doi:10.1017/S0003055412000214

Notes from the Editors

IN THIS ISSUE

We have readily assumed that, within Muslim countries, fundamentalists will most oppose American influence and policies, but Lisa Blaydes and Drew A. Linzer find a striking and perhaps surprising regularity: Anti-Americanism is most pronounced in the least observant Islamic countries. Moreover, opposition to the United States does not seem to be related to any particular American policies or to American culture generally. Anti-Americanism arises instead, they argue in "Elite Competition, Religiosity, and Anti-Americanism in the Islamic World,"[1] from elite strategy, in which fundamentalist political factions fan anti-American sentiments to compete with more secular groups. That competition is most intense, and hence the anti-American strategy most frequently employed, in Islamic countries in which divisions between secular and religious forces are most pronounced. Employing a mix of statistical and case study methods, Blaydes and Linzer find that, *within countries*, observant Muslims are likelier to express anti-American sentiments; *between countries*, competition between secular and religious forces, and not fundamentalism, inspires anti-U.S. sentiment.

Like Islam, Protestant Christianity has been a proselytizing faith. Have Protestant denominations' missionary successes influenced subsequent political development outside those sects' European and North American homelands? They have, argues Robert D. Woodberry in "The Missionary Roots of Liberal Democracy," and to a much greater extent than we might have imagined. Across Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Oceania, and controlling for many other plausible factors, the adoption of Protestant Christianity accounts for about half of the variation in present-day democracy, and that association holds within continents and when one instruments for Protestantism to guard against possible endogeneity. The likely causal mechanism, Woodberry suggests, has involved the influence of Protestantism on literacy, social organization, and colonial reforms.

Islam sought, and conversionary Protestantism flourished under, empire (in the case of Protestantism, especially British, Dutch, and U.S. rule); and the whole scholarly topic of empire has enjoyed a recent revival from the works of, among others, Michael Doyle and Niall Ferguson. Vast empires (Persia, Macedon, and Rome) existed alongside, contended with, and eventually succeeded the Greek city-states, yet with few exceptions the major figures of Greek political theory are generally taken to have centered attention on the *polis*. In "Between Empire and Polis: Aristotle's Politics," Mary G. Dietz shifts the perceptual field that sustains such "polis-centric" accounts of Aristotle's *Politics*. Drawing on Aristotle's broader philosophical corpus as well as on biographical and historical details, Dietz reveals a perspective capable of discerning empire and polis as things "coming to be and passing away" in the Hellenic world, and thus also attentive to the political stakes of this process of transience and change. Read in this light, Dietz argues, *Politics* can be understood as less invested in settled oppositions between Greek and barbarian, citizen and alien, center and periphery than is often supposed. Yet, Dietz concludes, it can also be seen as providing both heuristic resources for engaging contemporary questions of postnational citizenship and transnational politics and a cautionary tale for those would make the case for empire today.

As it did even against Alexander's attempts to meld loyalties,[2] the question of ethnic hegemony and privilege arises in every multinational regime. Romans, Britons, French, Austrians, Americans, Turks—all, throughout their respective empires, enjoyed privileges and immunities denied to subject nationalities, ethnicities, or (often enough) religions. Yet in present-day multinational states, such behavior seems counterintuitive. Leaders can count on the loyalty of their co-ethnics and will rationally better deploy state resources to win other groups to their side.[3] A logical testing ground for this puzzle is sub-Saharan Africa, where most states are multiethnic and power sometimes shifts from one ethnicity to another. Against some expectations, Raphaël Franck and Ilia Rainer show (in "Does the Leader's Ethnicity Matter? Ethnic Favoritism, Education, and Health in Sub-Saharan Africa") objective evidence of outcomes from 18 African states over 50 years that unambiguously supports the view that leaders privilege their co-ethnics, giving them, among other things, better primary education. The effect of leadership, which holds both over time and across countries, proves much stronger than that of linguistic fragmentation or ethnic segregation and may (they suggest) go far to explain sub-Saharan Africa's persistent underdevelopment.

So "strongmen" favor their co-ethnics; are they also likelier (facing low audience costs) to initiate conflicts with other states? Conventional wisdom answers "Yes." Yet, as Jessica L. Weeks demonstrates in "Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and the Initiation of International Conflict," we must distinguish among *kinds* of autocracies. Personalist and military dictatorships do, in fact, start wars more frequently, for reasons we can readily comprehend: A personalist dictator effectively answers to no domestic audience, whereas a military dictator responds to fellow

[1] The Managing Co-editor, as a previous co-author with one of the authors of this article, recused himself from all consideration of it.

[2] Most famously, Alexander tried to merge Persian and Macedonian loyalties by integrating Persians into the Macedonian army, by giving Persians command of some units, and (not least) by the mass marriage of his leading officers to daughters of the Persian aristocracy.

[3] Thus models of democratic voting assume that candidates focus their attention on "swing" voters, not those already committed to their (or the opposition's) side.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press

military officers, who are usually ready (as Clausewitz would have put it) "to continue policy by other means." Civilian dictatorships that are not personalist, Weeks shows, are far less prone to initiate interstate conflicts; indeed, civilian autocrats with powerful elite audiences start wars as seldom as do democracies. In Weeks's view, we need, both for scholarly understanding and for informed foreign policy, to distinguish among authoritarian regimes and bear in mind their substantial variation in belligerency.

In democracies, what kind of spending do voters reward, and how do politicians respond—likely anticipating voters' reactions? Although many studies of U.S. congressional elections have found little local or individual response to increased district-level "pork," a different picture emerges when one considers whether voters reward *presidents* for outlays in their localities. In "The Influence of Federal Spending on Presidential Elections," Douglas L. Kriner and Andrew Reeves find that voters do reward incumbent presidents (or the incumbent party's nominee) for increased local spending. They do so especially in battleground states and in counties whose representatives in Congress belong to the incumbent president's party. The effect is attenuated, but by no means obviated, among more conservative voters. Thus, Kriner and Reeves argue, federal spending is much like Congress: unpopular in the aggregate, but locally appreciated. Their result, interestingly, comports well with the wider swath of research that shows how presidents are credited (or blamed) for much that government does (and even a lot that it cannot do) and that representatives in Congress usually garner neither credit nor blame.

But why, if politicians gain (or believe they can) from distributive spending, do they often delegate spending decisions to bureaucrats?[4] In "Legislatures, Bureaucracies, and Distributive Spending," Michael M. Ting models a stripped-down interaction between a legislature and a bureaucracy. The legislature may choose to bypass the bureaucracy and allocate pork through internal bargaining (think "earmarks"), or it may "professionalize" such decisions, delegating allocation to civil servants with instructions to judge according to the objective quality of the proposed project. Professionalization becomes likelier, Ting finds, with (a) the expected overall quality of programs, (b) an anticipated scarcity of high-quality programs, and (c) the competency of bureaucrats—but only when the expected quality of programs is low (and hence low-quality programs face almost certain rejection by objective standards). If one adds to the set-up an independently elected executive, divided government tends to politicize allocations. Finally, politicized programs are larger (i.e., government is more frugal when decisions are professionalized). One implication of Ting's model is that we should be careful what we wish for: As the number of high-quality proposals to, for example, the National Science Foundation or the National Institutes of Mental Health increases, politicians will be tempted to circumvent peer review and earmark funds themselves.

Distributive spending on local pork differs substantially from redistributive spending on safety net programs: pensions; insurance against disability or unemployment; and aid to children, the elderly, or the poor generally. Support for welfare-state spending differs greatly over time and across nations and policy domains, as does polarization of public opinion on such issues—but why? This is a very old question, to which Philip Rehm, Jacob S. Hacker, and Mark Schlesinger offer an intriguing new answer in "Insecure Alliances: Risk, Inequality, and Support for the Welfare State." Although factors like pre-redistribution inequality (as measured by the Gini index or the income difference between the mean and the median voter) or the "skewness" of the income distribution[5] surely matter, we must remember that many social programs bear aspects of insurance as well as (or more than) redistribution. Hence, Rehm et al. argue, we must consider not only who in a given society is disadvantaged, but who is at risk (of unemployment or catastrophic injury or illness, for example). Where mostly the poor are at risk (i.e., "disadvantage" and "insecurity" are highly correlated), remedial programs will be seen as chiefly redistributive and will therefore elicit narrow support (chiefly among the poor) and strong opposition (chiefly among the better off). Where, by contrast, the better off are also (or even more) at risk, remedial programs enjoy broader support and are less contested. Deploying cross-national evidence both from the ISSP *Role of Government IV* surveys and from a battery of new items on income insecurity that the authors were able to add to the 2008–9 American National Election Study, Rehm et al. find statistically and substantively strong support for their hypothesis—across countries as well as among policy domains within the United States. Where the correlation between risk and poverty is weak, be it in a country (e.g., Switzerland) or a policy domain within the United States (e.g., long-term care), support for government intervention is strong, with little polarization. Where risk is strongly correlated with low income (e.g., among countries, the United States and United Kingdom; within the United States, loss of income from divorce), support for a government program is weak, and respondents are strongly polarized. So although rapid technological change and offshoring may make even the better off insecure (thus hypothetically increasing support for the welfare state), at least in the United States, the rich and well educated increasingly diverge from the poor and low skilled in their exposure to unemployment and illness, thus reducing support for and increasing polarization about the social safety net.

[4] In the United States, for example, many decisions about localized spending are made by the supposedly neutral civil servants of the General Services Administration (GSA), and laws (e.g., the Hatch Act) specifically forbid elected officials from attempting to influence the GSA's decisions. For evidence on the extent to which such decisions can, in fact, be politicized, see Sanford C. Gordon, (2011), "Politicizing Agency Spending Authority: Lessons from a Bush-era Scandal," this *Review*, 105: 717–34.

[5] Noam Lupu and Jonas Pontusson (2011), "The Structure of Inequality and the Politics of Redistribution," this *Review*, 105: 316–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A third important category of government spending, distinct from either pork or redistribution (both forms of consumption), is *investment* in durable public goods—roads, sewers, harbors, and the like. Intuitively, and in some previous work, government's choices between present consumption and future investment have been linked to such factors as politicians' anticipated tenure of office (a longer term permits less discounting of the future) and the concentration or fragmentation of power (fragmented responsibility induces a classic "common pool" problem that privileges consumption over investment). Much less attention has been devoted to the importance of supermajority approval, now becoming more common in many jurisdictions. If spending decisions by a legislature require a two-thirds or three-quarters majority, does the share of outlays devoted to long-term investment increase, decrease, or remain basically the same? In fact, according to Marco Battaglini, Salvatore Nunnari, and Thomas R. Palfrey ("Legislative Bargaining and the Dynamics of Public Investment"), investment will increase with the size of the required majority, reaching its maximum under unanimity rule (and, as previous work had suggested, a minimum where each representative can "dictate" local spending). Battaglini et al. reach this result first in a stylized model, where an arbitrary number of representatives from local districts bargain to divide a given endowment into long-term investment and transfers to each district.[6] They then test that result experimentally, where five-person committees decide such an allocation under a voting rule that may involve dictatorship, simple majority, or unanimity. Many readers will see this result as a more precise incarnation of Pareto optimality, in which unanimity rule guarantees that no one is made worse off, and at least someone is made better off, by a given decision.

Do people, when they hear or deliberate over opposing viewpoints, change their minds? The conventional answer in research on campaigns and public opinion is that they do, and probably all too frequently. Almost legendarily, early "frames" or impressions decay quickly, whether in experiments or campaigns, and the most recent message—however much it contradicts earlier ones—is what endures.[7] Yet this ephemerality may be confined to "captive" subjects (in the laboratory or sitting before their television screens), who are presented (or even bombarded) with information not of their choosing. In a different laboratory experiment, where after initial exposure, subjects can choose information themselves,[8] James N. Druckman, Jordan Fein, and Thomas J. Leeper find (in "A Source of Bias in Public Opinion Stability") quite an opposite effect: Subjects dogmatically adhere to opinions formed by early frames and reject later, contradictory frames. Although the context of the experiment was health care policy, Druckman and his colleagues suggest that the effect is likely much more general, extending to polarization (likely to intensify the more people can self-select information), the choice of early frames in policy debates or political campaigns, and—not least—how to design laboratory experiments to reflect better what goes on in the real world, where people are free to choose (and at least part of the time do choose) their own sources of information.

For most of us, the "frame" in which we perceive Mahatma Gandhi—shaped in large part, no doubt, by the 1982 Richard Attenborough film—has him as a saintly, otherworldly figure, admirable but somewhat out of place in the fray of power politics. His stance of nonviolence, we tend to believe, was a moral but hardly practical way of engaging the world. (The familiar trope is that nonviolence could work against the British, or even against U.S. bigots, but hardly against Hitler.) On the contrary, argues Karuna Mantena in "Another Realism: The Politics of Gandhian Nonviolence," Gandhi was profoundly realist in his view of politics and in the very practical kind of *satyagraha* ("nonviolent *action*"—with an equal emphasis on the second word) that he advocated. Both in practice and in theory, Mantena shows, Gandhi advanced nonviolent methods that exerted maximum pressure; he aimed to achieve change, not demonstrate virtue. He rejected violence chiefly because it rarely achieved its professed ends and almost always made the situation worse. Nonviolence was the superior tactic because it was *self-limiting.* Whereas violence could overshoot—leading to escalation, to ends that even its practitioners found odious,[9] or to both—nonviolence, while (if rightly designed) equally effective, could fall into none of these traps. Gandhi's tactics, at least as portrayed by Mantena, will remind some readers of the martial art *aikido*, in which no offensive tactics are countenanced: Rather, the shrewd defender simply deflects and redirects the attacker's force in ways that frustrate and, sooner or later, immobilize the assailant. By not attacking, the defender can do no harm; by astute action, he or she can render the attacker harmless.

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

[6] The authors conjecture, but do not prove, that their result will hold also in bodies elected at large (e.g., by proportional representation).

[7] See for example, Alan S. Gerber, James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw (2011), "How Large and Long-lasting Are the Persuasive Effects of Televised Campaign Ads? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment," this *Review*, 105: 135–50.

[8] In the middle stages of the experiment, subjects could choose to read stories that agreed with the frame initially presented, that were completely unrelated to it, or that contradicted the initial frame.

[9] Tacitus: *Auferre, trucidare, rapere, falsis nominibus imperium; atque, ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.* ("They plunder, they slaughter, they steal, and this they falsely name empire; they make a desert, and they call it peace").

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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).[10] 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.[11]

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 co-editors—following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

In addition, authors of quantitative or experimental articles are expected to address the issue of data availability. You must normally indicate both where (online) you will deposit the information that is necessary to reproduce the numerical results and when that information will be posted (such as "on publication" or "by [definite date]"). You should be prepared, when posting, to provide not only the data used in the analysis but also the syntax files, specialized software, and any other information necessary to reproduce the numerical results in the manuscript. Where an exception is claimed, you should clearly explain why the data or other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot be shared, or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

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

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

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

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

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries

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

[11] 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/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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. 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 to the journal's editorial offices at apsr@polisci.ucla.edu

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 50 pages (8.5 ×11 inch paper) or 45 pages (DIN A4), 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, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case (e.g., [Table 3 about here]).

If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications (e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (15th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003) 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 co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.

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

4. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 (310–794-1051) or by sending an e-mail to: apsr@polisci.ucla.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 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 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*, *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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 APSA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000214 Published online by Cambridge University Press