doi:10.1017/S0003055409090285

Notes from the Editors

IN THIS ISSUE

The first five of this issue's articles address how democracies work, or how they should work—what motivates voters, how democratic governments distribute public goods, how representatives are (or should be) constrained by their electorates' preferences, and whether episodes of civil violence spur or retard democratic participation.

How do citizens construct or alter their social identities, and when does loyalty to a group (or to the nation as a whole) trump economic self-interest? This is about as basic and enduring a question as any in political science, central to recent controversies about U.S. voting, comparative studies of ethnicity, constructivist analysis in international relations, and normative inquiry on our duty to others. More recently, cognate disciplines—experimental anthropology and economics, cognitive psychology and brain-imaging—have contributed importantly to collective understanding. The first two articles in this issue advance this debate significantly, and from quite different perspectives.

In our lead article, "A Model of Social Identity with an Application to Political Economy: Nation, Class, and Redistribution," Moses Shayo develops and tests an innovative and ambitious model of self-chosen and malleable social identity. Working with an exogenously given but impermanent matrix of social groups and of individual closeness to them, citizens choose the groups with which they will identify and the behaviors they will adopt, maximizing a weighted combination of status and post-tax income. Focusing on two social identities that are ubiquitous in industrial societies—nation and social class, Shayo draws out three central implications of his model: (a) that the poor will identify more strongly with the nation than will the rich; (b) that stronger identification with the nation will, all else equal, reduce political support for redistribution; and (c) that, particularly among the poor, identification with the nation will increase both with national power and prestige and with the growth of ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities. Shayo demonstrates, at both the national and the individual level, ample empirical support for all three propositions. Perhaps most importantly, his perspective can explain why, in sharp contradiction to the logically compelling Meltzer-Richard model, more unequal democracies often seem to redistribute less, rather than more: what Peter Lindert has called the "Robin Hood paradox." And in his careful incorporation of findings from social psychology and experimental economics, Shayo provides a model of interdisciplinary discourse.

Loyalty to nation rather than faction was precisely something that French revolutionaries and American federalists wanted to instill. And, as *The Federalist No. 10* famously argued, the "mischiefs of faction" would be fewer in a large republic. In our second article, "Moral Bias in Large Elections: Theory and Experimental Evidence," Timothy Feddersen, Sean Gailmard, and Alvaro Sandroni demonstrate experimentally a fundamental part of this insight: The larger the set of voters, and thus the lower the likelihood that any single vote will be pivotal, the greater is the probability that the electorate will be animated by "moral" rather than "instrumental" (i.e., purely self-interested) concerns. Whether such moral voting is normatively good or bad, they emphasize in an early footnote, is a question they leave open (as does Shayo). But putting Shayo together with Feddersen, Gailmard, and Sandroni we can say—somewhat paradoxically—that voting will likely become less materialistically self-interested as the society becomes larger, externally more powerful, internally less equal, and ethnically more fragmented.

But suppose we stipulate that voting in democracies is self-interested. Does public policy then favor small and concentrated interests (as would follow from theories of collective action) or large and diffuse ones (as the median-voter theorem would imply)? More precisely, does widening political participation advantage concentrated or diffuse interests? While previous studies have examined democracy's effect on the supply of public goods, David S. Brown and Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak, in (pun intended) "The Transforming Power of Democracy: Regime Type and the Distribution of Electricity," are among the first to hone in on how a specific public good, namely electric power, is distributed. Democratization, they find in a careful panel study involving 733 country-years, increases the share of electricity that goes to residential households (presumably a diffuse interest), while reducing the share received by industry (a concentrated one).

Modern work on the electoral connection, and on principal-agent problems more generally, actually complicates the Burkean dilemma about how an elected representative "ought" to behave—as merely a *delegate* (voting on each issue as her constituents desire), or as a *trustee* who brings to each issue independent judgment and perhaps better knowledge. As previous scholarship has shown, even a representative who seeks only re-election may be moved, if she understands better the consequences of a proposed policy, to defy constituents' short-term wishes. In "Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy," Andrew Rehfeld revisits this normative issue and argues that three separate questions are involved: the aims of legislation, representatives' proper source of judgment, and representatives' motives. Viewed in this way, the conflict between the representative as trustee and as delegate can be subsumed into a more general and nuanced problematic that characterizes broad categories of decision making.

Finally, under the rubric of democratic theory in its broadest sense, how does prior civil violence affect

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409090285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subsequent democratic participation? Most of us, probably, would conjecture *a priori* that participation would diminish. But Christopher Blattman, examining the experience of northern Uganda, finds in "From Violence to Voting: War and Political Participation in Uganda" that a history of forced participation in violence—typically via abduction—seems to *increase* voting and civic engagement among ex-combatants without affecting their nonpolitical forms of participation. Blattman notes that these findings, if they can be generalized, challenge our conventional theories of political participation, and for a possible answer he turns to psychological research on the impact of traumatic events.

Moving to a more direct emphasis on political violence, our sixth article, "Should Peacemakers Take Sides? Major Power Mediation, Coercion, and Bias," by Katja Favretto, asks how conflicts, whether civil or international, are affected by the intervention of a powerful outside party. Where conventional wisdom assumes that such intervention can work only if the would-be mediator maintains strict neutrality between the belligerents, Favretto finds empirically a U-shaped relationship. Although unbiased intervention by powerful outsiders indeed raises the likelihood of successful resolution, so does intervention that is strongly biased in favor of one of the disputants, chiefly because that bias reveals convincingly the intervener's readiness to enforce an agreement militarily. Turning then to some recent real-world examples of intervention, Favretto argues that attention to this nonlinear relationship can resolve what appear to be contradictory conclusions from previous empirical work.

On a different note, two complementary articles deal with the link between governance and privatization in post-Communist societies. In "Helping Hand or Grabbing Hand? State Bureaucracy and Privatization Effectiveness," J. David Brown, John S. Earle, and Scott Gehlbach exploit extensive regional variation in post-Communist Russia to examine whether a large state bureaucracy hinders or helps privatization. Surprising to those of us drawn to kleptocratic or "grabbing hand" views of the state, they find that privatization is systematically more effective and corruption less prevalent where bureaucracy—and, presumably, state capacity—is larger.

State capacity also seems to play a role in determining who, at the mass level, supports or opposes privatization. Working from survey data in a larger set of 28 post-transition economies, Irina Denisova, Markus Eller, Timothy Frye, and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya find, in "Who Wants to Revise Privatization? The Complementarity of Market Skills and Institutions," that, as governance grows more democratic and effective, high-skill workers tend more to support, and low-skill workers to oppose, privatization. Conversely, where government is autocratic and institutions are weak, the difference between low- and high-skill workers' support for privatization disappears.

Many, perhaps most of us, were raised on the view that Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws* was the brilliant but incoherent work of an aristocratic dilettante who could not be troubled to impose a unified structure or argument on his work. A minority view, or rather views, has held that there is some coherent structure, but few agree on what it might be. In our final article in this issue, "The Design of Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws*: The Triumph of Freedom over Determinism," Ana J. Samuel advances a genuinely novel thesis: The work is organized dialectically around an antithesis of human freedom and determinism, with freedom emerging triumphantly in the second half of the work.

Once again, we think we present a collection of first-rate articles that will be read with profit and enjoyment by a broad spectrum of political scientists—and, indeed, by a wider public. We congratulate the authors, and we look forward to the conversations that their contributions will stimulate.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

General Considerations

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

The *APSR* publishes original work. Therefore, authors should not submit articles containing tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places, or which are included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including online journals) or otherwise committed. In many such cases, subsequent publication of this material would violate the copyright of the other publisher.

The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or to part of a book or other larger work, should also not be submitted. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss any such publications related to a submission in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section of the online submission process. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review at the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. The editors may request copies of related publications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409090285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 carry out similar analyses on other data sets. For example, for surveys, at the least, sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings should be given; you should calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys* (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006). This document is available on the Internet (http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp). For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, subject payments and debriefing procedures, and so on. Articles should be self-contained, so you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

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

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

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

The *APSR* now accepts only electronic submissions. To submit a manuscript, please go to www.editorialmanager.com/apsr. This web site provides detailed information about the submission procedure and required manuscript formatting. Please direct any questions to the journal editorial offices at apsr@polisci.ucla.edu.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should not be longer than 45 pages including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices. This page size guideline is based on the U.S. standard 8.5×11 inch paper; if you are submitting a manuscript printed on longer paper, you must adjust accordingly. Font size must be at least 11 point for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception being any tables for which double-spacing would require a second page that would otherwise not be needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6-1/2 inches (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*). Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. The *APSR* style of embedded citations should be used, and there must be a separate list of references at the end of the manuscript. Footnotes or endnotes may be included, but should not be used for simple citations.

These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers and for potential copyediting and production needs, if accepted for publication. Papers not adhering to these guidelines are subject to being rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may place footnotes at the bottom of the pages instead of using endnotes, and you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text. However, manuscripts accepted for publication must be submitted with endnotes, and with tables and figures on separate pages at the back of the manuscript with standard indications of text placement, e.g., [Table 3 about here].

In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files or camera-ready copies 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. Instructions will be provided. For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. And/or for unusual style or formatting issues, you may wish to consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (15th ed.; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409090285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to *APSR*, it is recommended that you download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page (http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr/) and review its terms and requirements as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions. At any time after submitting, you may sign this and send it on ahead, by mail, to: *American Political Science Review*, c/o Dept. of Political Science, UCLA, 4289 Bunche Hall, Box 951472, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1472. In any case, a signed agreement will be required in order for your work to be published in this journal.
2. During the online submission process at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr you will be invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name but will be expected to provide specific reasons why they may be inappropriate. 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 paper; this file should not include any information that identifies the authors, or any other collaborators in the work (including anyone responsible for creating tables or figures, if they are also an author/collaborator); and, do not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information.; b) a separate title page that includes the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all credited authors in the order their names should appear, as well as each authors' academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the paper (e.g., previous presentations of the research) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive correspondence. In addition, you may choose to include a cover letter.
4. Please review all pages to make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. To insure anonymity throughout the review process, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in 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 include redacted self-citations and references (i.e., do not delete the names of your manuscript's authors). If you are unsure as to the best use of these or any other procedures in rendering manuscripts anonymous, contact the editorial offices of *APSR* prior to submission.

Manuscripts that are judged to be lacking anonymity will be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

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

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR* and *PS* through the APSA website (*www.apsanet.org*) 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 both the *APSR* and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), On-line 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409090285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 nonreceipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Sean Twombly,
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* 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 artide, 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 AP SA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409090285 Published online by Cambridge University Press