Submit five copies of manuscripts *and* a diskette containing a pdf file of the anonymous ver-

sion of the manuscript. If you cannot save the manuscript as a pdf, just send in the diskette with the word-processed version. Please ensure that the paper and diskette versions you submit are identical; the diskette version should be of the **anonymous** copy (see below). Please review all pages of all copies to make sure that all copies contain all tables, figures, appendices, and bibliography mentioned in the manuscript and that all pages are legible. Label the diskette clearly with the (first) author's name and the title of the manuscript (in abridged form if need be), and identify the word processing program and operating system.

3. To comply with the *APSR*'s procedure of double-blind peer reviews, only one of the five copies submitted should be fully identified as to authorship and four should be in anonymous format.
4. For anonymous copies, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in the list of references. In no circumstances should your prior publications be included in the bibliography in their normal alphabetical location but with your name deleted. Assuming that text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should include full citations as usual in the bibliography. Please discuss the use of other procedures to render manuscripts anonymous with the Editor prior to submission. You should not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information. *All acknowledgments must appear on the title page of the identified copy only.* Manuscripts that are judged not anonymous will not be reviewed.
5. The first page of the four anonymous copies should contain only the title and an abstract of no more than 150 words. The first page of the identified copy should contain (a) the name, academic rank, institutional affiliation, and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all authors; (b) in the case of multiple authors, an indication of the author who will receive correspondence; (c) any relevant citations to your previous work that have been omitted from the anonymous copies; and (d) acknowledgments, including the names of anyone who has provided comments on the manuscript. If the identified copy contains any unique references or is worded differently in any way, please mark this copy with "Contains author citations" at the top of the first page.

No copies of submitted manuscripts can be returned.

## ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually “moving wall”), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available on-line through JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/>). At present, JSTOR’s complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR* and *PS* through the APSA website ([www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org)) with their username and password. Individual non-member access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of both the *APSR* and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datastar (Datastar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

## BOOK REVIEWS

The *APSR* no longer contains book reviews. As of 2003, book reviews have moved to *Perspectives on Politics*. All books for review should be sent directly to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Susan Bickford and Greg McAvoy. The address is Susan Bickford and Gregory McAvoy, *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB No. 3265, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265. E-mail: [bookreviews@unc.edu](mailto:bookreviews@unc.edu).

If you are the author of a book you wish to be considered for review, please ask your publisher to send a copy to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors per the mailing instructions above. If you are interested in reviewing books for *Perspectives on Politics*, please send your vita to the Book Review Editors; you should not ask to review a specific book.

## OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association’s address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512 (voice), and (202) 483-2657 (fax). E-mail: [apsa@apsanet.org](mailto:apsa@apsanet.org). Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*  
E-mail: [rhauck@apsanet.org](mailto:rhauck@apsanet.org)

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for nonreceipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Elizabeth Weaver Engel,  
Director of Member Services  
E-mail: [membership@apsanet.org](mailto:membership@apsanet.org)

Reprint permissions:  
E-mail: [reprints@apsanet.org](mailto:reprints@apsanet.org)

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,  
Cambridge University Press  
E-mail: [journals\\_advertising@cup.org](mailto:journals_advertising@cup.org)

## EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING *APSR* AND *PS* ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

### Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association’s policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on

these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

### **APSR Authors**

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

### **Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials**

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

### **INDEXING**

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci; America, History and Life 1954-*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; Econ-Lit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 ([www.umi.com](http://www.umi.com)). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969-95, is available through the APSA.