doi:10.1017/S0003055413000324
© American Political Science Association 2013

Notes from the Editors

It is our pleasure to present Volume 107, Issue 3. The majority of the articles in this issue are pieces that were entirely processed by the UNT team. As always, we will continue the tradition of providing a brief introduction summarizing the basic arguments of each article that appears in the issue. The introduction is organized to provide the reader with a quick glimpse of the content of the issue, so as to pique interest. Thus, rather than a synthesized essay, our introductions will provide clear and straightforward summaries of each piece.

This issue (Volume 107, Issue 3) contains several articles that address important contemporary political issues, such as the effect of U.S. gun laws on levels of violence in border areas of Mexico, the causes of rape in civil wars, why campaign spending has skyrocketed in recent years, and whether ethnically integrative institutions actually change the level of prejudice and reduce the salience of ethnicity after an ethnic civil war has occurred. Further, this issue includes several articles that speak to some enduring issues as well—for instance, what do we mean by the quality of governance? Or what is the best way to redress wrongs perpetuated against various social groups? Or what explains patterns of state building in the West? These articles not only address a number of important and enduring issues in the discipline but should open exciting new lines of research.

In this Issue

In 2004, the Congress allowed the U.S. Federal Assault Weapons Ban to expire. One second-order consequence of this policy decision was the greater availability of assault weapons in Mexican *municipios* near Texas, Arizona and New Mexico. This was not the case in California, which retained a pre-existing state-level ban. In "Cross-Border Spillover: U.S. Gun Laws and Violence in Mexico," Dube, Dube and García-Ponce capitalize on this unique natural experiment to answer the question: To what extent, and under what conditions, does access to arms fuel violent crime? They specify a conditional fixed effects Poisson model to examine the relationship between access to guns and violence under varying political conditions and ultimately find differential increases in homicides, gun-related homicides and gun seizures after 2004. Most interesting, however, killings increased disproportionately in *municipios* near Texas, Arizona and New Mexico when local elections were competitive prior to 2004, with the largest differentials occurring in high narcotrafficking areas. These findings suggest political competition destabilized the existing relationships between drug cartels and local incumbents and the increased accessibility/presence of military-style weaponry escalated the level of killings associated with these power struggles.

Sarah Elizabeth Parkinson, in "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War," addresses the issue of the organizational resilience of rebel organizations. In a piece that uses methodologies not often found in the pages of the *Review*, she examines the internal dynamics within rebel organizations, not so much the male-dominated frontline units (which has been the focus of most studies of rebel organizations) but the female-dominated clandestine supply networks in the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Using very carefully done ethnographic research, involving dozens of interviews of participants in these support networks, she uncovers the social networks and mechanisms that helped sustain the organization during a period of extreme duress—Lebanon in the 1980s.

Marcus Agnafors maintains in "Quality of Government: Toward a More Complex Definition" that current understandings of what constitutes quality of government are flawed, not taking into account important factors that we agree should be weighed in assessing good governance. Efficiency and impartiality are important, Agnafors concedes, but they must be supplemented with consideration of the openness and rationality of the decision-making process, as well as the moral content of individual governing decisions, and the "beneficence" with which they are carried out. These in turn must rely on a "common morality" shared by all or most societies, and relevant elements of the local public ethos. Agnafors' argument should significantly advance the debate on assessing quality of government, an issue of vital concern in world politics today.

In "Quality Over Quantity: Amici Influence and Judicial Decision Making," Box-Steffensmeier, Christenson and Hitt apply the tools of network analysis to answer the question: What is the relative influence of interest groups on the decisions of the Supreme Court? More specifically, Box-Steffensmeier and colleagues employ a novel metric of interest group power, namely its position within the amicus network, to empirically demonstrate when and why certain groups have more success than others in their petitions to the court. They theorize that justices take into account more than just the number of supporters for the liberal or the conservative position and empirically demonstrate that when two sides of a case seemingly have similar levels of support, as determined by the number of amicus briefs filed, the arguments of the group positioned more centrally in the amicus network have more influence with the justices. Among the interesting findings in this paper is that the ideology of the justice moderates the effect of a liberal interest group's power or network position. That is, for more conservative justices, the presence of a powerful liberal amicus decreases their probability of casting a liberal vote whereas a powerful conservative amicus does not have the same effect on liberal justices.

Dara Kay Cohen's argument in "Causes of Rape During Civil War: Cross-National Evidence

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1980–2009)" challenges existing explanations, which assert that wartime rape is associated with ethnic war and with gender inequality and also that wartime presents opportunities to engage in rape that are not otherwise present. Cohen argues instead that the occurrence of wartime rape is a function of the ways in which fighters are recruited to become part of combatant groups. Specifically, she shows support for her theory of combatant socialization, which holds that if rape is more frequent when fighters are forcibly recruited, they must be quickly socialized into a coherent combatant force.

Robert Goodin's "Disgorging the Fruits of Historical Wrongdoing" tackles the very serious issue of seeking justice in cases of past crimes by regimes or other actors. Although restitution or retribution might be appropriate in many such cases, Goodin argues that disgorgement—forcing those who hold gains that were ill gotten, even though they may not be the original perpetrators—is a workable kind of "partial justice" when neither the perpetrators nor the original victims are alive, or cannot be identified. Disgorgement represents an important additional tool for those attempting to right ancient wrongs, which is a perennial, and especially grave, problem of domestic and international justice.

Why has campaign spending by House incumbents skyrocketed in recent years, especially in districts with marginal support for the incumbent's party? In "Money, Reputation, and Incumbency in U.S. House Elections, or Why Marginals Have Become More Expensive," Kim and LeVeck provide an interesting answer to this question. They note that the sharp rise in spending has occurred at the same time the parties in the House have become more cohesive in casting votes and more distinctive in terms of party reputation or brand with the public. They argue that these two phenomena are fundamentally linked. They develop a formal model and test it empirically using campaign spending data from 1972 to 2008 to demonstrate how the reputation of the incumbent's party affects voters' prior beliefs about the incumbent's record and how this in turn affects how much the incumbent needs to spend in order to communicate her record to the voters in her district. Most interestingly, the analysis show that establishing a distinct personal voting record—one that consistently bucks the party line—provides the incumbent with an alternative to a difficult and costly campaign and a fairly inexpensive method of increasing attention from the voters in lieu of spending campaign money.

In "The Political Origins of Primary Education Systems: Ideology, Institutions, and Interdenominational Conflict in an Era of Nation-Building," by Ben Ansell and Johannes Lindvall, the authors address a relatively unexplored relationship between politics and the development of primary education systems in the West and Japan between 1870-1939. Essentially, they identify three different patterns of development—centralization, secularization, and subsidization. Of great importance is their finding that a key part of diffusing religious conflict in religiously divided societies is the provision of public funding to private providers of education, particularly churches, a pattern exemplified by countries such as the Netherlands.

In "Rethinking Religious Reasons in Public Justification," Andrew March tackles a thorny but very topical issue in political theory: When may citizens use explicitly religious reasons to advocate their positions in public debate? Some argue that religious reasons are off limits in public justification, or must be expressed in religiously neutral terms, whereas others allow religious reasons to be used much more widely in the public forum. March argues for a nuanced view: we should allow certain types of religious arguments but not others and we should allow them in certain issue domains and not others. His argument should not only advance an important conversation in political theory but help us to understand how some of the most contentious debates in our democracies should be conducted.

In "Empowering Women Through Development Aid: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Afghanistan," Andrew Beath, Fotini Christia, and Ruben Enikolopov report on a randomized field experiment they implemented across 500 Afghan villages. They investigated the impact of mandatory inclusion of women in the village councils that made decisions regarding development projects. Did women's inclusion have an impact on attitudes about the role of women? They find that the intervention did have an impact on women's participation in the community but did not find a broader effect on the role of women within the household or the broader society.

Cyrus Samii, in the article entitled "Perils or Promise of Ethnic Integration? Evidence From a Hard Case in Burundi," addresses an important question regarding interethnic relations. Can ethnically integrating institutions such as the military help remove prejudices and behaviors that lead to social exclusion and conflict? Using evidence from the "hard case" of Burundi, a situation in which military reform was conducted to integrate Hutu and Tutsi military personnel after a bloody civil war, and data from a natural experiment comparing military officers who had been exposed to military integration with those who had not, Samii finds that exposure to ethnic integration decreases prejudicial behavior but does not necessarily reduce the salience of ethnicity. This piece has important implications about the effectiveness of ethnically integrative institutions, particularly in post-conflict environments.

In "The Semblance of Democratic Revolution: Revolutionary Coalitions in Ukraine's Orange Revolution," Mark Beissinger argues that those who participate in urban civic revolution may not be motivated by a desire for democratic change. Instead, such revolutions may be driven by temporary coalitions of disparate groups that share only their opposition to the incumbent regime. Beissinger relies on evidence from two unusual surveys that took place around the time of the Orange Revolution in the Ukraine to evaluate the motivations behind participation in the protests. His findings have implications that help to explain the sometimes troubled aftermath of such urban civic revolutions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Market Freedom as Antipower," by Robert Taylor, argues that neorepublicans should embrace markets as a mechanism for preventing domination, rather than as an instrument of domination. Contrary to the beliefs of some neorepublicans, Taylor maintains, the free market, properly regulated and supplemented, is not a danger to liberty as interpreted by neorepublicanism but rather is one of its most powerful safeguards. It is not, however, the free market of libertarians: the regulations and supplements it requires bring it closer to the Nordic model. Government measures must be in place, for example, to ensure real labor mobility, such as retraining programs. Taylor's essay adds a distinctive perspective to the ongoing project of building neorepublican theory.

Finally, Kamil Kivanc Karaman and Sevket Pamuk in "Different Paths to the Modern State in Europe: The Interaction Between Warfare, Economic Structure and Political Regime" test some long-held propositions regarding state building in early modern Europe—in particular, the relationship between warfare, economic structure, political structure, and the generation of tax revenue. Using a unique data set that standardizes tax revenues across different states, which facilitates comparative analysis, they find that the three determinants interact to produce different pathways in state building. In particular, when under pressure of war, representative regimes in urbanized commercial economies and authoritarian regimes in rural agrarian economies were most effective in extractive taxation and state building. These findings will cause scholars to rethink some of the fundamental assumptions made about state building in Europe, upon which much of our current theories of political development are based.

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

[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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press

other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot be shared, or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

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

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

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome wide significance—taking into account all sources of multiple testing (e.g. phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

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

American Political Science Review Vol. 106, No. 4

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

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

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

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

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations. Do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our web site. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copy-editors, 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

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TheChicago 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 excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal web sites or at institutions with which any of the coauthors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.

    b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.

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

Further questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940–891–6803) or by sending an e-mail to: 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 on-line through JSTOR (http://www.jstor.org/). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* through the APSA website (*www.apsanet.org*) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

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

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

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING APSR, PERSPECTIVES, AND PS ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed 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 PeriodicalLiterature*. 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 *Journalof Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/S0003055413000324 Published online by Cambridge University Press