APSA Awards Presented at the 2010 Annual Meeting

Recognizing excellence in the profession is one of the most important activities of the American Political Science Association. The Association's Annual Awards Ceremony and Luncheon will take place at 12:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 2 in the Palladian Ballroom of the Omni Shoreham Hotel. The luncheon is for award recipients and their guests by invitation. The ceremony is open to all registrants beginning at 12:45 p.m.

APSA DISSERTATION AWARDS

2010 Gabriel A. Almond Award

The Gabriel A. Almond Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of comparative politics

Award Committee: Nicolas van de Walle, Cornell University, chair; Kathleen Bruhn, University of California, Santa Barbara; Beatriz Magaloni, Stanford University

Co-recipient: **Tariq Thachil**, Cornell University

Dissertation: "The Saffron Wave Meets the Silent Revolution: Why the Poor Vote for Hindu Nationalism in India"

Dissertation Director: Ronald Herring, Cornell University

Co-recipient: **Maya Tudor**, Princeton University

Dissertation: "Twin Births, Divergent Democracies: The Social and Institutional Origins of Regime Outcomes in India and Pakistan and Immigration and Conflict"

Dissertation Director: Atul Kohli, Princeton University

Citation: We are extremely pleased to present the 2010 Gabriel A. Almond award for the best dissertation in comparative politics completed in 2008 or 2009 jointly to Tariq Thachil for "The Saffron Wave Meets the Silent Revolution" and to Maya Tudor for "Twin Births, Divergent Democracies."

Thachil's sophisticated study uses multiple methods to explain why the poorest strata of Indian voters have supported the BJP party in recent elections despite the BJP's defense of the caste system, which tends to limit their social mobility. Thachil uses recent electoral surveys to show that standard explanations do not well explain the electoral behavior of India's lowest castes, and why support for the BJP among these groups varies across India's different states. Relying on elite interviews, he then provides a careful historical analysis of the BJP and its evolving strategies to attract poor voters, notably by investing in social service provision despite its elitist ideology. Thachil then completes his analysis with his own careful surveys of two states in India to further show that poor voters are more likely to support the BJP in states in which social services are underprovided. Thachil's work sheds light on the voting behavior of the poorest voters, a topic regarding which there is remarkably little systematic research despite its obvious importance following the gains of the Third Wave of democratization.

Tudor's dissertation seeks to explain the reasons that India became a democracy following independence while Pakistan did not, despite similar economic structures and colonial histories. This is a topic about which there has been a lot of conjecture, but actually little systematic research. Tudor shows that arguments about political culture or socio-economic inequality cannot adequately explain the divergent outcomes; she argues convincingly instead that the distinctive class alliances behind the dominant nationalist parties in the two countries largely explain their divergent regime outcomes. The thesis uses extensive archival research, process-tracing, and elite interviews to trace the causal impact of the different class composition of the independence movements in the two countries, and how this shaped not only debates within the parties, but also their organizational and decision-making processes, which she shows compellingly provided divergent abilities to broker state-building compromises in the immediate post-independence period. Tudor has produced a sophisticated, theoretically astute analysis of the independence process in South Asia that constitutes a model of historical institutional scholarship.

These two excellent dissertations reflect the methodological diversity, vitality, and excellence of comparative politics, and we are honored to present Tariq Thachil and Maya Tudor with the Gabriel A. Almond Award for 2010.

William Anderson Award

The William Anderson Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of state and local government, federalism, or intergovernmental relations.

Award Committee: James G. Gimpel, University of Maryland, College Park, chair; Thad Kousser, University of California, San Diego; Carol S. Weissert, Florida State University

Recipient: **Zachary Callen**, Carroll College

Dissertation: "The Seams of the State: Infrastructure and Intergovernmental Relations in American State Building."

Dissertation Chair: Eric Oliver, University of Chicago

Citation: Zachary Callen's dissertation presents novel theory about the relationship between federalism and the expansion of national government power in American political development. The federal structure of government pits states and localities against one another, eventually producing winners and losers in many areas of policy action. In response to localized policy failure among the losers, the national government intervenes to mitigate inequality and restore balance. According to Callen, this pattern explains the development of national government involvement in American railroad expansion during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The increasing nationalization of public policy exhibited in this case turns out to be inherent in the nature of the federal form of government, and a predictable outcome. Callen's project serves as a fine model for evaluating the development of national power in many areas of public policy.

Franklin L. Burdette/Pi Sigma Alpha Award

The Franklin L. Burdette/Pi Sigma Alpha Award is awarded annually for the best paper presented at the previous year's annual meeting. The award is supported by Pi Sigma Alpha.

Award Committee: Wendy K. Tam Cho, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Benjamin Highton, University of California, Davis; David Woodruff, London School of Economics

Co-Recipients: **Thomas B. Pepinsky**, Cor-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nell University; **R. William Liddle**, Ohio State University; **Saiful Mujani**, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University
Title: "Testing Islam's Political Advantage: Evidence from Indonesia"
Citation: In "Testing Islam's Political Advantage: Evidence from Indonesia," Thomas B. Pepinsky, R. William Liddle, and Saiful Mujani shed important new light on how voters react to Islamic parties. By using a carefully constructed survey experiment, they convincingly demonstrate that Indonesian voters are more inclined to support parties based on their economic platforms rather than their religious ideology. They also show, however, that when little information is available, voters may regard a party's Islamic identity as a proxy for the economic policies it is likely to pursue. This conclusion should invigorate the conversation on the political appeals of Islam in a comparative context, while the impressive survey data collection on which it rests ought to inspire emulation. Finally, by bringing together scholars from one Indonesian and two U.S. universities, the study illustrates the kinds of achievements international collaboration can achieve.
Co-Recipients: Ben B. Hansen, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Jake Bowers, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Title: "Attributing Effects to a Cluster Randomized Get-Out-The-Vote Campaign"
Citation: Ben Hansen and Jake Bowers's paper "Attributing Effects to a Cluster Randomized Get-Out-The-Vote Campaign" makes significant substantive and methodological contributions to our understanding of field experiments. Experiments as well as the study of causal inferences using observational data have grown tremendously in political science, creating an enormous number of applications and highlighting the potential for applications of Hansen and Bowers's work.

In the past, Fisher exact tests have been used to test null hypotheses of no treatment effect. These tests are especially elegant because they do not introduce assumptions that are not warranted by the randomization. All the same, the tests are limited in scope. Hypotheses other than the strict null were either difficult to test without additional assumptions, framed in a way that made them difficult to interpret, or both. This limitation is especially vexing to political science because our experiments are often complex, involving techniques other than simple random assignment. As such, Fisher's work and Rosenbaum's extensions cannot be applied in a straightforward manner to many common political science experimental designs. To accommodate more complex designs, Bowers and Hansen artfully adapt Rosenbaum's conceptual framework to comport with sampling-based, as opposed to permutation-based, techniques. In so doing, they devise simple but powerful tests that are easily adaptable to experimental designs such as cluster-level assignment, block randomization, and informative covariates. The methods proposed are elegant in their simplicity, and produce with relative computational ease randomization-based estimates, tests, and confidence intervals.

Corwin Award

The Edward S. Corwin Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public law.
Award Committee: Kathryn Hendley, University of Wisconsin–Madison, chair; Cornell Clayton, Washington State University; Ken Kersch, Boston College
Recipient: **Patrick Peel**, Johns Hopkins University
Dissertation: "Building Judicial Capacity in the Early American State: Legal Populism, County Courts, and Credit, 1645–1860"
Citation: Drawing confidently from an array of fields, including economic and legal history, law and society, judicial politics, and state theory, Patrick Peel's arrestingly original dissertation argues that county courts played a crucial role in the development of a robust rule of law culture in the early U.S. notwithstanding the ambient weakness of the American state. Delving deeply and creatively into primary sources, and challenging some of the most influential scholarship in several literatures, Peel demonstrates the ways in which, nourished by ideas incubated in the populist legal reform movement of seventeenth century England, and by its unique powers to serve as cost-reducing mediators between creditors and debtors in a time of vigorous capitalist ascendency, America's county courts were indispensible adjuncts of American political and legal development. The committee commends this spirited, magisterial thesis for the importance of the questions it asks, and for the catholicity and skill by which arrives at often unsuspected answers. Peel's thesis significantly advances our understanding of a heretofore neglected level of American government, of the interplay of ideas and material interests in the formation of a rule of law culture, of institutional development—and of the critical role the judiciary can play in the construction of successfully functioning states.

2010 Harold D. Lasswell Award

The Harold D. Lasswell Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of policy studies. The award is supported by the Policy Studies Organization and the APSA Organized Section on Public Policy.
Award Committee: John T. Woolley, University of California, Santa Barbara, chair; John Zysman, University of California, Berkeley; Julia Lynch, University of Pennsylvania
Recipient: **Karen Long Jusko**, University of Michigan
Dissertation: "The Political Representation of the Poor"
Dissertation Co-Chairs: Christopher Achen, Princeton University; John Jackson, University of Michigan
Citation: This dissertation examines the factors affecting policies to reduce poverty and income inequality in advanced industrial countries. Previous widely accepted theories claim that the shape of the national income distribution and/or the characteristics of electoral systems are sufficient to explain cross-national and over-time variation in the production of anti-poverty policy by legislators. Karen Long Jusko's thesis offers a strikingly new alternative account that explains substantial additional empirical variation in redistributive policy by adding to the standard models only one new parameter: the spatial distribution of low-income voters. In this impressive work, Jusko shows that it is not just the electoral rules, but the rules in relationship to political geography, that determine how much effort goes to reducing poverty. Jusko's dissertation combines a formal model, cross-national quantitative estimation, and two important case studies of changes in electoral systems. The work is thorough, innovative, clear, well-designed and convincing.

The work speaks to important ongoing theoretical and empirical debates about the growth and development of the welfare state in rich democracies. Jusko's correctives to widely used models are a theoretical contribution with which all future scholarship on the subject will have to contend. More broadly, Jusko's work reminds us that these issues not only shape the life chances of the least advantaged members of society, but they reflect the quality of our democracies.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Helen Dwight Reid Award

The Helen Dwight Reid Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of international relations, law, and politics. The award is supported by the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation.

Award Committee: Michael H. Allen, Bryn Mawr College, chair; Katherine Barbieri, University of South Carolina; Kenneth Schultz, Stanford University

Recipient: **Stephen Craig Nelson**, Cornell University

Dissertation: "Creating Credibility: The International Monetary Fund and the Neoliberal Revolution in the Developing World"

Dissertation Chair: Peter Katzenstein, Cornell University

Citation: We are unanimous in our choice of Stephen Craig Nelson to be this year's recipient of the Helen Dwight Reid Award for excellence in a doctoral thesis in the field of international relations, law, and politics. Nelson's dissertation is a major achievement among several excellent submissions, a likely milestone work on the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Nelson's research addresses an interesting question about how the IMF treats countries in distress, but also more broadly about how international organizations try to pursue their missions in a complex world. It identifies important and interesting variation in the terms of IMF programs and offers a coherent and testable theory to explain this variation. The argument connects allegiance to neoliberal ideas to the problem of uncertainty facing the organization: given the enormous complexity associated with figuring out whether a country will make necessary reforms, the IMF conditions its behavior on whether economic decision makers share similar core beliefs. He then derives from this theory a set of hypotheses which are then tested using original data on IMF programs and the economic background of economic policymakers. In particular, Nelson shows that countries with neoliberal policymakers get better, more flexible deals from the IMF and that these policymakers enjoy greater security in office as a result.

Beyond its specific insights about the IMF, Nelson's research makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of the role of ideas in international politics. Nelson explains how the establishment of an idea (neoliberal economics) leads to the enhancement of bargaining power for the IMF and for neoliberal policy elites around the world. He treats the dialectics of knowledge—economic paradigms—in their structured historical contexts of markets, finance ministries, central banks, and multilateral institutions. In so doing, Nelson examines deeper questions in the social sciences regarding the levers of social change that have engaged Modernists and Post-Modernists. He traces a path from ideas to concrete outcomes, supporting it with the kind of rigorous empirical evidence demanded in established modernist epistemologies. In demonstrating in falsifiable form the impact of ideas and discourse upon real outcomes, Nelson takes us beyond the scholastic speculations of the post-modernists. We can follow the explanation of how the hegemony of neoliberal economic thought and professional practice was established throughout the world. In the process, Nelson also theorizes the agency of the IMF, in distinction from Realist and Institutionalist explanations, demonstrating what Susan Strange would have called structure-making power in its own right.

Nelson's contribution is likely to reshape the conversation in the subfields of international political economy, international relations theory, and the study of international organizations. He offers a sociology of economic knowledge, particularly on the transmission of ideas and production of institutional consensus in context of uncertainty.

The dissertation also makes an impressive contribution to empirical knowledge in IPE. The empirical excavations are extensive, aggregating and sifting through IMF records covering 503 cases over 20 years and providing a factual base which other scholars could use as platform for other case studies. Even where others may question Nelson's coding decisions, his presentation of the data is sufficiently explicit as to allow exploration of whether or not different coding decisions would affect his findings. This information will certainly generate debate as it is reinterpreted under different questions. Nelson tells us things about the IMF that were not publicly available before, and this is a huge service to the field.

There is much at stake for most of the world in choice of macroeconomic models and implications for foreign relations of states. Nelson provides explanations of the minute dynamics involved in gaining access to credit and helps us better understand the associated gradations of conditionality and institutional and socio-political consequences. But Nelson also gives us concepts with which to foster the hope that more humane and sustainable economic paradigms can supersede neoliberalism through research, graduate education, and institutional proliferation.

All of this is done in clear and engaging writing that is somewhat disarming for taking a very technical subject and making it accessible without obfuscating jargon. This is a demanding text which is exceptionally well signposted to guide the reader along the way. As a result, this dissertation will be a resource not only for practitioners and advanced researchers, but also for upper level undergraduates.

E.E. Schattschneider Award

The E.E. Schattschneider Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of American government.

Award Committee: Sarah Binder, Brookings Institution and George Washington University, chair; William Mayer, Northeastern University; Tracy Sulkin, University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign

Recipient: **Cory Smidt**, Michigan State University

Dissertation: "The Spinning Message: How New Media Coverage and Voter Persuasion Shape Campaign Agendas"

Dissertation Chair: Paul A. Beck, Ohio State University.

Citation: Cory Smidt's dissertation offers an ambitious and methodologically-sophisticated analysis of the origins of campaign agendas. Smidt asks a basic but still unanswered question: Where do issue agendas come from? Focusing on the interplay between candidates and their campaigns, the media, and voters, Smidt revises the conventional wisdom that candidates' issue agendas drive media and voter attention. Instead, Smidt's dissertation suggests that the greater credibility and persuasiveness of the news media increases the media's leverage in influencing candidates' campaign agendas and voter priorities. These relationships, Smidt argues, are dynamic, with reciprocal effects across candidates' campaigns, the media and voters.

Smidt marshals considerable empirical evidence from the 2000 presidential election, as well as from the 2000 and 2004 Senate elections. His dissertation combines a wide diversity of methods, including Bayesian time series, vector-auto regression, event history techniques, and content analysis. Importantly, Smidt puts these methodological tools to work without losing sight of the underlying theoretical and substantive questions that guide his research.

Given Schattschneider's own focus on elections, parties, and agendas, Smidt's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dissertation is a worthy recipient of this prize.

Leo Strauss Award

The Leo Strauss Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Mark Bevir, University of California, Berkeley, chair; Nadia Urbinati, Columbia University; Juliet Williams, University of California, Los Angeles

Recipient: **Joseph M. Mazor**, Stanford University

Dissertation: "A Liberal Theory of Natural Resource Property Rights"

Dissertation Chair: Dennis Thompson, Harvard University

Citation: The committee is delighted to award the Leo Strauss Prize for the best dissertation in political philosophy to Joseph M. Mazor. "A Liberal Theory of Natural Resource Property Rights" is a strikingly original thesis making exceptional use of work from political theory, philosophy, and economics, and drawing important conclusions for public policy.

Mazor offers us a remarkably sophisticated construction and defense of a general theory of the rights to property over natural resources. This ambitious dissertation begins with the general argument for a principle of equal claims. Mazor persuasively argues that both libertarians and egalitarians should accept the principle that people have an equal claim to natural resources. He pursues his analysis of this principle to suggest that it requires the equal division of natural resources. And he defends his interpretation of the principle of equal claims against various alternatives such as collective ownership, first possession, common access, and harmless appropriation.

As if the complex construction and defense of an ideal system of property rights in natural resources were not enough, Mazor then proceeds carefully and rigorously to explore the possible implementation of his system. He begins with equal division in a simple world and the idea of a notional auction of natural resources. However, as he well recognizes, the world is not simple. He therefore proceeds to identify and address the complex difficulties associated with issues such as heterogeneity, unexpected changes, future generations, and nation states with territorial sovereignty. In doing so, he carefully relaxes his initial assumptions while continuing to pursue his main lines of philosophical argument. The dissertation culminates with some "moderate proposals" for policymakers concerned to address what are surely among the most urgent issues of our times—poverty and war as well as the destruction of the environment.

Many of us care about the environment and natural resources. Many of us believe in rights to property. Mazor has given us the most coherent and consistent account of how the two might come together.

Leonard D. White Award

The Leonard D. White Award is given for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public administration.

Award Committee: Craig W. Thomas, University of Washington, chair; Jocelyn M. Johnston, American University; Michael M. Ting, Columbia University

Recipient: **Mikhail Pryadilnikov**, Harvard University

Dissertation: "The State and Markets in Russia: Understanding the Development of Bureaucratic Implementation Capacities through the Study of Regulatory Reform, 2001–2008"

Dissertation Chair: Timothy Colton, Harvard University

APSA PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

Heinz Eulau Award

The Heinz Eulau Award is given for the best article published in the *APSR* and *Perspectives on Politics* during the previous calendar year. Two Eulau Awards are presented, one for each journal. Committee members are asked to help make the selection from one journal or the other, and the chair is asked to participate in both decisions.

Award Committee Chair: Jack Citrin, University of California, Berkeley

American Political Science Review Committee: Christopher F. Gelpi, Duke University; Marc J. Hetherington, Vanderbilt University

Perspectives on Politics Committee: William T. Bianco, Indiana University; Bronwyn Anne Leebaw, University of California, Riverside

Co-Recipients: **Elizabeth Levy Paluck**, Princeton University, and **Donald P. Green**, Yale University

Title: "Deference, Dissent, and Dispute Resolution: An Experimental Intervention Using Mass Media to Change Norms and Behavior in Rwanda" *American Political Science Review*, 104 (4): 622–44

Citation: This paper is a masterful achievement in the use of multiple methods to address a crucial theoretical and political question: the capacity of new information to influence deeply held cultural norms regarding deference to authority and the willingness to express dissent. The original and innovate contributions of this paper are many, beginning with its success in investigating the research questions in post-genocide Rwanda, a forbidding context both for the conduct of the research and for the successful test of the hypothesis. The successful implementation of a field experiment, buttressed intelligently by qualitative data derived from focus groups interviews is truly impressive. The core of the research is an effort to see whether a different diet of radio programs over a period of a year influenced individuals attitudes, community norms, and deliberative behaviors, among communities of genocide survivors, Twa people, and imprisoned genocidaires. At the core of the inquiry was whether media could be an agent of change for political culture, and whether this varied with message, audience, and mode of receiving the message. Of particular significance was whether a "reconciliation" message would be effective, indicating the possibility of eroding the deep-seated ethnic suspicions and hatreds. The results of this complex study are nuanced. A central finding is that certain behavioral aspects of political culture are malleable and not just in the very long-run, a finding that runs somewhat against the grain of conventional wisdom.

Although media influence in this study was in large part vertical and top-down, there was also evidence that listeners did not constitute blind obedience but rather reflected the impact of discussion and peer influence. Media exposure boosted the willingness to express dissenting view and to undertake collective action that favored reconciliation. The authors judiciously note that the durability of these effects is uncertain. Nevertheless, the research provides an example to be followed and should become a staple of courses in methodology and political psychology. The paper shows that it is possible to use random assignment to create appropriate treatment and control groups in a real world setting, that it is possible to create media treatments of verisimilitude even in difficult settings, and that a variety of qualitative and quantitative measures can be used to supplement the interpretation of experimental findings. From a substantive and theoretical point of view, the research creates new conditions for specifying when media effects are likely to be powerful.

Co-Recipients: **Marijke Browning**, University of North Texas, and **John Ishiyama**,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press

University of North Texas
Title: "The Politics of Intercountry Adoption: Explaining Variation in the Legal Requirements of Sub-Saharan African Countries," *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (9): 89–101
Citation: This paper addresses an international issue of growing importance and one that connects the human face of globalization to national differences in dealing with both the moral and economic dimensions of this problem.

The authors provided a comprehensive account of alternative hypotheses regarding the restrictiveness of inter-adoption laws, distinguishing among international law, domestic political culture, the openness of state economies, and the Aids epidemic as explanatory factors. In a careful and elegant multivariate analysis that tests for the role of these alternative predictors, they show that greater interconnectedness with the global economy, and to a lesser extent, signing on to the Hague Convention that outlines international law in this domain, are the main predictors of more openness to inter-country adoption among African countries. A strength of the paper is its discussion of the implications of these findings, a discussion which is a subtle account of the costs and benefits of a more open regime for the orphaned children. The paper fulfills the purpose of *Perspectives on Politics*—the integration of normative concerns, empirical research, and policy analysis.

APSA BOOK AWARDS

Ralph J. Bunche Award

The Ralph J. Bunche Award is given for the best scholarly work in political science published in the previous calendar year that explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.
Award Committee: Carol Skalnik Leff, University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign, chair; Keith J. Bybee, Syracuse University; Melissa V. Harris-Lacewell, Princeton University
Recipient: **Christopher Parker**, University of Washington
Title: *Fighting for Democracy: Black Veterans and the Struggle against White Supremacy in the Postwar South* (Princeton University Press, 2009)
Citation: Political theorists have often understood American citizenship as an exchange of responsibilities for rights. Parker's beautifully written narrative of African American soldiers in the post-war South lays bare how this republican notion of earning full citizenship by performing the duties of citizens underlay black men's ideological and tactical resistance to Jim Crow. Through historical evidence, personal interviews, and analysis of survey data, Parker convincingly argues that black soldiers were emboldened to demand more of the American state after serving in America's foreign wars. This study is a contribution to multiple traditions within political science including theories of citizenship, studies of American racial politics, and investigations of American political development. Parker's text is a real achievement; drawing together multiple lines of empirical research, it is expansive and yet remains eminently readable.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award

The Gladys M. Kammerer Award is given for the best political science publication in the previous calendar year in the field of U.S. national policy.
Award Committee: Ann Chih Lin, University of Michigan, chair; Taylor E. Dark, III, California State University, Los Angeles; Eric Schickler, University of California, Berkeley
Co-Recipient: **Margot Canaday**, Princeton University
Title: *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton University Press, 2009)
Co-Recipient: **Anthony S. Chen**, Princeton University
Title: *The Fifth Freedom: Jobs, Politics, and Civil Rights in the United States, 1941–1972* (Princeton University Press, 2009)

Victoria Schuck Award

The Victoria Schuck Award is given for the best book published in the previous calendar year on women and politics.
Award Committee: Kristi Andersen, Syracuse University, chair; Judith Baer, Texas A&M; Elisabeth Gidengil, McGill University
Recipient: **Mona Lena Krook**, Washington University in St. Louis
Title: *Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide* (Oxford University Press, 2009)
Citation: More than 100 countries (most within the past 15 years) have established quotas specifying the proportion of women among legislators or party nominees for legislative seats. This has produced a good deal of scholarly literature, and Krook's book develops a theoretically and methodologically innovative way to sort through the possible explanations for the adoption of quotas and for variations in the impact of quotas once they are instituted. She begins by arguing that quotas are a global phenomenon, which despite their different origins and types (reserved seats, legislative quotas, party quotas) can profitably be analyzed within a unified institutional framework. She focuses particularly on countries which have experienced a number of periods of reform, which allows both cross-case and within-case comparisons. In particular, she examines the origins and impacts of reserved seats for women in Pakistan and India; party quotas in Sweden and the United Kingdom; and legislative quotas in Argentina and France.

The book would be valuable simply for its careful pulling together of data on the vast diversity of gender quota policies world-wide and its useful synthesis of the developing literature in the field. But Krook's successful comparisons of the "institutional configurations" which have given rise to and shaped the implementation of gender quotas mean that this book constitutes a definitive contribution to the fields of women and politics, public policy, and comparative politics.

2010 Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award

The Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award is given for the best book published in the U.S. during the previous calendar year on government, politics, or international affairs. The award is supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.
Award Committee: Mark Beissinger, Princeton University, chair; Jane Junn, University of Southern California; Charles Shipan, University of Michigan
Recipient: **Beth Simmons**, Harvard University
Title: *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2009)
Citation: The emergence of a human rights regime has been one of the revolutionary transformations in international law and in world politics over the past century. In this wide-ranging study of the rise and impact of international human rights treaties, this year's award-winner Beth Simmons provides us with a theoretically rich and comprehensive answer to why governments accede to the limitations on sovereignty involved in signing on to human rights treaties and why they might choose to comply with the treaty commitments that they make. In particular, she shows

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through detailed empirical analysis that human rights treaties have, under particular circumstances, altered domestic politics in significant ways—affecting elite agendas, facilitating challenging litigation, and empowering social movements. Thus, as Simmons masterfully demonstrates, human rights treaties have functioned as more than simply a reflection of the interests and preferences of states; they have also been an engine of political and social change by empowering domestic stakeholders in ways that otherwise would have been difficult or impossible in their absence. In this respect, the politics of commitment to and compliance with human rights treaties reflects the blurred lines between the domestic and the international that has come to pervade the contemporary world and that is the primary focus of this magnificent book.

Taking six of the most important multilateral human rights treaties as the central focus of her empirical investigation, Simmons examines patterns of domestic political behavior and institutional change that comport with the obligations contained in these formal treaty commitments. Through careful and extensive quantitative analysis and a series of detailed case studies from around the world, she shows that, subject to certain conditions and qualifications and with varying degrees of influence, the ratification of human rights treaties has had a palpable effect on the practice of civil rights, women's equality, the prevention of torture, and the exploitation of children. Importantly, she shows that the effect of human rights treaties is significantly greater on governments that are experiencing instability, partially democratized, or in the midst of transition.

Broad, ambitious, and authoritative, Mobilizing for Human Rights is a tremendous achievement. The hypotheses explored are crisp, the ideas are tightly argued, and the conclusions bear a far-reaching resonance. Simmons is exceptional in her ability to engage and "refute" a wide range of counterarguments. Taken together, the book speaks to fundamental questions in many fields, both within and beyond the political science discipline.

APSA CAREER AWARDS

John Gaus Award and Lectureship

The John Gaus Lecture is given to honor the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration.

Award Committee: Charles W. Gossett, California State University, Sacramento, chair; Eugene Bardach, University of California, Berkeley; Amy Zegart, University of California, Los Angeles

Recipient: **Steven Kelman**, Harvard University

Citation: The American Political Science Association confers the 2010 John Gaus Award on Steven Kelman in recognition of a "lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration."

Professor Kelman is the Albert J. Weatherhead and Richard W. Weatherhead Professor of Public Management at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. In the course of his distinguished career at Harvard, he has also served on two occasions in important roles in the federal government, most recently as the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget from 1993–97. From 1979 to 1981, he was the Associate Director of Management Planning at the Federal Trade Commission.

The first of his books to reach a wide audience, *Making Public Policy*, in 1987, carries the optimistic subtitle, *A Hopeful View of American Government*. It may be fair to say that the spirit of the subtitle is what animates much of the research, publication, and service that Steven Kelman has given us over the years. His work on procurement and organizational change is not only "academic" in the sense of just explaining some observed bureaucratic phenomena, but rather is crafted to help the reader see the possibilities of overcoming problems and challenges that impair the effective operation of institutions and policies in a democratic society. His research informs his government service and the government experience, in turn, is reflected in his scholarly work.

One of the nominators said of Kelman's work that "he has continued the intellectual tradition of his undergraduate and graduate school mentor James Q Wilson by focusing on the political environment of agencies, their goals, and the kinds of measures applied to their performance." Professor Wilson was the 1994 winner of the Gaus Award. The recognition of the interplay between politics and administration is apparent in his 2005 book, *Unleashing Change: A Study of Organization Renewal in Government*, which characterizes organizational change as a political process, and not just a problem of worker resistance to change.

Dr. Kelman's undergraduate and graduate studies were completed at Harvard University. He is a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and serves on the editorial boards of several professional journals, including *Public Organization Review* and the *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*. In 2001, he received the Herbert Roback Memorial Award from the National Contract Management Association. Much earlier in his career, Professor Kelman was the recipient of APSA's Gabriel Almond Award for the Outstanding Dissertation in Comparative Politics.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award

The Hubert H. Humphrey Award is given in recognition of notable public service by a political science.

Award Committee: William A. Galston, The Brookings Institution, chair; Stephen Ansolabehere, Harvard University; Daron Shaw, University of Texas

Recipient: **General David Howell Petraeus**, United States Army

Citation: The 2010 Hubert H. Humphrey Award recognizes one of the most distinguished soldier-scholars in the history of the U.S. military, David H. Petraeus, for his innovative use of political science training and scholarship to alter the doctrine, organization, and conduct of a major institution—the United States Army.

David Petraeus was born on November 7, 1952, at Cornwall-on-Hudson, New York. After graduating from West Point in 1974 as a distinguished cadet, he was commissioned as an infantry officer, which thereafter formed the core of his military career. He earned the General George C. Marshall Award as the top graduate of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Class of 1983 at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. He subsequently attended Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, earning an MPA in 1985 and a Ph.D. in international relations in 1987. His doctoral dissertation, entitled "The American Military and the Lessons of Vietnam: A Study of Military Influence and the Use of Force in the Post-Vietnam Era," explored that war's impact on subsequent intellectual and doctrinal developments in the U.S. military. He served as an assistant professor of international relations at the U.S. Military Academy. His numerous publications include essays and edited volumes on topics such as Korea, NATO, and the lessons of Iraq for the conduct of effective counterinsurgency campaigns.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press

General Petraeus currently serves as Commander, International Security Assistance Force and Commander, U.S. Forces Afghanistan. His previous four-star assignments included service as Commander of the U.S. Central Command, 2008–10 and as Commanding General of the Multi-National Force in Iraq, 2007–08.

The work for which General Petraeus is most recognized had its genesis in his tenure as Commanding General of Forth Leavenworth's U.S. Army Combined Arms Center, 2005–07. During that period, he and then-Lieutenant General James N. Mattis, USMC, oversaw the publication of a new field manual on counterinsurgency. This manual, which drew on the writings of a team of social scientists, military officers, and others, is widely regarded as marking a doctrinal revolution in the conduct of counterinsurgency campaigns.

Equally notable is the strategy General Petraeus adopted for making this doctrine effective in the organization and practices of the U.S. Army. Beginning with a core of able and committed young officers and gradually broadening out training and leadership development, he was able to achieve a remarkably rapid transformation, not only in counterinsurgency tactics, but also in the thinking of soldiers in the field. His emphasis on effective governance and the vital importance of protecting the security and earning the trust of civilian populations have entered the common parlance of both the U.S. military and civilian leadership. These changes are widely credited with contributing significantly to the military gains achieved after the "surge" of troops into Iraq that started early in 2007 under his leadership.

In a recent interview, General Petraeus said that today's generals must be "pentathlete leaders," equally adept at military tactics, diplomacy with national and local leaders, governance, and development. While it is difficult to predict how many officers have the capacity to become such leaders, it is not hard to see that General Petraeus is one of them. His current assignment in the notoriously tricky terrain and complex tribal politics of Afghanistan will put the distinctive fusion of intellectual acumen and practical skills for which he is being honored today to what may prove to be their hardest test.

Carey McWilliams Award

The Carey McWilliams Award honors a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics. This year, the Committee recognizes the impact of quantitative information and analysis on our understanding of political and public life.

Award Committee: Patricia Moy, University of Washington, chair; Pippa Norris, Harvard University; Lynn Vavreck, University of California, Los Angeles

Co-Recipient: **Charlie Cook**, *Cook Political Report*

Citation: Charlie Cook is an astute political observer who has assessed political races across the country with the utmost skill and precision. He has shared his election forecasts and rankings with the public in numerous capacities as political analyst for the National Journal Group, where he writes weekly for *National Journal* magazine and *CongressDailyAM*; as a regular columnist for the *Washington Quarterly*; as a political analyst for NBC News; and as commentator in various national print and broadcast media outlets. With a career that has spanned over three decades, Cook is most well-known today as publisher of the *Cook Political Report*, an independent, non-partisan publication that, for the last quarter-century, has analyzed elections and campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senate, governors, and president, as well as American political trends.

Considered by the *New York Times* to be one of the country's foremost political handicappers, Cook uses the authoritative *Cook Political Report* to translate his passion for political news and statistics into an invaluable asset for understanding the American electoral process. His keen processing of this information is complemented by visits to key congressional districts. Indeed, these opportunities to learn first-hand about various races have informed Cook's assessments. By focusing on details as well as the larger context, Cook offers accurate predictions that carry weight in both professional and academic realms. When Charlie Cook speaks, the political world listens.

Co-Recipient: Andrew Kohut, Pew Research Center

Citation: As an internationally renowned public opinion pollster, Andrew Kohut has shaped how the public understands politics and public affairs, both in the U.S. and globally. In the past three decades, he has stood at the helm of the Gallup Organization, the Times Mirror Center for the People and the Press, and currently, the Pew Research Center. In 2001, he created the Pew Global Attitudes Project, which has conducted more than half a million interviews in over 50 countries.

Throughout his work, Kohut has shown an unflagging commitment to high-quality research and the reporting of survey results in a form accessible to journalists, policymakers and interested lay audiences. His contributions to the study and dissemination of public opinion are numerous. Kohut has appeared regularly in various broadcast media outlets such as National Public Radio, the PBS *NewsHour*, and *Talk of the Nation*; he also has written for a wide range of publications, including the *New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, and the *Columbia Journalism Review*. Kohut also has shared his findings with the broader public in four co-authored books.

Kohut's contribution to the study and understanding of politics is institutional as well. The Pew Research Center makes its data generously available to scholars for secondary analysis, and produces quality research that is widely cited by major news organizations. The organization has become an increasingly valuable resource for journalism as the digital revolution has redefined what constitutes news. ■

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001575 Published online by Cambridge University Press