doi:10.1017/S0003055415000374
© American Political Science Association 2015

Notes from the Editors

In this issue, the last of volume 109, we are pleased to present a mix of articles that touch upon a variety of topics. These include the question of whether democratic leadership is possible, how one goes about bridging the divide between quantitative and qualitative research, how gender equality is conceptualized by the United Nations, whether remittances allow states to provide less in terms of social spending to their constituents, and the effects of persistent terrorism on levels of tolerance. As always, we try to illustrate in this volume the variety of research themes and methodologies that are prevalent in our discipline.

In This Issue

"Is Democratic Leadership Possible?" This is the simple yet complex question Eric Beerbohm asks in his essay of that title. If leaders are simply to follow the preferences of the people, even if only the "ideal" preferences, what room remains for leadership? Beerbohm proposes a new model of leadership that can accommodate robust leaders, without betraying basic democratic principles. The theory rests on the notion of shared intentions. Leaders may tap into, and help shape, underlying intentions or commitments held by the people. Thus, they follow underlying public beliefs but may express and implement them in creative ways, leaving broad scope for democratic leadership. Beerbohm notes that such leadership may take undesirable or even immoral forms but maintains that even such forms have to be designated "leadership." His essay represents a novel and important contribution to democratic theory, and to leadership studies.

In **"Mixing Methods: A Bayesian Approach,"** Macartan Humphreys and Alan Jacobs provide a method by which quantitative and qualitative approaches to causal inference can be unified via a method they refer to as the Bayesian Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative data (BIQQ). This technique allows researchers to draw causal inferences from combinations of within- and cross-case observations given prior beliefs about causal effects, assignment propensities, and characteristics of different types of within-case observations. They illustrate the use of this innovative framework by examining two longtime theoretical questions in political science—the origins of electoral systems and the causes of civil war. They demonstrate how the use of this framework yields greater insight on causal processes, and produces inferences that are somewhat different from those that were accessible before.

In the provocatively titled **"Feminisms, Women's Rights, and the UN: Would Achieving Gender Equality Empower Women?,"** Zehra F. Kabasakal Arat questions the assumptions underlying measures of gender equality that are commonly used within the United Nations (UN) system. She surveys the influence of different feminisms in shaping the debates within the UN and shows that liberal feminism has emerged as a dominant voice, shaping the measures used to evaluate progress toward gender equality. She asks whether these gender equality measures, such as the proportion of women in parliament, simply redistribute power resources differently between women and men, but do not alter social stratification more broadly. Hence, she concludes that gender equality as operationalized by these measures may provide some women access to power, but not empower women generally.

While many scholars think of Frederick Douglass as an abolitionist and civil rights activist whose thought and actions focused exclusively on the United States, in **"'A Black Sister to Massachusetts': Latin America and the Fugitive Democratic Ethos of Frederick Douglass,"** Juliet Hooker highlights the transnational dimension of Douglass' words and deeds while arguing that Latin America played an important role in shaping his political thought, especially as it relates to his conception of a multiracial democracy. Drawing upon previously underutilized writings and speeches of Douglass, she portrays him as a radically democratic thinker whose ideas regarding multiracial democracy contain important resources for ongoing debates about racial justice, cultural diversity, and U.S. democracy.

Rafaela M. Dancygier, Karl-Oskar Lindgren, Sven Oskarsonn, and Kåre Vernby present a compelling argument about the reasons why immigrants are underrepresented in politics in **"Why Are Immigrants Underrepresented in Politics? Evidence from Sweden."** The authors use new data to investigate the factors that explain the differences in attainment of political office between immigrants and native-born candidates for office. They conclude that the evidence is consistent with discrimination. They note that immigrant candidates are often placed in lower positions on the ballot, which suggests that party gatekeepers influence the likelihood that immigrant candidates get elected. Although the data are derived from a single-country case, the paper has implications for other contexts as well.

In **"Rights to the Realm: Reconsidering Western Political Development,"** Alexander William Salter reviews the rise of liberal constitutional governance from the perspective of political economy. First he examines "pure" autocracy and democracy models of government for the purpose of demonstrating how political-economic property rights influence the incentives of political decision-makers and highlighting the vulnerability of polities that approach these ideal types. Next, Salter investigates how bargaining over political-economic property rights may, or may not, improve welfare for other members of the polity and also discusses how political-economic property rights in the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"corporate polity" influence political-economic outcomes. Finally he argues that neither political property rights nor constitutional separation of powers is sufficient to achieve nondiscriminatory governance. A combination of "old world" and "new world" institutions is needed to incentivize stewardship of the polity's wealth and check possible predatory behavior of political elites.

What duties do people have to aid victims of natural disasters and other misfortunes? In **"Social Samaritan Justice: When and Why Needy Fellow Citizens Have a Right to Assistance,"** Laura Valentini argues that it is more extensive than many believe, though not limitless. Her essay seeks the foundation of the duty to be a "Samaritan" and weighs several alternatives. The duty could be an individual duty held by all of us; but then how does any one of us get singled out as the one to perform the duty? It could be a duty held collectively by mankind at large; but Professor Valentini argues that mankind cannot collectively be the bearer of such duties. She opts instead for a third way, "Social Samaritanism," whereby a society bears this duty toward its members, a duty that occasionally falls on individual bystanders. This is a duty to fellow-citizens, but not to others. Where appropriate, these Samaritans should then be compensated for their service by society at large. This argument is illustrated with the case study of Hurricane Sandy, which hit the Eastern United States in 2012. This provocative argument will spark further debate in the field of humanitarian justice.

In **"Rationalism in Politics,"** Peter J. Steinberger raises the question, current in contemporary political theory, whether politics, or the study of politics, can ever be a rational undertaking. He reviews three prominent "anti-rationalist" strains of contemporary political theory—emphasizing, respectively, the rhetorical in politics, the agonistic, and the realist—and finds their critiques of rationalism deficient. He argues that all these theoretical strains surreptitiously make use of rationalism in their portrayal of politics. Then, he turns to what he calls a "post-Kantian convergence" of rationalist schools outside of mainstream political theory, one he urges political theorists to make use of. This convergence differs from the dogmatic rationalism of older philosophy, which was based on a false "God's-eye point of view." Adopting this more anthropocentric, flexible perspective, Steinberger urges, would result in a better, richer understanding of what form rationalism takes in politics and political theory.

In **"Transparency, Protest, and Autocratic Instability,"** James R. Hollyer, B. Peter Rosendorff, and James Raymond Vreeland argue that the willingness of an individual to engage in strikes and protests is dependent on whether he or she believes that others will also participate. In this paper they contend that this willingness is affected by the amount of information provided to citizens, providing them with issues around which to mobilize. Thus they theorize that under autocratic rule, transparency increases the frequency of protests, and increases the extent to which protest is correlated with incumbent performance. In particular they examine the effect of a specific form of transparency—the disclosure of economic data by the government—on citizen belief-formation, and consequently on collective mobilization. They find strong empirical support for the claim that transparency destabilizes autocracies via mass protest

David Doyle in **"Remittance and Social Spending"** argues that remittances, due to their compensation and insurance functions, will increase the general income level and economic security of recipients and, as a result, reduce perceived income risk. This will result in the dampening of demand from recipients for government taxation and social insurance and hence result in reduced levels of social welfare transfers at the macro-level. This explains the rather curious lack of demand for social security transfers even in countries with high levels of inequality and economic insecurity. He tests this argument using data from 18 Latin American states, over the period 1990 to 2009. The results strongly support the argument regarding the effects of remittances on demand for social spending.

In **"'A Trust That Cannot Be Delegated': The Invention of Ratification Referenda,"** Jeffrey A. Lenowitz, looking at some of the debates surrounding the ratification of constitutions in the early United States, uncovers the roots of our notion that constitutions must be ratified by direct or indirect popular vote. He turns to the "Berkshire Constitutionalists" for the most complete set of arguments—perhaps the only complete set of arguments—maintaining that popular ratification is the only legitimate way to adopt a constitution. Lenowitz argues that examining their writings, which advocated popular ratification of the Massachusetts constitution of 1780, allows us to reopen the question of whether popular ratification is the only legitimate avenue, indeed whether it is the most advisable one. His essay concludes with some reflections on the place of popular ratification in constitution-making today. Problems with unfettered majoritarianism, manipulation by elites, perhaps even the impossibility of getting informed public consent on such an issue, Lenowitz argues, might give us pause today. His essay should inform future exercises of constitution-writing, as well as future studies of constitutionalism and American thought and history.

Mark Peffley, Marc L. Hutchison, and Michal Shamir in "**The Impact of Persistent Terrorism on Political Tolerance: Israel, 1980 to 2011"** examine the question of how persistent terrorism affects the level of political tolerance. Although there have been many studies that examine the impact of discrete events such as the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center, these studies are less useful in evaluating the effects of persistent terrorism. Using the case of Israel, the authors find that the corrosive influence of terrorism on political tolerance is much more powerful among Israelis who identify with the Right, who have also become much more sensitive to terrorism over time. They conclude by discussing the implications of their findings for other countries throughout the world.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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

[1] See http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp

[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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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.

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 website 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, 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 website. 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/apsr 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/apsr), 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 websites 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.
6. Charges apply for all color figures that appear in the print version of the journal. At the time of submission, contributors should clearly state whether their figures should appear in color in the online version only, or whether they should appear in color online and in the print version. There is no charge for including color figures in the online version of the *Journal* but it must be clear that color is needed to enhance the meaning of the figure, rather than simply being for esthetic purposes. If you request color figures in the printed version, you will be contacted by CCC-Rightslink who are acting on our behalf to collect Author Charges. Please follow their instructions in order to avoid any delay in the publication of your article.

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: apsr@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 online 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 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 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,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000374 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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*:

Phillip Ardoin, Appalachian State University
Paul Gronke, Reed College
Editors, *PS*
E-mail: ps@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: journalsadvertising@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 websites 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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000374 Published online by Cambridge University Press