DOI: 10.1017/S0003055408080118

Notes from the Editors

On July 1 of last year, someone in North Andover, Massachusetts flipped a switch, and the APSR, which had used the US mail to communicate with authors and referees for its first hundred and one years, hit the worldwide web. Simultaneously, the official term of duty began for an excited if slightly apprehensive group of nine new co-editors at the University of California in Los Angeles. Since then, the APSR has been located in a fourth floor office behind the imposing façade of Bunche Hall, where our new senior editor, Joseph Riser, freshly poached from Sage Publications, has been overseeing the many details of the new operation, ably supported by our two editorial assistants, Sarah Leary and Rebekah Sterling.

The transition we were beginning last July had three components. Besides the handover from one editorial team to the next and the leap from paper to broadband, we were pioneering a new model of editing via a team of scholars with different areas of expertise who would deliberate together on manuscripts as they progressed through the review process. As of this writing, we have been at it for six and a half months—time enough to get an initial read on how things are going. It has been, in a word, exhilarating. In our weekly editorial meetings, with the help of the often penetrating but not infrequently conflicting judgments of our referees, we have tried to "get under the hood" of the best papers, parsing the arguments, solving the models, working through the statistical analyses, and assessing their contributions to the literature. These discussions have generated an atmosphere of intellectual excitement that makes all of us glad we are in this profession.

At the same time, there have been challenges with which we continue to struggle. Foremost among these has been the challenge of sheer volume. Our illustrious predecessor had been receiving approximately 550–600 new manuscripts a year, but by August 1st we were running at an annual rate of close to 1,300. The numbers have settled down a bit since then, but the rate averaged over the first six and a half months remains about 900 a year. Needless to say, having planned and budgeted on the basis of at most a slight increase above 600 a year, we were swamped. Despite the long hours and heroic efforts of our small staff, a bottleneck arose at the point of submissions' entry into the system—that of the technical checking of manuscripts, their assignment to a particular co-editor, and the initial research to provide a list of possible referees.

We have been battling to overcome this. Not knowing whether the higher numbers were a temporary surge associated with the editorial handover or a permanent change, we held off panicking at first. But after several months, as the submissions remained high, we sent an urgent appeal to the APSA head office. Michael Brintnall has generously found resources to hire additional staff, and as we write Kristen Kao has signed on to the team as our third editorial assistant. Simultaneously, we have been working our way through most of the usual problems of transition, along with the unusual ones associated with converting submissions from paper to electronic form. We are extremely grateful for the patience shown by our authors during this difficult time and are deeply sorry that some have experienced unexpected delays.

Although we described our procedures for reviewing manuscripts in some detail in our "Editorial Statement" posted on the Review's website, it might be useful to say a little about this here. Manuscripts are now submitted via the APSR website at http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr (the technical and logistical details are provided there). Once he receives them, Joseph Riser logs them in and assigns them to one of our editorial assistants to check that the manuscript is complete and under the maximum length. Based on an initial reading of the paper, the editorial assistant also prepares a list of 8–10 possible referees, which is then forwarded to the co-editor whose expertise is most appropriate. The co-editor then chooses and invites three referees (or however many are necessary—sometimes as many as nine—until three agree).

When reviewers' reports come in, the handling co-editor reads these, rereads the paper, and makes an initial decision. When the referees either identify problems that the co-editor judges to be significant or do not believe the paper makes a sufficiently important contribution, as is the case for most manuscripts, the co-editor rejects the paper and writes to the author explaining the reasons why. Out of deference to authors' time, we generally follow Lee Sigelman's example of making such decisions after just two referee reports if the problems identified in these make it clear that even with a very strong third report the paper will not meet the threshold to go further. If, after three reviews, the co-editor judges that the paper could be revised into one that meets the standards of APSR, he or she forwards the paper to be considered at the next weekly meeting of all the co-editors.

So far, these meetings have had the flavor of a lively research seminar, at which the assembled co-editors engage the paper's claims and arguments on the basis of the referees' reports and their own readings. Often, there are points of disagreement among the referees that we must assess and arbitrate. In many cases, additional points emerge from our reading and discussion, sometimes about substance, sometimes in the form of constructive suggestions about how an author might frame an argument to make it more clear to nonspecialist audiences and to state its contribution to the field more precisely. The editorial collective decides whether to invite a revision (or offer a conditional or unconditional acceptance). To date, these deliberations have always allowed us to reach consensus. If a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

revision is to be solicited, the handling co-editor then drafts and—after consultation with the others—sends the letter that outlines for the author revisions we consider necessary as well as less obligatory suggestions on how the paper might be improved. When a revised submission comes back, the handling co-editor returns it to some or all of the original referees, and in rare cases to new referees (for instance, if the original ones are unavailable this time). The review process is then repeated.

One of the attractions of a web-based system is that authors can log into the website to check on the progress of their submission. In this context, let us warn of one common misunderstanding that has caused frustration in a few cases. When the website lists a paper as having "required reviews complete," this means only that the first two reports are in (and so, if both of these are sufficiently negative, the reviews required to reject the paper are in hand). If, alternatively, the first two reports are sufficiently encouraging, the paper will remain in this "required reviews complete" status until the third report comes in and the co-editor makes a decision on whether to take the paper further. Some authors, quite reasonably, have thought this meant the editors were needlessly sitting on their paper for weeks at a time. In fact, this almost always means the paper is still in the game and that we are waiting for the remaining review.

On the masthead, the UCLA team's Editorial Board appears for the first time in this issue, along with the smaller Executive Committee. It is a larger Board than in the past, and we have been extremely glad of that in the last few months. We have consulted many times on papers where referees disagreed or where we felt the need of the expertise represented by particular board members. An additional function of the Executive Committee and broader Editorial Board has been to handle submissions by anyone recently or currently associated with UCLA. We take seriously the responsibility to avoid even the appearance of favoritism, so in cases where a submission's author has studied or taught at UCLA during the previous three years, we ask the most appropriate available member of the Board to shepherd the paper through the review process—choosing referees, making the initial recommendation on disposition (which the co-editors' meeting may lower—e.g. from "revise and resubmit" to "reject"—but may not raise), and communicating with the author. Co-editors also recuse themselves from handling or deliberating on the merits of a paper when they have some significant connection to the author (for instance, if the author is a former student, collaborator, or close personal friend).

During the transition, we have been thankful for the advice and insights of our predecessor, Lee Sigelman, whose wisdom and dedication to the profession we continue to admire. He has replied to our various inquiries with patience and humor. Elizabeth Cook, Lee's managing editor, has also helped to make the turnover as smooth as possible. Continuing Lee's innovation, we automatically send all the referees on a given paper a copy of the editor's decision letter along with copies of all the reviews (of course, in anonymous form). The hope is that such transparency will help all involved understand the process better and increase confidence in its fairness and thoroughness. It also has the intellectual benefit of turning what can feel like an isolated act of evaluation into more of a conversation.

We can take no credit for the fascinating lineup of articles in the following pages, as all the papers in this issue were handled, from start to finish, by Lee Sigelman and his staff. Content handled by the UCLA team will begin appearing in the May issue, along with articles that initially entered the review process under Lee's editorship.

IN THIS ISSUE

"Disappointment [is] a basic spring of political change," wrote historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr. "As political eras run their course, they infallibly generate the desire for something different." In the lead article for this issue, Samuel Merrill, III, Bernard Grofman, and Thomas L. Brunell look carefully at this claim and reach two conclusions. First, despite some research to the contrary, electoral cycles do exist. Periods of party dominance last about 12 to 15 years, after which the opposition makes gains that last another 12 to 15 years, producing full cycles of about 25 to 30 years. The authors identify similar cycles for the House, Senate, and Presidency. Second, they conclude that cycles are driven by four factors: 1) parties' desire to enact non-centrist policy agendas, 2) their conflicting wish to capture the support of the median voter, 3) voter reaction to the parties' shifting policy positions, and 4) an incumbency advantage that decays over time. Decay of the incumbency advantage, which could be due to anything from loss of moxie by the in-party to simple desire for change by voters, is the dynamic factor in the paper's model of cycles. So which party is due for a win in 2008? You can estimate this for yourself while reading "Cycles in American National Electoral Politics, 1854–2006: Statistical Evidence and an Explanatory Model."

The next three papers explore how individuals decide—or are persuaded—to turn out to vote. In "Vote Buying or Turnout Buying? Machine Politics and the Secret Ballot," Simeon Nichter challenges the presumption that vote buying is intended to influence the recipient's vote choice. Instead, he suggests that parties use particularistic benefits simply to reward turnout. For a candidate to bribe supporters of a rival to vote for him has a double impact: the vote tally of the rival is decreased and the briber's tally is correspondingly increased. But it is difficult to monitor whether the bribe's recipient actually keeps her end of the bargain, especially when the ballot is secret. Bribing a supporter who would otherwise have stayed home to turn out and vote has a lower impact on the result—it does not steal votes from rivals—but compliance is easier to monitor. Nichter develops a game theoretic model in which turnout-oriented bribery generates different empirical implications than vote choice-oriented bribery. Most notably, the model predicts that turnout purchasers will target their own strong supporters while vote purchasers target the opponents' weak supporters. Analysis of survey data from Argentina (a case in which

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a party can plausibly, though not necessarily cheaply, monitor vote choice) implies that turnout buying is the dominant activity.

In the second turnout paper, "Social Pressure and Vote Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment," Alan S. Gerber, Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer use an experiment to demonstrate that another form of personal utility—fear of social disapproval from friends or family—can be a powerful stimulus to voting. Fear of disapproval is created by sending a letter to randomly selected registered voters telling them who in their neighborhood or family has voted in recent elections and promising an update to the neighborhood after the next election. "You and your neighbors will all know who voted and who did not," says one of the stimulus letters. The voting histories in the letters are real, gleaned from public records. Fear that neighbors will see one's voting record boosts turnout rates by about eight percentage points, while fear that other family members may see it has an effect of about five percentage points. Notably smaller effects were produced by informing voters that researchers were studying them or by making a simple invocation of citizen duty. According to the authors, the size of the neighborhood disapproval effect is "startling," by far the largest ever observed from a single piece of mail in a well-designed study. The payoff from the paper, however, is theoretical rather than instrumental, for the authors' aim is to point up the importance of the personal benefit of conforming to civic norms of voting rather than to advocate shaming as a general purpose get-out-the-vote technique.

Our next paper points up yet another aspect of the personal side of turnout decisions—social contagion. Scholars have long known that people in personal contact with each other participate at similar rates, but it has not been completely clear why. This is because it is difficult to disentangle social influences from individual characteristics held in common with friends, family, and other peers. Does the fact that my spouse votes actually influence my decision to vote, or is it simply the effect of my education and income levels, which, typically, are similar to those of my spouse? In "Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments," David Nickerson reports results of placebo-controlled field experiments in Denver and Minneapolis designed to isolate contagion effects. Two-voter households were randomly assigned to receive one of the following: a Get Out The Vote (GOTV) treatment, a recycling promotion "placebo" or no treatment. The effect of the GOTV message on the person who answered the door is similar to what has been measured in other studies, an increase of eight to ten percentage points. The impact of the message on the person who did not answer the door was roughly six percentage points, indicating substantial contagion within the household. This finding is consistent with the social pressure effect of Gerber et al., but it might be due to other factors, such as coordinated decisions to go to the polls by members of the same household. While this paper's effect is similar in magnitude to that of Gerber et al., since it is based on a face-to-face plea rather than mail, it should not be directly compared.

Our fifth paper shifts attention to a different electoral context. In "Challenges to the Impartiality of State Supreme Courts: Testing the Legitimacy Theory and 'New Style' Judicial Campaigns," James L. Gibson focuses on state level elections for judges. When, in 2002, the U. S. Supreme Court held that candidates for judicial office could not constitutionally be prevented from making policy statements in their campaigns, critics worried that this decision would undermine the legitimacy of courts. Respondents to experimental treatments within a representative survey in Kentucky suggest the concern is unwarranted. In the vignettes of campaigns for judicial office presented to the subjects, attack ads and campaign contributions had a corrosive impact on the respondents' perceptions of judges' ability to be even-handed. Candidates' policy statements, however, significantly affected neither perceptions of judges' impartiality nor support for the state supreme court's political independence. Only when candidates made specific promises as to how they would rule on particular issues was there appreciable negative impact, with that limited to a small percentage (3%) of respondents who were most supportive of the judiciary's functioning.

The two papers that follow focus on core concerns of international relations—the causes and consequences of war. Scholars of international politics offer conflicting arguments at different levels of analysis about the outbreak of militarized disputes. In "Systemic Politics and the Origins of Great Power Conflict," Bear Braumoeller attempts to bridge the gap and combine a systemic theory of international politics with a dyadic theory of conflict by specifying a two-step theory of great-power conflict. At the first stage, policymakers make partial adjustments to respond to the actions of other states and to move towards a preferred ideal. In the process, dyadic frictions and disagreements arise. In the second stage, the question is how and why these frictions produce conflict. At this second stage, rational deterrence theory argues that conflict occurs when states let down their guard. In contrast, the spiral model holds that defensive security-seeking behavior generates a spiral of ever-increasing hostility that often ends in conflict. Braumoeller applies this two-stage argument to Great Power interactions and conflicts in the 19th century. His empirical assessment draws on extant datasets (Correlates of War, Polity, and Militarized Interstate Disputes) and a new dataset of the survey responses of historians which provides data for the ideal points of Great Powers, for issue salience, and for states' security-related activity. One key result is that, during this period, the deterrence model explains more conflicts than the spiral model.

The next paper turns from the causes of war to its domestic consequences. Despite numerous studies establishing a link between wartime casualties and declining public support for war, disagreement remains about the precise way in which casualties enter individual assessments. In "The Multiple Effects of Casualties on Public Support for War: An Experimental Approach," Scott Sigmund Gartner develops a rational expectations theory of support for war and military intervention. He hypothesizes that a combination of recent casualties,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

casualty trends, and casualty forecasts affect support for continued military involvement. The paper presents results from six experiments, three focused on the Iraq war during October 2006 (a period of increasing U.S. casualties), and three that use a new panel experiment design to explore responses to hypothetical U.S. military interventions. The first series, based on real casualty figures, uses students in a laboratory setting and two national opinion surveys, while the second varies hypothetical casualty trends to assess variations in experimental subjects' support for intervention scenarios. The experiments suggest that casualty patterns and expectations that things will get worse before they get better provide interpretive frames through which individuals assess the meaning of casualty figures, which in turn affects their level of support for the continuation of armed conflict.

Rounding out the volume, finally, are three articles that consider a series of ostensibly internal political dynamics edged by normative concerns—gender inequalities, constitutionalism, and hedonism—from the perspectives of comparative political economy, game theory, and political philosophy, respectively. In "Oil, Islam, and Women," Michael Ross challenges the common view that the subordinate status of women in Middle Eastern countries is the result of Islamic tradition. Rather, he argues, the low representation of women in the workforce and in politics results from the dominant role of oil production in their economies. This crowds out the development of low-wage export-oriented industries, such as textiles, garment production, and food processing, which have served as a pathway into the workforce for women in other countries. Working outside the home, women more quickly develop informal networks and civic skills that translate ultimately into political influence. Using a crossnational data set, Ross provides evidence that oil and gas rents correlate negatively with female workforce participation and political involvement, and that the relationship between these and Islamic tradition disappears once one controls for mineral rents.

Roger Myerson's article, "The Autocrat's Credibility Problem and Foundations of the Constitutional State," then directs our attention to one of the oldest questions in politics, a question that he tracks back to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*: Why do autocrats keep the promises they make to their supporters? From a game-theoretic perspective, absolute rulers face a moral-hazard problem in recruiting supporters: because completely unconstrained leaders can renege on promises of reward without suffering consequences, potential supporters have no motivation to accept the deal in the first place. This credibility problem renders absolute power self-defeating. Working through a series of possible solutions to the problem, Myerson shows how leaders' prospects are improved by organizing supporters into ongoing courts or councils, the members of which may be capable of punishing the leader either by withholding assistance or by generating and supporting rival claimants to rule. The ruler thus builds trust by rendering himself vulnerable to judgment by his supporters, in effect increasing his power by subjecting it to limitation. This simple model of "personal constitution," Myerson argues, not only calls into question simplistic notions of absolutism. More importantly, it suggests the dynamics of trust and constraint that, however inflected by the facts of culture and history in particular cases, might underlie the development of formal constitutional regimes and inform leader-supporter relationships more generally.

Although "personal constitutions" might be writ large as the relations between leaders and followers, they might also be writ small, taken more literally as individuals' relations to themselves—their self-governance, as it were, in relation to the goods they pursue. To the extent, then, that games of reward tap personal desires for pleasure and advantage, so too might the "moral hazard" those desires entail be understood in terms of the way of life they incite or encourage one to pursue. Engaging one of the most difficult and intriguing of Plato's late works, Robert Bartlett takes up this dilemma by recourse to the classical debate over the pursuit of pleasure and the possession of knowledge as rival claims to the best human life. In "Plato's Critique of Hedonism in the *Philebus*," he traces the dialog's refusal of victory to both contenders, since each in its pure form is impossible to understand as a human life. The *Philebus*, Bartlett argues, reminds us that the question of the human good is thus also a question of self-knowledge, in part because the choice of pleasures depends on it, and in part because the intensity of some pleasures may drive self-knowledge beyond our grasp. A generalized defense of hedonism that posits pleasure as the good sought by all living things fails: begging the question of whether the hedonist is concerned most for his own good or for the good of others, it leaves him dependent on conventional views of such virtues as piety and justice to account for his implicit moralism. Moralism aside, Bartlett shows that on deeper examination the pleasures themselves prove perplexing, open to mixtures of various kinds and intensities of various degrees. Even the hedonist devoted to pleasure as his own good must agree that self-awareness is essential to its pursuit, and must be especially wary of pursuing such "mad pleasures," high and low alike, as those that prompt self-forgetting and impede self-knowledge. The difficulty of this dialog, Bartlett concludes, is at the same time its greatest virtue. Particularly for moderns, whose "universalized hedonism"—of "the greatest good of the greatest number" or of "self-interest well-understood"—simply assumes that the best life and the moral life are one and the same, the *Philebus* poses hard questions "whose importance as a path to self-knowledge we are in danger of forgetting."

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,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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). Submission of manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or to part of a book or other larger work, is also strongly discouraged. 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.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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).

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to *APSR*, is it 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press

personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci*; *America, History and Life 1954–*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; EconLit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (www.umi.com). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969–95, is available through the APSA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080118 Published online by Cambridge University Press