

Notes from the Editors

In this issue of the Review (108.1) we present a number of articles that illustrate the importance of cross disciplinary research in promoting innovations in the field. These include works that draw upon physical anthropology, theology, and genetics to add insights regarding political development, political ethics, and voting behavior. Further, consistent with our commitment to publish pieces that speak broadly to the field, in this issue there are a number of pieces that, although they appear to be focused on particular issues or countries, address themes that should have broad appeal to many different subfields in political science. In this way we hope to promote greater conversations across subfields, which we believe to be the basis for further innovation in our discipline.

As always, we continue to provide a brief introduction summarizing the basic arguments of each article that appears in the issue. The introduction is organized to provide the reader with a quick glimpse of the content of the issue, so as to pique the interest of the reader. Thus, rather than a synthesized essay, our introduction provides clear and straightforward summaries of each piece.

In this Issue

Our cover relates directly to the article “The Bones of Contention: The Political Economy of Height Inequality.” In this piece, which represents a real advance in the integration of the techniques of physical anthropology and political science, Carles Boix and Frances Rosenbluth provide intriguing new insight into human inequality on the basis of osteological data. They use height variance as indirect evidence of the distribution of resources within a society (with greater variance in height suggesting greater inequality), based on the assumption that income and social position permitted some to have more reliable access to food, shelter, and health than others in pre-industrial societies—and to grow taller as a result. The use of this osteological data permits Boix and Rosenbluth to examine human inequality for a range of societies and time periods that has not typically been investigated by scholars interested in the political economy of human inequality. Importantly, close examination of these data suggests that the impact of economic factors was mediated by military technology and political institutions.

The debate regarding the best method for selecting and retaining state judges continues even as judicial campaigns have become increasingly expensive, high-profile, and dominated by the participation of out-of-state interest groups. How have these “new-style elections” altered the effects of the selection method on judicial behavior? In “Judicial Selection and Death Penalty Decisions,” Brandice Canes-Wrone, Tom S. Clark, and Jason P. Kelly offer a carefully nuanced answer to this question. Utilizing an impressive new

dataset of death penalty decisions by state courts of last resort (from 1980 through 2006 with over 12,000 votes from over 2,000 cases), Canes-Wrone and colleagues show that the new judicial campaign context has created incentives for judges to cater to majority sentiment on the salient campaign issue of the death penalty. Contrary to conventional wisdom and many previous findings, they find that judges are significantly more responsive to majority opinion in nonpartisan than partisan election systems. Moreover, the evidence indicates that this result derives from judicial incentives, not simply differences in the types of judges selected between the systems. Similar effects are found for commission-retention systems, but the findings are less robust than those for nonpartisan elections.

In “Transforming Power Relationships: Leadership, Risk, and Hope,” James H. Read and Ian Shapiro ask how certain enduring conflicts can be brought to an end. Looking primarily at the case of South Africa’s transition to majority rule, they argue that seemingly irresolvable conflicts can be resolved if leaders come forward who are willing to take the risky step of negotiating their differences, and cultivating a new vision of the future for their peoples. As opposed to theories of conflict resolution that only look at “objective” factors, Read and Shapiro argue that the vital impetus for peace might come from leaders who are willing to engage in “calculated risk-taking in the face of imponderably complex circumstances,” an inherently nonquantifiable undertaking. This kind of “strategically hopeful action” can in effect transform a zero-sum situation into a positive-sum situation. Read and Shapiro outline a novel theory of transformative leadership that helps us to see conflict resolution in a new light.

Allison Carnegie’s article, “States Held Hostage: Political Hold-Up Problems and the Effects of International Institutions,” explains which states benefit most from participation in international organizations. Using the case of the World Trade Organization (WTO), she demonstrates that pairs of states that find cooperation difficult stand to gain the most from membership in international organizations. This is so, she argues, because international institutions help mitigate the impact of political asymmetries and reduce the likelihood that that more powerful states will “hold up” a weaker and politically dissimilar trade partner for political concessions.

David Cesarini, Magnus Johannesson, and Sven Oskarsson in “Pre-Birth Factors, Post-Birth Factors, and Voting: Evidence from Swedish Adoption Data” make a major contribution to the existing debate regarding “genopolitics,” which was a topic of an earlier forum that appeared in the Review in 2012. Using a unique data set derived from Swedish data and electoral turnout, the paper examines a large sample of adoptees, their siblings, their adoptive parents, and their biological parents. Using a simple regression framework

to decompose the parent-child resemblance in voting into prebirth factors, measured by biological parents' voting, and postbirth factors, measured by adoptive parents' voting, they find that adoptees are more likely to vote if their biological parents were voters and if they were assigned to families in which the adoptive parents vote. They also find evidence of interactions between the pre- and postbirth factors. In particular they find that the effect of the postbirth environment on turnout is greater amongst adoptees whose biological mothers are nonvoters. Finally, they demonstrate that the relationships between parental characteristics, such as education, and child turnout, persist even in the absence of a genetic link between parent and child. In many ways their findings suggest what is what might have been suspected in the first place—that it is neither exclusively genetics, nor exclusively environment, that determines political behavior, but a combination of both.

What are the challenges and consequences posed by the liberal ideal of the freedom to identify ourselves according to our own choices? In "Freedom, Form, and Formlessness: Euripides' *Bacchae* and Plato's *Republic*," Arlene W. Saxonhouse characterizes this ideal as "the escape from form" as she contemplates the answer to this question provided in these two strikingly different texts both from ancient Athens. The *Bacchae* captures the longing for an escape from form—and the disastrous consequences of an excess of such freedom, while the *Republic* defends forms (identities and boundaries) and insists upon them. Saxonhouse argues that "reading the *Republic* next to the *Bacchae* underscores the significance of the Socratic theory of the forms not only as an epistemological necessity, but as a bulwark against the political and social threats of a world in which forms dissolve." We want the freedom to recreate ourselves but we also long for the security of forms that enable us to know precisely who another may be and to interact with others having that knowledge.

In "How to Promote Order and Property Rights under Weak Rule of Law? An Experiment in Changing Dispute Resolution Behavior through Community Education," Christopher Blattman, Alexandra C. Hartman, and Robert A. Blair examine the impact that informal practices and norms have on governing disputes in postconflict societies. In particular, they examine the effects of mass education campaigns that promote alternative dispute resolution (ADR) on dispute levels and violence levels in post-civil-war Liberia. They find that in towns that received training in ADR practices and norms there were higher rates of resolution of land disputes and lower levels of violence than in towns that did not have training in ADR practices and norms, one year after the training occurred. In general, the results suggest that mass education can change conflict behaviors, and improving informal bargaining and enforcement behavior can promote order in postconflict environments. The lessons illustrated in this piece resonate far beyond Liberia itself.

In "Opening the Black Box of Social Capital Formation," Patricio Valdivieso and Benjamin Villena-Roldan introduce a rational choice model as the basis

for their empirical investigation. Assuming that participation in organizations has costs as well as benefits, they investigate what factors influence participation in associative life. The authors find that participation in different types of associations is driven by distinct sets of factors, and they show which factors influence participation in various categories of organizations. Importantly, Valdivieso and Villena-Roldan show that experiences that affect social trust negatively increase participation in associations, but also lead individuals to seek out specifically associations with others who share similar interests and values. In this, they conclude that their findings are more in line with the work of Eric M. Uslaner than with the "virtuous circle"—in which social trust and participation in associations mutually reinforce one another—proposed by Robert Putnam.

In "The Impact of Recentralization on Public Services: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis of the Abolition of Elected Councils in Vietnam," Edmund J. Malesky, Cuong Viet Nguyen, and Anh Tran take advantage of a natural experiment in Vietnam to test the effects of political decentralization on public service delivery. Although much work has focused on decentralization, there has been an increased effort at recentralization in many countries. Vietnam is a particularly interesting case in that its recentralization plan included piloting a removal of elected People's Councils in 99 districts across the country and stratifying the selection by region, type of province, and urban versus rural setting. This natural quasi-experiment allows for testing some of the core hypotheses regarding the decision to shift administrative and fiscal authority to local governments. They find that recentralization significantly improved public service delivery in areas important to central policy makers, especially in transportation, healthcare, and communications. This piece has important implications for the literature on centralization and recentralization, far beyond the test case of Vietnam.

"Max Weber and the Ethos of Politics beyond Calculation," by Shalini Satkunanandan, reopens some key questions regarding the place of morality and moral responsibility in Max Weber's political theory. While Weber clearly espouses a "hard-headed political ethos" in "Politics as a Vocation," he also holds to a moral vocation for statesmen. Against the interpretation that Weber's statesman is a cold-blooded follower of amoral expediency, Satkunanandan argues that Weber's hard-headedness is balanced with moral commitment. What Weber opposes in statecraft is not moral responsibility, but "calculable" moral responsibility. This is the responsibility characteristic of the bureaucrat, who rationalizes all things, or the ideologue, who believes that the purity of his motives is the only calculation he must make. "Incalculable responsibility" is a willingness to confront the world "as it really is," with all its unpredictability, accepting the unforeseen evil consequences of one's actions, along with the good. Weber's is not an argument against morality in politics, argues Satkunanandan; it is an argument against moral absolutism in politics.

In “Economies of Violence: The Bhagavadgītā and the Fostering of Life in Gandhi’s & Ghose’s Anticolonial Theories,” Jimmy Casas Klausen examines the philosophies developed by two of the major figures in the Indian struggle leading to independence from Great Britain. The two endorsed opposed tactics in this struggle, and the contrast between them, can tell us much about arguments for and against violence in many contexts. Both thinkers worked out religiously inspired theories of violence that placed it in a metaphysical and cosmic perspective. Both saw violence or harm (*himsā*) as a legitimate part of the cosmic order, and placed human action within that “economy of *himsā*.” Both sought to minimize harm. This famously led Gandhi to a virtually (though not wholly) pacifist stance, while Ghose was much more willing to endorse violence in struggles such as the push for Indian independence. The way that these similar approaches led to such different results is the theme of this fascinating, and enlightening, exercise in comparative political theory.

Guy Grossman and Janet I. Lewis in “Administrative Unit Proliferation” examine the question as to why developing countries increase the number of subnational administrative units. They contend that the existing literature fails to consider the impact of local actors on administrative unit proliferation. Rather, they argue that administrative unit proliferation occurs where and when there is a confluence of interests between the national executive and local citizens and elites from areas that are politically, economically, and ethnically marginalized. They further contend that, ironically, although the proliferation of administrative units often is justified in terms of decentralization, the actual result of such efforts is the recentralization of power. This is because the proliferation of new local governments fragments existing units into smaller ones with less ability and less leverage in intergovernmental negotiations. Using data from Uganda, they find support for these propositions, although their findings have far reaching implications for other countries engaging in “decentralizing” reforms. In many ways this piece dovetails well with the Malesky, Nguyen, and Tran article that also appears in this issue of the Review.

Finally we close with a question: Is politics compatible with moral action? The question of “dirty hands” in politics is examined from a fresh perspective by Charles Lesch in “Against Politics: Walter Benjamin on Justice, Judaism, and the Possibility of Ethics.” This nuanced reading of Benjamin’s thought takes issue both with those who believe that Benjamin lacks any normative theory of ethics, and those who hold that religious ideas had little impact on his writing. Lesch’s interpretation finds a thinker who combines Kantian elements with Jewish theological categories to think anew about the preconditions of ethical life, and its relation to politics. In brief, not only is there tension between the ethical and the political, but the brute power relations of politics shows a tendency to colonize other spheres of life. The resulting teaching has broad implications for our political and moral thought and action today.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the *APSR* consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your case, you should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of your submission’s review at the *APSR*—regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the “Specific Procedures” section that follows.

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 the article is accepted for publication—to permit other scholars to replicate your results and to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. With surveys, for example, provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; 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 (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).¹ For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on. In any case involving human subjects, the editors may require certification of appropriate

¹ See <http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp>

institutional review and/or conformity with generally accepted norms.²

The strength of evidence necessary for publication of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. The journal's coeditors—following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

In addition, authors of quantitative or experimental articles are expected to address the issue of data availability. You must normally indicate both where (online) you will deposit the information that is necessary to reproduce the numerical results and when that information will be posted (such as “on publication” or “by [definite date]”). You should be prepared, when posting, to provide not only the data used in the analysis but also the syntax files, specialized software, and any other information necessary to reproduce the numerical results in the manuscript. Where an exception is claimed, you should clearly explain why the data or other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot be shared, or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

Similarly, authors of qualitative, observational, or textual articles, or of articles that combine such methods with quantitative analysis, should indicate their sources fully and clearly enough to permit ready verification by other scholars—including precise page references to any published material cited and clear specification (e.g., file number) of any archival sources. Wherever possible, use of interactive citations is encouraged. Where field or observational research is involved, anonymity of participants will always be respected; but the texts of interviews, group discussions, observers' notes, etc., should be made available on the same basis (and subject to the same exceptions) as with quantitative data.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*.³ In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome wide significance—taking into

account all sources of multiple testing (e.g. phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).

- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

Articles should be self-contained; you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

American Political Science Review Vol. 106, No. 4

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—the first time it is mentioned in the text—and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, standard summary statistics (n, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided, and the reason for their inclusion discussed. However, tables and figures should also be comprehensible without reference to the text (e.g., in any figures, axes should be clearly labeled). Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

You may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear. If you advise readers that additional information is available on request, you should submit equally anonymous copies of that information with your manuscript as “supplemental materials.” If this additional information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* will be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section, using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed. The author(s) of the previously published article will be invited to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer-reviewed. While the *Review* does publish forums these are published very rarely. We do not publish rejoinders to rejoinders.

The *APSR* accepts only electronic submissions (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr). The web site provides detailed information about how to submit, what formatting is required, and what type of digital files may be uploaded. Please direct any questions regarding new submissions to the journal's editorial offices at apsr@unt.edu.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words including text, all tables and figures, notes, references,

² One widely accepted guide to such norms is given by the American Anthropological Association's Code of Ethics, particularly Section III. <http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf>

³ *Behavior Genetics* 42 (2012): 1–2, DOI 10.1007/s10519-011-9504-zvi

and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations. Do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our web site. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case (e.g., [Table 3 about here]). If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications (e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) and review recent issues of the *APSR*.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/aprs> and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit (at www.editorialmanager.com/aprs), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files.

- a) An "anonymous" digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal web sites or at institutions with which any of the co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.
- b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.

4. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication, and which may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

Further questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940-891-6803) or by sending an e-mail to: aprs@unt.edu

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*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* through the APSA website (www.apsanet.org) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the on-line 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 the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, 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.

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. Please direct correspondence as follows.

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

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*
E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

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

Director of Member Services
E-mail: membership@apsanet.org
Reprint permissions:
E-mail: Rights@cambridge.org

Advertising information and rates:
Advertising Coordinator,
Cambridge University Press
E-mail: journals.advertising@cambridge.org

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING APSR, PERSPECTIVES, 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; EconLit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly

Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; 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). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969–95, is available through the APSA.