

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

With this issue, the Organized Section moves—as we had long hoped to do—to a semiannual rather than an annual Newsletter, and to an expanded format that is made possible by the Section's own good financial condition and by a very generous grant from the Office of International Studies and Overseas Programs at the University of California, Los Angeles. Our editorial offices have moved from the University of Washington, where John Keeler served ably and diligently as Editor, to UCLA. Our next issue will appear roughly in August, and I invite submissions for it, with a deadline of 1 July. Please address them to:

Adam Levine
Assistant Editor
APSA-CP
Department of Political Science
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1472

As I hope the current issue suggests, we especially welcome the following kinds of contributions:

1. Short notices of recent or forthcoming books and of especially significant journal articles (including, in particular, publications that might otherwise escape general notice.)
2. Surveys of recent research in individual subfields of comparative politics.
3. Information on helpful research resources (archives of documents or data, research centers or facilities abroad).
4. News of the field, including new journals, newsletters, computer networks, and the like.

Several colleagues at UCLA have selflessly agreed to help share the editorial duties, and you may want to communicate with them directly about ideas for specific submissions. In alphabetical order, they are: Richard Anderson (the former Soviet Union), Leonard Binder (the Middle East), Barbara Geddes (Latin America), Miriam Golden (Western Europe), Edmond Keller (Africa), Ivan Szelenyi (Eastern Europe), James Tong (China), and Michael Wallerstein (formal work in comparative politics). It is easiest to communicate via e-mail, and Adam Levine can route your

Please turn to page 2, column 1

Ronald Rogowski is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, President of the APSA's Organized Section in Comparative Politics, and the editor of this Newsletter.

WINTER '93

Letter from the President
(cont. from page 1)

initial message appropriately; his address is *levine@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu*. If you prefer to fax, our number is (310) 825-0778.

In the current issue, I direct particular attention to the survey on data sources and usage that W. Phillips Shively has asked us to include; it begins on page 19 of this issue. Please take time to complete it and mail it in; the results will be given great weight in our consultations with the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, which David Laitin initiated.

Please also note the invitation to submit nominations for our newly established award for best paper or article in comparative politics. Margaret Levi (University of Washington), who heads this year's selection committee, is eager to receive your suggestions; see page 15 of this issue for more information.

At the Organized Section's Business Meeting at last Fall's American Political Science Association Meeting, a Nominating Committee headed by Alberta Sbragia (University of Pittsburgh) proposed David Laitin (University of Chicago) as Vice President and President-Elect; Russell Dalton (University of California, Irvine) as Secretary-Treasurer; and Ellen Immergut (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and Vivien Schmidt (University of Massachusetts-Boston) to fill at-large vacancies on the Executive Committee. All were elected unanimously, and Laitin will assume the post of President this coming September. Russell Dalton report-

Please turn to page 18, column 1

CONTENTS

Letter from the President	1
Data Bases, Archives, and Works-in-Progress	3
Book and Article Notices	8
Announcements	14
Comparativists' Survey	19

Officers of the Organized Section

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

Vivian Schmidt
University of Massachusetts, Boston

W. Phillips Shively
University of Minnesota

Newsletter Staff:

Editor:
Ronald Rogowski
University of California, Los Angeles

Assistant Editor:
Adam Levine
University of California, Los Angeles

This newsletter was printed on 100% recycled paper. Please recycle.

DATA BASES, ARCHIVES, AND WORKS-IN-PROGRESS

ELECTORAL AND LEGISLATIVE POLITICS IN BRAZIL: NEW DATA

Barry Ames is Professor of Political Science at Washington University.

For those who like their politics complex and exotic, with occasional chaos thrown in for flavor, Brazil is second to none. The country's electoral laws provide a textbook example of an institutional structure designed to weaken parties and promote individualism among politicians. Elections for Chamber of Deputies are proportional but *open-list*, with states serving as at-large, multi-member districts, with candidate selection controlled by state-level politicians, with no effective threshold for party representation, and with no bar to reelection. In three of every five years the country holds national elections, choosing (in terms of varying lengths) state and national legislators, governors, municipal mayors and councils, and the president. Because elections are nonconcurrent, legislators can run for mayor or governor without losing their legislative mandates.

The National Congress consists of Senate with three members per state and a Chamber of Deputies that, while based on state population, vastly overrepresents poor and rural states. Congress enjoys extensive legislative powers. Enjoying legislative powers, however, is not the same as using them; hardly any broad legislation passes the two chambers. Most deputies spend the bulk of their time servicing constituents; the number of budgetary amendments they have offered to benefit their electoral bailiwicks has risen from 8,000 in 1989 to 72,000 last year.

Given the programmatic weakness of parties, and the given tendency of the party system to fragment, presidents are unlikely to find stable majority support in the Congress without extensive use of patronage. Thus presidents build cabinets with an eye to the backing individual ministers can attract from the states they represent. The ministers themselves are expected to use intergovernmental transfer agreements and government jobs to build support for the president, but they also manage to look to their own political futures.

Happily, Brazilian politics is not merely exotic; it is also quite accessible. Information about governmental activities, information that in many countries remains closely guarded or simply nonexistent, is available if one perseveres. Moreover, newspapers have learned to

compete in investigative reporting that reveals the inner workings of political wheeling and dealing.

For the last few years I have been investigating Brazilian electoral and legislative behavior in the period since 1978. In the course of this research program I have built a number of data bases. Under the terms of the NSF grant funding a portion of the research, I will eventually deposit most of the data with the ICPSR at the University of Michigan. At the moment, the data are not sufficiently clean or organized so that scholars can use them without my guidance, but I will be amenable to collaborative arrangements with interested scholars.

The Data Bases:

1. *Election results for the Chamber of Deputies for 1978, 1982, 1986, and 1990.* These are *municipal-level* returns for every municipality in about eighteen states (roughly 3,900 municipalities). All economically important states are included. For most states the raw data include all candidates; for a few states the data include only victorious candidates, respectable losers, and defeated incumbents. For 1990 the data also include state assembly returns. (Assembly elections are held at large in the entire state.)
2. *Election results for the Presidential election*
Please turn to page 4, column 1

- of 1989. This data set includes results for both rounds of the election for all states, municipalities, and candidates.
3. *The 1980 census.* Until the 1990 census becomes available, this is the latest census. It contains extensive economic and demographic information at the municipality level. Better data on total population are available in data set two.
 4. *The computerized map.* A key to analyzing the geographic distribution of electoral support is its visual, spatial representation. In other words, when one can "see" how a deputy's vote spills across county lines, it is easier to explore potential causal factors. To facilitate such analysis, I constructed digitized maps, one for each state, of all Brazil's counties. The coordinates are in ASCII format and thus can be used by any GIS. I utilized a program called "Voyager," developed by Rudy Husar at the Washington University School of Engineering, to link the county polygons to the various data bases, i.e., to the electoral results, the census, and so on. The maps are constructed to conform to the municipal divisions of the 1980 census. For various reasons, including the potential for political gains, Brazil's municipalities tend to subdivide, so for states with many new municipalities (mostly frontier states), the maps are somewhat out of date. However, these errors can be corrected in the ASCII files.
 5. *The biographies.* The biographical data bank uses published Brazilian materials for information about the backgrounds and careers of each deputy in the legislatures of 1979-83, 1983-87, 1987-91, and 1991-95.
 6. *The budgetary amendments.* Deputies offer amendments to the central government budget. I recorded these amendments for 1989, 1990, and 1991 by deputy, program, and municipality. I also recorded the ultimate disposition of each amendment, i.e., acceptance or rejection. In my paper "Disparately Seeking Politicians..." I used these amendments as indicators of the localities where deputies planned to seek votes in the next election.
 7. *Intergovernmental transfers.* Ministries in Brazil sign *convênios* with municipalities to grant money for particular projects. The data cover 1986, 1988, and the whole Collor administration. They include three ministries: Housing, Education and Social Action. I re-

corded, for each agreement, the date on which it was signed, the municipality benefiting, the amount of money involved, and the nature of the program benefited.

8. *Radio and TV licenses.* These licenses, which are granted by the Ministry of Communications, are often seen as political payoffs. Each license includes its date, the municipality benefited, and the type of concession involved. The data set is complete for 1988.
9. *The Constituent Assembly.* Held in 1987 and 1988, the Assembly wrote Brazil's new constitution. The data set records the votes of all deputies and senators on over 500 issues, i.e., all significant votes on which at least fifty members took the losing side. The data are in the form of an ASCII file, and there is also an ASCII text codebook. Professor Timothy Powers of Louisiana State University collaborated on the preparation of this data set.

Access

Both graduate students and established Latin Americanists should think more about seeking and utilizing primary quantitative data on political institutions. The various cross-national "political statistics" compilations are no substitute for primary data collection, because their coverage is too spotty and they rarely disaggregate data to politically interesting levels. Too often, I think, scholars in the field overlook readily available quantitative data or overestimate the difficulty of obtaining rigorous measures of the phenomena they study.

Most of the data sets discussed above will eventually be deposited at the ICPSR, and I expect to begin sending components within about eighteen months. In the interim, I would be interested hearing from scholars who have similar data from other countries or have ideas for projects where these Brazilian data might be useful. Though I have developed no hard-and-fast access rules, my highest priority would be collaborative projects on unexplored topics. In some cases scholars may come to Saint Louis to work with the data. At the moment I do not have the time to provide perfectly clean data sets for users unfamiliar with Brazilian politics who are uninterested in collaboration, but such users can wait for the data to arrive at ICPSR. Application of these rules will vary across data sets, of course, because some are much cleaner than others.

Please turn to page 18, column 1

CURRENT RESEARCH: LATIN AMERICA

The shift towards democracy from authoritarianism in Latin America with which we have all become so familiar has had dramatic effects on the study of regional politics. The development of theories of democratic politics is now the research frontier for Latin Americanists. This effort requires both a substantial amount of data collection as well as the development and adaptation of theories. Moreover, quite a bit of cross-regional comparative work has also marked the field.

Data Collections

Barry Ames (Washington University) is currently involved in the most extensive and impressive of these data collection efforts (see page 3).

Michael Coppedge (SAIS, Johns Hopkins) has collected the results of all Chamber of Deputies elections from 1912 to 1991 for ten Latin American countries and is willing to share it.

I have collected information on the major parties and legal provisions affecting suffrage for all Latin American countries from the Nineteenth Century to the present (see "The Use of Case Studies in Path Dependent Arguments," presented at the 1992 American Political Science Association Meeting).

Theoretical work

Theoretical work is at a fairly early stage, mostly unpublished; much of it is focused on normative claims concerning presidential and parliamentary systems. Work of interest includes:

Arturo Valenzuela (ed.), *Politics, Society, and Democracy: Latin America* (forthcoming).

Arturo Valenzuela and Juan Linz (eds.), *The Crisis of Presidential Democracy: The Latin American Experience* (forthcoming).

Scott Mainwaring, Guillermo O'Donnell, and Samuel Valenzuela (eds.), *Issues in Democratic Consolidation: The New South American Democracies in Comparative Perspective* (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1992).

Matthew Shugart and John Carey, *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics* (see page 13).

Scott Mainwaring and Timothy Scully (eds.) *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America* (forthcoming).

On this subject there are also several ongoing projects which comparativists as well as Latin Americanists might find of interest. These

include:

Michael Coppedge (SAIS, Johns Hopkins) is working on a book that explains the evolution of party systems in Latin America.

Matthew Shugart (IRPS, University of California, San Diego) is working on a project linking formal political institutions to policy outcomes.

Frances Hagopian (Tufts University) is involved in a project explaining the reorganization of political representation, which was formerly organized to make state intervention in the economic more efficacious, after structural adjustment.

I am comparing the selection of new political institutions during transitions to democracy in Latin America and Eastern Europe. In this respect, the Jon Elster-Stephen T. Holmes data collection on constitutions in Eastern Europe, being done at the University of Chicago, has been most helpful. If you interested in the latter, you may contact Dwight Semler at the University of Chicago (312-752-3473) for more information.

Structural Adjustment

The other subject that continues to engage Latin Americanists is structural adjustment. Among the more interesting of the case-study based works are:

Robert Wade, *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992)

Robert Bates and Anne Krueger, *Political and Economic Interactions in Economic Policy Reform* (see page 10).

Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman (eds.) *The Politics of Adjustment: International Constraints, Distributive Policies and the State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

A good deal of work on this topic is also being done by economists. Among the best of—
Please turn to page 18, column 1

Barbara Geddes is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Philip G. Roeder is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego.

WORK-IN-PROGRESS: PHILIP G. ROEDER

If one looks back in history a mere five years, one is struck by the tremendous changes which have been witnessed worldwide in this interval; foremost amongst these is the implosion of the Soviet Union and the collapse of its bloc. While rapid change has a tendency to disorient and confuse, it also provides us with a great opportunity to reanalyze our long-held assumptions and challenge stylized facts relating to the subject. Moreover, it supplies us with new research agendas and is an occasion to look at issues in fundamentally new ways—to use theory in a novel fashion. This is the jumping-off point for the most recent work of Philip Roeder.

Roeder's forthcoming book, *Red Sunset: The Failure of Soviet Politics*, begins by posing a paradox about the demise of the Soviet Union; how is it that a political system, born of revolution and devoted to social, political, and economic change should perish from stagnation? What caused a seemingly stable polity to collapse with such suddenness? Roeder finds the answer to this conundrum in the Bolshevik "constitution"—the fundamental rules of the Soviet system that have evolved from revolutionary times through the post-Stalin era. These institutions increasingly prevented the Communist party from responding to the immense social change which it had itself set in motion; although the Soviet political system initially had vast re-

sources for transforming society, its ability to transform itself became severely limited.

In Roeder's view, the problem was not that Soviet leaders were resistant to change or did not attempt it, but that their attempts were so often defeated by institutional resistance to reform. The leaders' successful efforts to stabilize the political system reduced its adaptability, and as the need for reform continued to mount, this stability became a fatal flaw. Roeder's analysis of institutional constraints on political behavior provides a strong basis for comparison of the Soviet experience with constitutional transformation in other authoritarian polities.

Mark Hallerberg is a Ph. D. candidate in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

DISSERTATION-IN-PROGRESS: GERMAN TAX REFORM AND THE ROLE OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

This project examines the extent of tax reform in the individual German states from 1871 to 1914 and its relationship to political reform. The unification of Germany in 1871 created one common currency among the twenty-six states, and made it much easier for capital and labor to travel freely within the new country. While unification also meant that the individual states lost certain revenue sources, such as customs levies, to the central government, each state still determined its own tax and political system until the outbreak of World War I.

In this case economic pressure did not force tax systems to converge, as some authors assert has occurred recently among OECD countries, and the extent of economic development of a state was also not the determining factor, since states with similar levels of economic development often relied on different revenue sources. States did maintain autonomy over their tax

policies, and the relative openness of a state's political institutions was decisive in policy outcomes; in states where the franchise was extended or relatively open at the time of unification, such as in Bavaria and Baden respectively, the tax became less regressive, while in states with restricted franchises, such as the two Meck-

Please turn to page 17, column 1

DISSERTATION-IN-PROGRESS: PARTY COMPETITION, ISSUES, AND ELECTORAL OUTCOMES IN POSTWAR JAPANESE POLITICS

The study of issues is central to any study of competitive electoral politics. Like peering through a window on a society, studying issues allows one to see what conflicts occupy a society at a particular moment in history. More than this, knowing what conflicts comprehend a society's electoral politics also provides a way to understand electoral outcomes. Schattschneider pointed out that conflict management is the essence of political strategy. Political parties endeavor to control the nature and scope of conflict because the conflicts that define party competition bear heavily on their electoral fortunes.

If issues are at the center of party competition and electoral outcomes, it is curious that there has been no systematic investigation of the issues that have consumed postwar Japanese politics and what role they have played in determining postwar electoral outcomes. Even where issues have been addressed—most often in narrowly-gauged, cross sectional studies—their influence on electoral outcome has been deemed to be either small and indirect, or simply unimportant. This study proceeds from the notion that issues have been an important factor in determining the changing constellation of party fortunes that define postwar electoral outcomes. However, understanding the electoral influence of issues requires a different research design than has been used previously.

This study employs a design that is informed by "saliency theory." According to saliency theory, political parties advocate certain policies to promote the interests of the groups that support them. This leads to their acquisition of certain policy images vis-à-vis the electorate. In other words, political parties become the owners of certain issues, and, on these owned issues, electorates associate them with a certain level of proficiency, or credibility. For example, social democratic parties are often considered more proficient at promoting welfare policies than their conservative counterparts.

To use this framework for understanding the relationship between issues and electoral outcomes, saliency theorists have divided political parties into two types, bourgeois and socialist, and distinguished them according to their differing policy tendencies. They have also classified the universe of salient election issues as

belonging to one of fourteen categories, each characterized loosely as a socialist or bourgeois issue area. When issues become salient in elections, they benefit the party which owns that issue. With this framework, salient issues in elections can be identified, party ownership noted, and impacts on electoral outcome estimated.

In principle, this framework permits a comparative study of issue effects in any electoral democracy, but, because it is informed principally by West European electoral history, application to the Japanese context is problematic. This study involves a mapping of the issues that have been salient in postwar Japanese elections. In many cases, the assumed issue effects work differently in Japan. After mapping the postwar issue agenda, and identifying the issues that Japan's several parties own, each postwar election was coded for its issue effects. By performing a content analysis of written reports of each lower house election, issue effects were coded as being neutral, favorable to the opposition, or favorable to the ruling LDP. Issue impacts on party fortunes were then estimated by regressing party vote shares on the issue effect scores.

The results of this analysis will be of interest to scholars who study electoral politics in advanced industrial societies as well as those who focus more narrowly on Japan. In addition to understanding how issue conflicts in Japan compare to other nations, the analysis provides a way to understand why the pattern of LDP predominance endures, the decline of its traditional support bases notwithstanding. This is true because this study's framework over-

Please turn to page 16, column 1

Dennis Patterson is a Ph. D. candidate in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles. This Autumn, he will join the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

BOOK AND ARTICLE NOTICES

Richard D. Anderson, Jr. is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

IAN BREMMER AND RAY TARAS (EDS.). *NATIONS AND POLITICS IN THE SOVIET SUCCESSOR STATES*. CAMBRIDGE: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1993. \$19.95

Bremmer and Taras have compiled a valuable, informative survey of the recent politics of the fifteen former Soviet republics, plus chapters on historical Soviet ethnic policy and on the "ethnic archipelagoes" of the Middle Volga, the North Caucuses and Siberia. Most of the chapters also provide helpful guidance to what it means, historically and culturally, to be a Kyrgyz, a Chuvash, a Balkan or a Belarusan. The authors are experts from a variety of disciplines on the language and culture of each former republic or region (with Cynthia Kaplan filling in capably for Estonia, for which a contributor who knew the language was probably impossible to find). Even when the authors are émigré patriots, they have written detailed, professional accounts that are reasonably objective despite their evident enthusiasm for independence. One might debate, for example, the Ukrainians' charges of discrimination against their republic by Soviet industrial policy, or question the formulation of statements about some Balts' participation in Nazi persecution of Jews, but at least it receives mention and the victims are not blamed.

While the reader can learn plenty about nation and state building in the former Soviet Union from the chapters, the editors' introductory and concluding chapters do not provide a theoretical synthesis of the volume. In his conclusion, Taras asserts, "No single theory can account for the historical path traveled in the early 1990s in the former Soviet Union by the Balts and Turkik peoples, Uniates and Buddhists, industrialized sectors and communities of reindeer herders." He is right to claim that the experiences of the former Soviet republics are extremely diverse, but of course explaining variation is what good theory is for. Taras himself supplies a "Boolean analysis" attributing mobilization for national sovereignty to the interaction of four variables—size, homogeneity, wealth, and recent economic advance or decline—measured as dichotomous dummy variables. If that information is all one needs to account for the emergence of national sovereignty movements in the former Soviet Union, one wonders why publish five-hundred pages of detailed analysis.

The editors' aversion to theory limits the usefulness of the chapters. A very fine survey of the Tajik republic by the historian Muriel Atkin, by no fault of the author, does not even

discuss the possibility of an impending outbreak of internecine warfare there. Surely if a theory of nationalism could do anything at all, it could supply criteria for judging which former Soviet republics were more or less likely to disintegrate into Lebanons. In all the chapters the peoples of the Soviet republics are presented as moving to cities, learning to read, joining organizations formed by ambitious local politicians, and responding to the cultural productions of discontented intellectuals. All of these experiences are key variables in standard theories of nationalism by Karl Deutsch, Ernest Gellner, or Benedict Anderson, and national integration in each republic presumably depends on the degree to which these processes have occurred. When Atkin observes that few urban Tajiks share the Russian-speaking city dwellers' prejudices against the rural majority of Tajiks, that the meaning of Tajik ethnicity is profoundly uncertain and contested both historically and geographically, and that nationalist politicians failed to mobilize effective opposition to the local communists before independence, all these theories would take her observations as signs pointing to trouble, if not necessarily foreboding it.

It would not be difficult for the editors to
Please turn to page 17, column 1

IRA KATZNELSON. "THE STATE TO THE RESCUE," *SOCIAL RESEARCH* 59:4 (WINTER, 1992).

Christine Vicars Gray is a Ph. D. student in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Just over ten years have passed since Stephen Skowronek's *Building a New American State* signaled the launching of a new, state-centered body of scholarship in American politics. Since then, this scholarship in American Political Development (APD)—itself a symptom of a broader movement to counter the pervasiveness of ahistorical theorizing and methodological individualism in political science—has inspired the founding of a new journal, *Studies in American Political Development*, and has produced what Ira Katznelson describes as, "the most interesting, certainly the most audacious" work on American political history today. Katznelson finds much to praise in the outpouring of APD scholarship over the last decade. It has, he asserts, "created fundamentally new ways of apprehending the American regime."

But in this recent article, Katznelson's purpose is not to offer praise. Rather, it is to deliver a cautionary note; one that he found to be powerfully underscored by some "telling points" made by comparativist Leonard Binder in another context against a similar target. In "The Natural History of Development Theory," Binder directs a trenchant criticism against state-centered approaches in development theory. Too often, in Binder's view, the complexity and multidimensionality of the issue of state power is lost in simple considerations along the single spectrum of stateness. Katznelson sees here a resonating echo of worrisome trends in recent state-centered scholarship in APD. He notes a certain narrowing of perspective in APD scholarship, a withdrawal from the breadth and depth which marked Skowronek's foundational text. He finds in the scholarship of Western and American development, no less than does Binder in the third world development literature, a tendency to treat "the enhancement of state capacity as a relatively unproblematic good." Too easily, it is argued, this can lead to an underappreciation of the tensions and accommodations by which liberalism and social democracy are linked in the apparatus of the state.

A similar threat of impoverishment lurks in

another aspect of APD scholarship which Katznelson find troubling; to wit, the tendency of APD scholarship to function from deep within the American perspective. To better "interrogate the American experience," and to more deeply examine "the awesome capacities of modern states for good and evil," Katznelson calls for APD scholarship to seek out broader perspectives, to draw on work from political theory, comparative politics and international relations. Yet whether scholars in APD will be able to respond to Katznelson's call to incorporate the perspectives of neighboring subfields is an open question. Equally to the point, can comparativists, political theorists, and those in international relations take heed of Katznelson's appeal to cross subfield boundaries? The current trend towards specialization of the discipline's subfields undoubtedly makes interfield scholarship an increasingly difficult challenge for individual scholars. On the other hand, the achievements of APD scholarship over the last decade are a measure of what may be accomplished when the challenge is taken up to reverse a reigning trend. For now, however, Katznelson's precautionary challenge to the discipline at large, and to APD in particular, still holds. It demands attention.

Sandra Fullerton Jolreman and Winston Wells are Ph. D. students in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

ROBERT H. BATES AND ANNE O. KRUEGER (EDS.). *POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC INTERACTIONS IN ECONOMIC POLICY REFORM*. CAMBRIDGE: BLACKWELL. 1993. \$59.95.

This volume is a welcome attempt to combine extremely disparate regional literature on structural adjustment programs. The empirical research for the book was conducted in such a way as to generate truly economic hypotheses and conclusions. Bates and Krueger commissioned eight teams of researchers; each composed of at least one political scientist and an economist. The teams' initial agenda was to unravel the puzzle of why good economics means bad politics in relation to these structural adjustment programs. To meet that end, the teams were asked to investigate three phases surrounding the adjustment programs. Informed by current theories of interest groups, rent extraction, and bureaucracies, these analysts explored the political and economic background of the period prior to the reform process itself, and the political and economic reactions to adjustment. Included in the volume are the standard cases of stabilization and adjustment (Ghana, Zambia, Brazil), yet case selection is varied, resulting in fascinating studies of Turkey, Ecuador, and Egypt. In considering these less studied countries, the volume adds a wealth of monographic data to its theoretical agenda.

Comparativists will find much of note in the country studies that constitute the core of the book. From Grindle and Thoumi's description of politically fragile Ecuadorian presidents muddling through adjustment to Leith and Lofchie's and Stalling and Brock's explorations of the power of economic ideas in Ghana and Chile, the volume's eight cases reflect the political richness of economic reform in the developing world. Most lead us to conclude that societal interests and external actors are relatively ineffectual in bringing about and sustaining economic reform. The country teams, for example, find little evidence to suggest that in periods of economic crisis negatively impacted interest groups are able to pressure leaders to embark on politically risky programs of reform. As the editors note in their conclusion, the impetus in both cases appears to emerge almost entirely from the executive branch of government.

Many of these cases (Ecuador and Egypt, for example) also support the work of Haggard, Kaufman, and Remmer, which in recent years has cast doubt on the ability of regime type to account for the success or failure of particular episodes of adjustment. Of greater significance is the ease in which contributors move beyond this increasingly stale debate to focus more on the role that institutions play in the reform process. Just as adjustment leads to the modifica-

tion of existing economic structures, a similar process appears to occur in the political realm. In Turkey and Chile, economic restructuring led to the increased insulation of technocrats; in Zambia, political imperatives forced the locus of economic policy-making to oscillate between government ministries and party committees during adjustment. Reform may not require authoritarianism, but the process does seem to infuse energy in the executive.

Most of volume's contributors adhere to the editors' initial framework, although Holt and Roe's treatment of the Egyptian case is a notable exception. Their focus on the agricultural sector comes at the expense of both the editors' agenda and a serious discussion of the future of economic reform in the country. We also remain somewhat puzzled by the inclusion of Korea in the project, despite the editors' discussion of the theoretical and practical considerations that motivated their case selection. Korea's restructuring in the early 1960s differs fundamentally from the episodes of reform covered in the other cases, most of which are informed by the notion of policy-based lending developed by the World Bank during the 1980s. Practical issues aside, recent episodes of reform in Thailand or the Philippines might have been better suited for a work of this nature.

Please turn to page 17, column 1

LEONARDO MORLINO AND FRANCO MATTEI. "VECHIO E NUOVO AUTORITARISMO NELL'EUROPA MEDITERRANEA." *RIVISTA ITALIANA DI SCIENZA POLITICA*, 7:1 (APRIL 1992).

Amie Kreppel is a Ph. D. student in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

While much treatment has been given recently to the transition from authoritarian regimes to democratic ones, little attention has focused on the vestiges of authoritarian sentiment which persist in these societies. Leonardo Morlino and Franco Mattei have recently sought to remedy this situation with a cross-national study of Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain. The authors center their discussion on three distinct, but related issues: variance between countries in the level of support for a reversion to authoritarianism, the demographics of this support, and the potential threat to these relatively young democratic regimes which this support poses.

Support for a restoration of authoritarianism was found to vary between the four countries, from a high of 13% in Italy to a low of 5% in Greece. The variance is explained by two variables: the interval and level of consolidation of authoritarian rule, and the country's historical distance from it; both variables are correlated positively with authoritarian support. Thus the low levels of support for authoritarianism in Greece are accounted for by the military regime's short duration and lack of consolidation (six years) and the youth of the democratic state (two decades). On the other hand, the fascist regime in Italy endured for a longer period and dissipated almost half a century ago.

The first of these two explanatory variables suggests, in keeping with much of the political culture literature, that high levels of support for authoritarianism should be found amongst age-groups who were socialized under the authoritarian regime. The second variable leads us in the opposite direction. Historical distance from authoritarian rule is positively correlated with authoritarian support because those individuals who have not experienced the brutal nature of such states are more likely to respond positively to them. Thus, under the authors' reasoning, we should expect to find support for authoritarianism to be highest amongst the oldest and youngest age-groups. The results of the authors' survey are mixed on this account. In Italy, support for an authoritarian reversion is spread fairly evenly among age-groups, with the lowest level of support found in the youngest age-group; Portugal also provides a quandary for this explanation. On the other hand, the authors' expectations for the other countries were at least par-

tially held up.

Morlino and Mattei are also intimately concerned with the possibility that, during a period of political or economic crisis, an authoritarian opposition may mobilize against the democratic state. They measure the probability of such an occurrence by the amount of interest expressed in politics in general, and the endorsement of "strikes, demonstrations and occupations." In almost all cases, it is the authoritarians (other than those who define themselves as "indifferent" to politics) who are least interested in political participation and who give the lowest level of approval to strikes, demonstrations and occupations. The authors have taken the authoritarians' low levels of interest in politics and their small numbers as indicating that authoritarian mobilization against democracy is unlikely.

There are, however, three methodological considerations which should be addressed before such arriving at such a conclusion. First, there would seem to be the obvious difficulty of the study's lack of a control group. All four countries in the study are Southern European countries which have undergone a transition to democracy relatively recently (Italy excepted). In order to better understand the significance of the numbers which the survey has produced, it might have been wise to include other countries in this survey which occupied different locations on these political spectra. How can we know what "low" levels of support are unless we have a large sample for comparison? Second, it should be noted that historically, minority support for authoritarianism has proven to

Please turn to page 16, column 1

David J. Pervin is a Ph. D. student in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles.

MICHAEL N. BARNETT. *CONFRONTING THE COSTS OF WAR: MILITARY POWER, STATE, AND SOCIETY IN EGYPT AND ISRAEL*. PRINCETON: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1992. \$39.50

Research on the Middle East has long been dominated by historians and area specialists who generally have held, implicitly or explicitly, that regional politics are *sui generis* and thus cannot and should not be compared either with the European experience or that of other third world regions. More recently, political scientists have increasingly sought both to use the Middle East to test and improve established theories and to use established theories to shed new light on Middle Eastern politics. In the field of international relations, Stephen Walt used the Middle East to refine traditional balance of power of theory with an emphasis on the balance of threat. In comparative politics, John Waterbury, Alan Richards, and others have drawn on political economy to increase our understanding of domestic politics in various Middle Eastern countries.

It is widely recognized that the barriers separating the study of international relations and comparative politics impede our understanding of both domestic and international phenomena, and that there is a need for theoretical development taking into account the interaction of the two "levels." This need may be of particular importance when studying developing countries that, as many scholars have argued, are more concerned with domestic threats than international ones and have less control over their international environment in any case.

One route of addressing this need is to focus on the state as an autonomous actor with its own goals, and to emphasize its "two faces" by "embedding" it in the international and domestic domains. This "Janus faced" nature of the state is the starting point of Michael Barnett's stimulating new book. He argues that the state's domestic goals, including political stability and economic growth, at times conflict and even contradict its international aims (most prominently war preparation), necessitating tradeoffs. How the state deals with this tension is affected by the opportunities, constraints, and threats of both the international and domestic environments. Of particular importance in this respect is the state's strength relative to society, and thus its ability to extract resources—both economic and in terms of manpower (i.e., conscription).

There are three strategies available to the state to ameliorate the adverse effects of this contradiction. The first two are domestic: an "accommodational strategy" in which changes are made to the status quo, and a "restructural

strategy" in which states "attempt to restructure the present state-society compact in order to increase the total amount of financial, productive [material], and manpower resources...for war preparation." The third is an "international strategy" in which the state forms alliances in order to gain military or economic support from external sources. While these are presented as distinct strategies, Barnett recognizes that in fact more than one may be pursued at any given time; the question, then, becomes one of emphasis.

In reviewing the literature on war and the state based on European experience, Barnett notes that there is a division between one perspective that war has led to increased state strength and one that suggests just the opposite. This puzzle can be examined, he argues, through looking at how the pressing needs for war preparation over time affected the relative strength of state and society in Egypt and Israel, two countries in sustained conflict that are seen as having strong states. Both Egypt and Israel, particularly the former, pursued the three strategies sequentially, initially making small changes and then, as the needs for war preparation rose, increased state strength. When internal resources proved insufficient, both increasingly relied on external assistance and, paradoxically, saw a decline in state strength.

That state strength declined is a paradox, argues Barnett, because it is not what one would expect given the European experience. But it is not necessarily clear why one would expect the same outcome given the important differences

Please turn to page 18, column 1

MATTHEW SOBERG SHUGART AND JOHN M. CAREY. *PRESIDENTS AND ASSEMBLIES: CONSTITUTIONAL DESIGN AND ELECTORAL SYSTEMS.* CAMBRIDGE: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1992. \$16.95

Given the current prominence of democratization and redemocratization in comparative politics, *Presidents and Assemblies* is a timely and relevant book, seeking to answer the question, "Which is 'better,' presidential or parliamentary democracy?" It is a question not only of theoretical, but practical importance as well. From Latin America to Eastern Europe, the question of what form of representative democracy best serves the needs of the governed is at the forefront of popular debate in countries experiencing a return to democratic forms of government.

Shugart and Carey start by creating a simple typology of representative democracies. Based on two variables, presidential authority over the cabinet, and separation of the assembly and the cabinet, they assume three basic types: Presidential, Premier-Presidential and Parliamentary-Presidential. The Presidential type is based on the maximal separation of cabinet and assembly and the full responsibility of the cabinet to the president. Premier-Presidentialism features a president with significant power, but who is constrained by a cabinet responsible solely to the assembly. Parliamentary-Presidentialism involves the sharing of responsibility over the cabinet between the assembly and the president.

The authors are most interested in the hybrid systems, that is the Parliamentary-Presidential system and the Premier-Presidential system. The authors recognize that the central problem to these types is that while they address the representative concerns that critics of purely presidential systems raise, an attempt at combining these forms of government can lead to a confusion of responsibilities between the president and the assembly, especially regarding authority over the cabinet. Premier-Presidential regimes, for example, are most prone to instability given the combination of presidential and cabinet authority, especially during periods of cohabitation when the president and premier are from opposing parties. In such a situation, the stability of the regime will depend on the clarity of the division between the respective powers of the president and the cabinet.

The authors begin with an examination of the critiques of the presidential system, and conclude that there are elements of the presidential

system worth preserving in the hybrid forms, most notably the clear choice presented to voters in their selection of a chief executive. The rest of the book, through an examination of the dynamics of different electoral systems and presidential powers, is centered around achieving an optimal balance between the representative benefits of assembly-dominated systems and the clear authority and efficiency of presidential systems. Given the seemingly intractable contradiction between these two forms of representative democracy and the fact that it appears impossible to maximize the benefits of one without depleting the other, *Presidents and Assemblies* becomes an exploration of the factors that can make for a workable trade-off between the representative features of assembly-dominated systems and the relative efficiency of presidential systems.

One of the strongest features of *Presidents and Assemblies* is the wide sample of regimes that are examined. By using examples from Finland to Sri Lanka, the authors draw from a variety of different areas and systems to provide enough interesting examples so that even readers familiar with the literature will find something new. Another useful feature is the attempt the book makes to distinguish between various types of presidential and parliamentary regimes. As the authors note, critics of presidential systems have the unfortunate tendency to box all types of presidential regimes together. Shugart and Carey explore the shades of gray that the hybrid forms produce, giving some insight into the nuances of the presidential form of government.

The main problem seems to be the lack of distinction between the two variables used to delineate the types of regimes. Essentially both

Please turn to page 15, column 1

Zachary Selden is a Ph. D. candidate at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is the co-author, with Charles Philippe David and Nancy Carroll, of *Foreign Policy Failure in the White House*, to be published by University Press of America this Spring.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Marcus Schlegel, is a Ph. D. candidate at Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität. He has been researching into the possibilities of improving international communication through computer networks for the Seminar fuer Politische Wissenschaften, and is currently supporting the organization of POSCIM.

FROM VIRTUAL REALITY TO THE VIRTUAL CAMPUS: ELECTRONIC MAILING LISTS AS A NEW FORUM FOR DISCUSSION

Virtual reality has become one of the most discussed topics of technology in the 1990s. Architects and designers were amongst the first to recognize the usefulness of computers in simulating reality in order to project new layouts into the real world and to get a clear-cut idea of what their effects will be.

The vision of a global village, as related to the synergetic energy that can be the product of the interconnection of computers and modern means of data transmission, has received much discussion. On a growing scale, the connection of data networks such as Internet has, over the last few years, become accessible to an ever-growing scientific community worldwide.

As the natural sciences have been making extensive use of these new facilities for a number of years, the idea of creating a virtual, international campus for the political science community was a logical, almost foregone conclusion. The notion of virtuality here refers to the fact that the capabilities of modern computer communications can be put to work for a host of communication needs that, if implemented by traditional methods of exchange and discourse (i.e., physical transport or telephones in all its variations) were prone to two imperfections. To wit:

1. If a group of people were involved in the communication process, it was either relatively slow (e.g., print media) or logistically difficult to organize (e.g., conferences).
2. If traditional means of telecommunication were involved, the spread of ideas would be quicker, but an exact addressee had to be known. Thus, information could only be disseminated to a narrow and select group.

Drawing on the consequences of these natural weaknesses in traditional modes of communication, the Seminar fuer Politische Wissenschaften at Bonn's Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität has created a "virtual campus," a forum where ideas, concepts or mere technical information could be exchanged. As would happen on a real campus, the virtual campus provides not only the well defined communication between known partners, but also the encounter of heterogeneous concepts which can

often help create entirely new solutions and glosses on a given problem.

It was for this reason that the Political Science Mailing List (POSCIM) was created at Bonn University on 14 January 1983. It is a closed user group, available only to an interested and qualified public by means of distributing electronic mail to subscribers. The typical weakness of traditional Bulletin Board Systems (BBSs), namely the phenomena of "flaming" of some discussants at others from the twilight zone of anonymity, and the unacceptable number of insubstantial contributions to a given topic (which is quite habitual in political topics), can be controlled.

Texts that are contributed by one listmember are addressed to a mailserver, assuring redistribution of the text to all other listmembers. In addition, a database of the entire body of messages sent to the list is available to members as well as a text-archive, containing useful information that can automatically be distributed by the mailserver.

The following examples give evidence to the potential of this powerful new tool.

1. Electronic publication of texts to a worldwide scientific community with an immediate feedback that allows for an effective way to deal with the ever accelerating succession of events in international politics
2. Preparation of meetings and congresses.
3. Development of initiatives and inter-institutional partnership programs.
4. Maintenance of the steady exchange of ideas on an international level that would otherwise be impossible for reasons of geography or practicality.

Similar attempts in the field of computer science have worked with exceedingly beneficial results. For example, the non-commercial

Please turn to page 15, column 1

computer operating system LINUX and its software was in large part developed by programmers who organized their cooperation by means of electronic mailing lists.

POSCIM can be joined by any individual teaching, studying or practicing in the field of

political science with access to Internet electronic mail facilities. Simply send the command *subscribe to listserv@dearn.bitnet*.

Schlegel (cont.)
from page 14)

The American Political Science Association's Organized Section in Comparative Politics will award its first prize for the best book or article published in 1990, 1991, or 1992. This new award will hopefully remedy the dearth of honors given for comparative politics; the only prize currently given is the Gabriel Almond dissertation prize.

Please submit nominations by May 1, 1993 to:

Margaret Levi
Department of Political Science
DO-30

University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
Voice: (206) 543-7947
Fax: (206) 685-2146
E-mail: *mlevi@u.washington.edu*

Other members of the award committee are Professor Aristide Zolberg, Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research; and Professor Michael Allen, Bryn Mawr College.

The award, which carries a \$200 cash prize, will be announced at the Annual Business Meeting at the 1993 American Political Science Association Meeting.

The APSA-CP Award

The 1993 meeting of the Northeast Political Science Association will be held at the Hilton Gateway Hotel in Newark, New Jersey on November 11-13. The NPSA is seeking to broaden the base of the conference and has invited the of the American Political Science Association's Organized Section in Comparative Politics to develop and submit a panel proposal. As it is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the NPSA, they are especially interested in a panel that would comment on the twenty-fifth anniversary of some special event, political or

scholarly.

Interested scholars may contact Ron Rogowski at:

University of California, Los Angeles
Department of Political Science
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1472
Voice: (310) 825-4371
Fax: (310) 825-0778
E-mail: *rogowski@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu*

If you would like further information, please consult the December 1992 issue of *PS*.

The 1993 NPSA Meeting

variables simply measure the authority over the cabinet held by either the president or the assembly. Someone must have authority over the cabinet so if not the president then it must be the assembly and vice versa. These do not appear to be two distinct variables but rather opposite ends of the same scale. However this is not a critical flaw, for the main purpose of the book is to explore the means of constructing

regimes that are representative without sacrificing efficiency. To achieve this end, Shugart and Carey concentrate on electoral mechanisms, especially electoral timing. Operating on the assumption that the most recently elected branch of government will enjoy a greater claim to legitimacy, staggered elections can provide a relatively clear means of determining whether the

Please turn to page 17, column 1

Selden (cont.)
from page 13)

**Patterson (cont.
from page 7)**

comes many weaknesses that characterize existing explanations.

Existing explanations have tended to focus on limited segments of Japan's postwar electoral history. In contrast, all postwar elections are covered in this study. Existing explanations are also limited in that they assume a causal link between postwar socio-economic changes and the political changes that have ostensibly followed in their wake. An illustration of this is the post-industrial explanation which ties the rise of opposition support in the 1970s to the growth of Japanese voters possessing modern values. This explanation worked well in the 1960s and 1970 but cannot explain why the LDP enjoyed renewed levels of support in the 1980s. By linking socio-economic change to salient election issues, this study separates socio-economic change that carries political (electoral) significance from that which does not.

The nature and extent of electoral change in postwar Japan has been another important topic in the literature. Existing explanations, however, are unable to determine convincingly whether the changes that have occurred in the fortunes of the parties have been long-term permanent changes or merely short-term fluctuations. By isolating the variance in party vote shares that is explained by short-term forces (i.e., the portion due to issue and candidates effects) this study provides a way to measure how much secular political change has actually occurred in postwar change.

Many political scientists in the Japan and

United States have argued that in the late 1970s younger, urban-dwelling voters became LDP supporters. Moreover, they contend that the LDP's overwhelming victory in the 1986 "double election" was the dénouement of this secular trend, leading to what the Japanese literature has referred to as *hoshu kaiki* or conservative resurgence (or realignment). The study shows that because short-term issue effects explain much of the LDP's decline and resurgence, assertions that a realignment has occurred are premature.

Finally, it is presently widely accepted in the literature that electoral politics in Japan is local politics. Most scholars have argued that Japan's two to six member election district system has caused individual candidates to be the major stimulus in voting behavior. Combined with public opinion research that shows that Japanese voters are motivated principally by local concerns, this assumption has led scholars to reject national level influences as an important explanatory variable. On the contrary, this study argues that national level influences are important in explaining the variance in the vote. Using a nested design ANOVA, this study shows not only that the explanatory power of local effects has been overstated but that the Japanese electorate has become more nationalized throughout the postwar period. Indeed, the results of the analysis indicate that, in the 1970s and 1980s, over half the variance in the vote is due to national level effects.

**Kreppel (cont.
from page 11)**

be a flimsy safeguard for democracy; authoritarian regimes tend to be, by their very nature, elitist in character. Thus the inference that the low levels of support for authoritarianism in these countries presupposes an improbable authoritarian restoration is problematic.

Finally, the types of political participation which respondents were queried about are generally considered democratic manifestations. The conclusion that authoritarians take an aversion to political participation should not be surprising to someone familiar with the Almond-Verba political culture framework. Authoritarians, one would expect, would exhibit a "subject" political culture and thus should not be expected to express enthusiasm for the sorts of

political participation which the authors describe. There are exceptions to this, as the rallies of Nazi Germany and the May Day parades of the Soviet Union clearly demonstrate, but the question as asked is perhaps too general. Perhaps a more specific question regarding military intervention during a political crisis, or the use of violence to obtain political goals would have been more appropriate.

On the whole, Morlino and Mattei's article offers several interesting and valuable insights into the societal impacts of democratic transformations. It should be viewed as an able companion to the recent wave of democratization literature which has swept over comparative politics.

lenburgs or Saxony after 1869, the system stayed or became more regressive. Other political changes that reduced the arbitrariness of the state, such as the growth of an impartial judiciary, also made it easier for a state to impose the potentially most progressive tax, the income tax, because citizens were more likely to comply with it. Certain micro-level models of income tax compliance are used to investigate this link between political reform and the practicality of the income tax.

Those interested in this project are encouraged to contact Mark Hallerberg at:
Geisbergstr. 42/Stöveno
100 Berlin 30
Germany
or
Department of Political Science
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1472

**Hallerberg (cont.
from page 6)**

synthesize existing theories of nationalism and to ask each author to examine the resulting hypotheses against his or her local knowledge. This procedure would help to organize the disparate chapters, and the resulting book would not only provide background information for teaching and research but also advance the theoretical enterprise. I hope Cambridge will pub-

lish a second, revised and updated edition of this useful volume in two years or so, and that the editors and authors will use this interval to read widely in the theoretical literature. The present volume may be a stage on the way to that project, and in any case the editors and the authors deserve applause for what they have accomplished so far.

**Anderson (cont.
from page 8)**

The volume's contributors succeed in challenging with empirical evidence many of the stylized facts that continue to drive the study of economic reform in the developing world. At a fundamental level the book contributes to our stock of case knowledge on structural adjustment. But it also manages to rise above much of the existing literature. Bates and Krueger's effort fits most comfortably with recent cross-

regional work on adjustment by Nelson, Haggard and Kaufman, and Perkins and Roemer. As with these collections, the present volume harnesses the power of ideography in the search of simple, testable hypotheses about the interaction of politics and economics during periods of reform. It deserves a wide audience among those interested in the political economy of development.

**Joireman and
Wells (cont. from
page 10)**

legislature or executive holds the upper hand, especially in periods of cohabitation when the conflict between assembly and president are most likely to result in governmental paralysis. Staggered elections are therefore a recommendation that appears repeatedly throughout *Presidents and Assemblies*.

Presidents and Assemblies is a well-balanced work which provides not only a system-

atic assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the various types of representative democratic regimes, but also provides some specific and quantitatively supported recommendations that could be of value to those confronted with the formidable task of organizing or reorganizing democracies from the former republics of the Soviet Union to Latin America.

**Selden (cont.
from page 15)**

Letter from the President (cont. from page 2)

ed that our membership continued to be healthy at about nine-hundred members, and that our finances were sound, as reflected by the following balance sheet:

Previous Balance	2725.41
Income	1852.02
APSA check (9/91)	844.00
APSA check (1/92)	882.00
CD Income	136.02
Expenses	(776.23)
1991 Business Meeting	(66.23)
1991 Newsletter	(560.00)
Lynn Girardeau (Newsletter)	(150.00)

Remaining Assets	3811.20
CD (Purchased 10/91 for \$2500)	2636.02
Checking Account	1175.18

Again, I invite suggestions and criticisms about the work of the Organized Section. Please contact me by mail or through e-mail at rogowski@polisci.sscnet.ucla.edu.

Ames (cont. from page 4)

Papers from the Project

"Disparately Seeking Politicians: Strategies and Outcomes in Brazilian Legislative Elections." (1992). Presented at the meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, October, 1992.

"The Reverse Coattails Effect: Local Party Organization in the 1989 Brazilian Presidential Election." (1993). To be presented at the meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 15-17, 1993

Geddes (cont. from page 5)

forts in this respect come from Dani Rodrik. Recent articles include "The Limits of Trade Policy Reform in Less Developed Countries."

Journal of Economic Perspectives, Winter, 1992; and "Political Economy and Development Policy," *European Economic Review*, 1992.

Pervin (cont. from page 12)

between the European experience and that of the contemporary Middle East, in particular the far greater ability of Middle Eastern states to draw on external resources. An additional paradox is why a state's strength relative to society should decline when it is increasingly able to draw on external resources, presumably decreasing its reliance on internal ones. To explain this paradox, at least in the case of Israel, Barnett relies less on an exchange or bargaining model and more on an ideological change on the part

of important Israeli officials.

Confronting the Costs of War is an interesting synthesis of a variety of literatures that are usually distinct and frequently seen as having little to offer each other. While its problems highlight the need to clearly distinguish the similarities and differences among different temporal and structural environments, its greater benefits lie in its theoretically informed research, which in turn can inform theory.

Survey of Comparativists' Data Needs

Our group has established a committee to consider comparativists' needs for archived data, and to act as a liaison with the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. Committee members are W. Phillips Shively (chair, University of Minnesota), Barry Ames (Washington University), Robert Bates (Duke University), Thomas Lancaster (Emery College), and Kaare Strøm (University of California, San Diego). As part of the committee's effort in this regard, we enclose the following questionnaire on members' data requirements. Please complete the survey and return to:

W. Phillips Shively
Department of Political Science
1414 Social Science Towers
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455



1. What are the research problems you expect to be working on over the next few years?

2. What sorts of data will be important to you in your research and your teaching, other than what you will generate for yourself (e.g., data on the size and professionalism of bureaucracies in Africa; panel data on postmaterialism, etc.)? Please rank the importance of this data on a scale of one to ten.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

3. Are there any specific data sets that you hope to use, or wish you could use for any of the above? Please be as specific as possible to help us in locating the source; the name of the investigator, address or location, and a journal or book citation would be most helpful.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

4. Of these, in what order would you prioritize them?

5. Do you have any comments or suggestions about the accessibility of these data sets?

Name _____

Address _____

Phone/E-mail _____



APSA-CP

Ronald Rogowski, Editor
Department of Political Science
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1472

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
UCLA