

History and Politics Section Newsletter

An Organized Section of the American Political Science Association

Vol. 2, No. 1

Fall 1991

From the Editors

Elaine K. Swift (Dept. of Political Science, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill) and Kenneth Finegold (Dept. of Political Science, Rutgers University)

With the first of this academic year's editions of the *History and Politics Section Newsletter*, we're pleased to include two brief, but provocative, articles on the interdisciplinary study of history. The first, written by William E. Leuchtenburg (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill), president of the American Historical Association, was originally delivered as part of "The Uses and Abuses of History: An Interdisciplinary Roundtable" at the recent meeting of the APSA. It traces the rich tradition of collaboration between political scientists and historians, ending with a discussion of the prospects for future research in political history by scholars from both disciplines. The second, written by Martin Shefter (Cornell), explores three uses—and two abuses—of history in political science. Shefter was originally scheduled to deliver his remarks at the same roundtable. However, as you may know, he was injured in a serious accident last spring. While Shefter was unable to deliver his remarks at the convention, he has graciously permitted us to publish them here. We wish him continued progress and look forward to seeing him in Chicago next year!

In addition, we continue our efforts to bring readers up-to-date on section news and the latest research. Much of this issue is taken up with news of the section. In her first report, new section president Theda Skocpol discusses several pending issues. We are also printing the minutes of the annual business meeting, including the list of new officers, and the complete by-laws of the section, as adopted at that meeting. We also call your

attention to Margaret Weir's call for papers for the 1992 APSA meeting.

In this issue, you will again find the *Journal Scan*, into which we have incorporated more titles suggested by our readers. You will also notice a new feature: Quotes. These are quotations, scattered throughout the newsletter as fillers, which we found especially pertinent to the study of history and politics.

For the rest of this academic year, we plan to publish two more newsletters, the deadlines for which will be January 20, 1992 and March 15, 1992. We may also be preparing a section directory, if the APSA is able to provide some assistance. In future newsletters, we would like to incorporate any quotes on history or politics that you have found particularly meaningful; please send these along with complete citations. Also, please continue to send us any research inquiries;

(continued on the next page)

Editor(s) Wanted

For the *History and Politics Section Newsletter*. Responsible for all aspects of *Newsletter* production and distribution. Also responsible for minimal duties as section treasurer. Three-year commitment, beginning Fall 1992. Please submit a c.v. and a cover letter detailing your ideas for the *Newsletter* as well as any available departmental or university support (clerical and/or financial) to: Theda Skocpol, Department of Sociology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138. Applications may be submitted either by an individual or by two or more collaborators. The final selection will be made by the section president and council. Deadline for applications is January 15, 1992.

(continued from last page)
announcements; syllabi; book notes; synopses of work in progress; suggestions for the Journal Scan; or any other items of interest. Our address for 1991-92 will be: Department of Political Science, Hamilton Hall, CB #3265, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265; Phone: (919) 962-0409; BITNET: ESWIFT@UNC; FAX: (919) 962-4777. We look forward to hearing from you.

Section President's Report

Theda Skocpol (Dept. of Sociology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138; Phone: 617-495-3851)

I would like to thank Jeffrey Tulis for his outstanding service as president of the History and Politics Section over the past year. Besides his work on the section's by-laws, he helped to put History and Politics on an admirably firm footing. According to figures published in the September issue of *PS*, our section ranked 12th out of 25 sections in membership, even though it had only officially been in existence for a year. The section has continued to grow since February, when these statistics were calculated, and now has 484 members.

My first act as Section President was to introduce myself to Catherine Rudder, Executive Director of the APSA, and to Kay Sterling and Mike Brintnall, the APSA staffers in charge of liaison with the organized sections. I discussed with each of them the chief concern that came up at our business meeting: Even though our section is larger than certain others, and even though we have a high demand for participation in our sessions, and put on panels that are well-attended, we have proportionately fewer panels allocated to us than are given to other groups. To put it mildly, the APSA does not seem to have a fixed, clearly statable "formula" for allocating panels among sections, so it is difficult to make unassailable claims. But I do think I succeeded in making a case that our new, rapidly expanding section deserves more room on the program. Before long, Margaret Weir, the section's 1992 program chair,

will find out from 1992 APSA Program Chair, Tom Mann, what our allocation is.

Following the instructions of the by-laws, I will soon ask five colleagues from various subfields and parts of the country to serve as members of the 1991-92 Nominating Committee, which will propose new officers to be elected for 1992-93. If you would like to suggest prospective members of this important committee, please contact me soon. I would also welcome your suggestions as to whom the section should nominate for the panel chair of the 1993 APSA meeting.

The possibility of establishing section prizes for outstanding books and articles in History and Politics was discussed at the Business Meeting. Many APSA sections have such prizes, and there was broad agreement that I should work with the Council over the next year to draft concrete proposals for the 1992 Business Meeting to consider. Specific questions need to be weighed:

(continued on the next page)

Call for Papers and Presenters

The Section on Politics and History invites proposals for papers, panels, or roundtables that examine the intersection of political science and history for the 1992 meetings of the American Political Science Association. Proposals from all subfields are encouraged. For 1992, topics of special interest include: (1) the relationship between historically-informed inquiry and other approaches in political science; (2) processes of institutional change, including shifts in the boundaries between the state and civil society; (3) the relationship between politics and group identities. These suggestions are not meant to limit the range of proposals; submissions on other aspects of history and politics will also be considered.

Interested persons should contact Margaret Weir (Dept. of Government, Harvard University, Littauer Center, Cambridge, MA 02138; Phone: 617-495-2529, Fax 617-495-0438). The deadline for receipt of submissions is December 1, 1991.

(continued from last page)

- Should books and articles compete for the same annual prize; or should two prizes perhaps be given on alternate years?
- Whose work would be eligible, and what should the nomination procedures be? Without artificial exclusions, could we perhaps devise terms that would encourage section membership and limit the sheer number of nominations that members of prize committees would have to consider?
- Should we name a prize or prizes after individuals? The possibility of a "David Greenstone Award" was mentioned.
- Might it make sense to have a career award in addition to award(s) for individual books or articles? If so, how often should it be given?
- Should awards be purely honorary; or should they have money attached to them? If the latter, how are we to judge the implications for the budget—and section dues—while keeping in mind that our section newsletter also costs quite a lot of money?

Other issues that the Council and I will contemplate in coming months include: (a) recruiting new newsletter editor(s); (b) deciding whether to propose that section dues should be increased a bit; (c) finding tactics that might be used to further expand section membership; and (d) considering whether our section could respond to an invitation issued by the APSA to propose a half-day "short course" for the 1992 APSA Meeting. These short courses are advertised to all APSA members, and people who enroll in them

Quote

To analyse a problem historically is to study contradictions and change, not simply to uncover "origins". While it is true that an historical investigation will typically involve gathering data from the past, the critical issue is not the temporality of the data but the way in which they are analysed. It is entirely possible to conduct ahistorical investigations of the past and historical investigations of the present.

Erik Olin Wright, *Class, Crisis and the State*. London: Verso, 1979, p. 13.

pay fees. The APSA is currently proposing to share those fees with sections that organize and teach appropriate short courses. If the History and Politics Section could mount an attractive short course, therefore, we could both advertise our ideas within the APSA and make some money for our treasury.

If you have thoughts on any of these issues—or ideas about other ways to help our section—I would be delighted to hear from you. Please call or write.

Section Business Meeting Minutes

Richard Valelly (Dept. of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139)

The annual business meeting of the History and Politics Section convened on August 30, 1991, as part of the APSA convention. The meeting addressed the following items:

1) Ratification of by-laws drafted by Jeffrey K. Tulis as outgoing section president. An amendment requiring that section officers be dues-paying members was approved. The by-laws were then adopted. [The complete by-laws follow.]

2) Election of section officers. Theda Skocpol (Harvard) was elected as section president. As stipulated in the by-laws, half of the interim council was elected to two-year terms, with the other half elected for one-year terms. David Brady (Stanford), Peter Hall (Harvard), Gwendolyn Mink (University of California–Santa Cruz), and Richard Valelly (MIT) were elected for two years. Lisa Anderson (Columbia), Amy Bridges (University of California–San Diego), H. Douglas Price (Harvard), and Michael Smith (Virginia) were elected for one year. Kenneth Finegold (Rutgers) and Elaine Swift (North Carolina) were elected to continue as section treasurers and co-editors of the Newsletter. Margaret Weir (Harvard; soon to be Brookings) had previously been selected as section program chair for the 1992 annual meeting.

3) A lively debate about whether to reach out to historians in order to bring them into the section. One view was that since historians and political scientists really do treat history

differently, our constituency and professional audience ought to be political scientists. The other view was that the section is explicitly interdisciplinary in purpose and ought to act on this conception.

4) Discussion of the number of panels allocated to the section. Vicki Hattam reported on the section's difficulties in getting an adequate number of panels for 1991. Theda Skocpol announced an intention to address this potential difficulty for 1992. David Brady pointed out that if individual section members found this a problem they should write letters to Thomas Mann and Catharine Rudder, who find this kind of evidence from a section's constituency quite persuasive. In this connection, it is quite important for section members, or would-be members, to be paid up in their section dues, since the size of a section has some relationship to its representation at the annual meeting.

5) Discussion of section finances. Kenneth Finegold reported the cost of the newsletter in 1990-91 to be \$2200. In light of this cost, there was discussion about raising dues if the quality of the newsletter is to be maintained and if a section member directory is to be published. This may come up at the 1992 business meeting.

6) Discussion of possible section awards. Andrew Polsky raised the idea of awards for books and articles. There was general enthusiasm about this idea, and in particular about the suggestion an award be named after the late J. David Greenstone. Skocpol and the Council will develop a more specific proposal for discussion at next year's business meeting.

7) Discussion of possible section mini-courses, to be offered the day before the annual meeting opens. Participants suggested this would be a very good way for other members of the discipline to learn about our sub-field. Mini-courses would also raise money for the section.

8) Discussion of ideas for panels at next year's meeting. Several topics were proposed and will be passed on to Margaret Weir.

9) Discussion of the reviewing policies of the *American Political Science Review*. Concern was expressed that historically oriented submissions receive appropriate review and that the book reviews cover works of interest to the section.

History and Politics Section By-Laws

I. Purpose of the History and Politics Section

The Section has been founded to promote scholarship and teaching that conjoins politics and history. This conjunction embraces subject matter, methodology, epistemology, and theory.

Exemplary research objectives, which illustrate variations among these dimensions, include social science which turns to history to expand the number of cases of political phenomena; long-standing historical puzzles which offer foils for clarifying the explanatory power of particular theories; projects that seek the deep structure or broad contours of contemporary political problems, the developmental logic of institutions, and the comprehensive constitution of political life itself. This Section will engage competing epistemological attitudes. For instance, some members use history to further formal scientific goals of explanation while others see it as an appropriate context for different understandings of scientific approaches to politics, like interpretation.

The effects of such a conjunction will transcend the traditional categories of history and the conventional fields of political science. Debate about the fundamental dimensions of inquiry and approach which occasion the founding of this Section remains a continuing activity within it.

II. Membership of the Section

A. All members of the American Political Science Association are eligible for membership, including members of the national associations of cognate academic disciplines like the American Historical Association who join the APSA by special arrangement.

B. Membership in the Section is established by current payment of annual Section dues to the APSA. Dues will be set by the section Council.

III. Administration of the Section

A. Officers

The Section will be administered by a President, a Program Chair, a Newsletter Editor who also serves as Treasurer, and an eight-member Council.

(continued from last page)

1. **President.** Chairs the meeting of the Section at the annual meetings of the APSA; appoints Program Chair; appoints and chairs the nominating committee for Section officers; appoints officers to fill unexpired terms; administers policies of the Council or carries out other assignments requested by the Council; and performs other duties that are in the interest of the Section.

2. **Program Chair.** Organizes the meetings of the scholarly program of the Section in a manner that reflects the disciplinary diversity as well as the interdisciplinary character of the Section.

3. **Newsletter Editor.** Directs and produces the publications of the Section, as established by the Council. Maintains roster of members; administers mailings to the membership; manages income and disbursements, and keeps financial records, of the Section; prepares an annual report to the APSA.

4. **Council.** Represents the disciplinary diversity and interdisciplinary character of History and Politics; makes general thematic and administrative policy for the Section; approves the budget and plans for the financial needs of the Section.

5. For the single offices (i.e., President, Program Chair, and the Newsletter Editor), more than one person may jointly fill the position. In such cases, they must be nominated together for election. And in any instance where the officers of the Section make a collective decision, each office will have only one vote.

6. All section officers must be members of the section. However, one may join the section upon election as an officer.

B. Elections

1. The President of the Section shall organize a nominating committee composed of five members of the Section who represent diverse interests within the Section.

2. The nominating committee shall canvass the membership of the Section for names of candidates. It shall recommend to the membership a slate of candidates who are broadly representative of the Section. In deciding on the slate, it shall endeavor to include those people who have been proposed by any significant number of Section members.

3. A group of ten or more members of the Section may nominate additional candidates for office. Such a petition, including a statement of agreement of the candidate to stand for office, must be received by the President before the Section meeting.

4. For offices for which no petitions have been received, the nominating committee's proposals will be elected upon approval of a majority of those voting at the business meeting. The officers so elected at the annual meeting will take office at its close. For offices that are contested, a mail ballot will be conducted among the membership of the Section as soon as practicable after the annual meeting, with a deadline for the receipt of ballots specified. Elections to single offices will be by plurality; elections to the Council shall consist of the eight highest vote-getters.

5. The previous year's Council will resolve all electoral disputes.

6. For the election of the initial officers, a nominating committee composed of the transitional officers (namely, President, Newsletter Editor, and Treasurer) will propose a slate of candidates to the business meeting that approves the By-Laws. Additional candidates may be nominated at the meeting, provided the candidate is willing to stand. Election will be by majority of those voting at this meeting.

(continued on the next page)

Quote

A generic book review:

This is an OK book. Parts of it are pretty good. There are parts that could have been better. There are some parts that would have been much better if I had written them because I am really an expert while the author is just learning. You could read this book, if such things interest you, or not, if they don't. It's really up to you. Books these days aren't cheap, but this one is not overpriced by that much.

Tom Hodges, *The Independent Weekly*, Sept. 25, 1991, p. 3 (originally printed in the *Newspaper Research Journal*.)

(continued from last page)

C. Terms of Office

The term of the President shall be for one year; the Program Chair for one year; the Newsletter Editor for three years; the members of the Council for two years of equal classes on staggered terms—except that the initial election will be for equal classes of terms of two years and one year.

IV. Implementation of the By-Laws

The Section was officially established in 1990 on the basis of the relevant procedures of the APSA. The By-Laws will become effective upon a majority vote at a business meeting of the membership specially called for the purpose and held at the Annual Meeting of the APSA.

V. Amendments to the By-Laws

Amendments may be proposed by the Council, by a majority vote at the annual Section meeting, or by written petition by 25 members of the Section. Ratification of amendments will require either a majority vote of the annual Section meeting after a proposed amendment has been published in the Newsletter at least two months before the meeting or by mail ballot after a majority vote, held at an annual meeting, to submit a proposed amendment to the membership at large.

Roundtable:

The Uses and Abuses of History

William E. Leuchtenburg (Dept. of History, University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265)

In his introduction to *Idioms of Inquiry: Critique and Renewal in Political Science*, Terence Ball remarked that one of the besetting ailments of the field is “amnesia.” He went on to say, “Our amnesia arises from our foreshortened sense of history. We cut ourselves off from our own history in any number of ways.”

Ball had particularly in mind the notion that the history of political science could be divided into two eras, with “the first, and by far the longest...the Dark Age before behavioralism, in which” it is supposed, he wrote in parody,

“superstition reigned, statistics had not yet been invented, empirical questions were engaged in normative ones, and the state rewarded political inquirers by giving them hemlock instead of research grants.”

These comments came to the fore as I approached this afternoon’s panel, for I recall the time when I first started out, which does not seem so long ago to me but I guess was in the Dark Age, when it seemed altogether natural for political science to have a historical dimension. Overwhelmingly the most influential book of American history when I was a boy was *The Rise of American Civilization*, written by Charles Beard in collaboration with Mary Beard. But when I arrived as a freshman at Cornell in the fall of 1939, and signed up for Robert Cushman’s political science course, no one thought it at all surprising that the text assigned was *American Government and Politics*, also written by Charles Beard. Indeed, Beard himself, when he was on the Columbia faculty, was not compartmentalized in a single discipline but taught “history and politics.” (One thinks, too, of another scholar who found it perfectly natural to write a multi-volume work of history and also a classic of political science, Woodrow Wilson.)

When I went on to graduate school at Columbia, the line between history and political science seemed no more rigid. Though I majored in history at Cornell, I pursued an M.A. in International Administration (with Franz Neumann), only to cross over once again to history for the Ph.D. Yet, though I had opted for history, I was appointed, while I was still a graduate student, to the government department at Smith College where I spent a happy two years with Jack Peltason as my office mate, and as a member of a group of New England political scientists led by V. O. Key. From Smith’s government department I moved to Harvard’s history department, and then to the history department at Columbia, where I was to teach for the next thirty years, with no more sense of trauma than one would encounter in walking from one neighborhood to another.

I had hardly arrived at Columbia in 1952 when I was invited to join a faculty seminar. Its members included my colleague in history, Richard Hofstadter, but it was chaired by a political

(continued from last page)

scientist, David Truman, was attended by another young political scientist, Richard Neustadt, and was called significantly, *The State*. (Among its other members were, in those collegial days, the social psychologist, Herbert Hyman, and two sociologists, Daniel Bell and Seymour Lipset.) We met roughly every other week, and felt ourselves to be part of one community.

In the years since then historians and political scientists have increasingly drifted apart. For a multitude of reasons that you know better than I political scientists came to reject history for behavioral and other types of analysis—because history was perceived to be unscientific, impressionistic, anecdotal, among its many sins, or because the past was thought to be irrelevant to contemporary politics. Historians, in turn, even political historians, more and more found political science literature inaccessible, sometimes because a good many of them—I for one—never got beyond intermediate algebra.

To be sure, the rupture was never total. When in 1961 I was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, I gravitated instinctively to the outstanding group of political scientists who were there that year. Every day I joined them for mid-morning coffee, and I spent many an afternoon learning from Warren Miller how his findings and those of his colleagues could sharpen my own work in political history. In 1964 I started doing the presidential election analysis for NBC—for Huntley-Brinkley and then for John Chancellor—and when in 1965 I had the opportunity to spend a summer at the Survey Research Center at Ann Arbor, I seized upon it. It's true that if Warren Miller had been handing out grades, I probably would have flunked out, but at least I made an effort. There have been political scientists, too, who never abandoned the historical method. I think of Clement Vose who made excellent use of archival research and even more of James MacGregor Burns who continued, decade after decade, to write first-rate history. But that having been said, there is no denying that there has been a conspicuous parting of the ways.

Hence, I regard the creation of a History and Politics Section of this association as very good news indeed. To some, it will be seen as a bold

departure, and no doubt within the context of the recent experience of this association, and for a new generation, it is. But in another sense it re-establishes continuity with the world of scholarship as I first knew it when historians and political scientists shared a sense of community. I realize, of course, that this is not, in Yogi's immortal phrase, "deja vu all over again." Too much has happened, in the world, to return to a universe of almost invisible distinctions between at least some historians and political scientists that I initially encountered more than half a century ago. But I do find this quickened interest among political scientists in history inspiring.

Yet, ironically, at just the moment when a number of political scientists have been moving toward political history, historians have been moving away from it. In the most important survey of the field, Michael Kammen has written: "It seems fair to say that political history is no longer the focal point for historical scholarship," and another historian has observed, "In its recent assessment of the prospects and achievements of American history, *Reviews in American History* published no essay on the field of political history, an omission that probably escaped the notice of

(continued on the next page)

Call for Papers and Presenters

**New England Political Science Association
Annual Conference, Providence, Rhode
Island, April 3-4, 1992**

The New England Political Science Association encourages participation across a broad range of interests and disciplines in political science. The 1992 Annual Conference will feature "Meet the Author" roundtables, topical roundtables, and panels presenting scholarly research. The deadline for receipt of submissions for paper or panel proposals is December 15, 1991.

Please write directly to the Program Chair:
Prof. Eileen McDonagh, Dept. of Political
Science, Northeastern University, Boston, MA
02115, (617) 495-8140 or (617) 437-2796.

(continued from last page)

many readers, or if it did not, went unlamented." Little wonder then that when I gave my presidential address to the Organization of American History five years ago, I began by saying, "When someone tells you, as I am about to tell you, that the historian's next frontier is political history, there would appear to be only one sensible response: You have got to be kidding." Nonetheless, that was, in fact, the theme of my talk—that the neglect of political history was distorting our understanding of the past, and indeed of the present, and that there were rich intellectual rewards to be found in exploring the growth and nature of the State.

I would hope that any sensible political historian would acknowledge that much of the attention to social history has been salutary—that it has made us more aware of the lives of the people, notably women and minorities, who had gotten too little notice before. But I am no less persuaded that the neglect—at times even the abandonment—of political history has been impoverishing. In my presidential address to the American Historical Association in this December, I am planning, unrepentantly, to engage another aspect of this theme by examining "The Historian and the Public Realm"—an exploration of what the prospects are, both for good and ill, of efforts by historians to shape public policy.

Since giving my address to the OAH five years ago, I've had any number of communications from historians complaining that nothing has changed. At one recent history convention in this city, one historian, noting that almost none of the sessions was in political history, came up to me, and, alluding to my address, asked, "Wasn't anybody listening?"

Still, I do think there are signs of change. In particular, some of the most prominent social historians have been saying that the move away from political history has gone too far. Just this year, another former president of the OAH, Anne Firor Scott, a pioneer in the renaissance of women's history, wrote that "one of the weaknesses of most recent women's history is that in the enthusiasm for social history, politics has been all but forgotten. Historians are now beginning to recognize that there is no such

dichotomy in real life, and that while politics is more than government, government matters."

I find such words promising for the future of the historical profession. And I am cheered by the words of a political scientist like Thomas Ferguson who says, "I certainly don't think that historical modes of thought are the only ones. But...asking yourself, 'How does this develop over time?' is a tremendous antidote to thinking that you're somehow facing something that's totally unique." In sum, I am hopeful that the creation of a "History and Politics Section" in the APSA will not only be fruitful for political science but may renew the bonds between political science and history as I once knew them—that it will be possible, again to borrow a phrase from Terence Ball, for us to have a "conversation" again.

Martin Shefter (Dept. of Government, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853)

A knowledge of history is invaluable to political scientists. There are three major uses to which political scientists can put this knowledge. First, history provides a major source of data to political science. Let me provide a personal example of the significance of this data source. Last year I delivered a talk in which I argued that partisan division between the presidency and Congress is a major source of recent institutional conflicts in the United States, as in the Iran-contra investigation or the conflict between Congress and the Bush administration in 1990 over the budget and taxes. David Mayhew responded that such conflict was not a result of partisan division but was a characteristic feature of American politics, and he cited conflicts between the Rules Committee and the president when both institutions were controlled by the same party during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. I responded that legislative-executive conflict is more pervasive and serious today—when Congress seeks to destroy the president, as it did during the Watergate investigation—than it was in the 1930s and 1940s. Immediately we each started citing historical examples to support our respective arguments. Here was a clear case of an argument in political science turning on data drawn from history. So this

(continued from last page)

is an indication of the first major use of history to political scientists.

In some cases, the most comparable period to the present is not the immediate past, but an earlier historical period. For example, during the next episode of political realignment in the United States, the Lincoln and Roosevelt presidencies will be more comparable to the situation faced by the incumbent president than the Bush presidency will be. If one wants to discern the range of possibilities the incumbent president faces in his or her efforts to lead Congress it will be more useful to explore the records of the Lincoln or Roosevelt administration—the legislative accomplishments of the Civil War and New Deal Congresses—than the legislative record of the Bush presidency.

A third major use of history is to provide information on the origins of contemporary patterns of political behavior. If one wants to learn how the national government established its supremacy relative to state and local governments, it is important to look at the 1860s. Similarly, to explain how labor acquired the political position it occupies today, one must look at the 1930s. And the explanation for the particularities of what became institutionalized often is a matter of historical detail. To know why labor has come to exercise the particular magnitude of power it exercises within the Democratic party—less influence than unions have within the British Labour party but more than they have within the American GOP—it is necessary to explore the particularities of the relationship established by Roosevelt and Sidney Hillman, and to recognize that Hillman's being a Jewish labor leader from New York affected the extent of the influence he acquired. On the one hand, Hillman's influence was enhanced by the balance-of-power role New York's American Labor Party played in the largest American state. On the other hand, Roosevelt had to worry about being seen as being politically dependent upon a Jewish labor manipulator, as he was depicted by Walter Winchell when he quoted the president as saying "Clear it with Sidney." And the triumph of the national government in the 1860s was a consequence of the military skills that happened to be possessed by Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan and the fact that the national government

was supported by the more heavily industrialized section of the country.

These, then, are three uses of history to political scientists. What are some ways in which history can be misused—or abused—by our profession? The most obvious way is when political scientists draw data or examples from the past but forget the historical or social context within which those events occurred, the context that helps explain those events and that made them meaningful to the actors involved in them. For example, Jefferson's advocacy of democracy is explained by the fact that he spoke for agrarian interests at a time when a majority of Americans were farmers and by the fact that his opponents, the Federalists, were notorious opponents of democracy. The democracy he advocated was not inconsistent with substantial inequality among the people or with the institution of slavery. To rip his speeches and writings from this context and to attach modern understandings to his words is to be seriously misleading. Any discussion of Jeffersonian constitutionalism must take account of the context within which it emerged if it is not to be seriously misleading.

Another mistake in political analysis that does not so much abuse history as reflect an inadequate understanding of it is the failure to recognize how substantially patterns of political behavior or political institutions have changed over time. For example, any discussion of the near-unanimity of opposition among black public officials and organizations to the nomination of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court that regarded this opposition as natural would suffer from a failure to recognize that the association of blacks with liberalism and the Democratic party goes back only to the 1930s. From the 1860s through the 1920s blacks were associated with the party of business, and hence the unanimity of official black opposition to Thomas presumably is a consequence of the factors that brought about this substantial change in the political loyalties and ideology of blacks. So the explanation for this contemporary political event is partly historical and any explanation that fails to recognize this is deficient.

In conclusion, history presents political scientists with a source of data, with a pool of comparisons and contrasts to recent events, and

(continued from last page)

with explanations of the origins of contemporary patterns of political behavior. A shallow knowledge of history leads some of our colleagues to rip quotations from the context that makes political thought meaningful and others to offer misleading interpretations of current events. It is for these reasons that knowing some history is as crucial for Americanists as learning a foreign language is for comparativists. Though an obligation, this is by no means an unpleasant responsibility. It is far more enjoyable to read political history than it is to memorize irregular verbs.

Conference Announcement

THE DYNAMICS OF AMERICAN POLITICS: APPROACHES AND INTERPRETATIONS. A Conference to be Held in the Center for the Study of American Politics and the Department of Political Science, University of Colorado, Boulder. February 20-22, 1992. Co-Convenors: Larry Dodd and Cal Jillson (Dept. of Political Science, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309; Phone: 303-492-7871).

The study of American politics has changed dramatically over the past several decades. Scholars have turned from a static interpretation of American politics, focused heavily on immediate contemporary events, to a dynamic perspective that seeks to understand politics in terms of the broad historical dynamics at play in American life. With an increasingly dynamic perspective has come a second development, a more self-conscious focus on different levels and types of political explanation.

Clearly, in light of these developments, there is a need for mutual awareness and greater dialogue among adherents of the differing approaches and interpretations. The purpose of this conference is to facilitate such awareness and dialogue. It will do so by bringing together adherents of the key perspectives over two and a half days to exchange and discuss papers on the contribution of their orientations to an understanding of American political development. Out of the conference will come a book pulling the papers together so that

they can help generate and inform dialogue in the profession at large. The book will be published in Dodd's series, "Transforming American Politics," at Westview Press.

The following will be presenting papers:

Aldrich, John (Duke)
Beck, Paul (Ohio State) and Bob Huckfeldt (Indiana)
Brady, David W. (Stanford) and Elaine K. Swift (UNC-Chapel Hill)
Burnham, Walter Dean (UT-Austin)
Carmines, Ted (Indiana)
Dodd, Larry (U. Colorado, Boulder)
Edelman, Murray (U. Wis.-Madison)
Ferguson, Tom (U. Mass.-Boston)
Gray, Virginia (Minnesota)
Greenberg, Ed (U. Colorado-Boulder)
Hanson, Russell (Indiana)
Hero, Rodney (U. Colorado-Boulder)
Jillson, Cal (U. Colorado-Boulder)
Kingdon, John (Michigan)
Lowi, Theodore (Cornell)
Mansbridge, Jane (Northwestern)
Mayhew, David (Yale)
Riker, William (Rochester)
Rockman, Bert (Pittsburgh)
Shafer, Byron (Oxford)
Shefter, Martin (Cornell)
Skocpol, Theda (Harvard)
Skowronek, Steve (Yale) and Karen Orren (UCLA)
Steinmo, Sven (U. Colorado-Boulder)
Stone, Clarence (Maryland)
Stone, Walt (U. Colorado-Boulder)

Several scholars will critique these works and lead discussion. They are:

Joseph Cooper (Hopkins)
Linda Fowler (Syracuse)
Hugh Heclo (George Mason)
Jane Mansbridge (Northwestern)
Manning Marable (U. Colorado-Boulder)
Karen Orren (UCLA)
Nelson Polsby (UC-Berkeley)
Paul Quirk (U. Illinois-Chicago Circle)
Steve Smith (Minnesota)
Charles Stewart (MIT)

(continued from last page)

For information on attending this conference, please contact either Cal Jillson or Larry Dodd.

New Books

Davidson, Chandler. *Race and Class in Texas Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990. 344 pp. \$24.99.

V. O. Key, in *Southern Politics*, described Texas in the late 1940s as perhaps the most advanced of the southern states in its potential for developing a two-party system, putting the politics of race aside, and embarking on a course in which a politics of economics would transform the state.

This book, written by a political sociologist, tests Key's dynamic model by following Texas's development from the 1940s through the 1980s. The key actors are the liberal and conservative factions of the Democratic party, the state's three major ethnic groups—blacks, Mexican Americans, and Anglos—the upper class and the “have nots,” the radical right of the 1950s and 1960s and the religious right of the 1980s, and the emerging Republicans.

The central story tells of the unraveling of the New Deal coalition, made up primarily of working-class whites, blacks, and Mexican Americans. This collapse was closely connected with the enfranchisement of minority voters and the Second Reconstruction, followed by the Republicans' adept use of the “southern strategy,” beginning in 1964 and continuing to the present, to appeal to whites unhappy with the civil rights movement. The Republican right, often allied with the upper class and key religious fundamentalists, was able to move the Texas party far to the right of what progressive advocates of realignment in the 1940s had imagined modern southern Republicanism might look like.

While several important aspects of Key's model apply to Texas politics, the realignment that he believed had a good chance of occurring was just the opposite of the kind that actually occurred. Rather than a two-party system based on class issues and redistribution of life chances favoring the have-nots, the realignment, particularly at the

presidential level, is now firmly based on racial polarization.

Gamm, Gerald H. *The Making of New Deal Democrats: Voting Behavior and Realignment in Boston, 1920–1940*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. 278 pp. Hardback, \$24.00. Paperback, \$15.95.

An understanding of the electoral foundations of the New Deal realignment is crucial both to analyzing the political upheaval of the 1930s and to assessing the value of the realignment concept. Examined here are the timing of electoral decisions, the linkages between the votes cast for national and local political offices, the relationships between those voting patterns and patterns of partisan registration, and the relative importance of voter conversion and the mobilization of new voters to the emergence of a Democratic majority. What results is a book that looks to voting behavior to understand realignment.

At the book's heart are the decisions made by Boston voters over the twenty years between 1920 and 1940. Employing sources as diverse as settlement house studies, census data, and street directories, this book arranges voters into clusters of ethnically and socioeconomically homogeneous precincts in order to gain insight into probable individual behavior. Five ethnic groups are included: Jews, Italians, African Americans, Yankees, and Irish. Registration and voting statistics are further divided along gender and class lines. Drawing on this data, the book describes how the decisions of individuals collectively effected vast systemic change.

One overarching finding of *The Making of New Deal Democrats* is the intricacy and detail of the electoral upheaval that took place in the 1920s and 1930s. The concept of party realignment emerged in the 1950s as an attempt by scholars to place the upheaval of the 1930s in a coherent framework. Yet, as this book demonstrates, realignment theory fails to characterize accurately the electoral changes of the era. What Gamm finds is a series of small realignments compressed in time, rather than any massive, single realignment. The book argues that these partisan shifts of the 1930s are

(continued from last page)

qualitatively indistinguishable from shifts that occurred in the electorate earlier in this century, and in the decades since the New Deal era.

Goldstone, Jack A. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991. 608 pp. \$34.95.

Why did the major revolutions and rebellions of European history cluster in two distinct periods, 1618-1660 and 1789-1848, with roughly a century of stability in between? Even more puzzling, why did these periods of European turmoil coincide closely with the great revolutions and rebellions of the Ottoman Empire and Imperial China, such as the Celali and Janissary revolts that toppled the Sultan (1600-1648), the fall of the Ming dynasty (1644), and the Taiping Rebellion (1850)? Goldstone tackles these questions and more in a broad survey of the causes and process of revolution and rebellion from England in the 1640s to China in the 1850s.

The key to understanding the timing of political instability in these centuries is the response of economic and political institutions to ecological pressures. All across Eurasia, population rose strongly in the 16th and early 17th centuries, fell and stabilized in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, and then rose rapidly again from the mid-18th century to the mid-19th century. In the agrarian-bureaucratic states of the early modern era, when population grew more rapidly than food output, prices rose. This put pressure on states, whose tax revenues tended to be fixed for long periods, and opened up both new possibilities and new pressures for elites. The result was contention over taxes, and heightened intra-elite competition and conflict. At the same time, real wages fell, the size of youth cohorts increased, and urban populations grew, increasing the likelihood that restive elites could mobilize popular groups for political contention. The result was that periods of sustained population growth tended to culminate in revolutions and rebellions. By contrast, periods of stable population were accompanied by stable or declining prices, which meant gains in real income

for states; relatively low mobility and tensions among elites; and stable or rising real wages among the populace. As a result, periods of population stability tended to also be politically stable.

This model is further developed with quantitative graphing and time-series tests of key relationships, and attention to regional differences and patterns of conflict. Two concluding chapters focus on the role of culture and ideology in guiding the process of revolution, and on implications for understanding modern revolutions and the ability of the U.S. to absorb its own "baby boom" generation.

Morone, James. *The Democratic Wish: Popular Participation and the Limits of American Government*. New York: Basic Books, 1990. 402 pp. \$22.95

"At the heart of American politics," writes James Morone, "lies a dread and a yearning." The "dread" is the bias against public action that is embedded in American institutions; the "yearning" is a recurring struggle for direct democracy. Morone argues that Americans have overcome their anti-statist bias through great populist movements. Repeatedly, efforts to empower the people have—ironically, unexpectedly—built up the American state.

Morone traces America's ironic state building through the Revolutionary and Constitutional period, the Jacksonian era, the Progressive reforms, and the New Deal. It then suggests that the same dialectic that built up the American state illuminates some of its most contested reforms—the politics of class (in the 1930s), race (in the 1950s and 1960s), and even health care (in the 1970s). While each historical moment is unique, Morone argues that a common thread runs through American political development: the search for direct democracy facilitates the growth of public power while reinforcing its weak and fractured nature.

The Democratic Wish won the APSA's 1991 Gladys M. Kammerer award for the best political science publication in the field of U.S. national policy.

Ritchie, Donald A. *Press Gallery: Congress and the Washington Correspondents*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991. 293 pp. \$29.95.

If journalism is the first rough draft of history, how much do we know about the journalists who made that draft? This study examines the evolution of Washington correspondence from 1800 to 1932, years when Congress rather than the presidency held the advantage in press attention. Throughout the nineteenth century, the White House was such a poor source that no newspaper bothered to station reporters there, sending them by at random to collect information as needed. By contrast, both the Senate and House provided press galleries, from which the correspondents daily viewed the proceedings and telegraphed dispatches to their papers.

Correspondents regularly wrote under pseudonyms, in part to protect themselves from retaliation. *Press Gallery* lifts their anonymity and reveals the lives and experiences of individual reporters, particularly their relations with the politicians they covered. Political patronage, lobbying, leaks, and exposes are among the many issues surveyed. After a series of scandals reduced relations between politicians and the press to their nadir, journalists created the Standing Committee of Correspondents, through which they took over regulation of press gallery accreditation. Their rules not only eliminated lobbyists from the press gallery but also barred the doors to women reporters for decades after. Despite recurring clashes between Congress and the press, the book concludes that the relationship between Washington correspondents and members of Congress was far more collaborative than adversarial.

Shafer, Byron E., ed. *The End of Realignment? Interpreting American Electoral Eras*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991. 187 pp. Hardback, \$30.00. Paperback, \$12.95.

In a set of unusually well-integrated essays, the authors address the realignment framework for the analysis of contemporary American politics and the realignment synthesis for the organization of American history. In the resulting—stiff—debate:

Joel H. Silbey argues that electoral realignments are not useful for carving American history into grand political eras; Everett Carl Ladd argues that the structural preconditions for a realignment have disappeared in our time; and Byron E. Shafer addresses the question, “If not realignment, then what?” through a framework centered on the notion of an “electoral order.” Samuel T. McSeveney follows with a general overview of this debate, suggesting that the first three authors are at least overstated in historical terms. Walter Dean Burnham argues that Silbey, Ladd, and Shafer are wrong. They are most especially wrong in contemporary terms. Harold F. Bass, Jr., closes with a short bibliographical essay and a lengthy bibliography on realignment and its alternatives.

Silbey, Joel H. *The American Political Nation, 1838–1893*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991. 363 pp. \$35.00.

This book is rooted in Silbey’s criticism and reformulation of critical realignment theory, and in his previous work in the history of political parties in the middle of the nineteenth century. He argues that a distinct, partisanly defined and structured era, one unlike any other period of American political history, characterized the years between the two sets of off-year elections that bound the period. The bulk of the book is a description of the different elements that defined the political era, from party operations, popular and legislative voting, to political culture, policy-making and the role played by the state and an analysis of how these elements came together and interacted to form this discrete era. Silbey draws on the scholarship of political scientists and the new political historians as well as his own research in nineteenth century politics in order to make his case.

Call for Book Manuscripts

American Politics: Historical, International and Comparative Perspectives. A Series of Books. Edited by Ira Katznelson (New School), Martin Shefter (Cornell University), and Theda Skocpol (Harvard University).

Princeton University Press is pleased to announce a new series devoted to books that treat American politics in historical, international, and comparative perspective. The project aims to give some of the best work in this genre a common home. The series will be inclusive with respect to method. All the volumes, however, will share a taste for history in an analytical vein and the goal of illuminating American politics with a developmental and institutionalist outlook. The editors are particularly eager to encourage the publication of manuscripts characterized by one or more of the following features:

Cross-National Comparison. The series will publish work that situates and explains American patterns in comparative frames of reference with various levels of ambition and scale.

Comparisons Within the United States. As a country with continental scope, significant regional differences, a federal political system, and more than two centuries of history, the United States invites scholarship that treats similarities and differences across places, issues, and times.

Connections to Formal and Normative Theories. The series is keen to traverse the familiar divide between theory and empirical research by promoting works that treat such subjects as democracy, identity formation, political culture, and markets.

Links Between Social History and Institutional Analysis. Social history and political studies frequently are studied as separate domains; the series will promote the joining of analyses of social and political structures.

Policy Analysis. If most studies of public policy have short time horizons, and most historical studies of policy decisions start and stop in the past, emergent work is utilizing historical analysis to illuminate contemporary policy choices.

International and Domestic Ties. The series will seek manuscripts that analyze the impact of international economic, geo-political, military, and cultural processes on the development of American institutions and politics.

Authors interested in having their work considered for publication in *American Politics* or who wish to make preliminary inquiries should contact any one of the editors or Walter Lippincott, Director.

Journal Scan

We scanned historically oriented articles in the following journals: *American Historical Review*; *American Journal of Political Science*; *American Journal of Sociology*; *American Political Science Review*; *American Politics Quarterly*; *American Scholar*; *American Sociological Review*; *British Journal of Political Science*; *Comparative Studies in Society and History*; *Diplomatic History*; *Historical Methods*; *International Organization*; *Journal of African History*; *Journal of American History*; *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*; *Journal of Policy History*; *Journal of Politics*; *Journal of Urban History*; *Journalism Quarterly*; *Labor History*; *New Left Review*; *Political Science Quarterly*; *Politics & Society*; *Polity*; *Public Interest*; *Radical History Review*; *Representations*; *Social Science History*; *Studies in American Political Development*; *Theory and Society*; *Western Political Quarterly*; *Women and Politics*; and *World Politics*. Due to space limitations, book reviews and review essays are not included in the scan. For this issue of the newsletter, we scanned issues of those journals published between February and August 1991 that were available at nearby libraries. We have also included some earlier listings for journals that were unavailable to us at the time of our last issue.

American Historical Review:

R. B. Goheen, "Peasant Politics? Village Community and the Crown in Fifteenth-Century England," 96 (Feb. 1991):42-62.

Steven J. Ross, "Struggles for the Screen: Workers, Radicals, and the Political Uses of Silent Film," 96 (Apr. 1991):333-367.

Melissa L. Meyer, "'We Can Not Get a Living as We Used To': Dispossession and the White Earth Anishinaabeg, 1889-1920," 96 (Apr. 1991):368-394.

Seymour Drescher, "British Way, French Way: Opinion Building and Revolution in the Second French Slave Emancipation," 96 (June 1991):709-734.

Stuart B. Schwartz, "The Voyage of the Vassals: Royal Power, Noble Obligations, and Merchant Capital before the Portuguese Restoration of Independence, 1624-1640," 96 (June 1991):735-762.

Steven L. Hoch, "The Banking Crisis, Peasant Reform, and Economic Development in Russia, 1857-1861," 96 (June 1991):795-820.

American Journal of Political Science:

Thomas M. Holbrook, "Presidential Elections in Space and Time," 35 (Feb. 1991):91-109.

C. Neal Tate and Roger Handberg, "Time Binding and Theory Building in Personal Attribute Models of Supreme Court Voting Behavior, 1916-88," 35 (May 1991):460-480.

Terry Sullivan, "The Bank Account Presidency: A New Measure and Evidence on the Temporal Path of Presidential Influence," 35 (Aug. 1991):686-723.

George C. Edwards III, "Response to Sullivan's 'The Bank Account Presidency: A New Measure and Evidence on the Temporal Path of Presidential Influence': Presidential Influence in Congress: If We Ask the Wrong Questions, We Get the Wrong Answers," 35 (Aug. 1991):724-729.

Terry Sullivan, "Rejoinder to Edwards's 'Presidential Influence in Congress: If We Ask the Wrong Questions, We Get the Wrong Answers': Wrong Questions, 0-Questions, Legitimate Questions, Reasoned Answers: Affirming the Study of Temporal Path," 35 (Aug. 1991):730-737.

American Journal of Sociology:

Don Sherman Grant II and Michael Wallace, "Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?" 96 (Mar. 1991):1117-1150.

Judith Stepan-Norris and Maurice Zeitlin, "'Red' Unions and Bourgeois' Contracts?" 96 (Mar. 1991):1151-1200.

Edgar Kiser and Michael Hechter, "The Role of General Theory in Comparative-historical Sociology," 97 (July 1991):1-30.

Bruce G. Carruthers and Wendy Nelson Espeland, "Accounting for Rationality: Double-Entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality," 97 (July 1991):31-69.

David Kowalewski, "Core Intervention and Periphery Revolution, 1821-1985," 97 (July 1991):70-95.

Duane F. Alwin and Jon A. Krosnick, "Aging, Cohorts, and the Stability of Sociopolitical Orientations over the Life Span," 97 (July 1991):169-195.

American Political Science Review:

Judith N. Shklar, "Redeeming American Political Theory," 85 (Mar. 1991):3-15.

Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey, "Lobbying for Free Trade in 19th-Century Britain: To Concentrate or Not," 85 (Mar. 1991):37-58.

Timothy Mitchell, "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics," 85 (Mar. 1991):77-96.

B. Honig, "Declarations of Independence: Arendt and Derrida on the Problem of Founding a Republic," 85 (Mar. 1991):97-113.

Barbara Geddes, "A Game Theoretic Model of Reform in Latin American Democracies," 85 (June 1991):371-392.

John R. Hibbing, "Contours of the Modern Congressional Career," 85 (June 1991):405-428.

Ted Hopf, "Polarity, the Offense-Defense Balance, and War," 85 (June 1991):475-493.

R. Michael Alvarez, Geoffrey Garrett and Peter Lange, "Government Partisanship, Labor Organization, and Macroeconomic Performance," 85 (June 1991):539-556.

Warren E. Miller, "Party Identification, Realignment, and Party Voting: Back to the Basics," 85 (June 1991):557-568.

American Politics Quarterly:

Lee Sigelman and David Bullock, "Candidates, Issues, Horse Races, and Hoopla: Presidential Campaign Coverage, 1888-1988," 19 (Jan. 1991):5-32.

Harold W. Stanley and Richard G. Niemi, "Partisanship and Group Support, 1952-1988," 19 (Apr. 1991):189-210.

Donald Gross and David Breaux, "Historical Trends in U.S. Senate Elections, 1912-1988," 19 (July 1991):284-309.

Samuel B. Hoff, "Saying No: Presidential Support and Veto Use, 1889-1989," 19 (July 1991):310-323.

American Scholar:

W. R. Connor, "Why Were We Surprised?" (Spring 1991):175-184.

American Sociological Review:

Michael Burawoy, "Marxism as Science: Historical Challenges and Theoretical Growth," 55 (Dec. 1990):775-793.

David Strang, "From Dependency to Sovereignty: An Event History Analysis of Decolonization, 1870-1987," 55 (Dec. 1990):846-860.

J. Craig Jenkins and Augustine J. Kposowa, "Explaining Military Coups d'État: Black Africa, 1957-1984," 55 (Dec. 1990):861-875.

George Steinmetz, "The Local Welfare State: Two Strategies for Social Domination in Urban Imperial Germany," 55 (Dec. 1990):911-911.

Nancy S. Landale and Stewart E. Tolnay, "Group Differences in Economic Opportunity and the Timing of Marriage: Blacks and Whites in the Rural South, 1910," 56 (Feb. 1991):33-45.

Aaron Benavot, Yun-Kyung Cha, David Kamens, John W. Meyer, and Suk-Ying Wong, "Knowledge for the Masses: World Models and National Curricula, 1920-1986," 56 (Feb. 1991):95-100.

Edwin Amenta and Sunita Parikh, "Capitalists Did Not Want the Social Security Act: A Critique of the 'Capitalist Dominance' Thesis,"; and J. Craig Jenkins and Barbara Brents, "Reply: Capitalists and Social Security: What Did They Really Want?" 56 (Feb. 1991):124-131.

Jess Gilbert and Carolyn Howe, "Beyond 'State vs. Society': Theories of the State and New Deal Agricultural Policies," 56 (Apr. 1991):204-220.

Barry Schwartz, "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," 56 (Apr. 1991):221-236.

Edwin Amenta and Yvonne Zylan, "It Happened Here: Political Opportunity, the New Institutionalism, and the Towns and Movement," 56 (Apr. 1991):250-265.

Bruce Western, "A Comparative Study of Corporatist Development," 56 (June 1991):283-294.

Susan Olzak and Elizabeth West, "Ethnic Conflict and the Rise and Fall of Ethnic Newspapers," 56 (Aug. 1991):458-474.

Greg J. Duncan and Willard Rodgers, "Has Children's Poverty Become More Persistent?" 56 (Aug. 1991):538-550.

British Journal of Political Science:

David W. Brady and Bernard Grofman, "Sectional Differences in Partisan Bias and Electoral Responsiveness in US House Elections, 1850-1980," 21 (Apr. 1991):247-256.

Andrew S. McFarland, "Interest Groups and Political Time: Cycles in America," 21 (July 1991):257-284.

Grzegorz Ekiert, "Democratic Processes in East Central Europe: A Theoretical Reconsideration," 21 (July 1991):285-313.

Walter Korpi, "Political and Economic Explanations for Unemployment: A Cross-National and Long-Term Analysis," 21 (July 1991):315-348.

Comparative Studies in Society and History:

Christopher Merrett and Roger Gravil, "Comparing Human Rights: South Africa and Argentina, 1976-1989," 33 (Apr. 1991):255-287.

Fernando Coronil and Julie Skurski, "Dismembering and Remembering the Nation: The Semantics of Political Violence in Venezuela," 33 (Apr. 1991):288-337.

Hilton L. Root, "The Redistributive Role of Government: Economic Regulation in Old Régime France and England," 33 (Apr. 1991):338-369.

Jennifer Alexander and Paul Alexander, "Protecting Peasants from Capitalism: The Subordination of Javanese Traders by the Colonial State," 33 (Apr. 1991):370-394.

Ricardo Godoy, "The Evolution of Common-Field Agriculture in the Andes: A Hypothesis," 33 (Apr. 1991):395-414.

Germaine A. Hoston, "Conceptualizing Bourgeois Revolution: The Prewar Japanese Left and the Meiji Restoration," 33 (July 1991):539-581.

Diplomatic History:

Beth McKillen, "The Corporatist Model, World War I, and the Public Debate over the League of Nations," 15 (Spring 1991):171-197.

Alex Danchev, "Taking the Pledge: Oliver Franks and the Negotiation of the North Atlantic Treaty," 15 (Spring 1991):199-219.

Tor Egil Førland, "'Selling Firearms to the Indians': Eisenhower's Export Control Policy, 1953-54," 15 (Spring 1991):221-244.

Robert D. Schulzinger, "Complaints, Self-justifications, and Analysis: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations since 1969," 15 (Spring 1991):245-264.

Bruce J. Evensen, "A Story of 'Ineptness': The Truman Administration's Struggle to Shape Conventional Wisdom on Palestine at the Beginning of the Cold War," 15 (Summer 1991):339-359.

Jerald A. Combs, "The Compromise That Never Was: George Kennan, Paul Nitze, and the Issue of Conventional Deterrence in Europe, 1949-1952," 15 (Summer 1991):361-386.

Jonathan E. Helmreich, "The United States and the Formation of EURATOM," 15 (Summer 1991):387-410.

Rosemary Foot, "Making Known the Unknown War: Policy Analysis of the Korean Conflict in the Last Decade," 15 (Summer 1991):411-431.

Historical Methods:

Catrien C. J. H. Bijleveld and Eric H. Monkkonen, "The Dynamics of Police Behavior: A Data Reanalysis," 24 (Winter 1991):16-24.

Haia Shpayer-Makov, "Measuring Labor Turnover in Historical Research," 24 (Winter 1991):25-34.

Susan B. Carter, Roger L. Ransom, and Richard Sutch, "The Historical Labor Statistics Project at the University of California," 24 (Spring 1991):52-65.

W. Phillips Shively, "A General Extension of the Method of Bounds, with Special Application to Studies of Electoral Transition," 24 (Spring 1991):81-94.

International Organization:

David Strang, "Anomaly and commonplace in European political expansion: realist and institutional accounts," 45 (Spring 1991):143-162.

Robert Mark Spaulding, Jr., "German trade policy in Eastern Europe, 1890-1990: preconditions for applying international trade leverage," 45 (Summer 1991):343-368.

Michael N. Barnett and Jack S. Levy, "Domestic sources of alliances and alignments: the case of Egypt, 1962-73," 45 (Summer 1991):369-395.

Journal of African History:

John K. Thornton, "Legitimacy and Political Power: Queen Njinga, 1624-1663," 32 (1991):25-40.

William Beinart, "Transkeian Migrant Workers and Youth Labour on the Natal Sugar Estates, 1918-1948," 32 (1991):41-63.

Humphrey J. Fisher, "Slavery and Seclusion in Northern Nigeria: A Further Note," 32 (1991):123-135.

Journal of American History:

Michael Wayne, "An Old South Morality Play: Reconsidering the Social Underpinnings of the Proslavery Ideology," 77 (Dec. 1990):838-863.

Michael McGerr, "Political Style and Women's Power, 1830-1930," 77 (Dec. 1990):864-885.

Pete Daniel, "Going among Strangers: Southern Reactions to World War II," 77 (Dec. 1990):886-911.

James C. Cobb, "'Somebody Done Nailed Us on the Cross': Federal Farm and Welfare Policy and the Civil Rights Movement in the Mississippi Delta," 77 (Dec. 1990):912-936.

Daniel Walker Howe, "The Evangelical Movement and Political Culture in the North during the Second Party System," 77 (Mar. 1991):1216-1239.

Leslie J. Reagan, "'About to Meet Her Maker': Women, Doctors, Dying Declarations, and the State's Investigation of Abortion, Chicago, 1867-1940," 77 (Mar. 1991):1240-1264.

Mark H. Leff, "The Politics of Sacrifice on the American Home Front in World War II," 77 (Mar. 1991):1296-1318.

Jonathan Prude, "To Look upon the 'Lower Sort': Runaway Ads and the Appearance of Unfree Laborers in America, 1750-1800," 78 (June 1991):124-159.

Richard P. Adelstein, "'The Nation as an Economic Unit': Keynes, Roosevelt, and the Managerial Ideal," 78 (June 1991):160-187.

Joan C. Zimmerman, "The Jurisprudence of Equality: The Women's Minimum Wage, the First Equal Rights Amendment, and *Adkins v. Children's Hospital*, 1905-1923," 78 (June 1991):188-225.

Journal of Interdisciplinary History:

Francisco Vidal Luna and Herbert S. Klein, "Slaves and Masters in Early Nineteenth-Century Brazil: São Paulo," 21 (Spring 1991):549-573.

Claudio Cioffi-Revilla, "The Long-Range Analysis of War," 21 (Spring 1991):603-629.

Avner Ben-Amos, "The Sacred Center of Power: Paris and Republican State Funerals," 22 (Summer 1991):27-48.

Roy A. Church, Quentin Outram, and David N. Smith, "The Militancy of British Miners, 1893-1986: Interdisciplinary Problems and Perspectives," 22 (Summer 1991):49-66.

Journal of Policy History:

Guy Alchon, "Mary Van Kleeck and Social-Economic Planning," 3 (1991):1-23.

Michael S. Mayer, "The Eisenhower Administration and the Desegregation of Washington, D.C.," 3 (1991):24-41.

Jeffrey E. Cohen, "The Telephone Problem and the Road to Telephone Regulation in the United States, 1876-1917," 3 (1991):42-69.

Steven Noll, "Southern Strategies for Handling the Black Feeble-minded: From Social Control to Profound Indifference," 3 (1991):130-151.

Niels Ijjerre-Poulsen, "The Heritage Foundation: A Second-Generation Think Tank," 3 (1991):152-172.

George Horwich and David J. Bjornstad, "Spending and Manpower in Four U.S. Mobilizations: A Macro/Policy Perspective," 3 (1991):173-202.

Samuel P. Hays, "The New Environmental West," 3 (1991):223-248.

Ann Crloff, "Gender in Early U.S. Social Policy," 3 (1991):249-281.

Martin Reuss, "Engineers, Science, and the Public Interest: Water Resources Planning in the Atchafalaya Basin," 3 (1991):282-308.

Susan Menenbaum, "The Progressive Legacy and the Public Corporation: Entrepreneurship and Public Virtue," 3 (1991):309-330.

Journal of Politics:

Jean Yarbrough, "Race and the Moral Foundation of the American Republic: Another Look at the Declaration and the *Notes on Virginia*," 53 (Feb. 1991):90-105.

Michael S. Lewis-Beck and Peverill Squire, "The Transformation of the American State: The New Era-New Deal Test," 53 (Feb. 1991):106-121.

John G. Geer, "Critical Realignments and the Public Opinion Poll," 53 (May 1991):434-453.

James E. Campbell, "The Presidential Surge and its Midterm Decline in Congressional Elections, 1868-1988," 53 (May 1991):477-487.

Kenny J. Whitby and Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr., "A Longitudinal Analysis of Competing Explanations for the Transformation of Southern Congressional Politics," 53 (May 1991):504-518.

Thomas J. Volgy and John E. Schwarz, "Does Politics Stop at the Water's Edge? Domestic Political Factors and Foreign Policy Restructuring in the Cases of Great Britain, France, and West Germany," 53 (Aug. 1991):615-643.

Joshua Mitchell, "Luther and Hobbes on the Question: Who Was Moses, Who Was Christ?" 53 (Aug. 1991):676-700.

Paul Allen Beck and M. Kent Jennings, "Family Traditions, Political Periods, and the Development of Partisan Orientation," 53 (Aug. 1991):742-763.

Journal of Urban History:

Robert Lewis, "The Segregated City: Class Residential Patterns and the Development of Industrial Districts in Montreal, 1861 and 1901," 17 (Feb. 1991):123-152.

John B. Jentz, "Class and Politics in an Emerging Industrial City: Chicago in the 1860s and 1870s," 17 (May 1991):227-263.

John F. Bauman, Norman P. Hummon, and Edward K. Muller, "Public Housing, Isolation, and the Urban Underclass: Philadelphia's Richard Allen Homes, 1941-1965," 17 (May 1991):264-292.

Leonard Wallock, "The Myth of the Master Builder: Robert Moses, New York, and the Dynamics of Metropolitan Development Since World War II," 17 (Aug. 1991):339-362.

William B. Thomas and Kevin J. Moran, "The Politicization of Efficiency Concepts in the Progressive Period, 1918-1922," 17 (Aug. 1991):390-409.

Journalism Quarterly:

Susan Herbst, "Assessing Public Opinion in the 1930s and 1940s: Retrospective Views of Journalists," 67 (Winter 1990):943-949.

Kathleen L. Endres, "National Security Benchmark: Truman, Executive Order 10290 and the Press," 67 (Winter 1990):1071-1077.

Summer E. Stevens and Owen V. Johnson, "From Black Politics to Black Community: Harry C. Smith and the *Cleveland Gazette*," 67 (Winter 1990):1090-1102.

Labor History:

Howard Kimeldorf, "Bringing Unions Back In (Or Why We Need a New Old Labor History)," 32 (Winter 1991):91-103.

Michael Kazin, Alice Kessler-Harris, David Montgomery, Bruce Nelson, and Daniel Nelson, "The Limits of Union-Centered History: Responses to Kimeldorf," 32 (Winter 1991):104-127.

Howard Kimeldorf, "Reply to Comments," 32 (Winter 1991):128-129.

Julia Greene, "'The Strike At The Ballot Box': The American Federation of Labor's Entrance Into Election Politics, 1906-1909," 32 (Spring 1991):165-192.

Kathryn J. Oberdeck, "'Not Pink Teas': The Seattle Working Class Women's Movement, 1905-1918," 32 (Spring 1991):193-230.

Eileen Boris, "Tenement Homework On Army Uniforms: The Gendering of Industrial Democracy During World War I," 32 (Spring 1991):231-252.

William J. Breen, "The Mobilization of Skilled Labor in World War I: 'Voluntarism,' the U.S. Public Service Reserve, and the Department of Labor, 1917-1918," 32 (Spring 1991):253-272.

New Left Review:

Robin Blackburn, "Fin de Siècle: Socialism after the Crash," No. 185 (Jan./Feb. 1991):5-66.

Andrzej Walicki, "From Stalinism to Post-Communist Pluralism: The Case of Poland," No. 185 (Jan./Feb. 1991):92-121.

David Edgerton, "Liberal Militarism and the British State," No. 185 (Jan./Feb. 1991):138-169.

Étienne Balibar, "*Es Gibt Keinen Staat in Europa: Racism and Politics in Europe Today*," No. 186 (Mar./Apr. 1991):5-19.

Ellen Carol DuBois, "Woman Suffrage and the Left: An International Socialist-Feminist Perspective," No. 186 (Mar./Apr. 1991):20-45.

Stephen Padgett and William Paterson, "The Rise and Fall of the West German Left," No. 186 (Mar./Apr. 1991):46-77.

Hege Skjeie, "The Uneven Advance of Norwegian Women," No. 187 (May/June 1991):79-102.

Reiner Grundmann, "The Ecological Challenge to Marxism," No. 187 (May/June 1991):103-120.

Robert Brenner and Mark Glick, "The Regulation Approach: Theory and History," No. 188 (July/Aug. 1991):45-119.

Political Science Quarterly:

Lisa Anderson, "Absolutism and the Resilience of Monarchy in the Middle East," 106 (Spring 1991):1-15.

Alonzo L. Hamby, "An American Democrat: A Reevaluation of the Personality of Harry S. Truman," 106 (Spring 1991):33-55.

Ben L. Martin, "From Negro to Black to African American: The Power of Names and Naming," 106 (Spring 1991):83-107.

Alexander J. Groth and Richard G. Randall, "Alliance Pathology: Institutional Lessons of the 1930s," 106 (Spring 1991):109-121.

Robert B. Reich, "What Is a Nation?" 106 (Summer 1991):193-209.

Alexander Moens, "President Carter's Advisers and the Fall of the Shah," 106 (Summer 1991):211-237.

James J. Wirtz, "Intelligence to Please? The Order of Battle Controversy during the Vietnam War," 106 (Summer 1991):239-263.

Aaron L. Friedberg, "The Changing Relationship between Economics and National Security," 106 (Summer 1991):265-276.

Politics & Society:

Adam Przeworski, "Could We Feed Everyone? The Irrationality of Capitalism and the Infeasibility of Socialism," 19 (Mar. 1991):1-38.

Joshua Cohen, "Maximizing Social Welfare or Institutionalizing Democratic Ideals? Commentary on Adam Przeworski's Article," 19 (Mar. 1991):39-58.

Zhiyuan Cui, "Market Incompleteness, Innovation, and Reform: Commentary on Adam Przeworski's Article," 19 (Mar. 1991):59-69.

Harold Benenson, "The 'Family Wage' and Working Women's Consciousness in Britain, 1880-1914," 19 (Mar. 1991):71-108.

Willfried Spohn, "Religion and Working-Class Formation in Imperial Germany 1871-1914," 19 (Mar. 1991):109-132.

Wolfgang Streeck and Philippe C. Schmitter, "From National Corporatism to Transnational Pluralism: Organized Interests in the Single European Market," 19 (June 1991):133-164.

Colin Gordon, "New Deal, Old Deck: Business and the Origins of Social Security, 1920-1935," 19 (June 1991):165-207.

John Vincent Nye, "Revisionist Tariff History and the Theory of Hegemonic Stability," 19 (June 1991):209-232.

Polity:

Frederick G. Whelan, "Church Establishments, Liberty & Competition in Religion," 23 (Winter 1990):155-185.

David Boucher, "Inter-Community & International Relations in the Political Philosophy of Hobbes," 23 (Winter 1990):207-232.

Dennis J. Goldford, "The Political Character of Constitutional Interpretation," 23 (Winter 1990):255-281.

Saul Brenner, Timothy Hagle, and Harold J. Spaeth, "Increasing the Size of Minimum Winning Original Coalitions on the Warren Court," 23 (Winter 1990):309-318.

Jeff Spinner, "Constructing Communities: Edmund Burke on Revolution," 23 (Spring 1991):395-421.

Gerard S. Gryski, "The Influence of Committee Position on Federal Program Spending," 23 (Spring 1991):443-459.

Public Interest:

George G. Graham, "WIC: A Food Program That Fails," No. 10 (Spring 1991):66-75.

David Whitman, "The Great Sharecropper Success Story," No. 10 (Summer 1991):3-19.

Nathan Glazer, "The Lessons of New York City," No. 104 (Summer 1991):37-49.

Lino A. Graglia, "One Hundred Years of Antitrust," No. 104 (Summer 1991):50-66.

Radical History Review:

Nathan I. Huggins, "The Deforming Mirror of Truth: Slavery and the Master Narrative of American History," No. 49 (Winter 1991):25-47.

Peter H. Wood, Peter Dimock, and Barbara Clark Smith, "Three Responses," No. 49 (Winter 1991):49-59.

Ellen Carol DuBois, "Making Women's History: Activist Historians of Women's Rights, 1880-1940," No. 49 (Winter 1991):61-84.

Tim Mason, "Whatever Happened to Fascism?" No. 49 (Winter 1991):89-98.

William Appleman Williams, "Empire as a Way of Life," No. 50 (Spring 1991):71-102.

Van Gosse, "'To Organize in Every Neighborhood, in Every Home': The Gender Politics of American Communists between the Wars," No. 50 (Spring 1991):109-141.

Peter Linebaugh, "Jubilating; Or, How the Atlantic Working Class Used the Biblical Jubilee against Capitalism, with Some Success," No. 50 (Spring 1991):143-180.

Representations:

Elizabeth Hanson, "Torture and Truth in Renaissance England," No. 34 (Spring 1991):53-84.

Social Science History:

Frank Munger, "Legal Resources of Striking Miners: Notes for a Study of Class Conflict and Law," 15 (Spring 1991):1-33.

Ann M. Carlos and Patricia Fulton, "Chance or Destiny? The Dominance of Toronto over the Urban Landscape, 1797-1850," 15 (Spring 1991):35-66.

Robert Whaples and David Buffum, "Fraternalism, Paternalism, the Family, and the Market: Insurance a Century Ago," 15 (Spring 1991):97-122.

Steven Ruggles, "Comparability of the Public Use Files of the U.S. Census of Population, 1880-1980," 15 (Spring 1991):123-158.

James K. Cohen, "Structural versus Functional Determinants of New York's Fiscal Policies towards Metropolitan Transportation, 1904-1990," 15 (Summer 1991):177-198.

Eric Monkkonen, "Introduction: History and the Other Social Sciences, Part I," 15 (Summer 1991):199-200.

Andrew Abbott, "History and Sociology: The Lost Synthesis," 15 (Summer 1991):201-238.

Hugh Rockoff, "History and Economics," 15 (Summer 1991):239-264.

Richard Dennis, "History, Geography, and Historical Geography," 15 (Summer 1991):265-288.

Theory and Society:

Maarten Prak, "Citizen Radicalism and Democracy in the Dutch Republic: The Patriot Movement of the 1780s," 20 (Feb. 1991):73-102.

Philip Smith, "Codes and Conflict: Toward a Theory of War as Ritual," 20 (Feb. 1991):103-138.

Marc W. Steinberg, "The Re-Making of the English Working Class?" 20 (Apr. 1991):173-197.

Nicole Woolsey Biggart, "Explaining Asian Economic Organization: Toward a Weberian Institutional Perspective," 20 (Apr. 1991):199-232.

Amir Ben-Porat, "Immigration, Proletarianization, and Deproletarianization: A Case Study of the Jewish Working Class in Palestine, 1882-1914," 20 (Apr. 1991):233-258.

Dale Tomich, "World Slavery and Caribbean Capitalism: The Cuban Sugar Industry, 1760-1868," 20 (June 1991):297-319.

Philip McMichael, "Slavery in Capitalism: The Rise and Demise of the U.S. Ante-Bellum Cotton Culture," 20 (June 1991):321-349.

William Roseberry, "La Falta de Brazos: Land and Labor in the Coffee Economies of Nineteenth-Century Latin America," 20 (June 1991):351-381.

Sidney W. Mintz, "Comment on Articles by Tomich, McMichael, and Roseberry," 20 (June 1991):383-392.

Western Political Quarterly:

John M. Roberts and Keith R. Legg, "Political Strategies for Economic Manipulation: Democratic Elections in Greece 1960-1985," 44 (Mar. 1991):39-65.

Barbara Headrick and David J. Lanoue, "Attention, Asymmetry, and Government Popularity in Britain," 44 (Mar. 1991):67-86.

Barbara Luck Graham, "Federal Court Policy-making and Political Equality: An Analysis of Judicial Redistricting," 44 (Mar. 1991):101-117.

Timothy M. Hagle and Harold J. Spaeth, "Voting Fluidity and the Attitudinal Model of Supreme Court Decision Making," 44 (Mar. 1991):119-128.

Keith Nicholls, "The Dynamics of National Executive Service: Ambition Theory and the Careers of Presidential Cabinet Members," 44 (Mar. 1991):149-172.

Gloria T. Beckley and Paul Burstein, "Religious Pluralism, Equal Opportunity, and the State," 44 (Mar. 1991):185-208.

L. Marvin Overby and Sarah J. Ritchie, "Mobilized Masses and Strategic Opponents: A Resource Mobilization Analysis of the Clean Air and Nuclear Freeze Movement," 44 (June 1991):329-351.

Gregory R. Weiher and Jon Lorence, "Growth in State Government Employment: A Time Series Analysis," 44 (June 1991):373-388.

James L. Payne, "Why Government Spending Grows: The 'Socialization' Hypothesis," 44 (June 1991):487-508.

Women & Politics:

Judith A. Baer, "Nasty Law or Nice Ladies? Jurisprudence, Feminism, and Gender Difference," 11 (No. 1, 1991):1-31.

Iva Ellen Deutchman, "The Politics of Empowerment," 11 (No. 2, 1991):1-18.

World Politics:

Stephen D. Krasner, "Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto Frontier," 43 (Apr. 1991):336-366.

John P. Lewis, "Some Consequences of Giantism: The Case of India," 43 (Apr. 1991):367-389.

Peter Swenson, "Bringing Capital Back In, or Social Democracy Reconsidered: Employer Power, Cross-Class Alliances, and Centralization of Industrial Relations in Denmark and Sweden," 43 (July 1991):513-544.

Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey, "Specific Factors, Capital Markets, Portfolio Diversification, and Free Trade: Domestic Determinants of the Repeal of the Corn Laws," 43 (July 1991):545-569.

Guidelines for Newsletter Contributors

Work in Progress should be two or three typed, double-spaced pages in length. These pieces should not be organized as summaries of forthcoming books or articles, but as broader descriptions of ongoing projects. In preparing your Work in Progress, remember that your audience is the entire History and Politics Section. Try to write for an audience that is theoretically sophisticated, but may know very little about your specific area and topic.

As for other features, we welcome New Book notices for works published in the past two years or immediately forthcoming. New Books should be summaries of two or three paragraphs and should include the following publication information: full title, publisher, publisher location, total pages, type of binding, and price(s) according to binding(s). Again, try to emphasize those aspects of most interest to members of the Section, who may not be familiar with names or terms specific to a particular country or period. Announcements and Queries should be concise and specifically relevant to History and Politics. Please send notices of more general interest to the political science discipline to *PS*. Since we are conserving space by photocopying Syllabi at half-size, these submissions should be clean (no written annotations) and freshly printed or typed (no photocopies). Any partial references on the Syllabi, such as "handout" or "packet," should be replaced by full citations.

Please be sure that anything you submit is relevant to History and Politics. If major revisions are necessary, we will contact you to discuss our suggestions; if only minor editing is necessary, we will do it ourselves. All submissions should be accompanied by the questionnaire form at the back of this issue. In addition, all submissions should include your FAX number and your BITNET address, if you have them. We would also be very grateful if you would send any submission in both paper and diskette forms. Specifically, please provide a double-spaced printed copy and either a 3 1/2" or a 5 1/4" IBM-compatible diskette. Please use ASCII; most word processing programs will give you options for converting your text into this standard format.

History and Politics Section Newsletter
c/o Prof. Elaine Swift
Department of Political Science
Hamilton Hall, CB #3265
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check all that apply:

The following feature(s) should be added to the Newsletter (list):

The following journal(s) should also be scanned (list):

I am enclosing (check):

- Work in Progress summary
- New Book description
- Course Syllabus
- Announcement
- Query
- Quote
- Other

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE _____

Membership Office
American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please enroll me as a member of the History and Politics Section. I enclose a check for \$5.00 annual section dues.

Please send me an application to join the APSA. (American Historical Association members: be sure to request your special \$40.00 membership rate.)

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

History and Politics Section Newsletter
Department of Political Science
Hamilton Hall, CB #3265
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265

Non-Profit
Permit #216
Chapel Hill NC
27514

DAVID B. ROBERTSON
DEPT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
UNIV OF MISSOURI-ST LOUIS
ST LOUIS MO 63121