

LETTER FROM THE OUTGOING PRESIDENT

This year and last, I have been involved in various meetings that addressed the problem of post-Soviet and East European studies; and those sessions have raised, at least in many participants' minds, the larger question of area expertise versus comparative theory that David Laitin so thoughtfully discusses in his contribution on page three of this issue. In undergraduate teaching, we have probably all faced the same problem: in lecturing on European politics, for example, are we not really talking about the politics of all advanced, industrial societies? Do we want, or need, to focus on the peculiarities of French, or German, or Swedish, or even European political systems?

Looking at other disciplines, at least three models seem possible.

1. In *economics*, as Laitin notes, geographical expertise has yielded almost wholly to unified theory. Soviet, Latin American, or development economics led a vestigial existence only so long as their subjects remained systematically peculiar, i.e., deviated predictably from the market-oriented model of "mainstream" economic. As the peculiarities recede, so does the justification for regional expertise. Whatever one needs to learn, most economists believe, can be acquired in the course of research, or through local collaborators. Certainly no student is encouraged to spend time on linguistic or historical training.
2. In *physics*, experimentalists long ago were segregated from (but have remained complementary to) theorists. Within political science, legislative studies (and perhaps some other domains) seems to have evolved in a similar direction, high theorists seeing little need to study Congress empirically, and close students of Congress eschewing theoretical ambitions; yet, increasingly, each reading and appreciating the other.

3. In *history* and *literature*, regional and period expertise remain trumps; "theory" is but a lens (skeptics will say: a jargon) through which one views or describes.

Adam Smith's fundamental insight about the virtues of specialization inclines me (as I think it does Laitin) toward the second, or "physics," model. Yet it is worth pondering exactly what such a model means for "engaging our data with theory" in Laitin's sense.

As our theories and models (often derived from economics) grow technically more sophisticated, they demand more training to do, or even to understand, well. Scholars will be able to work theoretically only if they do so in a concentrated fashion; and, among this group, regional, cultural, and historical expertise will increasingly be neglected. At the same time rewards and prestige will accrue to those who subject the brilliant theories to the hard tests of empirical accuracy; but (the physics model suggests), good testing will require **both** detailed knowledge and a high degree of technical expertise.

The second point, I think, is crucial. Comparative experimentalists (or should we say,

Ronald Rogowski is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, the outgoing President of the American Political Science Association's Organized Section in Comparative Politics, and the Editor of this *Newsletter*.

Please turn to page 19

OFFICERS OF THE ORGANIZED SECTION

OUTGOING PRESIDENT:
Ronald Rogowski,
University of California, Los Angeles

VICE-PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT-ELECT:
David Laitin
University of Chicago

SECRETARY-TREASURER:
Russell Dalton
University of California, Irvine

PROGRAM COORDINATOR:
Adam Przeworski
University of Chicago

AT-LARGE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
David Collier
University of California, Berkeley

Ellen Immergut
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Peter Lange
Duke University

Vivien Schmidt
University of Massachusetts, Boston

W. Phillips Shively
University of Minnesota

*This newsletter was printed on
100% recycled paper. Please re-
cycle.*

NEWSLETTER STAFF

EDITOR:
Ronald Rogowski
University of California, Los Angeles

REGIONAL EDITORS-AT-LARGE
Soviet Successor States
Richard Anderson
University of California, Los Angeles

Middle East
Leonard Binder
University of California, Los Angeles

Latin America
Barbara Geddes
University of California, Los Angeles

Western Europe
Miriam Golden
University of California, Los Angeles

Africa
Edmond Keller
University of California, Los Angeles

Eastern Europe
Ivan Szelenyi
University of California, Los Angeles

Formal Analysis and Methodology
Michael Wallerstein
University of California, Los Angeles

ASSISTANT EDITOR:
Adam Levine
University of California, Los Angeles

CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE OUTGOING PRESIDENT	1
LETTER FROM THE INCOMING PRESIDENT	3
DATABASES, ARCHIVES, AND WORKS-IN-PROGRESS	4
BOOK AND ARTICLE NOTICES	6
ANNOUNCEMENTS	12

LETTER FROM THE INCOMING PRESIDENT

A specter is haunting comparative politics; it is the specter of pure theory. While the Section in Comparative Politics of the American Political Science Association has the largest membership (about nine hundred) of any Organized Section, and the Editor of the Association's Review is a distinguished comparativist, the future of our specialty within political science nonetheless remains uncertain.

In two sister disciplines, linguistics and economics, comparativists disappeared once pure theorists generated an intellectual revolution. Comparative linguistics was a vibrant, descriptive subdiscipline (and remains so in Europe) before the Chomsky revolution. Descriptive linguistics at universities in the United States may now be found only at the margins of anthropology departments. Excellent linguistics departments, for example, do not need an expert in Bantu linguistics in order to maintain their national reputation. By the same token, in the wake of the neoclassical revolution in economics, specialists in the economic systems of different regions or states are no longer hired by major economics departments. The systematic study of the particular dynamics of various economies is now relegated to the political science curriculum.

Rational choice theory, with its claims to axiomatic reasoning, deduction as a fountainhead of truth, and universal principles of politics, is challenging political science in ways quite comparable to the gauntlets thrown down in linguistics and economics to their comparativists. The idea of having a political science specialist for every piece of international real estate may soon seem as arcane as having a specialist for every planet in an astronomy department.

Many of us, for both intellectual and self-interested motives, are seeking to buck this trend. One tack to take is turf protection, arguing that comparativists teach undergraduates useful things, and make constructive media appearances when their region becomes troublesome for the United States. (As a Somalist, I recently lamed how helpful I could suddenly become.) We could argue that political science is a diverse discipline; therefore teaching and writing about the political dynamics of the world's several regions ought to have its bailiwick. Moreover, we could continue writing astute, inductively-driven analyses of our areas

of specialty.

I, however, prefer a different tack: to engage our data with rational choice theory in order to raise an ever expanding set of questions for political scientists to answer. Rational choice theorists are already doing this themselves, even addressing "anti-economics" issues such as culture (see, for example, Avner Greif, "Reputation and Coalitions in Medieval Trade-Evidence on the Maghribi Traders," *Journal of Economic History*, 49: 4, December, 1989: 857-882; John Ferejohn, "Rationality and Interpretation: Parliamentary Elections in Early Stuart England," in K. Monroe, ed., *The Economic Approach to Politics*, New York: Harper Collins College Publishers, 1991; and David Kreps, "Corporate Culture and Economic Theory," in James E. Alt and Kenneth A. Shepsle, *Perspectives in Positive Political Economy*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990). We should engage more directly with this work, continually tantalizing theorists with uncomfortable data. To use our area knowledge to discover interesting anomalies, to provide plausible deductive accounts of our statistically validated patterns, or to identify theoretically appropriate data sets would be to integrate theory and empirical data far better than has been done in linguistics or economics thus far. This is our disciplinary challenge; it is one that members of this Section should attend to. It is my goal as incoming President of this Section to aid our sub-discipline in addressing this challenge.

Two books now in press attempt to answer this call. Robert H. Bates, V. Y. Mudimbe and Jean O'Barr are editing a volume, *Africa and the Disciplines: The Contributions of Research in Africa to the Social Sciences and Humanities*, to be published by University of Chicago Press, in which the editors asked contributors precisely how area specialists contributed to their disciplines. The articles by Richard Sklar on political science and Paul Collier on econom-

Please turn to page 18

David Laitin is Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, and the incoming President of the American Political Science Association's Organized Section in Comparative Politics.

DATABASES, ARCHIVES, AND WORKS-IN-PROGRESS

Miriam Golden and Michael Wallerstein are Professors of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

NEW DATA ON WAGE-SETTING INSTITUTIONS IN ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES

With Western Europe caught in the worst recession since the 1930s, the continuing debate over the relative impact of different kinds of wage-setting institutions has acquired a new political urgency. Evaluating different systems of wage formation has proved highly controversial, in part because the debate touches deeply held theoretical and political beliefs.

On one side, social democratic governments and trade unions have encouraged the explicit coordination of wage setting across different industries and firms in the belief that economic growth is best achieved through cooperation and bargaining among highly centralized organizations of unions and employers. Social democrats have argued that the benefits of wage moderation are, to an important extent, public goods. The wages received by any single union, it is argued, have only a small effect on the aggregate wage level. Individual unions, therefore, rationally ignore the effects of their wage demands on aggregate economic performance. A national union confederation that negotiates on behalf of its affiliates, however, sets wages throughout the economy with visible macroeconomic consequences. Thus, the centralization of wage setting may prevent individual unions from aggressively seeking to improve their own members' wages at the expense of workers who belong to other unions (or who belong to no union at all).

Alternatively, conservative governments and employers' associations have argued that labor markets require competition and wage flexibility—not coordination—if they are to function smoothly. Centralized wage setting, it is claimed, reduces the sensitivity of wages to local variations in the demand and supply of labor. In addition, employers have charged that centralized bargaining inhibits microeconomic adjustment by reducing their ability to use wage differentials to encourage workers to obtain new

skills and take on new duties in the workplace. While social democrats view coordinated wage setting as cooperative behavior aimed at attaining the public goods of low inflation and full employment, conservative parties perceive the same institutions as collusive practices whose real purpose is to protect the unions' monopolistic position in the labor market.

In principle, since the issues outlined above are susceptible to empirical testing, it should be possible to resolve this debate through empirical research. In practice, empirical testing has been constrained by the inadequacy of the available measures of coordination in the wage-setting process. Currently available indices typically consist of a single number or ranking for union centralization for all union confederations within a country at all points in time since the Second World War. This is a reasonable procedure only if (1) union centralization is more or less equal among all confederations within a country, and (2) union centralization has been relatively constant since the late 1940s. While both are true for some advanced industrial societies, neither is true for all. In fact, in many countries, wage-setting institutions have varied significantly over time during the postwar period. Yet such longitudinal variation is frequently ignored in the empirical literature due to the absence of appropriate data.

Equally serious measurement problems arise from the chronic disagreements among scholars regarding the degrees of coordination found in different systems of wage determination. Please turn to page 18

DIETER NOHLEN (ED.). *ENCICLOPEDIA ELECTORAL LATINOAMERICANA Y DEL CARIBE*. SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA: INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE DERECHOS HUMANOS. 1993. ISBN: 9977-962-43-X.

DIETER NOHLEN (ED.). *HANDBUCH DER WAHLDATEN LATEINAMERIKAS UND DER KARIBIK*. OPLADEN: LESKE UND BURDICH. 1993. DM96. ISBN: 3-81 00-1 028-6.

Arend Lijphart is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego.

Dieter Nohlen, the well known German electoral systems expert whose *Wahlsysteme der Welt* (Munich: Piper, 1978) has long served as a rich source of information about the electoral systems of countries in all parts of the world, has again provided an extremely valuable service to comparative political scientists by organizing the collection of detailed election data for the Latin American and Caribbean counties. These data have been published simultaneously in Spanish and German editions. The editor hopes to issue an English version as well, but no definite publication arrangements have been reached to date. Since the bulk of the two volumes consist of tables, only a rudimentary knowledge of Spanish or German is required to make fruitful use of them.

The **volumes** are inspired by, and follow the format of Thomas T. Mackie and Richard Rose's *International Almanac of Electoral History* (Washington, D. C: Congressional Quarterly, 3rd ed., 1991). For all legislative and **presidential** elections, **both** the numbers and **percentages** of votes cast for each party or candidate are given; numbers and percentages of seats won are also provided for legislative elections. In addition **to** these election **results**, **each** country chapter contains an historical introduction, a description of the electoral systems for **legislative** elections (and presidential elections, where appropriate), a description of the electoral **system** for legislative elections (and, where **relevant**, presidential elections), an explanation of the sources of electoral **data**, a table detailing **the growth of the** electorate, **a** list of political **parties** and the elections in which they **participated**, **a** list of election dates (as well as the **referenda** and **coups d'état** where these **occurred**), the results of any elections for constitutional **conventions**, a list of democratic and **non-democratic** office-holders (*gobernantes/Machthaber*) in presidential systems, and an extensive **bibliography**. **Like the Mackie-Rose handbook**, the Nohlen volumes concentrate on aggregate data on national-level elections.

There are some important differences **between** the Mackie-Rose and Nohlen volumes as well. One is that the Nohlen election data do

not reach back as far as the **Mackie-Rose** data, **partly** due to the fact that a **number** of **Western** hemisphere **countries**, especially the former British colonies in the Caribbean, simply do not have long electoral histories, and partly due to the unavailability of older data for the Latin American counties. On the other hand, unlike **Mackie-Rose**, Nohlen covers the elections of **second** chambers (senates) that **are directly elected**. Compared with the twenty-five countries covered by **Mackie-Rose** (most of these **primarily** Western democracies have been **continuously** democratic since 1950), **Nohlen** covers **a** **larger** number of countries (thirty-three), **including** the smaller countries of the region **like Guyana**, Suriname, Grenada, and Saint Lucia. Thus the Nohlen volumes contain data for all of the independent countries in the Western hemisphere, **except the United States and Canada**. A **final** difference is that the Nohlen volumes represent **a** team effort. **Three country chapters** were written **or co-authored** by Nohlen himself; the **others were** written by twenty-one **different** (primarily German **and** Latin American) **collaborators**.

Nohlen and his collaborators faced much greater problems with regard to **the** availability **and accuracy of their election data**. **For this reason**, many elections could not be covered at all; for instance, there **are no** data **for the senate elec-**

Please turn to page 20

Editor's Note: The ISBNs for these books, which we normally do not publish, have been included here to aid interested scholars in obtaining these volumes from their international publishers.

BOOK AND ARTICLE NOTICES

David L. Ellison is a Ph. D. student at the University of California, Los Angeles.

SVEN STEINMO, KATHLEEN THELEN, AND FRANK LONGSTRETH (EDS.).
STRUCTURING POLITICS: HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALISM IN COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. NEW YORK: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1992. \$18.95.

S*tructuring Politics* is a welcome addition, bringing together a diverse array of articles centered about the methodology of historical institutionalism. As this volume illustrates, historical institutionalism provides a distinct alternative to other approaches in political science. In its **wake**, traditional institutional approaches appear too deterministic, traditional rational choice approaches appear to neglect appropriate historical contexts, and the interest group literature appears to ignore the importance of institutional footholds granted to specific actors. As the essays in this volume show, policy outcomes are neither strictly the result of institutional constraints, nor of the range of strategic choices, nor of the interests and relative power of individual or collective actors, but rather, the interplay between them.

Bo Rothstein demonstrates that while **institutions** can be the target of political strategies, not all actors make correct choices. He argues that the trade union administered system of **unemployment insurance** (the "**Ghent**" system) was advocated, at least in Sweden, by the **Social Democrats** in order to promote working class organizational strength. Moreover, the Ghent system goes a long way in explaining the relative strength of trade union movements in Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, and **Belgium** over other countries. **However**, as Rothstein emphasizes, not all political actors make strategically advantageous decisions. In **Sweden**, for example, the union movement was **initially** opposed to the Ghent system, and in **Denmark**, the Ghent system was **introduced** by a Liberal government in 1907.

Ellen Immergut, on the other hand, shows that **institutions have effects** beyond their original design. Immergut finds that the passage of a national health insurance system in Sweden was aided by **institutional mechanisms—mechanisms which favored executive authority—that** were originally intended to bolster the **Conservatives**. Both France and Switzerland, **however**, were unable to **introduce** such sweeping

changes due to institutional "veto points" accorded by parliamentary power in Fourth Republic France (before executive authority was **strengthened in the Fifth Republic**), and by **electoral** power in Switzerland via referenda. These veto points increased the capacity of medical interests to intercede or obstruct reforms.

Colleen Dunlavy illustrates that it is **impossible** to infer the impact of institutions on **policy** structures from the institutions themselves. The traditional view of the American state is that it is weak and non-interventionist **in** the economic **arena**, while the **Prussian** state is seen as its mirror-image. With respect to early railroad **policy**, **however**, Dunlavy reaches a quite dissimilar conclusion. When railroads were in **their infancy in the early 1800s**, individual states in the United States were intimately involved in their financing and regulation, as they were with other **infrastructure** improvements. In **Prussia**, on the other hand, the state was unable to finance **railroad** policy without risking political liberalization, thereby failing to gain the **leverage necessary for economic regulation**. Not until the 1850s did the American and Prussian states begin to approximate the **more** widely held

Please turn to page 17

FREDERIC J. FLERON, JR. AND ERIK P. HOFFMAN (EDS.). *POST-COMMUNIST STUDIES AND POLITICAL SCIENCE: METHODOLOGY AND EMPIRICAL THEORY IN SOVIOLOGY*. BOULDER, CO: WESTVIEW PRESS. 1992. \$21.95.

Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. is Professor of Political Science at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

This anthology elucidates the theories and methodologies of Sovietology and underscores the need to adapt them to the dramatically changing conditions in the USSR during the 1980s and in its successor countries during the 1990s. The editors and many other contributors argue that post-Communist studies should be integrated more closely with the discipline of political science, and with the other social sciences.

This is the first book-length analysis of these issues in over two decades. It is a thoroughly revised and updated successor to Fleron (ed.), *Communist Studies and Social Sciences: Essays on Methodology and Empirical Theory* (Chicago: Rand McNally 1969). The present volume features comprehensive introductory and concluding essays by the co-editors, who identify the basic problems and opportunities confronting post-Communist studies, present their own views and recommendations, and identify salient features of the contributors' essays.

It is the only book on a subject vitally important to all students of post-Soviet affairs and post-Communism (i.e., how and why they investigate their subject). It gives practical suggestions to researchers in the spirit of method

ological pluralism (i.e., alternative methodologies and theories are presented for consideration and their initial results are demonstrated). Moreover, it gives valuable guidance to graduate and advanced undergraduate students (i.e., old conceptual orientations are reevaluated and new ones are proffered).

For more than half a century, Westerners have attempted to understand the USSR in a very different fashion than they have examined other societies, claiming that Soviet society was completely different from any other on earth and that, because of its closed nature and the paucity of reliable data, *sui generis methods* had to be developed to study it. Unique methods were required to study a unique system and, of course, they gave unique results. Hence, it was argued, Please turn to page 14

RICHARD S. HILLMAN AND THOMAS J. D'AGOSTINO. *DISTANT NEIGHBORS IN THE CARIBBEAN: THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND JAMAICA IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE*. NEW YORK: PRAEGER. 1992. \$45.00.

F. W. Knight is Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University.

An interesting, informative, readable, and important book. By looking carefully at the separate historical traditions of the Dominican Republic and Jamaica (authoritarian versus democratic), the institutions and processes of government (presidential versus parliamentary), the internal and external milieu in which politics operates, the competitive constituencies within each state, and the ways in which political performance has been judged locally, Hillman and D'Agostino persuasively conclude that "regimes in both countries exhibit characteristics that are neither strictly authoritarian nor truly democratic. While Dominican leaders have struggled to realize democratic ideals within a history of anarchy and authoritarianism, Jamaican democracy has been challenged by inherent authoritarian impulses." The bibliography is excellent, and the major generalizations appear valid for small, resource scarce states in any region.

Sandra Fullerton Joireman is a Ph.D. student in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

JEAN ENSMINGER. *MAKING A MARKET: THE INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION OF AN AFRICAN SOCIETY*. NEW YORK: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1992.

The publication of *Making a Market* marks yet another excellent contribution to the field from the Cambridge Series on Political Economy. Similar to the other volumes in the series, it emphasizes the interaction of political structures and institutions with economic change. Yet whereas most of the previous volumes in the series have been written by political scientists or economists, this book stands out as unique in that it is written from an anthropological perspective. Unusual as this is, the book gives an extremely sophisticated and readable application of the new institutional economics to the developing world.

The explicit intent of the book is to analyze the interaction of ideology, institutions, organizations, and bargaining power among the Galole Orma in Northern Kenya. Ensminger notes that the book is significantly influenced by Douglas North and the implicit goal of the volume seems to be pressing forward with the model of institutional change presented in North's book. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990). North stated that institutional change results from a change in relative prices, or a change in preferences or tastes. Ensminger moves ahead with this formulation by attempting to determine whether it is preferences or prices that have a greater effect on institutional change. Understandably the results are inconclusive, yet the process of arriving at this uncertainty is quite intriguing.

Several sections of the book are worthy of specific note. First is Ensminger's contribution to the arguments against a moral economy. She notes in her research that assistance to those less well-off among the Orma was diminished with sedentarization and the development of the market. This is consistent with James Scott's findings in *The Moral Economy Of the Peasant* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976). However, Ensminger identifies the cause behind the decrease as the higher cost of donations to the poor. The price of alms increased with sedentarization because pastoralists once dependent upon milk as their staple food chose grain as a staple once sedentarization occurred. This transformation was largely due to the fact that cattle could no longer supply the necessary calories to sustain the Orma without the exchange of meat for grain at the market. Thus, the "moral

economy" ended when sedentarization occurred, and the cost of alms became defined in monetary terms. Yet Ensminger notes that this market development and sedentarization did not lead to an increase in the amount of poor within the community. On the contrary she notes that as a whole the poor seem to be better clothed and better fed in the late 1980s, after a severe drought that led to increased settlement, than they were in the 1970s when she first began her observations. This seems to empirically refute any vestiges of truth in the concept of a moral economy.

Empirical evidence collected over a long period of time, as exemplified above, is a strong suit of the book. Over a decade of observation lends striking empirical data to the arguments presented. Ensminger gives statistical evidence on interest rates, market prices, and levels of education that correspond to sedentarization. Additionally she is able, due to the breadth of data, to trace the rate of sedentarization throughout the study.

Africanists will find the book particularly appealing in that, while it is strong in theory and empirical data, it is correspondingly rich in detail and description. Of particular note in this respect is a chapter devoted to the application of agency theory to Galole herding relationships. The chapter explains the reduction of principal-agent slippage through non-wage employment that allows evaluation of performance before payment. Full payment may take place after many years of service, with the principal paying the bridewealth for his agent herder. As awkward as this might seem, reading the chapter leaves one convinced that the new institutional economics has tremendous potential for

Please turn to page 16

LITERATURE REVIEW .

THE COMMUNITY AS POLITY: THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF REGULATION

The literature on institutions, policy-making, and public policy of the European Community covers such a wide range of subjects that it is impossible to pay it full justice in this forum. There are large bodies of work which focus on the Community's institutional framework (many of the most recent contributions in this group have employed the literature on federalism rather than international relations theory), the relationship between the Community and its member states, or interest group activity within the Community.

The impact of the Single European Act has spawned a new literature reflecting the new kinds of policy-making which have emerged in the Community. This literature falls loosely under the rubric of "regulation" or "regulatory policy-making." I shall focus on this relatively new body of literature, as it is an increasingly important component of the literature on institutions and policy-making, and yet reflects a different orientation from the earlier literature about the Community.

This body of literature is broadly concerned with the emergence of the Community as a "regulatory state." The Community has comparatively few fiscal resources. Its macroeconomic policy is thus confined to monetary policy, necessarily eschewing distributive and redistributive policy. Much of the Community's policy activity therefore, involves regulating the behavior of firms, and of national and subnational governments.

For those interested in understanding the type of polity the Community may become, the literature on regulation within the Community is pivotal. The Community will not be similar to the nation-state if only because its expenditures are unlikely to become significant in macroeconomic terms in the medium-term. The development of the Community as a "regulatory state" is an option which allows a strung Community presence in key sectors to emerge without an equally strong fiscal presence. The literature exploring the "political economy of regulation" sketches the contours of public policy in those areas in which Brussels has jurisdiction but for which it spends no money.

The literature on European regulation draws on the deregulatory thrust of the internal market (Jacques Pelkmans, *Europe's Domestic Market*, London: Royal Institute of International

Affairs, 1988) as well as the trend toward privatization and deregulation at the national level which occurred in some member states in the 1980s. However, all the literature points out that deregulation as such is a misnomer; typically, one type of structure is dismantled and a new type of regulatory structure—often at the Community level—is put into place.

Regulation, of course, can be analyzed from numerous perspectives. Kenneth Dyson (ed., *The Politics Of German Regulation*, Aldershot: Dartmouth University press, 1992) identifies culture, the international political economy, institutions, and coalitions/policy networks as the "interrelated factors that shape the nature and dynamics of regulation, and that condition and limit the reception and adoption of the new regulatory ideas." The work that is appearing on the emerging regulatory framework of the EC tends to cover all those factors, although some emphasize one rather than another.

Two volumes help focus attention on the political economy of regulation in Europe. One, edited by Giandomenico Majone (*Deregulation or Re-regulation? Regulatory Reform in Europe and the United States*, London: Pinter, 1990), explicitly includes the American experience while the other, edited by Leigh Hancher and Michael Moran (*Capitalism, Culture, and Economic Regulation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), expressly excludes it. While Majone's volume covers both economic regulation and "social regulation," most of the literature in the regulatory field tends to focus on one or the other. In that sense, the Hancher-Moran volume is typical. However, the study of regulation in Europe is still so new that the divisions between scholars specializing in various areas of regulatory activity are not as entrenched as they are among scholars of American regulation. For

Please turn to page 10

Alberta Sbragia is Professor of Political Science at the University of Pittsburgh and is the Director of the University's West European Studies Program.

Sbragia (continued from page 9)

example, the *European Journal Of Political Research* March/April 1991 special issue (volume 19, numbers 2 and 3) was entitled *The Politics of Transitional Regulation: Deregulation or Reregulation?* Within that issue, Peter A. Vipond dealt with capital movements and financial services in the single market (pp. 227-244), Martin Rhodes with the social dimension (pp. 245-280), and Angela Liberatore with environmental policy (pp. 281-306). The range of topics covered in the issue gives us an idea of how far-reaching the emergence of a Community regulatory structure can be.

The Hancher-Moran volume indicates what the study of economic regulation might look like in the European context. The concluding chapter, written by the editors and entitled "Organizing Regulatory Space," is important in that it clearly distinguishes the study of economic regulation in Europe from that in the United States. The Majone volume, for its part, was critical for those interested in the Community. It alerted scholars in regulation that the Community was now involved in this area, and informed Community scholars that the involvement formed part of a larger movement, and was not restricted to the Community.

Given that the English language regulation literature at the time of the 1992 project was almost exclusively concerned with the American experience, European scholars necessarily worked within a cross-national or comparative perspective even when the American experience was not specifically included in the research projects. The comparative literature is striking, especially since so much of the traditional literature on the Community treats the latter as *sui generis*. Focusing on the political economy of regulation allowed scholars to avoid "ghettoizing" the study of regulatory public policy within the Community.

Much of the literature on the deregulatory/re-regulatory thrust of the 1992 project focuses on specific sectors such as pharmaceuticals, telecommunications (Wayne Sandholtz, "Institutions and Collective Action: The New Telecommunications in Western Europe," *World Politics*, 45: 2, January 1992: 242-270), transport, financial services, competition policy and state aids (Peter Montagnon, ed., *European Competition Policy*, London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1990), industrial policy (Phenon Nicolaides, ed., *Industrial Policy in the European Community: A Necessary Response*

to Economic Integration? Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1993), technical standards (Michelle Egan, *Reconciling Regulation and Free Trade*, Center for European Policy Studies, forthcoming; Jacques Pelkmans, "The New Approach to Technical Harmonization and Standardization," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 25: 3, March, 1987: 249-69), and the link between the internal market and environmental policy (Albert Weale and Andrea Williams, "Between Economy and Ecology? The Single Market and the Integration of Environmental Policy," *Environmental Politics*, 1: 4, Winter, 1992: 45-64). Other approaches include comparing national regulatory regimes, regimes which are broadly similar across sectors within a country, but differ between countries. Of particular importance in this category is the Stephen Woolcock, Michael Hodges, and Kristin Shreiber's (eds., *Britain, Germany, and 1992: The Limits of Deregulation*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1991) comparison of the British and French regulatory framework. Finally some scholars have begun analyzing the response of firms to the regulatory activity of the Community carried out in pursuit of the internal market. David Mayes' edited volume (*The European Challenge: Industry's Response to the 1992 Programme*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991) is a good introduction to this type of work.

While Majone's 1990 book helped put the study of regulation on the scholarly agenda, his later work has alerted scholars to the importance of social regulation. The "regulatory polity" engages in both economic and social regulation, the latter including such areas as environmental and consumer protection policy. In a seminal paper ("Cross-National Sources of Regulatory Policymaking in Europe and the United States," *Journal of Public Policy*, 11: 1, January-March, 1991: 79-106), Majone argues that regulatory models in many areas of economic and social regulation are imported from other countries and experiences. For example, American regulatory models were important in the area of social regulation. In the area of economic deregulation, however, "the impact of American deregulation or regulatory reform has been quite uneven across countries and industries."

Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, Majone distinguishes between traditional "welfare state" policies, and those falling under the

Please turn to page 15

SIDNEY TARROW. *REBIRTH OR STAGNATION? EUROPEAN STUDIES AFTER 1989*. NEW YORK: SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1993. FREE OF CHARGE.

Sidney Tarrow is Professor of Political Science at Cornell University.

In a new report published by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), Sidney Tarrow examines the implications of recent changes in Europe for social science research and training on Europe in the United States. The report, entitled *Rebirth or Stagnation? European Studies After 1989*, will be of interest not only to Europeanists but to comparativists generally and is available free of charge from the Western Europe Program of the SSRC.

Sidney Tarrow was asked by the SSRC and the German Marshall Fund of the United States to identify trends and raise issues of importance to the future of European studies in the universities, and among funders and other concerned organizations. He conducted over one hundred interviews with scholars and officers at twelve major universities, and with Europeanists at other colleges and universities. Twenty officials responsible for international education at the United States' Department of Education and at funding agencies were also interviewed.

The report finds Europe to be one of the regions of the world that has generated increased levels of student interest in the past five to ten years. In light of the emergence of the 1992 European integration project, the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the break-up of the Soviet Union, the weakening of traditional party systems and the rise of "new" social movements, and the resurgence of ethnic and religious nationalism, Europe is becoming more autonomous, more complicated, and more interesting to students and scholars alike.

This new level of scholarly interest may be related to the fact that, as Professor Tarrow notes in his report, a number of exciting comparative projects are underway that use European cases to investigate important theoretical issues. For example, scholars of democratic transitions have been looking at the Southern and Eastern European countries in the postwar and post-Cold War eras. In addition, there is considerable interest in identifying the comparative impact of different electoral systems.

Yet, just as Europe is capturing the imagination of a new generation of researchers, the support structure necessary for effective research and winning and research on Europe is experiencing considerable strains. This results in part from overburdened history and language offer-

ings—especially for Central and Eastern Europe, but for Western Europe as well—and in part because there has been a decline in real terms of government and foundation support for training in European studies. These strains are compounded by the fact that European studies was founded by a generation of scholars who were either born in Europe, or received much of their training there. With the passage of that generation from the scene and the retirement of the postwar generation of American leaders who had a direct experience with Europe, there is a palpable gap of European expertise. With a demographic pyramid turning away from groups of European origin, and the growing influence of a constituency-based, rather than a problem-based educational philosophy, knowledge of Europe is declining and is likely to decline further.

There is also a concern that without a solid empirical grounding in the area, increased interest can lead to uninformed, overly specialized, or American-biased research. In the context of a changing Europe, two dangers are apparent: (1) overly applied, quick-and-dirty research projects to take advantage of rapidly changing situations; and (2) Western Europeanists extending their expertise into Eastern Europe without sufficient recognition of its differences. One solution, advanced by the Council for European Studies through its research planning grants, is for combinations of scholars to work closely together in the interest of generating in-depth, focused comparisons among European countries. Another is to establish close working relations among specialists on Western and Eastern Europe in university centers for international studies to facilitate grounded, comparative research projects and training of graduate students on the new problems of European

Please turn to page 16

Kent Worcester is Professor of Political Science at New York University.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

APSA-CP To Go ON-LINE

New communication technologies are presenting us with a rapidly expanding terrain of opportunities. Electronic mail, desktop publishing (of which this Newsletter is a sterling example), facsimile machines, cell and microwave transmission, and satellite and fiber-optic networks—to name a few—have made discourse and data transmission more facile, expeditious, and efficient than it ever has been in the past. We are in the midst of the greatest quantum leap in communication media since the advent of the printing press and movable type.

Clearly this is a propitious moment to make a quantum leap of our own. In our endless quest to stay ahead of the technology curve—or at the least not to fall too far behind—the outgoing President of the Organized Section, Ronald Rogowski, has initiated discussions aimed at creating an on-line system to complement, although not replace, this Newsletter.

The primary shortcomings of existing on-line systems—especially those employing traditional 'LISTSERVE' software—are twofold. First, discussions often tend to degenerate below what might be termed a scholarly level. Since the software automatically posts all messages, there is no operation of wheat from chaff. Second, LISERVE software allows anyone to subscribe to a system, and then redistributes every message to all list members; those of you who have subscribed to such systems know how quickly mail—often of dubious distinction—can pile up in your mailbox.

Presently we are looking into a different software package, developed at the University of Minnesota, dubbed 'GOPHER: The GOPHER user enters a system of hierarchical, nested menus. The main menu lists the various available discussion groups. After selecting a group, the user is presented with a menu of submissions (e.g., new data sources, book notices, etc.) within that group. Each submission would lead to another menu of responses to that submission; thus the user can read the entire trail of dialogue as it proceeds, or skip around through it. Moving between message boards will be as

effortless as a keystroke or two. At any time, the user can download any or all of the postings, only receiving what he or she desires, and avoid the 'junk-mail' problem of LISERVE systems. Moreover, the posting of submissions and responses would not be automatic, but only on the approval of a monitor, much as is done by the editor of a newsletter or journal. In such conditions, discourse would have less of a tendency to deteriorate beyond acceptable levels. It is with this software that we hope to balance the dual priorities of keeping the system accessible to all comparativists while, at the same time, avoiding the problems discussed above that are part and parcel of more unrestricted systems.

Another boon of the GOPHER system is that it offers the opportunity for uncircumscribed expansion of discussion groups. Groups could be created by region (e.g., Africa, Asia, etc.), subject (e.g., institutional theory, political economy, etc.), or whatever we would like; the possibilities are limited only by our own imaginations.

Since the proposed system is primarily for the use of the membership of the Organized Section, we invite your input before we get the system up and running. What would you hope to gain from such a system? How precisely would you like it to be structured? What discussion groups would you like to see? Would you like to see it as part of a larger GOPHER board which caters to the entire discipline, rather

Please turn to page 13

An international conference entitled "The End of the Cold War and Small European States: European Reintegration and Institution Building in Austria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, and Hungary," will be hosted at the University of Minnesota, on October 29-31, 1993 by the University's Center for Austrian Studies in conjunction with several other sponsors. The conference inaugurates a research and network-building initiative on small European states. Panels consisting of presenters from each country will examine comparatively the following themes:

1. "Supranational Authority and National Autonomy: Strategies of Monetary Integration;"
2. "Domestic Adjustment to International Pressure: The Future of Neo-Corporatism;"
3. "Regional Interactions in the New Europe: Resource Transfers and Institutional Implications?"
4. The final panel will address "The Economic Future of Small States in the New Europe" to help define paradigm shifts in this field.

For further information, contact Professor Randall W. Kindley at:

Center For Austrian Studies
University of Minnesota
314 Social Sciences Building
267 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Voice: (612) 624-9811
Fax: (619) 626-2242
E-mail: casahy@umnacvx

Conference on Small European States, European Reintegration, and Institution Building

Atentative schedule of the Organized Section's 1993 APSA panels, organized by this year's Program Chair, Adam Przeworski (University of Chicago), is contained in the June, 1993 issue of *PS*; all members should have received it some time ago.

Accidentally omitted from that listing was the time of the Organized Section's Annual Business Meeting, which will be held at 12:30 P.M. on Friday, 3 September (location to be published in the final program). On this year's agenda is the election of a new Vice President/President-Elect and two at-large members of the Executive Committee to replace David Collier (University of California, Berkeley) and Peter Lange (Duke University), whose two-year terms

expire in September (see separate notice of the appointment of the Nominating Committee on this page fourteen of this *Newsletter*; and, for a complete list of current officers, the masthead on page two of this *Newsletter*). Please make every effort to attend; and, if you wish to place a specific item on the agenda, please notify Ronald Rogowski or another current member of the Executive Committee (once again, see the masthead on page two of this *Newsletter*).

1993 APSA Panels and the Organized Section's Annual Business Meeting

than just our particular field? Please direct all comments, suggestions, and responses to:
Adam Levine
UCLA Department of Political Science

405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024-1472
Fax: (310) 825-0778
E-mail: levine@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu

On-line (continued from page 12)

Nominating Committee

Section President Ron Rogowski (University of California, Los Angeles) has announced the appointment of this year's Nominating Committee. Required by the By-Laws to "represent the diverse interests of the Section," the Committee this year will be headed by Peter Hall (Harvard University) and will include as additional members R. Michael Alvarez (**CalTech**), Valerie Bunce (Cornell University), Karen Rimmer (University of New Mexico), and Ekkart Zimmerman (TU Dresden). The group will be charged to nominate a new Vice-President/President-Elect, **who** will become President in 1995 on the expiration of David Laitin's (University of Chicago) term, and two at-large members of the Executive Committee to replace David Collier (University of California, Berkeley) and Peter Lange (Duke University), whose two-year terms expire this September. Ellen Immergut (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and Vivien Schmidt (University of Massachusetts, Boston) continue as at-large members of the Executive Committee; Russell Dalton (University of California, Irvine), as Secretary-Treasurer, continues *ex-officio*; and, according to the By-Laws, Adam Przeworski (University of Chicago), as 1993 Program Chair, replaces 1992 Program Chair, W. Phillips Shively (University of Minnesota), as a member of the Executive Committee.

Members are encouraged to contact Peter Hall (**FAX: 617-495-8509**) with suggestions for nominations. In addition, the By-Laws provide that "five members of the Section may nomi-

nate candidates for any **office** (except President) at the Annual Section Meeting, or by petition sent to the President prior to the meeting."

Fleron (continued from page 7)

social science and **Sovietology** had little to offer each **other**.

In this light it **seems that** Sovietologists were unprepared for *perestroika* and **post-Communism**, not because they had been influenced too much by Western social science, but because **they were** influenced by it too little. Now the editors ask, where are we and **where** should we focus **our** energies? **They** provide some judicious but challenging answers to **these** and other questions.

Political scientists, **area** specialists, policy **advisors**, and university students can profit from reading the **thoughtful** essays contained in this volume. **The** contributors' different assumptions, approaches, and conclusions attest to the diversity of opinions and skills of Sovietologists. The authors **demonstrate** how we can advance our **understanding** of the Communist past, the **transitional** present, and the past-Communist

future.

Follow-up: A further exploration of these issues can be found in "Whither **Post-Sovietology**," *The Harriman Institute Forum*, 6, 6-7 (February-March, 1993) containing essays by **Fleron**, ("Comparative Politics and Lessons for the Present"), Hoffman ("Nurturing **Post-Sovietology**: Some Practical Suggestions"), and **Edward W. Walker** ("Post-Sovietology, Area-Studies, and the Social Sciences"). Copies may be obtained from:

Professor Frederic I **Fleron, Jr.**
Department of Political Science
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260

or
The Harriman Institute
Columbia University
420 West 118th Street
New York, NY 10027

rubric of social regulation. In his words, "While the programmes of the welfare state are largely concerned with the provision of 'merit goods' (busing, medical care, education, retirement income, and so on), the aim of social regulation is to provide 'public goods' like environmental protection, product safety or consumer information." The expansion of the Community's activity in the area of environmental policy has fueled much of the interest in social regulation.

Social regulation, according to Majone's analysis, is central to the evolution of the Community. In later work, he develops the argument that within the EC efforts will be devoted to social regulation rather than focusing on transferring the welfare state to the community level. To put it simply, national governments will keep the welfare state while social regulation will be handled at the Community level ("The European Community between Social Policy and Social Regulation," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 31: 2, March, 1993: 153-70).

Renaud Dehousse has carried the debate forward. In a recent article ("Integration v. Regulation? On the Dynamics of Regulation in the European Community," *Journal Of Common Market Studies*, 30: 4, December, 1992: 383-402), he argues that the EC's activity in the area of social regulation is not nearly as effective as that in the United States. Rather, the Community's effort primarily involves harmonization of laws rather than a preemption of national regulatory discretion. For example, the use of the directive allows the member states to decide whether sanctions will be attached to violations

of those laws transposed into the domestic legal code because of the Community Implementation is in the hands of the member states rather than the Commission. In fact, Dehousse argues that social regulation is characterized by "the 'dual subsidiarity' of social regulation. ...: subsidiarity with respect to... market integration and subsidiarity with respect to national regulatory policies." The debate clearly continues as to the importance of social regulation within the Community, its impact on overall integration, and its implications for the Community's policy structures.

Analytically much of the work in the regulatory area relies on comparative method. The American experience is important for many scholars. Within political science, this literature would be seen as belonging to comparative politics, comparative public policy in particular, rather than international relations. The federal model, often the American, undergirds many of the referents. The Community is not approached analytically as an international organization; the literature therefore rarely refers to the debates between the neo-functionalists and intergovernmentalists. The Community is viewed as developing structure which can be usefully be compared with that found in federal systems. In sum, this literature reinforces the growing cleavage between those who approach the Community through the lens of international relations theory and, those who approach it using analytic frameworks drawn from comparative politics and the study of public policy

Sbragia (continued from page 10)

Joireman (continued from page 8)

application to changing African societies.

Criticisms of *Making a Market* are due, in large part, to its anthropological nature. Though the anthropological foundation benefits the book in some fashion, due to the extended time frame, parts of the book can be frustrating for political scientists to read. Specifically aggravating is the lack of consideration of the state as a separate institution with an independent agenda. The state is mentioned peripherally in the book as an exogenous force affecting local institutions. Its policies are given without specific explanation of its goals. Additionally the reader is never given an assessment of the ability of the state to intervene, or its interest in the institutions that may develop. Throughout the book Ensminger views the state through the eyes of the Galole Orma. This is more than likely desirable for most anthropologists, towards whom the book is targeted, yet political scientists may be left feeling as if something is missing in the analysis.

Moreover, there is no attempt at comparison of the Orma to other groups or other experiences of market development. The develop-

ment of a broader perspective would have been helpful in making a strong case for the applicability of new institutional economics to developing societies, as well as placing the Orma experience in the context of other developing markets. Yet, this is not in the tradition of anthropological analysis which favors participant observation to comparative analysis. The burden of comparative studies in market development will have to fall on other scholars of new institutional economics.

The book as a whole is a remarkable achievement. Ensminger has combined years of observation and careful analysis into a theoretically relevant and empirically specific volume that bridges the disciplines of anthropology, political science and economics. The longitudinal breadth of the study leaves one with the feeling that Ensminger has taken the pulse of the society as institutions in its social, political, and economic spheres have been transformed. *Making a Market* is an important book for all those claiming interest in Africa and political economy.

Tarrow and Worcester (continued from page 11)

politics.

Professor Tarrow's report calls for increased funding for graduate student field experience in Europe, and for added attention to the methodological and language skills essential for problem-oriented comparative research in Europe. The report also makes a number of specific recommendations for enhancing the quality of research and training in the field. These include greater cooperation between American and European centers of European research; new pro-

grams of short-term "exposure" grants that allow students to advance their language skills and gain research experience; fellowships to help students combine area studies with disciplinary training; greater levels of support for language training; new summer research workshops for advanced graduate students and recent postdoctoral students. A number of these recommendations could be applied to other regions of the world, and to the study of comparative politics in general.

views of their **interventionist** tendencies. Thus, **Dunlavy** concludes, institutions do **not independently** determine the range of policy choices, but must be viewed within the historical **context** in which they operate.

Victoria **Hattam** finds that the role of **institutions** varies depending on the socioeconomic and political context. **Hattam** explains why the US labor movement, contrasted with that in Britain, failed to **develop a political** movement. Although the US labor movement secured **legislation** protecting labor's right to organize, the **courts** continued to prosecute industrial action. Judiciary independence in the US allowed the courts to pursue a judicial agenda which was impossible under the British conditions of **Parliamentary** supremacy. Similar legislation in Britain effectively defended labor's interests. The political **side of labor's struggle was rewarded**, while the American labor movement eventually developed an antistatist strategy. However, prior to this period, the US courts did not play a significant role in hindering or **promoting** labor interests.

Peter **Hall** demonstrates that institutions do not always have the inertial **properties** which are often ascribed to them, but rather can **become** agents of change. For Hall, the **introduction** of monetarist policies in Britain **occurred**, and **was both** more abrupt and more extensive than in other countries, due to a number of **institutional** factors. Among them was the **fragmentation** of the trade union movement which **contributed** to the inability of the **Labour government** to control wage movements. In **addition**, the two-party system and electoral **competition** forced the opposition to **elaborate a distinct** set of alternatives. **Finally**, responsible **party government**, through its centralization of power, facilitated policy implementation. Although the institutions did not produce economic **policy**, they clearly mediated its passage.

Finally Margaret Weir and Desmond King focus on how ideas **are** channeled by **institutions**. Weir explains how ideas can be constrained by institutional **structures**. She finds

that original innovations in US employment policy were later hampered by the fragmented structure of **institutions created** to promote it during the New Deal and postwar periods. Moreover, these institutional structures **restricted** the range of new policy proposals. Such "bounded innovation" left the structure of **employment** policy remarkably vulnerable to new strategies and helps to explain the relative **success** of Reagan era policies. King describes the way in which institutions channel ideas into policy. He discusses the introduction of **work-welfare** programs in the US and Britain in the 1980s, and the influence of the New Right's ideas. In his **view**, these policies were introduced in the US due to the relative **success** of **individual** state level work-welfare programs, but **incorporated** a mandatory New Right-influenced work requirement due to the excessive **influence** afforded by the Presidential veto. In **Britain**, on the other hand, New Right **work-welfare** policies were introduced due to their **support** from Conservatives, and the institutional **strength of majority parties in Britain**. The **Conservatives** were able to modify the existing manpower institution to exclude labor's **influence** and simplify the introduction of a **work-welfare program with compulsory work requirements** for all recipients of unemployment **benefits**.

There is, however, a downside to this **impressive** piece of scholarship. The relative **specificity** of historical institutionalism **does not argue** well for its ability to generalize political phenomena. In this approach, political institutions appear less deterministic than previously thought. The **array** of "strategically **correct**" choices of individual **actors** appears less self-evident than rational choice theories would have us believe. Moreover, this approach illustrates that more attention must **be** paid to the power of individuals or collectives to exploit or **implement** institutional features to their advantage. For comparative politics, however, this **relative** complexity only renders the task of explaining political outcomes more invigorating.

Ellison (continued from page 6)

"empiricists'?) most possess: (1) a good enough grasp of the formal models to understand, apply, and criticize intelligently what the theorists propose; and (2) the methodological skills to make their tests convincing. Work that, in my view, points in this direction includes G Bingham Powell's *Contemporary Democracies* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1982); the tests of Mancur Olson's hypotheses by Frederic L. Pryor (in Dennis C. Mueller, ed., *Political Economy of Growth*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983, pp. 90-108), and Virginia Gray and David Lowery ("Interest Group Politics and Economic Growth in the United States," *American Political Science Review* 82: 1, March, 1988: 109-31); Michael Wallerstein's analysis of trade union density ("Union Organization in Advanced Industrial Societies," *American Political Science Review* 83: 2, June, 1989: 481-502); R. Michael Alvarez, Geoffrey Garrett, and Peter Lange on comparative economic performance ("Government Partisanship, Labor Organization, and Macroeconomic Performance," *American Political Science Review* 85: 2, June, 1991: 539-56); and the important effort by Robert Keohane, Gary King, and Sidney Verba to unify quantitative and qualitative approaches to comparative testing (textbook manuscript in circulation).

In an ideal world, then (or, to be more modest, an ideal Department), graduate students will be educated along two distinct tracks: one theoretical, the other (actually in all likelihood, more demanding) empirical in the sense just outlined. Undergraduate teaching will likely involve three distinct levels: "core" introductory courses that focus on models and theoretical issues; intermediate ones that inculcate area expertise; and advanced offerings devoted to systematic comparison.

That, at least, is my hunch; but above all we need collegial discussion of this whole complex

of issues. I hope that this publication will continue to serve as a central vehicle, at least among comparativists, of that discussion.

Rogowski (continued from page 1)

The Organized Section continues healthy if quite lean. (For a more detailed account of Section finances, see *APSA-CP* 4: 1: Winter, 1993: 18.) Adam Przeworski has done a superb job of organizing our panels for this year's American Political Science Association Convention (see the detailed listing in the June issue of *PS* and the notice on page 13 of this issue), and I am confident that Gary Cox will continue the tradition next year. We continue to be the largest Section, counting over nine hundred members. As Organized Sections continue to proliferate, the APSA Council has considered how best to assure the focus and seriousness of Section activities; and it is likely that higher dues (the current minimum, to which we adhere, is five dollars annually), a larger membership, or both will be required in the future. We should discuss, if only preliminarily, at this year's Business Meeting whether we want to fund expanded Section activities (e.g., further improvements in the Newsletter) through increased dues, admitting that doing so might deprive us particularly of our least well-off members. (Bear in mind that, currently the Section receives only two dollars annually from each member, the remaining three dollars are retained by the APSA as its "administrative charge.")

As noted on page fourteen of this Newsletter, David Collier, Peter Lange, and Phil Shively rotate off the Executive Committee this year. All have given outstanding service; Peter, as indefatigable founder of the Section, deserves particular praise. I have enjoyed my term as titular head of this enterprise, and I happily pass the torch on to the capable hands of David Laitin.

