doi:10.1017/S0003055410000390

Notes from the Editors

IN THIS ISSUE

This issue's articles address three broad themes, each of which looms large in present-day political science: (a) revolution, civil war, and nationalism; (b) representation and deliberation; and (c) domestic and international sources of governments' economic policies.

Revolution, civil war, and nationalism. Are civil wars affected by international conflicts? Do lost wars displace domestic leaders? And do domestic leaders adopt different foreign policies as a result? Do structural factors or a revolutionary vanguard matter for the success of efforts to change regimes? And when is liberalism consistent with nationalist demands for a separate regime (i.e., secession)?

Civil wars undoubtedly increased over the last quarter century, but most believe that the end of the Cold War had little to do with that expansion. Our lead article, by Stathis N. Kalyvas and Laia Balcells, calls this view into question, arguing that the demise of the East-West conflict changed not the overall number of civil wars but, rather dramatically, *how* such wars were fought: the "technologies of rebellion." Disaggregating civil wars into three distinct categories—irregular wars (insurgencies), conventional wars, and symmetric non-conventional wars—Kalyvas and Balcells show, in "International System and Technologies of Rebellion: How the End of the Cold War Shaped Internal Conflict," that the end of the Cold War brought a sharp decline in one particular form: insurgencies. Indeed, in a broader historical perspective, insurgency will likely be seen as an atypical form, furthered by the peculiar circumstances of the Cold War's bipolar conflict. Their findings and theoretical analysis suggest a new and different focus for research on civil wars.

A lost war, we also know, can cost leaders their offices or their lives, and most of us have believed that democratic leaders bear a higher risk of losing office than dictators. But that conclusion, assert Alexandre Debs and H. E. Goemans in "Regime Type, the Fate of Leaders, and War," rests on erroneous statistical inference. Although freely elected leaders indeed are at greater risk of losing office in any given year, the odds that they will do so, conditional on a lost war, are lower than for authoritarian leaders; and the post-incumbency fate of democratic leaders is normally sanguine, that of dictators more often sanguinary. Moreover, among authoritarian leaders, civilian dictators are less likely than monarchs or military despots to lose office and life from a lost war. But, argue Debs and Goemans, the less risk international interactions carry for a given leader, the likelier she is to avoid war and strike a peaceful bargain. Hence the empirical regularity that they discover offers an explanation for the "democratic peace," the greater propensity of dictators to go to war, and, previously little noted, why civilian dictators avoid conflict more than military rulers or monarchs.

Defeat in war, as Theda Skocpol first argued, is among the most powerful of "structural" factors that, along with things like waning repressive capacity and economic decline, can mobilize long-standing grievances into revolutionary action. However, subsequent critics have noted many cases in which the structural factors were obtained but no revolution ensued. Related, scholars have been uncertain about the role that revolutionary "vanguards" and demonstrative violence play in the outbreak of revolution. What we have overlooked, contends Ethan Bueno de Mesquita in "Regime Change and Revolutionary Entrepreneurs," is that revolutionary mobilization (or failure to mobilize) is inherently a situation with multiple equilibria, including one in which revolution is certain not to occur. In such a non-participatory equilibrium, neither structural factors nor actions of a revolutionary vanguard can affect outcomes. In participatory equilibria, where revolution is possible, both structural factors and actions of a vanguard, including violence, may facilitate mass mobilization. The model that Bueno de Mesquita develops, however, casts much recent empirical research into doubt. Structural factors may relate only weakly to revolutionary mobilization in general because so many equilibria are non-participatory. And, because the model also predicts that a revolutionary vanguard will arise only in a participatory equilibrium, the connection we observe between vanguards and revolutions may be largely due to selection effects.

Since the late eighteenth century, a major source of revolutionary grievance and mobilization has been nationalism, a phenomenon with which liberals have had a troubled and inconsistent relationship. Liberalism has historically justified peoples' and nations' right to choose their own political institutions, including political autonomy or independence. Yet the violence and displacement that often attend separation, the intolerance and ethnic cleansing that sometimes ensue, and even the absurd inefficiencies of governing Lilliputian states all offend liberal values.[1] On the other hand, within liberal constitutional orders the liberal values of individual autonomy, freedom, and choice have often proved solvents of group identities and loyalties, encouraging assimilation, endorsing pluralism, and—some would say—undermining community. In "A Liberal Defense of Black Nationalism," Andrew Valls explores these tensions in relation to the historical and contemporary situation of African Americans in the United States. Drawing on recent liberal theories of secession and multiculturalism, he contends that two successive forms of black nationalism—Classical Black Nationalism and Community Black Nationalism,

[1] Even, or perhaps especially, liberals scarcely aware of their liberalism have developed similar (mostly utilitarian) balancing rules, for example, between economies of scale in governance and the benefits of cultural autonomy (Alberto Alesina and Enrico Spolaore, *The Size of Nations*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

respectively—are each compatible with liberal values and principles. Although secessionist theories would support early black nationalists' quest for a separate African American republic, recent developments in multicultural theory can be modified to support the more limited forms of institutional autonomy sought by Black Power activists and community black nationalists since the Civil Rights era. Community black nationalist claims to some forms of autonomous institutions, Valls argues, are not only timely responses to persistent inequalities but are themselves defensible in terms of liberal justice.

Representation and deliberation. Five articles address these broad themes, in both democratic and nondemocratic settings.

In "Nodding or Needling: Analyzing Delegate Responsiveness in an Authoritarian Parliament," Edmund Malesky and Paul Schuler pit broader theories of authoritarian representation (i.e., why dictatorial regimes bother to have parliaments at all) against detailed textual evidence from the proceedings of the Vietnamese National Assembly. In particular, Malesky and Schuler analyze the stenographic records of that Assembly's question times, which permit delegates to interpellate ministers (including the Prime Minister) on locally or nationally important issues. Not only do the MPs sometimes question aggressively, but (a) the question times (televised nationally) draw a broad and enthusiastic audience and (b) successful questioning is sometimes followed by a change of policy or even of personnel (ministers who perform badly have sometimes resigned). While advancing evidence that the interpellations are not merely orchestrated "show trials," in which an already decided change in policy or personnel is simply given an operatic fanfare, Malesky and Schuler examine particularly *who* does the questioning (two thirds of delegates only "nod," rather than "needle"), which constituencies elected them, and whether in doing so they are directly expressing constituents' complaints or concerns. Perhaps not surprisingly, the most assertive delegates were not centrally nominated, are not part of the bureaucracy, and represent the better-off areas of the country. Although we have noticed for some time that the existence of a parliament affects authoritarian policy and performance, Malesky and Schuler are among the first to show exactly *how* it matters.

Even in more freely elected parliaments, incumbency conveys large advantages. Does that advantage extend, however, to the cabinet level? More precisely, in multi-party parliamentary systems, does a party that held office in the previous government have, all else equal, a better chance of retaining office in the next cabinet? Although much research suggests that such an "incumbency advantage" exists, no very convincing explanation has been offered. In fact, according to Lanny W. Martin and Randolph T. Stevenson (in "The Conditional Impact of Incumbency on Government Formation"), the incumbency advantage—except where it rests on institutional rules—is conditional and can be intuitively explained. Incumbents have an advantage only in re-forming coalitions with previous partners with whom they have worked amicably and not suffered major election defeats. The alleged incumbency advantage disappears whenever the previous coalition was brought down by deep conflict, or where the previous coalition lost seats. The simple-minded theory, Californians might add, is that an amicable uncoupling is likelier to be followed by an amicable re-coupling.

A recurrent problem in democracies is the election of representatives who are more extreme than their constituents. Although writers ranging from F. A. Hermens to Anthony Downs have in the past argued that this was seldom a problem under plurality election (candidates would converge on the position of the median voter), others have offered evidence that policy on average is more moderate (closer to the median voter's bliss point) under proportional representation. Looking only at the U.S. case, and particularly at the 109th and 110th Congresses, Joseph Bafumi and Michael C. Herron find, in "Leapfrog Representation and Extremism: A Study of American Voters and Their Members in Congress," that U.S. Representatives are consistently more extreme than the constituents of their home districts, and, when such an extremist fails of re-election, *pace* Downs, she or he is typically replaced not by a more moderate candidate but by an opposing extremist—the phenomenon that the authors label "leapfrog representation." It is worth noting, as do Bafumi and Herron, that this result appears to be at odds with that of Stephen Jessee in "Spatial Voting in the 2004 Presidential Election," previously in this *Review*,[2] where constituents were found usually to be more extreme than their representatives. Both the contradictory findings and an explanation for them (or whichever turns out to be correct) will doubtless be the object of much future inquiry in a field that has barely begun to open.

Whatever causes political polarization, and whatever its extent, it presumably has consequences, among other things for the size of government spending. But previous theory has advanced plausible reasons for both a negative and a positive effect: in a veto-player perspective, polarization might limit the size of government, while a "squeaky wheel" theory might expect that polarization could be bridged only by increased spending. Working directly from data on respondents' political positions and their preferences for increased or decreased spending, Erik Lindqvist and Robert Östling demonstrate, in "Political Polarization and the Size of Government," that, controlling for other kinds of fractionalization and other plausible factors, higher polarization is correlated with lower government spending. That this result holds only in democratic countries suggests that polarization likely affects spending, and not the other way around; but more research would be required, as the authors note, to buttress any conjecture about causality.

One answer to polarization, it has been argued, is "deliberative democracy," in which representative

[2] February 2009, 103 (1): 59–81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

groups of citizens engage one another in rational and informed discourse about major issues of the day.[3] But can deliberation work in the real world? Won't most voters have little taste for deliberation, or actually find the process paternalistic and alienating? Among the minority who might actually want to deliberate, the argument goes, most would already be highly engaged politically. Testing both sets of assumptions in an elaborate real-world setting, Michael A. Neblo and his co-authors[4] inquired about respondents' willingness to deliberate either with other citizens or with their representative in Congress (who had actually made himself or herself available for such discussion). In "Who Wants to Deliberate—And Why?" they find widespread willingness to deliberate in both settings, even at some cost. Surprisingly, respondents with little history of, or inclination toward, participation in usual partisan politics were among the most eager to deliberate.

Domestic and international sources of governments' economic policies. Even after we allow for such obvious factors as political risk, some countries attract much more foreign investment than others. Equally puzzling is that some countries with weak domestic competition, high labor costs, and high real-exchange rates are surprisingly successful exporters.

In "Familiarity Breeds Investment: Diaspora Networks and International Investment," David Leblang calls attention to a underappreciated factor in attracting foreign investment, namely, diasporas from less-developed countries who reside in wealthier, outward-investing economies. Controlling for all other plausible factors, Leblang shows that the bigger the diasporic ties between two countries, the bigger the portfolio and the more foreign direct investment flows between them. The reason seems straightforward but is buttressed by Leblang with other evidence: The diaspora's networks and knowledge lower information and transaction costs to potential investors, making the potential site of investment less "foreign." In an age of growing mass migration, Leblang's finding has evident future importance.

Some countries, visitors will readily notice, defy the "Law of One Price." Sweden, Switzerland, and Japan (to name only a few) have high real-exchange rates and (think only of the "Big Mac Index") high real prices—one result being that a dollar, euro, or pound sterling will buy far less there of almost any given commodity (hamburgers, hotel rooms, clothing) than at home, or even in a neighboring country that uses a less-appreciated currency. Despite their high real prices, note Torben Iversen and David Soskice in "Real Exchange Rates and Competitiveness: The Political Economy of Skill Formation, Wage Compression, and Electoral Systems,"[5] many such countries perform very well as exporters in world markets. The answer to the paradox, they argue with much evidence, lies in a dense interlocking network of political parties, institutions, and redistribution—the key to which is skill formation. Union centralization provides both wage restraint (in export industries) and wage compression (in non-trade sectors). However, the quid pro quo that permits necessary wage restraint is governmentally subsidized but union-run training, which can be sustained only by a long-run coalition that includes both labor and employers. While wage compression in non-traded sectors yields high real prices (i.e., a high real-exchange rate), wage restraint preserves the country's advantages in export markets. A remaining question for many readers will be whether such arrangements can be preserved in a world in which more and more previously sheltered sectors become open to trade.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

General Considerations

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

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

The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or to part of a book or other larger work, should also not be submitted. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss

[3] See, for instance, the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University: http://cdd.stanford.edu; the Centre for Deliberative Democracy & Global Governance at Australian National University: http://deliberativedemocracy.anu.edu.au; or the Deliberative Democracy Consortium at http://www.deliberative-democracy.net

[4] Kevin M. Esterling, Ryan P. Kennedy, David M. J. Lazer, and Anand E. Sokhey.

[5] Given that the Iversen & Soskice article takes as its starting point some work on which *APSR* Managing Co-Editor Ronald Rogowski was a co-author, it is appropriate to note that Rogowski recused himself from all stages of this article's consideration for publication.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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 criticized. The original author(s) of the article being critiqued will be invited to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer reviewed.

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

Manuscript Formatting

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

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

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

In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files or camera-ready copies of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications. Instructions will be provided. For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. And/or for unusual style or formatting issues, you may wish to consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (15th ed.; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to *APSR*, it is recommended that you download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page (http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr/) and review its terms and requirements as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions. At any time after submitting, you may sign this and send it on ahead, by mail, to: *American Political Science Review*, c/o Dept. of Political Science, UCLA, 4289 Bunche Hall, Box 951472, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1472. In any case, a signed agreement will be required in order for your work to be published in this journal.
2. During the online submission process at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr you will be invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name but will be expected to provide specific reasons why they may be inappropriate. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files: a) an "anonymous" digital file of your paper; this file should not include any information that identifies the authors, or any other collaborators in the work (including anyone responsible for creating tables or figures, if they are also an author/collaborator); and, do not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information.; b) a separate title page that includes the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all credited authors in the order their names should appear, as well as each authors' academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the paper (e.g., previous presentations of the research) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive correspondence. In addition, you may choose to include a cover letter.
4. Please review all pages to make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. To insure anonymity throughout the review process, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not include redacted self-citations and references (i.e., do not delete the names of your manuscript's authors). If you are unsure as to the best use of these or any other procedures in rendering manuscripts anonymous, contact the editorial offices of *APSR* prior to submission.

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

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

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

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR* and *PS* through the APSA website (*www.apsanet.org*) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of both the *APSR* and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), On-line Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed artide, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

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

INDEXING

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000390 Published online by Cambridge University Press