doi:10.1017/S000305541200055X

Notes from the Editors

EDITOR'S NOTE

The subtitle's placement of its apostrophe means something: While all previous "front matter" (as well as the "In This Issue" summary that follows) has been a collective product, in this final "UCLA" issue I want to speak as Lead Co-editor, the post I have held for most of the *Review*'s tenure here. (Dan Treisman served as Acting Lead in our initial year, and very special thanks are due to him).

Primarily, I want to express my profound gratitude, not only to Dan, but to all who have served as co-editors during this five-year stint: at UCLA, Kathy Bawn, Michael Chwe, Jeff Lewis, Kirstie McClure, Karen Orren, Dan Posner (since moved to MIT), Art Stein, and John Zaller; via videoconference from other locations, Greg Caldeira, Gary Cox, Jennifer Hochschild, David Laitin, and Arthur "Skip" Lupia. A special nod is owed to the co-editors who remained during the final year and the transition months: Caldeira, Cox, Hochschild, Laitin, McClure, and Stein. And, at the risk of repetition, I want again to acknowledge the extraordinary services of our Senior Editor throughout the five years, Joseph Riser. He has supervised a terrific staff of Editorial Assistants – graduate students who with few exceptions served only one year. I (or we) have named them all before in our end-of-year reports, and I forbear to do so again here; but they know who they are and what tremendous work they have done.

Our Editorial Board and its Executive Committee have also rendered yeoman service whenever called upon, usually to help us resolve a case of sharp disagreement among referees. I want to thank particularly Colin Elman, who has worked very hard (and with no little success) to bring qualitative work back to the *APSR*; also Claudine Gay, Peter Gourevitch, Paul Quirk, and Stephen White, who served on our third-year review committee and whose report helped us enormously to "tune up" our operation. At the American Political Science Association, Michael Brintnall, Polly Karpowicz, and five successive association presidents have given us unwavering support; at Cambridge University Press, Mark Zadrozny and his staff, including especially Jonathan Geffner, who have put up with our casual attitude toward deadlines and have brought us better design and better publicity and have contributed a great deal toward bringing the *Review* back to its status (now for the third year running) as the most-cited journal in political science.

This is beginning to sound like an Academy Awards acceptance speech, and I do hear the music beginning to swell to nudge me off the stage. I will only add that it has been a tremendous privilege and a profound learning experience to have served in this role and to have sat in on what must be one of the world's best seminars, namely our weekly meeting of co-editors. Thanks again, and I extend my (and our) very best wishes to the University of North Texas team as they carry on these responsibilities.

IN THIS ISSUE

Five of this issue's articles illuminate the broad question of whether, how, and by what standards voters can or do hold their elected representatives accountable. In our timely lead article, "Unemployment and the Democratic Electoral Advantage," John R. Wright rebuts the common belief that unemployment turns voters away from the incumbent, regardless of that incumbent's partisan affiliation. Rather, Wright shows, high unemployment, controlling for other factors, normally advantages the Democratic candidate (gubernatorial or presidential, incumbent or challenger). The Democratic advantage from unemployment is greater under Republican administrations, but it prevails even when the Democrat is the incumbent. The reason, Wright conjectures, is that Democrats have come historically to "own" the issue of job creation; and many voters assume that, however bad the current situation, a Republican governor or president would make it worse. Readers likely will be receiving this November issue shortly after the 2012 presidential elections and should be able to assess the impact of high, but clearly declining, unemployment on a Democratic incumbent's chances.

If unemployment confers chiefly a partisan advantage, the "pork" that a district receives should benefit the incumbent representative regardless of party (and, as we've seen in another recent article, an incumbent president of the representative's party perhaps even more: Kriner and Reeves (2012), this *Review*, 106: 348–66). Yet a lot of mysteries remain: Why does pork matter, if it constitutes such a small part of federal spending? How do constituents learn about what pork the district receives, and who allocated it; and why should they take the effort to find out? When a representative claims credit for having won pork, does that claim resonate with voters and help build a personal vote? Most readers will be surprised to learn what Justin Grimmer, Solomon Messing, and Sean J. Westwood argue (in "How Words and Money Cultivate a Personal Vote: The Effect of Legislator Credit Claiming on Constituent Credit Allocation")—namely that the *frequency* of credit-claiming matters far more than the *actual amount* of pork garnered. Relying on both observational and experimental evidence, Grimmer and his colleagues find that voters respond more to messages that claim credit than to ones that provide non-partisan information, but that constituents' view of the representative's merit and effectiveness increases with the number of claims, not the total amount claimed. One implication is that a representative is wiser to bring many small tidbits of pork to her constituency (and to claim credit for each) than to garner a few large "sides" of pork.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Relatedly, and relying entirely on experimental evidence, Gregory A. Huber, Seth J. Hill, and Gabriel S. Lenz show (in "Sources of Bias in Retrospective Decision Making: Experimental Evidence on Voters' Limitations in Controlling Incumbents")—that voters weigh recent incumbent performance more heavily relative to overall performance in office, even when incentivized not to do so; and—reminiscent of findings on "shark attacks"—even allow changes in their welfare from an unrelated lottery to influence their evaluations. While their findings are in line with much observational evidence (e.g., that voters evaluate an incumbent president by what happens in the last few quarters before election, weight trend more heavily than actual performance, and blame or credit the incumbent for events completely outside her control), they offer the first strong experimental confirmation of these findings.

So do smart politicians intuitively understand voters' cognitive limitations? Do they favor their friends (or co-partisans) in the allocation of pork, do they do so especially in "swing" districts, and do they do so in democracies outside the United States? Yes, argue Fernanda Brollo and Tommaso Nannicini, in "Tying Your Enemy's Hands in Close Races: The Politics of Federal Transfers in Brazil." Looking at intergovernmental transfers in Brazil, they find that cities whose mayors are allied politically with the incumbent national president receive about one-third more discretionary infrastructure allocations in pre-election years than non-allied mayors. More remarkably, opposition mayors who won narrowly in the previous election (and whose cities therefore count as "swing" constituencies) are especially short-changed in pre-election years, evidently in an effort to "tie their hands" on infrastructure expenditures and minimize these opponents' chances of re-election.

Reformers frequently assume that voters could, and would, monitor their representatives more effectively if only they had readier access to information: More transparency would translate into greater accountability—perhaps even in authoritarian regimes (cf. Egorov, Guriev, and Sonin 2009; this *Review*, 103: 645–68). For apparently the first time in this line of research, Edmund Malesky, Paul Schuler, and Ahn Tran subject that assertion to rigorous, randomized testing in the particular context of the Vietnamese National Assembly (in "The Adverse Effects of Sunshine: A Field Experiment on Legislative Transparency in an Authoritarian Assembly"). The actions—or inaction—of a random sample of delegates were publicized extensively in a widely-read online newspaper, while a control group received only the normal, rather restricted, publicity. Transparency in this semi-authoritarian context turned out to have perverse effects: The delegates whose activities were publicized curtailed their participation and reduced their odds of re-election. Transparency, Malesky and his colleagues conclude, likely increases accountability only in fully democratic settings.

Turning from politics within nations to relations between them, Branislav L. Slantchev offers a new insight into the old riddle of why fully informed states would ever risk a war. (Instead, we usually assume, they would reach a bargain that reflected their relative strengths, since these would be fully known to both parties). Even models that incorporate incomplete information or inability to commit credibly, Slantchev observes, cannot easily explain why wars last so long or why warring powers often advance even more unrealistic demands the longer the war continues (recall the case of Germany in World War I). A more convincing explanation, Slantchev argues in "Borrowed Power: Debt Finance and the Resort to Arms," and one that holds even under complete information and an ability to commit credibly, is sovereign debt. Paradoxically, the fact that defeat usually entails repudiation of debt (whether explicitly or through inflation), encourages risk-taking and extravagant demands that would be impossible without the option of borrowing. Thus indirectly the ability of states to borrow can eliminate a bargaining range that would otherwise exist—whether before or during the war—and precipitate or extend destructive combat.

Our next three articles turn us back to questions of citizenship within states, and specifically of what democratic citizenship requires and entails. In "'Writing a Name in the Sky': Rancière, Cavell, and the Possibility of Egalitarian Inscription," Aletta J. Norval takes up the question—particularly acute in emerging democracies—of how the previously voiceless manage both to be heard and to stake previously unheard-of claims; and how, once such an "interruption" has occurred, it can proceed to "inscription" that makes the previously excluded, and their issues, an ongoing part of the political order. Drawing on two aspects of theorists who have previously addressed such issues, Jacques Rancière and Stanley Cavell, Norval turns to specific events they have emphasized – the secession of the plebs in Republican Rome, Blanqui's self-identification as "proletarian" in an Orleanist French courtroom, Nora's hesitating proclamation of her new self in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*—to draw our attention to how such assertions are received, what kind of community emerges among the previously voiceless, and how – or whether – such communities become assimilated into the existing order, or (perhaps by continued disruptions) retain a separate identity. As Norval concludes, "moments of challenge and critique . . . are crucial to the deepening and sustaining of a democratic ethos, an ethos that foregrounds democratic responsiveness."

Quite relatedly, but proceeding from a different theoretical perspective, Josiah Ober, in "Democracy's Dignity," advances "dignity," understood as "nonhumiliation and noninfantalization," as a third crucial criterion (along with liberty and equality) of democratic citizenship.[1] Advancing not only a normative argument for this position, Ober seeks to demonstrate, with simple game theory and historical examples (including a

[1] Privately, Lyndon Johnson is supposed to have argued for the public accommodations sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 by saying, "Damn it, a man has a right not to be humiliated in front of his children." Publicly, he said at the signing ceremony, "Now the Negro families no longer suffer the humiliation of being turned away because of their race" (April 11, 1968: http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/4036).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press

case from ancient Athens, prosecuted by Demosthenes, for the crime of "willful and harmful infliction of humiliation upon another"), that self-interested citizens can be motivated to defend others against threats to their dignity. Thus "a civic dignity regime is theoretically stable," unlike such alternatives as meritocracy or universal human dignity. Ober's argument thus echoes Norval's: To the extent that we infantilize nominally equal fellow citizens, we leave them voiceless and deny them the reality of equal citizenship.

If the United States lacks a Demosthenes, let alone a Pericles, it has at least a Supreme Court that has, on occasion, given voice to the voiceless and dignity to the humiliated (see, respectively, *Gideon v. Wainwright* and *Brown vs. Board)*. But, as the Court's power has grown – and as appointments to it have become correspondingly more contentious – attorneys, Senators, and the chattering classes generally have tried to identify the "swing" or median Justice and to contemplate both how to frame arguments to appeal to that Justice and how a possible new appointment would, or would not, shift that median. That approach is misguided, argue Benjamin E. Lauderdale and Tom S. Clark in "The Supreme Court's Many Median Justices." Not only does the "median" Justice vary over time, even with no shift in personnel (a point already widely accepted), but a more finely grained analysis of the Court's decisions from 1953 through 2006 (a total of 4186 non-unanimous decisions, involving 29 different Justices) reveals: (a) that the "median" Justice varies depending on the type of case[2] and, correspondingly; (b) that one cannot reduce Justices' preferences, at any time, to a single left-right dimension. More clearly understanding the Court's evolution, and more accurately predicting its decisions, requires closer attention to the Justices' positions on particular kinds of cases. As Lauderdale and Clark note, in principle the same method can be used on other courts, city councils, legislative committees, etc. Thus, while we have grown accustomed to ideological mappings of the U.S. Congress, of the parliaments of many other countries, of supranational bodies, and most recently of U.S. state legislatures (Shor and McCarty 2011; this *Review*, 105: 530–51), efforts to do so for smaller bodies have been (as it seemed, inevitably) less precise. The estimator employed by Lauderdale and Clark holds out a possible remedy.

Historians of the period between the World Wars are acutely aware of what democratic theorists have come to call the "boundary problem," i.e., that one cannot decide democratically whom to include in (or exclude from) a given democracy's territory. One can conduct a plebiscite (as in Alsace-Lorraine or Schleswig-Holstein), but how can one decide democratically within what territory to hold that plebiscite? To put the question most sharply: Can the "demos" be democratically demarcated? Likely not, argues Arash Abizadeh in "On the Demos and Its Kin: Nationalism, Democracy, and the Boundary Problem." All efforts to date, at any rate, display seemingly insurmountable difficulties: Efforts to define the boundary culturally collapse, inevitably, into ethnic nationalism. And once we see the demos as unbounded, we can easily arrive at a vague, institution-free, appeal "to humanity as some kind of pre-political, global demos." The best we can do in practice, Abizadeh concludes, is to insist on fully democratic practices that include, as a minimum, "expression, contestation, negotiation, [and] justification," particularly toward those regarded as outsiders vis-à-vis the given boundaries. At a more fundamental level, however, Abizadeh concludes, "the demos is both everywhere and nowhere. It is everywhere: in principle unbounded. It is nowhere: a regulative ideal that no actual, politically articulated collectivity can ever fully succeed in instantiating."

In twentieth-century practice, many boundary problems were solved violently, by expulsion, flight, and "ethnic cleansing." Among the most horrific examples was the Partition of India, in which probably 12 million people were displaced and up to a million killed. Yet the death rates varied enormously across regions, for a variety of reasons: Sometimes minorities remained scarcely touched, sometimes they emigrated unscathed; on the other side, some local majorities engaged in organized butchery, while among others violence was rare and disorganized. Efforts to attribute the differences to prior intercommunity amity, exposure to lurid rumor, or even on-site visits by Gandhi, have yielded at best partial success. In this issue's final article ("Does Combat Experience Foster Organizational Skill? Evidence from Ethnic Cleansing during the Partition of South Asia"), Saumitra Jha and Steven Wilkinson find greater power in a very different explanation, one that focuses on means rather than motive: whether the given area (and community) had veterans who had experienced combat in World War II and hence presumably possessed the military and organizational skills to provide an effective defense (or, for that matter, offense).

Imbued with our received images of European and East Asian soldiers, we easily forget that 2.5 million Indians—some 3 per cent of the adult male population – enlisted for service in World War II. The great majority of them saw combat, for weeks, months, or years. Where exactly a unit served, and how much combat it experienced, seems to have been virtually random. Building an impressive new dataset that relies both on the detailed unit histories compiled by the British Armed Forces and on the Imperial War Graves Commission, Jha and Wilkinson are able to ascertain the extent to which a community (Sikh, Muslim, Hindu, Parsi, etc.) in a given locale included combat veterans. Their finding is stark: Where a local minority included combat veterans, its death rate was significantly lower—either out of deterrence or, more commonly, because the minority conducted a well-organized and well-defended emigration and did not fall prey to the frequent slaughters (often along railway lines) of ill-organized refugees. Sadly, it seems also to be the case that local *majorities* with combat experience were more effective at ethnic cleansing, presumably because they

[2] The analysis adopts the thirteen categories used in the Supreme Court Database (Spaeth et al.). These include such rubrics as First Amendment, Civil Rights, Privacy, Economic Activity, and Federalism.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press

could more effectively intimidate (or, intimidation failing, more effectively butcher) local minorities. Far from being of interest only to historians of modern India, or indeed to students of ethnic conflict, Jha and Wilkinson's work (as they observe) carries implications for students of revolutions, mass movements, and seemingly peaceful expansions of the franchise. It has long been observed that all of these phenomena multiply after major wars, and it may well be that masses whose ranks include combat-experienced former soldiers present a more formidable threat to the elites of their day.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the *APSR* consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your case, you should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of your submission's review at the *APSR*—regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the "Specific Procedures" section that follows.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and—in the event the article is accepted for publication—to permit other scholars to replicate your results and to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. With surveys, for example, provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).[3] 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.[4]

The strength of evidence necessary for publication of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. The journal's coeditors—following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

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

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

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*.[5] In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be

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

[4] 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

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press

considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication, and which may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

Further questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940-891-6803) or by sending an e-mail to: apsr@unt.edu

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

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

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

Full text access to current issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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/S000305541200055X Published online by Cambridge University Press