APSA Awards Presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting

Recognizing excellence in the profession is one of the most important activities of the American Political Science Association. The Association's Annual Awards Ceremony and Luncheon took place on August 31 as part of the 2006 Annual Meeting. It was made possible through the generous support of *Polity.*

Dissertation Awards

Gabriel A. Almond Award ($750)

For the best doctoral dissertation in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: Timothy Frye, Ohio State University, chair; Terri E. Givens, University of Texas-Austin; Dali L. Yang, University of Chicago

Recipient: **Matthew Adam Kocher,** University of Chicago

Dissertation: "Human Ecology and Civil War"

Citation: With great enthusiasm, we award the Gabriel A. Almond Award for the Best Dissertation in Comparative Politics completed in 2004 and 2005 to Matthew Kocher for "Human Ecology and Civil War." Drawing on an impressive empirical base, Kocher argues that the key to understanding civil wars lies in the ability of rebel forces to "build states" that hold territory and monopolize violence. Rebels are much more successful in these "state-building" efforts where the cost to existing states of exercising a monopoly on violence is higher, e.g., in the countryside and in moderately rough terrain. His argument suggests that the oft-cited negative correlation between economic development and civil war is spurious once terrain and population density are taken into account.

Kocher's empirical work is methodologically diverse and sophisticated in anticipating possible objections. He uses field work in Kurdistan to hone his intuition and motivate the argument; a cross-national statistical analysis to assess the scope of his theory; a case study of Northern Ireland to address an obvious counterexample; a quantitative analysis of the civil war in Vietnam to extend the geographic boundaries of his argument and a historical analysis of the Ottoman Empire's attempts to preempt civil wars in Kurdistan in the 19th and 20th centuries to expand the temporal basis for his claims. This type of fearless trespassing across methodological and subfield boundaries is comparative politics at its best. It is our pleasure to recognize Matthew Kocher as the winner of the Gabriel Almond A. Award for 2006.

William Anderson Award ($750)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2004 or 2005 in the general field of federalism or intergovernmental relations, or state and local politics.

Award Committee: Richard E. Foglesong, Rollins College; William E. Nelson, Jr., Ohio State University, chair; Jeff Talbert, University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth

Recipient: **Joon Suk Kim,** University of Chicago

Dissertation: "Making States Federatively: Alternative Routes of State Formation in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe"

Dissertation Chair: Suzanne Rudolph, University of Chicago

Citation: This important work challenges the orthodox view that workable states are centralized political authorities formed through external struggles. Kim shows how a long-standing historiographical tradition has systematically favored a particular view of the state over other views, despite historical examples to the contrary. Problematizing our taken-for-granted assumptions about the state, he demonstrates the viability of an alternative "federative state" model, using examples from late medieval and early modern Europe. Thus, he explains how the Holy Roman Empire, Swiss Confederation, and Dutch Republic continued to retain decentralized, loosely integrated political and institutional structures despite engaging in geopolitical competitions throughout the 15th and 16th centuries.

These early examples of state building, he concludes, show both the limits of the modern state model and the viability of alternative state forms. His historical argument has value for scholars and diplomats alike in showing the utility, over extended periods of time, in face of major external and internal challenges, of the federative state alternative. As one contemporary example, he argues in his concluding chapter for the legitimacy of the European Union as a workable federative state.

He accomplishes all this while writing with great economy of language, making careful use of the approach of "historical institutionalism" while also acknowledging and responding to the shortcomings of this theoretical perspective. And he makes a noteworthy contribution to an America-centric field by showing the utility not only of rethinking accepted concepts, but of re-examining pre-modern, non-American examples of state models, thus extending the empirical and theoretical reach of an established field of political science research.

Edward S. Corwin Award ($750)

For the best dissertation completed in the field of public law.

Award Committee: Jeff Yates, University of Georgia, chair; Austin Sarat, Amherst College; Sanford C. Gordon, New York University

Recipient: **Justin Wert,** University of Oklahoma

Dissertation: "The Not-So-Great Writ: Habeas Corpus and American Political Development"

Dissertation Chair: Rogers M. Smith, University of Pennsylvania

Citation: Justin Wert's "The Not-So-Great Writ: Habeas Corpus and American Political Development" is the committee's choice for the 2006 Edward S. Corwin award for the best dissertation completed in the field of public law. It is an outstanding work of political science scholarship. The study fits into the broader themes of public law research by analyzing a topic that is of interest not only to scholars of law and courts, but also the executive, public policy, and American politics generally.

The author provides an intriguing and thorough analysis of the historical dynamics of the Great Writ—the key instrument in the American system through which individuals incarcerated by the state can demand, receive, and challenge in a public forum the reasons for their incarceration. He traces the development of Habeas Corpus law across four periods of American history—ante-bellum slave law; Reconstruction; the incorporation of the Bill of Rights; and use of the writ during war, with special focus on the current "War on Terror"—and argues that writ has been inextricably linked to shifting conceptions of American citizenship and race.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In sum, he provides a compelling account of the role politics has played in shaping the capacity of the writ to fulfill its potential as a shield of individual liberties.

Harold D. Lasswell Award ($1,000)

For best dissertation in the field of policy studies.

Award Committee: J. Nicholas Ziegler, University of California, Berkeley, chair; Marie Gotts, University of Pennsylvania; Andrew D. Grossman, Albion College

Recipient: **Jonathan Ari Laurence,** Boston College

Dissertation: "Managing Transnational Religion: Muslims and the State in Western Europe (1974–2004)"

Dissertation Chair: Stanley Hoffman, Harvard University

Citation: This dissertation makes an original and forceful argument to explain the distinctive politics shaping the integration of Muslim minorities in France, Germany, and Italy. Through impressive empirical fieldwork, the author illuminates an administrative "awakening" in all three countries.

Laurence shows how national leaders have moved in recent decades from a narrow strategy of dealing only with the official representatives of Islamic countries, i.e., "Embassy Islam," to a more active strategy of engaging the independent political organizations that represent particular Muslim communities in different European countries. The political debates that accompanied the process varied, but Laurence shows how political leaders in all three countries explicitly tried to encourage the emergence of moderate interlocutors who might help create distinctive national versions of Islam in Europe. By documenting the consistency of this pattern across three major cases, Laurence provides a model of comparative research and delineates the possibilities as well as the limits of enlightened leadership in an era of identity politics.

Helen Dwight Reid Award ($750)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in the previous two years (2004 or 2005) in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

Award Committee: James R. Kurth, Swarthmore College, chair; John J. Mearsheimer, University of Chicago; Helen Milner, Princeton University

Recipient: **Alexander B. Downes,** University of Chicago

Dissertation: "Targeting Civilians in Wartime"

Dissertation Chair: John J. Mearsheimer, University of Chicago

Citation: We have selected Alexander Downes (Ph.D., University of Chicago) as the winner of this year's Helen Dwight Reid Award. His dissertation, "Targeting Civilians in Wartime," examines and tests competing explanations for why states choose to target civilians in the course of their military operations during wartime. Downes addresses a question of central and continuing importance, refutes the answer that focuses upon the type of regime and that is now dominant in the field, and convincingly demonstrates the power of his own explanation, which focuses upon calculations by government leaders of the costs of a war and the dangers of losing it.

Analysts of international politics have long debated competing explanations about why states go to war and how they behave in war. Among the classical candidates has been the type of regime, and in the past two decades this explanation has become the most prominent and widely accepted among both professional scholars and policy elites. In particular, "democratic peace" theory is widely considered one of the most robust findings of political science, i.e., democratic states are much less warlike than authoritarian ones. This is especially true with regard to a state's decision to go to war, but also with the way it wages war, e.g., a democracy is supposed to be less likely to choose a strategy that calls for targeting enemy civilians.

Downes' dissertation refutes this contention. In doing so, he uses both large-N statistical techniques (e.g., all countries which participated in interstate war since 1815) and process tracing in several detailed historical cases (e.g., U.S. versus German strategic bombing in World War II; U.S. strategic bombing since World War II; the British blockade of Germany and the German use of unrestricted submarine warfare in World War I, etc.). Downes finds that regime type exerts little influence on the choice of governments to target civilians, with liberal democracies employing this strategy at about the same rate as authoritarian states. Indeed, when liberal democracies are engaged in costly wars of attrition, they are more likely to target civilians than are non-liberal states.

Downes proposes an alternate explanation based upon government leaders' perceptions of (1) the costs of fighting (e.g., military fatalities), "the cost reduction logic," and (2) the likelihood of defeat, "the desperation logic." The power of his explanation is convincingly demonstrated in the detailed process tracing in his case studies. In these studies, he not only shows a mastery of the scholarly literature on the topic, but in several he goes beyond the conventional understanding among historians to offer an original reinterpretation of the history of the case.

In summary, Alexander Downes addresses a question of central and continuing importance in international politics; advances an original and counter-conventional explanation; and, deploying lucid theoretical reasoning and a vast body of evidence, provides an exceptionally comprehensive, systematic, and convincing demonstration of his argument. The result is a dissertation of high distinction, one that makes an extraordinary and valuable contribution to advancing the professional understanding of international relations. All future efforts to explain the targeting of civilians in war should take this commanding work into account.

2006 E. E. Schattschneider Award ($750)

For best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2005 in the field of American government and politics.

Award Committee: Arthur Lupia, University of Michigan, chair; David M. Hart, George Mason University; Eileen McDonagh, Northeastern University

Recipient: **Robert W. Mickey,** University of Michigan

Dissertation: "Paths Out of Dixie: The Decay of Authoritarian Enclaves in America's Deep South, 1944–1972"

Dissertation Chair: Theda Skocpol, Harvard University

Citation: For the 2006 E. E. Schattschneider Award, the committee recommends "Paths Out of Dixie: The Decay of Authoritarian Enclaves in America's Deep South, 1944–1972" by Robert W. Mickey. The thesis concerns transitions in three Southern states: Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Some scholars hold that all of the Southern states emerged from the Jim Crow South in a similar manner. Others have argued that the states had different experiences, with some scholars emphasizing economic differences as causing the states to experience different "paths out of Dixie," while other scholars, including Doug McAdam, argued that pre-existing differences in the manner of Black protest organizations explained the difference.

Mickey accounts for these factors, but offers a different and more fundamental explanation. He shows how the role of pre-existing differences in the institutions of state government led to very different paths of out Dixie in the three states. He uses these differences to explain similari-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ties and differences in the three states' reactions to restrictions on the White primary, the Dixiecrat revolt, the Brown decision and college integration, and, finally, the movement of Blacks into the Democratic Party and the movement of conservative Whites to the Republican Party. The final act shows how the states react to an emboldened national Democratic party that becomes focused on civil rights and the fall of Jim Crow. In every case, he explains how institutional differences affected the incentives and behaviors of key actors. He shows how these dynamics affected not only when such challenges affected each state but also whether each state managed the challenges effectively.

The key tension in the argument is the notion that leaders in the state had roughly similar desires. None wanted Jim Crow to fall. All were against federal interference in race-related issues. None initially wanted to join the Republican Party, given the role that the GOP played in reconstruction, but many eventually did. While the three states shared these similarities, there were stark differences in how they reacted to new challenges. Mickey documents these differences in compelling detail and argues that state and local institutions are a key source of difference.

"Paths Out of Dixie" is an important piece of scholarship housed in a gripping narrative. As a published book, it will undoubtedly draw the attention of many political scientists and historians. It will force them to rethink how the South got from where it was in the 1940s to where it is today. As a dissertation, it is simply outstanding. We are enthusiastic and unanimous in concluding that the 2006 E. E. Schattschneider Award should go to Robert W. Mickey for "Paths Out of Dixie: The Decay of Authoritarian Enclaves in America's Deep South."

Leo Strauss Award ($750)

For the best dissertation completed and accepted during 2004 or 2005 in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Ruth Grant, Duke University, chair; Aurelian Craiutu, University of Indiana; Donald Moon, Wesleyan University

Recipient: **Xavier Marquez,** University of Notre Dame

Dissertation: "The Stranger's Knowledge: Political Knowledge in Plato's *Statesman*"

Dissertation Chair: Catherine Zuckert, University of Notre Dame

Citation: The 2005–2006 Leo Strauss Award Committee is pleased to nominate Xavier Marquez for receipt of the award for the best dissertation in political philosophy completed and accepted in the years 2004 and 2005. His dissertation is entitled, "The Stranger's Knowledge: Political Knowledge in Plato's *Statesman.*"

This dissertation is an illuminating meditation on political knowledge; what it is, how it is distinguished from both philosophy and technical expertise, the limitations on the possibility of acquiring it, and the implications of these issues for understanding the relation between theory and practice. The author pursues these issues primarily through an analysis of Plato's *Statesman* that is notable for the clarity and forcefulness of its argumentation and the breadth and depth of its scholarship. The interpretation is original, arguing that the political knowledge of the statesman is superior to philosophy and that the ideal of statesmanship provides a critical standard for philosophical inquiry. The author's account of Plato's view of political science serves to enhance our own.

Leonard D. White Award ($750)

For the best doctoral dissertation completed and accepted in 2004 or 2005 in the field of public administration.

Award Committee: Catherine E. Rudder, George Mason University, chair; Charles W. Gossett, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Gary Mucciaroni, Temple University

Recipient: **David Pitts,** Georgia State University

Dissertation: "Diversity, Representation, and Performance: Evidence about Ethnicity in Public Organizations"

Dissertation Chair: Lawrence J. O'Toole, Jr., Georgia State University

Citation: The Leonard D. White Award for the best dissertation in the field of public administration is accorded this year to David W. Pitts. The award committee unanimously selected his work, "Diversity, Representation & Performance: Evidence about Ethnicity in Public Organizations," as the superior choice in a rich field of nominated dissertations. This manuscript serves as a model for design and execution of original research. The framing of the research questions, the embedding of hypotheses in theory, the breadth and succinctness of the literature review, the scrupulousness in the choice and use of methods, the thoughtful specification and testing of models, the care taken in interpreting the findings, the quality and clarity of exposition, and the significance of the project—each aspect of the undertaking reflects a mature intelligence and portends a future of penetrating, significant scholarship from Pitts.

The topic of this dissertation, the impact of ethnic diversity on organizational performance, is explored, first, by making a careful but uncommonly made distinction between ethnic diversity and ethnic representation, two overlapping but discrete concepts. Discussions about diversity often confuse the two. Ethnic diversity refers to variety, while ethnic representation connotes correspondence. Thus, the more the ethnic variety among teachers in a school district, the more diversity. However, representation can be understood in this context as the degree to which teachers' ethnicity reflects that of their students.

Pitts takes a subset of public organizations, public school districts in Texas, and separately assesses the impact of diversity and representation on the school districts' performance—as measured by student dropout rates, standardized test scores, and college-bound rates. He finds that diversity of teachers produces a significant and negative impact on districts' performance whereas representation has a salutary effect. Importantly, neither diversity nor representation of managers (assistant principals, principals, and district superintendents) seems to matter much. The key to performance is for those who directly deliver services, the teachers, to reflect the ethnicity of the clientele they are serving, their students.

Pitts takes great care in discussing his findings and their applicability more broadly. He is appropriately cautious and sets forth a series of worthy future research questions that one can only hope that he will pursue, as the policy implications are substantial. If, for example, unmediated ethnic diversity produces low performing organizations, and if, normatively, such diversity is desirable, what interventions might effectively reverse this relationship between diversity and performance? Or, to give another example, if diversity is imposed as a conscious policy to be helpful to public clients, might ethnic representation of the clientele be a better way to serve them? Beyond ethnicity, do Pitts' findings hold for other types of diversity such as gender? Are schools sufficiently similar to other public organizations that the implications of Pitts' research could usefully be extended to them?

In sum, Pitts has produced a provocative, tidy piece of scholarship that is worth emulating but that, as good research does, raises as many questions as it answers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Paper and Article Awards

Franklin L. Burdette/Pi Sigma Alpha Award ($750)

For the best paper presented at the previous year's Annual Meeting. Supported by Pi Sigma Alpha.

Award Committee: Sunita Parikh, Washington University in St. Louis, chair; Byron E. Shafer, University of Wisconsin; and Jytte Klausen, Brandeis University

Recipient: **Dawn M. Brancati,** Harvard University

Paper: "The Impact of Political Decentralization on Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism"

Citation: In "The Impact of Political Decentralization on Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism," Dawn Brancati utilizes an impressive combination of theoretical, empirical, and statistical approaches to analyze an important question in political science. Brancati examines the relationship between ethnic conflict and political decentralization. Scholars of federalism have argued that decentralization reduces ethnic conflict, pointing to cases such as Belgium, Spain, and India. But others have countered with examples in which decentralization has not been accompanied by a reduction in ethnic strife. Brancati explains this variation by examining the role of political parties. She argues that regional parties frequently increase ethnic conflict and secessionist tendencies by reinforcing regionally based ethnic identities and favoring certain ethnic groups over others.

To test this hypothesis Brancati has created an impressive dataset, which collects constituency-level election results from 50 countries between 1945 and 2000. She combines this with data from the Minorities at Risk dataset to analyze the effects of decentralization and regional parties on ethnic conflict in 30 countries between 1985 and 2000, using an ordered logit regression model. Brancati finds that decentralization is an effective tool in reducing ethnic conflict and secessionism. However, because decentralization also increases the probability that regional parties will become strong, it is linked through the party system to increased ethnic strife. By demonstrating the precise nature of this linkage, Brancati has increased our understanding of the relationship between decentralization and ethnic conflict and has suggested both theoretical and policy avenues for further research. The paper and its conclusions are of importance to political scientists and policymakers, and it can be expected to stimulate other work in the field.

Heinz I. Eulau Award ($750)

For the best article published in the *American Political Science Review* and *Perspectives on Politics* during the previous calendar year. Two Eulau Awards are made, one for each journal.

Award Committee: Claire Jean Kim, University of California, Irvine, chair; Joseph M. Bessette, Claremont McKenna College; Dennis Chong, Northwestern University; Jonas Pontusson, Russell Sage Foundation; Deborah Stone, Dartmouth College

Recipient: **Jennifer L. Hochschild,** Harvard University

Title: "Editor's Notes," *Perspectives on Politics*

Citation: As the first editor of *Perspectives on Politics,* Jennifer Hochschild fashioned a new genre in her "Editor's Notes" at the same time as she fashioned a new journal for the discipline. Her notes at the beginning of each issue were always a tour de force of intellectual synthesis—and eloquent, fresh writing. She found common themes in seemingly disparate articles, and in her creative juxtapositions, she illuminated each article, enlarging its significance beyond a stand-alone article. Collectively, her notes form a running commentary on the state of the discipline. In her role as editor, Hochschild has educated and inspired the profession.

Recipient: **Susan C. Stokes,** Yale University

Title: "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina," *American Political Science Review,* vol. 99, no. 3 (August 2005)

Citation: This year's Heinz Eulau Award Committee has selected Susan Stokes' article "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Evidence from Argentina" as the best article published by the *APSR* in 2005. Stokes' article is organized around an elegant game-theoretic model of the strategic interaction between party machines and voters that yields several testable hypotheses about the conditions that are most conducive to vote buying and the types of voters who are most likely to be targeted by machines.

The model focuses our attention on the credibility problem that is implicit in but largely neglected by the existing literature on clientelism: How do parties know that voters will honor their part of the bargain when they cast their ballots? Stokes argues persuasively that three conditions give rise to and sustain vote buying: (a) voting technologies that allow party activists to monitor voters in more or less subtle, informal ways; (b) community structures characterized by lack of anonymity; and (c) "tentacle-like" party organizations.

The hypotheses that Stokes derives from her formal model are tested and largely supported by her analysis of original survey data from Argentina. In exemplary fashion, Stokes' article combines formal modeling with an empirical analysis that is appropriate to the data at hand, compelling, and readily accessible. Collected by the author, the empirical data speak directly to the micro foundations of the formal model.

Stokes' article breaks new ground not only by placing the question of "perverse accountability" (parties monitoring voters) center stage, but also by shedding light on the question of why "dueling machines" is a rather uncommon phenomenon, why it is often the case that some parties specialize in machine-style politics while others pursue different electoral strategies. The committee is confident that this article will endure as a central reference point in new theorizing and empirical research on machine politics and clientelistic practices. Especially in view of the prevalence of clientelistic practices in new democracies across the developing world, the questions addressed by Stokes are important to political science as a whole.

Book Awards

Ralph J. Bunche Award ($500)

For the best scholarly work in political science published in the previous calendar year that explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Daniel Kryder, Brandeis University; Rodolfo Rosales, University of Texas-San Antonio, chair; Valeria Sinclair-Chapman, University of Rochester

Recipient: **Lisa Garcia Bedolla,** University of California, Irvine

Title: *Fluid Borders: Latino Power, Identity, and Politics in Los Angeles* (University of California Press, 2005)

Citation: In this excellent study of the changing influence of stigma and identity on political efficacy as they cut across race, class, gender, language ability, generation, and social context, Dr. Lisa Garcia Bedolla establishes an exciting new paradigm by which to approach the political analysis of Latino community participation. While political scientists have focused on the individual to measure political efficacy, ignoring how that political efficacy came about, Bedolla carefully builds the context in which one can then link participation and efficacy and, more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

important, how they are prefigured by the factors in that context. Furthermore, in the presentation of this study Bedolla provides an excellent multi-disciplinary discussion of the various approaches to the study of efficacy and participation.

Bedolla's pivotal premise in her study of two Latino communities from East Los Angeles and Montebello is the distinction she makes between the electoral definitions of the collective identity as the abstract state as opposed to a more direct form of collective identity found in community mobilization in non-electoral activity. Based on this premise, Bedolla's analysis then takes the reader into a really superb discussion of how women tend to be more connected to community. While this gender connection is documented in other studies, the analysis of how electoral politics is more individualistic an act as compared to community activism is a major contribution to the understanding of why not only Latinos, but minorities in general, are alienated from a system that in the end is distinctly Anglo in its individualistic approach to empowerment. Bedolla finds that "they [community members] can see clear connections between non-electoral activity and addressing group problems. When it came to electoral politics, these connections were more difficult for the respondents to see. Their general sense of separateness from Anglo society, and by extension formal politics, decreased their level of comfort with the electoral system."

Finally, Bedolla's study addresses a very important question about the electoral system in general. If this system is an individualistic process then how do we explain the participation rates of one community where there is greater participation and where the other participates little or not at all. In asking the question if stigma, identity, and group cohesion, which historically and politically characterize the Latino community, do not lend themselves to an individualistic process like voting, Bedolla captures the distinct role of the historical, political, and cultural context of the two communities as explanatory forces for the various responses of Latino communities.

Gladys Kammerer Award ($1,000)

For best political science publication in 2005 in the field of U.S. national policy.

Award Committee: Barbara Sinclair, University of California, Los Angeles, chair; Desmond King, Oxford University; Daniel J. Tichenor, Rutgers University

Recipient: **Jonas Pontusson,** Princeton University

Title: *Inequality and Prosperity: Social Europe vs. Liberal America* (A Century Foundation Book, Cornell University Press)

Citation: Professor Pontusson's *Inequality and Prosperity: Social Europe vs. Liberal America* is a superb empirical comparative study of the presumed trade-off between equality and economic growth. Combining methods of quantitative analysis with careful case studies, Pontusson shows that the trade-off is not as strict or as simple as much economic theory argues. Neither the Anglo-American liberal market economies/polities nor the European social market economies/polities have all the answers; each can learn something for the other model, and, further, finer-grained institutional features have major effects on the extent to which equality and economic growth can be reconciled. For Americans disturbed with the growing inequality in our society, this book offers instructive policy lessons as well as the hope that severe inequality is not a necessary price we much pay for continued prosperity.

Recipient: **Suzanne Mettler,** Syracuse University

Title: *Soldiers to Citizens: The G.I. Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation* (Oxford University Press)

Citation: Professor Mettler's *Soldiers to Citizens: The G.I. Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation* is an outstanding scholarly work in the relatively new study of policy feedback effects. Using a diversity of methods and data sources, Mettler shows how the G.I. Bill of Rights not only contributed to the development of a broad middle class in post-war America but also generated an unusually high level of civic and political involvement among its beneficiaries. "The G.I. Bill of Rights stands as a premier example of how government can, thorough public policy, provide social opportunity, and at the same time, promote active citizenship, making American more democratic," Mettler writes. Policy design and implementation were important in bringing about these effects. Readily accessible and smoothly administered, an inclusive and earned benefit for all World War II soldiers, the G.I. Bill conveyed to returning soldiers that their country and their government valued them and they in turn gave even more back as citizens.

Victoria Schuck Award ($1,000)

For the best book published in the previous calendar year on women and politics.

Award Committee: Laura Katz Olson, Lehigh University, chair; Nancy J. Hirschman, University of Pennsylvania; Jean L. Cohen, Columbia University

Recipient: **Valentine M. Moghadam,** UNESCO, Social and Human Sciences Sector

Title: *Globalizing Women: Transnational Feminist Networks* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005)

Citation: This powerful book provides a vital analysis of global feminism through a study of transnational feminist networks. Emerging in the mid-1980s and proliferating in the 1990s, these groups represent, according to the author, local, state, and regional women uniting around a common, worldwide feminist agenda. Their main goal, as well as the author's, is to present globalization as a gendered process and demonstrate its gendered dimensions. As such, they challenge the neo-corporate agenda at its core.

Moghadam focuses on two main areas: women's human rights in the face of harsh gender regimes in Muslim countries; and the economic consequences for women of ruthless structural adjustment policies imposed by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, among other entities, on Third World nations. She shows how women are not only resisting the exploitation of female labor and patriarchal fundamentalism but also are attempting to influence new policies based on gender and economic justice. The book depicts how transnational feminist networks engage politically through various mechanisms, including lobbying and advocacy, organizing coalitions with other groups, providing information and data to varied governmental and quasi-governmental organizations, and enhancing public awareness everywhere.

This book is not just "about women" but is feminist in its very foundation; the questions that motivate it, the way it frames analysis. Using a feminist political economy model, Moghadam's concern with the affects of globalization on women relies on the interplay among capital, class, race, and gender. Her book also stands out because it interweaves theoretical feminist analysis with that of women's activism, examining the ways in which agency and structure interact. As she puts it, the work addresses both "globalism-from-above" and "globalism-from-below." As such, *Globalizing Women: Transnational Feminist Networks* is an original and significant contribution to the study of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

women and politics and most deserving of the Victoria Schuck Award.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award ($5,000)

For the best book published in the U.S. during the previous calendar year on government, politics, or international affairs. The award is supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.

Award Committee: Michael C. Dawson, University of Chicago, chair; Miriam A. Golden, University of California, Los Angeles; Ian S. Lustick, University of Pennsylvania

Recipient: **Philip Tetlock,** University of California, Berkeley

Title: *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* (Princeton University Press, 2005)

Citation: Given the enormous variety of work in our discipline, the annual task of selecting a recipient for the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award for the best book on government, politics, or international affairs is a daunting task and one that demands a certain degree of intellectual hubris. We can safely say that this year the task was particularly difficult, not only because of tough competition among several terrific books, but because the best book among them makes a devastatingly effective argument against the exercise of hubristic judgment. In *Expert Political Judgment* Philip E. Tetlock argues compellingly that experts who think they know the right answer to a tough question in their fields of expertise, especially those who are very confident in that answer, are only slightly more likely to be correct in that judgment than dart-throwing chimpanzees.

Tetlock's book is a fascinating, powerful, sustained, and slightly unnerving study of how much of a contribution expertise makes to the quality of political predictions. Based on nearly two decades of repeated carefully designed studies of the predictive capacities of experts about important, real world political phenomena, Tetlock concludes that experts, as a group, seldom outperform statistical extrapolation, and are usually little better than mindless algorithms in predicting what will happen in the political domain. Expertise, in short, is not worth much at all as measured by the ability of highly trained and self-acknowledged experts to predict outcomes on issues as diverse as the likely direction of events in India after the victory of a Hindutva government, the future of Russia under Yeltsin and his successors, the stability and territorial integrity of Kazakhstan, the effect of economic shock therapy for Poland, or prospects for continued rule by the Saudi royal family.

Yet, Tetlock also shows that expertise is not irrelevant if we seek to understand why and how we are wrong. Exhibiting an inspiring mastery of statistical methods integrated within a strongly and often humorous narrative, Tetlock deploys Isaiah Berlin's classic distinction between "foxes" and "hedgehogs" to powerful effect. Hedgehogs are confident in their own ideas, have strong theoretical frameworks with which to understand the world, and are resistant to updating their beliefs even in the face of discouragingly wrong predictions. Foxes, by contrast, are often uncertain and cautious in the predictions they make, think of theoretical explanations as useful guides but not infallible intellectual architectures, and are flexible in their belief systems. Tetlock shows that for most forecasting tasks and in most analytic situations fox-type thinking outperforms hedgehog thinking, and that these differences in intellectual style are more important, per se, than sheer expertise. How we think about politics, how aware we are of our proneness to error, and how impressed we are by the complexity of the political world, are together more important to our abilities to predict outcomes than having amassed specialized degrees, decades of experience, and even public notoriety.

Rarely does a book whose contribution is squarely methodological speak so directly to all of the subfields of political science. This is an exciting study, one that should cause reflection and reconsideration throughout our discipline. The issues it raises touch on the degree of attention we should give to punditry in general and to the role of the media in promoting precisely the kind of thinking about the future most likely to be wrong. Thus the media, notes Tetlock, actively search for and reward talking hedgehog heads, confident they can be relied on to provide snappy and definitive sound bites that will track consistently with desired points of view. In his attention to the deeper epistemological and methodological questions associated with counterfactual thinking, statistical models, extrapolation of case studies, belief updating, scenario writing, analogical reasoning, and his own "neo-positivist" project of testing specific predictions for accuracy, Tetlock subjects his own enterprise to the self-scrutiny that comes naturally to his fox-like style.

Tetlock causes us to reflect in the deepest ways on how we think and on the social and collective purposes of our shared disciplinary enterprise. Indeed if there is any source of reassurance that expertise ~~p~~passionately, systematically, and self-critically applied ~~ca~~n enhance our understanding of the political world, Tetlock has provided it by example in this book. No one who reads *Expert Political Judgment* will come away untouched, either professionally or personally.

Career Awards

John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer ($2,000)

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

Award Committee: Jørgen Grønnegaard Christensen, University of Aarhus; Kathryn Newcomer, George Washington University, chair; Meredith A. Newman, University of Illinois, Springfield

Recipient: **Kenneth J. Meier,** Texas A&M University

Award Address: "The Public Administration of Politics, Or What Political Science Could Learn from Public Administration"

Citation: The APSA confers the 2006 John Gaus award on Kenneth J. Meier in recognition of a "lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration." Dr. Meier is the Charles H. Gregory Chair in Liberal Arts at Texas A&M University. He has spent a long career working at the intersection of political science and public administration and is one of this generation's most prolific scholars. He has displayed a willingness to push the frontier of public administration research and be critical of views that are too easily accepted at that moment. He also has a joint appointment at the Cardiff University of Business in Wales as a professor of public management.

Meier has employed a multi-disciplinary approach combining normative and empirical questions in his research. Over his career he has examined political patronage, government corruption, antitrust policy, insurance regulation, agricultural policy, education policy, public health policy, access to abortion and family planning, child support enforcement, sexual assault, gender and bureaucracy, gay rights, drug and alcohol policy, tobacco policy, gun control policy, and a large number of other issues.

Meier is currently the director of both the Texas Educational Excellence Project and the Cantu Hispanic Education and Opportunity Endowment. He is also chair of the APSA Public Administration Section's Mentoring Committee. Current-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ly he is an associate editor for the *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* as well as the Johns Hopkins University Series in Public Management. From 1994 to 1997 he was the editor of the *American Journal of Political Science,* and from 1991 to 1993 he served as associate editor of the *Journal of Politics.* He also is president of the Midwest Political Science Association and the Public Management Research Association.

Among his awards are the American Society of Public Administration's Charles H. Levine (2005) and William E. and Frederick C. Mosher Awards (2005), the ASPA/NASPAA Distinguished Research Award (2003), and the Herbert Kaufman Best Paper Award (2001 and 1992). He is also a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award ($1,000)

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

Award Committee: Merle Black, Emory University, chair; Jay Barth, Hendrix College; and M. Richard Zinman, Michigan State University

Recipient: **William A. Galston,** The Brookings Institution

Citation: This year's award recognizes William A. Galston of the Brookings Institution for his outstanding public service, deep involvement in vital questions of public affairs, and the quality and breadth of his scholarship in political science.

The Humphrey Award honors involvement in public affairs. Galston is superbly qualified by his long record of personal involvement in policymaking and advocacy. For more than three decades he has actively taken political science and theories about good public policy beyond the academy and into the arenas of national party politics and government at the highest levels in the United States. He has been especially influential in studying, advocating, and promoting the engagement of Americans in multiple dimensions of civic life.

His qualifications for the Humphrey Award extend beyond his direct engagement in public affairs. Throughout his career, Galston has sought to revive and exemplify the classical understanding of political science as a practical discipline—one that arises directly out of the characteristic conflicts of political life, takes its bearings from those conflicts, and seeks to provide impartial guidance to statesmen and citizens. Galston has played this role in two ways: On the one hand, he has attempted to demonstrate that liberalism (in the theoretical, not political, sense of term) is theoretically defensible and, indeed, superior to any of the available theoretical alternatives. On the other hand, while acknowledging that theory can never be a substitute for statesmanship, he has attempted to demonstrate, in speech and deed, that what he calls liberal pluralism is the best guide to the great domestic policy debates of our time. As a result, Galston's career is a model of the unity of theory and practice.

Galston was born on January 17, 1946. He graduated from Cornell University in 1967 and received his M.A. (1969) and Ph.D. (1973) from the University of Chicago. He is the author or co-author of 10 books and scores of articles in the fields of political theory, American politics, and public policy. He currently chairs the Task Force on Religion and Public Values National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, and serves on the Board of Directors of the Council for Excellence in Government. In 1993 and 1994 he was the deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy in the Clinton Administration. He has also been the executive director of the National Commission on Civic Renewal (1996–1999) and was the founding director of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (2001–2005). In addition, Galston has been an active and influential participant in party politics, serving as a senior advisor in the 1988 and 2000 presidential campaigns of Al Gore, and as issues director in the 1984 presidential campaign of Walter Mondale. He is now a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, where his work centers on the important topic of political polarization in the United States.

The 2006 Humphrey Award recognizes the achievements of an outstanding political scientist whose talents and energies have made him a respected and influential voice in modern public policy debates in American political life.

Carey McWilliams Award ($750)

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

Award Committee: Catherine A. Holland, University of Missouri, Columbia; Joseph P. McCormick, II, Pennsylvania State University; Ruth O'Brien, The Graduate Center, City University of New York, chair

Recipient: **Mark Danner,** University of California, Berkeley

Citation: Mark Danner writes on foreign affairs and international conflict in Central America, Haiti, the Balkans, and, most recently, Iraq. His books include *The Secret Way to War: The Downing Street Memo and the Iraq War's Buried History; Torture and Truth: America, Abu Ghraib and the War on Terror; The Road to Illegitimacy: One Reporter's Travel's Through the 2000 Florida Vote Recount;* and *The Massacre at El Mozote: A Parable of the Cold War.* He is a staff writer for the *New Yorker* and contributes often to the *New York Review of Books.* In many of his books and articles, Danner brings to light vital information about international conflicts.

We're extending him the Carey McWilliams Award because of his 2005 exposure of the Downing Street memo, establishing that the Bush Administration was quietly, but not gently, exerting pressure on the Blair Administration to support the invasion of Iraq as early as 2002, well before the UN Security Council took up the question. The *NYRB* essays on the Downing Street memo, which were recently expanded into his book, *The Secret Way to War,* link the Administration's secrecy policies to its foreign policy and illuminate the degree to which the strategy of preemptive war has (thus far) relied not only on distortions of evidence but also on the suppression of public debate through the deliberate marginalization of the democratic public itself in foreign policy deliberations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506231251 Published online by Cambridge University Press