One Hundred Years of Wisconsin Political Science!
Come Celebrate with Us and
Meet Old Friends and Faculty!

Mark it on your calendars right away! On March 26th and 27th, 2004 Wisconsin’s Department of Political Science will be marking its Centennial Celebration. A hundred years ago, in January 1904, the university’s Board of Regents officially approved the creation of a new Department of Political Science.

As most of you know, political science as an academic discipline is a relatively young enterprise. It is true that it traces its lineage back to Aristotle and Plato, and contemplating and philosophizing about politics have been ageless endeavors. But the American Political Science Association, the professional organization of political scientists in the United States, was only established in 1904—the same year our Department was formally established. Wisconsin’s Department of Political Science has been a major part of the story of American political science. It has a distinguished history as one of the first political science programs in the United States and has long been ranked among the top ten programs in the country. Many of the outstanding scholars of American political science have made the Department their intellectual home. The Department has been a source of innovative ideas and analyses concerning the philosophy and practice of government throughout the world. And it has trained several generations of students and scholars, many of them achieving prominence within the discipline or in the policy, business, or journalism fields.

Wisconsin’s Department of Political Science has also been a large part of the story of Wisconsin politics. With over 11 thousand living alumni, it has educated multiple generations of Wisconsin citizens about our country, our state, and our world, playing a significant role in developing an informed citizenry. It has produced many outstanding alumni who have left their mark on our politics and our nation—among them, Vice President Dick Cheney, our current U.S. Senators Feingold and Kohl (the latter, together with Commissioner of Baseball Bud Selig, having graduated from the now defunct “American Institutions” major), former Wisconsin Governor and current U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson, Wisconsin Congressmen David Obey and Thomas Barrett, former U.S. Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, former U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky, and current Madison Mayor Dave Cieslewicz.

For our Centennial Celebration in March, which will be jointly organized with the Wisconsin Alumni Association, we are inviting all our alumni to return to campus to renew their ties with the Department, meet with old friends and faculty, and celebrate the Department’s past and its future. Part of the two-day celebration will include presentations and discussions of departmental history, involving mainly emeritus faculty and drawn in part from the ongoing Department History Project headed by Crawford Young (see Crawford Young’s article in this edition of our newsletter). Part of these festivities will also include a series of discussions about contemporary political issues involving faculty and some of our most prominent alumni. We have also invited several of our most well-known alumni to deliver addresses to the gathering and plan to hold a Gala Dinner celebration on the evening of Saturday, March 27th. More information about the events—and how you can register and make plans for attending—will
be mailed to you shortly. Please come and help us celebrate at what we anticipate will be a fun, interesting, and worthy set of events.

In honor of our 100th anniversary, we are also establishing a Centennial Fellowship Fund to help fund one or more fellowships for future students in the Department. As many of you know, fellowship support for students is scarce, and Madison lags significantly behind many of its peer institutions in this regard. We hope that many of our alumni, faculty, and loyal supporters will contribute to the new Centennial Fellowship Fund (To make a contribution, see details on the last page of this issue). Indeed, as a small incentive we will provide a complimentary copy of the soon-to-be-published History of Political Science at University of Wisconsin-Madison for donations to the Centennial Fellowship Fund at a level of $500 or over.

We hope that you enjoy this issue of Wisconsin Political Science and hope to see as many of you as possible at our Centennial Celebration in March.

Mark R. Beissinger
Chair

Departmental History Project
by Crawford Young

The centennial history of our Department begins to show visible progress. Work on what is anticipated to be a book-length publication began in April 2002. We anticipate having most of the chapters available in draft form for presentation at a colloquium on Department history planned in conjunction with the Centennial Celebration on 26-27 March 2004.

The volume will include a narrative history of the first century of Political Science at Wisconsin by Crawford Young. For the post-1945 years, when the Department expanded greatly in numbers and specialization became far more marked, chapters covering the major sub-fields are planned. Charles Jones will examine the American politics area; international relations, theory and comparative politics will be chronicled by David Tarr, Booth Fowler, and Young respectively. Shorter contributions are planned from Joel Grossman on public law, Charles Franklin on methodology, and Donald Kettl on public administration. Richard Merelman is writing an intellectual portrait of the Department, for which his excellent newly published monograph on Political Science at Yale and its role in pluralist theory serves as partial model. Jack Dennis will reflect on the impact of the rise of behavioralist approaches, and John Witte will examine the departmental role in the creation and growth of the LaFollette School of Public Affairs.

The antecedents of Political Science at Wisconsin extend back further than we first thought, well beyond the official creation by action of the College of Letters and Science and Board of Regents in January 1904. The first Chancellor of the University, John Lathrop, appointed in 1848, was also professor of “civil polity,” a course which he regularly taught. With a brief interruption in the 1860s, “civil polity” reemerged as a professorship, long held by J.B. Parkinson, who also became a Vice President of the University. “Political Science” in a more formal and organized sense appeared in 1892, with the creation of a School of Economics, Political Science, and History, under Richard T. Ely; it was this school that awarded the first doctorates in Political Science to Samuel Sparling (1896) and Paul Reinsch (1898), both of whom became initial faculty members when the Department was launched as an independent unit.

With the help of two able Project Assistants, Matthew Dull and Rachel Girshick, much basic material has been assembled. We have profiles of the 200 odd past and present faculty members, and brief biographical data on our several hundred doctoral alumni, 121 of whom responded to our survey early this year. Though much of the basic data has been collected, there is abundant archival material which remains to be explored. The project is directed by Crawford Young, with the assistance of a steering committee composed of Leon Epstein and Booth Fowler. Financial support for the history has been provided by a generous gift from Emeritus Professor Clara Penniman.

State Budget: Wrestle With the Real Problems, Please

By Don Kettl, Professor of Political Science and Public Affairs, UW-Madison

[If any member of our current faculty epitomizes the Wisconsin Idea, it is Don Kettl, whose extensive work on improving state, local, and national government has earned a reputation as one of the country’s leading reformers of public administration. The following essay is adopted from an article that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, August 24, 2003.]

This year’s budget battle produced an epic battle of championship wrestling proportions. The Republicans thought
they had Gov. Jim Doyle in a tax-increase headlock, but he squeezed out. Doyle tagged the Republicans with a soft-on-education charge, but their failure to win a veto override left Doyle’s education plan in place. Then the Republicans tried to body slam Doyle and the Democrats to the mat with a plan to freeze property taxes. They collected the names of legislators who wouldn’t go along with the freeze, but the Democrats, though a bit dizzy from the maneuver, managed to escape yet again. It all made for a great show. However, this battle had as much to do with real budgeting as the WWF has to do with real wrestling. The local property tax freeze might have been at the center of the budget battle, but everyone knew that local property taxes have no impact on state spending.

If we were serious about the state government focusing on the most important state issues, we’d work on the three biggest problems. First, we’d recognize that the core of the state budget problem in fact is linked to local property taxes. We have a budget system in which almost two-thirds of the state revenues go to local spending. As the non-partisan Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance has found, this separation of responsibility for taxing and spending tends to drive spending up and accountability down. We need to directly connect responsibility for raising money with the responsibility for producing results.

Second, we’d recognize that Wisconsin is governed too much through hyper-narrow stovepipes. We have more police departments than California, which has more than six times as many people. We have more local governments than 39 other states, even though we rank just 20th in population. And the problem is not just at the local level. The commission I headed in 2000 found just as much fragmentation among state agencies as among local governments. The world is becoming more interconnected. Wisconsin’s governments are becoming less so, and that makes government more expensive and less effective. We need to find new ways to effectively link both local governments and state agencies.

Third, we’d recognize that we have a serious economic development problem. Our income is below the national average and the gap is growing. That means less opportunity for our kids and greater strain on our governments. Our taste for public services hasn’t diminished and our ability to pay for them has shrunk. More growth doesn’t necessarily mean more spending. It does mean we can lower taxes without slashing valued programs. We need to focus like a laser on growing the state’s economy.

We shouldn’t mistake this year’s entertaining budget battle as a real effort to attack these core problems. It won’t solve our real issues any more than Arnold Schwarzenegger’s “Hasta la vista, baby!” will solve California’s. If we were serious, we’d launch a genuine debate on ideas like these 10:

1) **Shared revenue.** The disconnect between the current program’s goals and available revenue has it on life support. One reform idea: Use state funds to level out the ability of local governments to provide a broad basket of basic urban services. Don’t provide state funds for anything more. Give local governments responsibility for running their own affairs. And make local voters hold local officials accountable for the way local governments work.

2) **Collaboration.** Too many governments doing the same thing is inherently wasteful. Consolidation is no panacea. Just like welfare reform, it might well cost a little more in the short run. But it can also help reduce long-run costs and the long-term effectiveness of local services. Neither monkeypox nor job growth stops at the boundary line. We need a strong system of incentives to encourage local officials to do what, in their heart of hearts, they know they need to do.

3) **Performance contracts.** On other state-funded, county-administered services, like criminal justice and social services, we ought to use state funds to buy a defined quantity of services and give county governments flexibility in how best to provide them. This would make it clear who is responsible for paying—and providing—for what.

4) **K-12 programs.** Our state formula providing two-thirds of the cost of local schools is unsustainable. We need either to ratchet up state support—and state control—or we need to ratchet down state support, perhaps by providing a foundation amount for each child and allowing local voters to hold local school boards accountable for the quality of local schools. We can’t live in a never-never land where local spending decisions determine the draw on state revenues and where accountability is muddled.

5) **Corrections.** We imprison many more people than many other states, yet our crime rate is no lower. Something isn’t right here. We need to shift corrections policy to a plan for keeping people out of prison to begin with and, once they’re in, making sure they don’t come back. Other states, especially Minnesota, have charted the course.

6) **The university system.** Quick question: What do the Silicon Valley, Texas’s high-tech corridor, and North Carolina’s Research Triangle all have in common? Three things: high-growth of high-wage jobs, a strong university system, and strong links between the university system and the state economy. Wisconsin is disinvesting in its university system without giving the system the flexibility it needs to compete in the 21st-century economy. We need a long-term plan for the university’s role in getting Wisconsin to where we want to go.
7) Rethinking the tax system. We’re trying to fund our state government with an Edsel-era revenue system. Former state Department of Administration Secretary Mark Bugher and his colleagues put forth a simple but powerful reform plan last year. We need it—or something like it—to reposition how Wisconsin raises tax money. An impetus: the states that had better, more balanced revenue systems fared far better in the most recent economic downturn.

8) Performance. Other states, like Virginia and Utah, have worked hard to connect the dots between money spent and results produced. In the most recent state report card, the Government Performance Project gave Wisconsin just a C for performance management. This is no magic bullet, but better information about what we get for the money we spend can vastly improve the way Wisconsin government works.

9) Information technology. While other states like Michigan and Washington have become e-government stars, we’ve dismantled our Department of Electronic Government. To be sure, the DEG was badly plagued, but we can’t expect to keep up by stepping back. Information is often the best way to break through stovepipes. Wisconsin’s retreat from e-government has only reinforced our worst, insular instincts.

10) Economic development. Our recent economic development initiatives have shown an instinct for aiming at the ankles. We need a high-level, statewide focus on growing the Wisconsin economy. More growth means more opportunity for Badgers and more allure to entrepreneurs around the country. A careful look at the economic development strategies of states like Virginia and North Carolina could provide a guide.

There’s enough in this list to enrage almost everyone about something. Fair enough. There’s no magic in it. But unless we begin refocusing public debate in Wisconsin on items like these, we’re likely to relive this year’s budget battle, over and over again.

That could replay the state’s own version of WWF under the Capitol dome, which could prove highly entertaining. We just shouldn’t mistake it as real wrestling.

Thinking About the 2004 Presidential Election

by Professor Kenneth Meyer

The prognosticators are already at work forecasting the 2004 presidential election. What is likely to happen? What follows is not a firm prediction, but rather a framework that might be useful in trying to understand how the 2004 campaign might unfold.

I begin with the 2000 presidential election, which was highly unusual, both in terms of the overall strategic environment and the selection of candidates. Yet for all the furor over the 2000 recount and Bush v. Gore, the Democratic Party’s efforts to convert it into victories at the ballot box failed. In the 2002 midterm elections, the incumbent President’s party picked up seats in the House, repeating the 1998 results and reversing decades of presidential party midterm losses that extended back to the 1930s. Although many people were quick to argue that September 11 “changed everything,” one thing that we now know hasn’t changed is the overall pattern of presidential popularity. While we don’t really know how-or even whether-Presidents can affect their own popularity ratings, we know a good deal about what influences those ratings. A long line of research has shown that the public will rally behind the president during national crises, that these rallies are temporary, and that as the economy goes, so goes the president’s approval rating. A graph of Bush’s public approval rating shows that these forces are still very much in play (Figure on page 5).

Obviously, the most notable feature of Bush’s approval rating is the post-September 11 rally, in which his popularity went from the mid- to low-50s (more or less “normal” for this part of a president’s term, all other things being equal) to the high 80s. From there, his approval rating began a predictable, slow decline, with another sharp rally occurring when U.S. forces began military operations against Iraq. This rally, too, was temporary, and Bush’s ratings are now about where they were before the war started—and roughly equivalent to where they were before September 11. Even so, Bush remains slightly more popular than Bill Clinton at the same point in Clinton’s first term; a Washington Post/ABC poll put Clinton’s approval rating at 51% in July 1995.
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At the same time, the public is uneasy about the economy. What counts here is less the statistical picture of economic activity (The recession, which bottomed out in November 2001, is now over, according to the National Bureau of Economic Research), but the impression that voters have about economic health. Although the economy is growing slowly, public opinion holds that things are in bad shape, and Bush is clearly vulnerable if the economic situation does not continue to improve (or deteriorates). But rather than focus on any specific economic indicator—unemployment, the deficit, GDP growth—look for economic factors to frame the debate rather than determine the outcome of the presidential campaign.

How will this work out in the 14 months before the 2004 election? On the one hand, Iraq, the war on terrorism, and taxes all play on areas of traditional Republican strength. If the campaign is about tax cuts and national security, Democrats will not have an easy time over the next year. The key is not only the overall direction of foreign policy and the rebuilding of Iraq, but also whether any of the Democrats is perceived as being more capable than Bush. On the other hand, if the campaign is about the economy and a continuing public perception that Bush has been inattentive to it, he could suffer the same fate as his father, who saw his post-Gulf War rally dissipate entirely over the next 18 months and wound up losing to Clinton in 1992.

One caution, though, about interpreting certain types of poll questions. A common technique is to ask whether an incumbent deserves reelection or should be replaced. A recent Newsweek poll found that 44% of the public said that they would like to see Bush elected another term, against 49% percent who said no (other similar polls showed, more or less, the same thing). This was, according to Newsweek, the “first time since 9/11 [that] people say they’d rather elect someone other than Bush in 2004.” But the election will not be between Bush and “someone else,” but between Bush and a specific Democratic candidate who will come with his own set of strengths and liabilities. A month before the Newsweek question showed some vulnerabilities, other polls showed Bush trouncing specific Democratic candidates in head-to-head matchups, winning by margins of between 19 and 28 points against Dean, Kerry, Gephardt, and Lieberman. It is too early to know with any certainty how these matchups will fare once the nominee is chosen: this far in advance most people pay little attention to electoral politics, and it is likely that some unforeseen event will occur between now and November 2004 to render moot any predictions. But it is never good odds to bet against an incumbent president.

---

### Bush Approval Rating
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- X-axis: Months from February 2001 to August 2003
- Y-axis: Percentage of Approval
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As Others See Us

by Professor Graham Wilson

[In spring 2004 Graham Wilson will be introducing a new course on how the United States is viewed by others around the world. Here, he provides us with a look at a few of the ideas underlying this new course.]

Perhaps the most famous couplet by the Scottish poet, Robert Burns is

\[ O'wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us \\
   To see ourselves as others see us. \]

Americans have long provided an audience for foreigners who wish to offer an opinion on their political system. The writings of the nineteenth century French scholar Alexis de Tocqueville have received more attention from American scholars than in his native land. Tocqueville’s great essay in political sociology, *Democracy in America*, is quoted frequently, particularly those parts that fit with the self-conception of Americans. No book on interest groups in the United States is complete, it seems, without an invocation of Tocqueville’s comment that Americans have a particular genius for forming voluntary organizations and interest groups. Yet Americans are not so insecure that they remember only the praise of foreigners for their political system. Dickens’s *American Notes* combine both praise and criticism, yet is always in print in the USA. Lord Bryce, a prominent Liberal politician in the U.K. and at one time its ambassador to the USA, is perhaps best remembered for the chapter in his study of the US political system *The American Commonwealth* that explained “Why Great Men Do Not Become President.” Bryce was making a fair comment about the US political system in the period in which he wrote; Woodrow Wilson, a political scientist who went on to occupy the White House himself, reached much the same conclusion.

Why have foreigners such as Tocqueville, Bryce, and Brogan written such good books about the US political system? The answer is in part that the United States has always claimed to embody ideals to which others can aspire. From the “city on the hill” of the Puritans to the democratic ideals of Lincoln’s “last best hope of mankind,” the United States has offered itself as an embodiment of enduring values. It is only natural that foreigners should come to check out whether or not the United States does indeed live up to the ideals it proclaims. As Gunnar Myrdal noted in his study of race in the United States in the period before the Second World War (*An American Dilemma*), unfortunately the answer is that it does not. Human nature being what it is, foreigners are sometimes rather pleased to point out this difference between American ideals and practices.

The events of September 11th, 2001 have born home to us that the opinions of foreigners about the United States have more than intellectual consequences. The modern political scientist benefits from having available large bodies of empirical data drawn from opinion polls in which foreigners are asked their opinion of the USA. Foreigners are not, of course, a homogeneous lot; peoples in different countries have different attitudes to the United States. The opinion research commissioned by Pew Global Attitudes Project, for example, tells us that whereas 70% of Britons hold favorable attitudes about the United States, the same was true of only 15% of Indonesians. In some cases, the explanation for these unfavorable views of the United States is obvious. Many more Latin Americans than people in the United States remember that September 11th is the anniversary not only of the terrorist attacks on the United States in 2001, but also of the overthrow of the constitutionally elected President of Chile, Salvador Allende, in a military coup encouraged and facilitated by the USA; estimates of the number of Chileans killed by the military government of General Pinochet are about as high as the number of victims of the terrorists of September 11th, 2001. Latin Americans who remember these events may have understandable difficulty in viewing the USA as the embodiment of democratic ideals. Yet as many writers have described, even in places in which most people hold unfavorable opinions about the United States, people’s beliefs are more complicated than we might suppose. It is common for American journalists to encounter protestors, for example in the West Bank, angrily denouncing the United States while wearing American fashions and longing to visit the USA or study in one of its universities.

In the twenty first century, Americans will still benefit intellectually from foreigners’ perspectives on their polity and society. Yet since 9-11, Americans also know that their safety as they go about their daily lives and follow their democratic practices depends to a significant degree on what opinions foreigners hold about them. The terrorists of Al Qaeda can never be won over to a more sympathetic point of view about the United States; our security may depend crucially on the degree to which citizens and security services from Pakistan to Indonesia to Europe see the United States as an ally to defend by actively opposing terrorists using their countries as bases or as a corrupt and brutal power against which almost any measures are justified. Understanding how others see us matters more than ever.
Recent Publications by Alumni

Four New Faculty Join the Department

Please join us in welcoming the following new faculty to the Department.

Scott Gehlbach
Scott Gehlbach is a recent Ph.D. in Political Science and Economics at University of California at Berkeley and a new assistant professor in our Department. Gehlbach melds impressive abilities in the area of formal theory with serious fieldwork in the area of comparative politics. His dissertation addresses the role that political-economic environment plays in exacerbating or mitigating a politician’s incentives to support more taxable activity, with a focus particularly on corruption and tax policy. He tests the predictions from his formal model using data from a survey of firms in twenty-three postcommunist countries. He also has engaged in extensive fieldwork in Russia. Gehlbach’s economics training includes a specialization in advanced theory (game theory and mechanism design). Scott will be teaching courses for us on game theory and formal modeling (long a gap within our curriculum), as well as courses on political economy and post-communist transitions.

Eric MacGilvray
Eric MacGilvray will be joining us next fall as a new assistant professor, specializing in contemporary political theory. Eric received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1999 and had been teaching at Chicago until accepting his position at Wisconsin. His book The Task Before Us: Pragmatism and Political Justification will be published by Harvard University Press in 2004. In the book MacGilvray attempts to redefine the nature and terms of political justification in a way that challenges dominant modes of analysis, constructing a pragmatic philosophy based not on naturalistic criteria, but rather on values. Unlike many pragmatists, MacGilvray
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does not locate or justify public values by reference to whatever social consensus happens to exist. Instead, he establishes an independent standard of analysis and evaluation based on the criteria and characteristics of pragmatism as a method of thought that involves dialectical analysis, narrative, and experimentation. These criteria balance tolerance, equality, and open-mindedness with the concomitant obligation to make substantive judgments in a contingent world. Eric is currently on leave from the Department for the year on a fellowship in Australia and will be arriving in Madison in Fall 2004. He will be teaching a wide variety of courses in the political theory field, including courses on ancient, medieval, early modern, modern, contemporary, and post-modern theory.

**Tamir Moustafa**

Tamir Moustafa is a recent Ph.D. from the University of Washington and a new assistant professor in our Department, specializing in Middle Eastern politics (with a specific focus on the Arab world). This is a critical area in which we have traditionally lacked expertise. Within Middle Eastern politics, Tamir’s areas of interest have revolved around issues of democratization and legal systems. His dissertation addresses the challenging puzzle of why Egypt under Sadat established a constitutional court empowered with the authority to undertake judicial review, thereby opening up the possibility for restricting the powers of the authoritarian regime. Employing a neo-institutional framework, he shows how the Sadat regime was interested in using the court to signal potential foreign investors that Egypt was a safe place to invest, thereby suggesting a relationship between economic change and pressures toward democratization. Tamir has won a number of prestigious fellowships and has published several articles, including a study of the relationship between religious clergy and the Egyptian regime. At Wisconsin Tamir will be teaching courses on Middle Eastern politics, Islamic politics, democratization, and comparative legal institutions.

**Joe Soss**

Formerly Associate Professor of Government at American University, Soss (Wisconsin Ph.D., 1996) returns to Wisconsin this year as a tenured member of our Department. He is the author of an outstanding book on welfare and welfare reform entitled *Unwanted Claims: The Politics of Participation in the U.S. Welfare System* (published by University of Michigan Press) and a forthcoming edited book on race and the politics of welfare (also published by Michigan). He has also written numerous articles and book chapters. Soss’s work focuses on the politics of welfare reform, and specifically how welfare policy has played out differently across the fifty states. He also has written considerably on the influence of racial attitudes on welfare policy outcomes. Soss is known for his creative use of both quantitative and qualitative methods, combining, in a very sophisticated way, a thorough knowledge of the policy-making process with outstanding work in the area of public opinion. Soss is also an award-winning teacher, having been twice voted “Outstanding Teacher” at American. At Wisconsin, Joe will be teaching courses on political behavior, the politics of welfare, public opinion, the policy-making process, and race.

**Some Recent Faculty Doings…**

**David Canon** is serving as a Fulbright Scholar, holding the John Marshall Distinguished Chair in Political Science at the University of Debrecen in Hungary.

**Bert Kritzer** has been appointed editor of *Law & Society Review*, volumes 38–40. He is also the general editor for *Legal Systems of the World* (ABC-CLIO, 2002 [4 volumes] and the co-editor of *In Litigation: Do the Have's Still Come Out Ahead?* (Stanford, 2003).

**Ken Goldstein** spent the spring 2003 semester in Israel conducting a series of surveys of Israeli voting behavior.

**Kathie Hendley** was a Fellow last year at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and is currently on leave at the Kellogg Institute at Notre Dame, finishing work on her book *Revitalizing Law in Russia*.

**Paul Hutchcroft** is currently on leave on a Fulbright grant in the Philippines, completing research and writing for his forthcoming book *Deciphering Decentralization: Central Authority and Local Bosses in the Philippines and Beyond*, to be published by Cambridge University Press.

**David Leheny** has published the book *The Rules of Play: National Identity and the Shaping of Japanese Leisure* through Cornell University Press in spring 2003. He has also been awarded an Abe Fellowship from the Social Science Research Council and the Japan Foundation’s Council for Global Partnership and will spend the 2003-2004 academic year as a visiting fellow at the University of Tokyo.

Mark Pollack has published the book *The Engines of European Integration: Delegation, Agency and Agenda Setting in the EU* (New York: Oxford University Press). He has also been appointed for a one-year term as the Chair of the European Politics and Society Section of APSA.

Virginia Sapiro will spend 2003-04 as a Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholar. She will be traveling to eight different campuses across the country to spend 2-3 days working with undergraduates, including delivering a lecture at each campus. She has also been appointed as Associate Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning.

Michael Schatzberg’s book *Political Legitimacy in Middle Africa* (Indiana University Press, 2002) has been selected as a Choice Outstanding Academic Book for 2003.


Byron Shafer has published his latest book *The Two Majorities and the Puzzle of Modern American Politics* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003), which Michael Barone, long-time editor of *The Almanac of American Politics*, calls “the definitive work on American party politics of our generation.”

Aseema Sinha has received funding from the American Institute of Indian Studies to conduct research this year in India for her project, “Weapons of the Strong: Business and State in Post-Reform India.”

Aili Tripp has become Associate Dean for International Studies.

Kathy Cramer-Walsh has a book coming out in January 2004 entitled *Talking about Politics: Informal Groups and Social Identity in American Life* (published by University of Chicago Press). She was also named to serve on the American Political Science Association’s Task Force on Civic Engagement and Civic Education.

David Weimer’s paper from his National Science Foundation funded project comparing internet and telephone surveys was published recently in the journal *Political Analysis*. Other publications in the last year have appeared in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *Swiss Political Science Review*, *Canadian Public Policy*, and *Health Services Research*. Also, a note related to his beloved avocation: David was elected chair of the newly created Board of Directors of the American Go Association.

---

**UW-Madison Political Scientist Wins Three Awards**

*Taken from the September 10th, 2003 issue of Wisconsin Week*

A study looking at the collapse of the former Soviet Union has earned a political scientist at the University of Wisconsin-Madison three prestigious book awards.

Mark Beissinger, chair and professor in UW-Madison’s Department of Political Science, spent 13 years traveling to the former Soviet Union and Munich, Germany, where he pored over press accounts and the details surrounding thousands of protests and violent events that occurred in the Soviet Union between 1987 and 1992.

The resulting book, “Nationalist Mobilization and the Collapse of the Soviet State” (Cambridge University Press 2002), argues that uprisings by different ethnic nationalities led to a “tide of nationalism,” which gained momentum with each occurrence, and ultimately led to the collapse of the Soviet state.

Beissinger’s awards include the American Political Science Association Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award, which honors the best book published in the United States during 2002 on government, politics or international affairs; the 2003 Mattei Dogan Award, which is presented by the Society for Comparative Research, an interdisciplinary scholarly organization in the social sciences, for the best book published in the field of comparative research; and the award for the best book on European politics published in 2002, an award given by the Organized Section on European Politics and Society of the American Political Science Association.

Beissinger’s ambitious study looked at how the Soviet collapse went from seemingly impossible to seemingly inevitable during the course of four years of what he calls “thickened history,” a time in which events acquired a sense of momentum and began changing Soviet political institutions.

“The cross-case influences and unraveling of order that accompanied the tide of nationalism created opportunities for the expression of nationalist demands which, in normal times, were simply unthinkable,” Beissinger says.

The momentum from multiple waves of nationalist revolt, he argues, made it impossible for the political structure of the Soviet Union to defend itself and “ultimately brought about the disintegration of the Soviet state.”

---

**Do you have a favorite faculty member from the past? Someone who was a great teacher or mentor? Please write and tell us about it!**
Virginia Sapiro, associate vice chancellor for teaching and learning and Sophonisba P. Breckinridge Professor of Political Science and Women’s Studies, has chaired the committee that selects the Woodrow Wilson award, and calls Beissinger’s selection a special “coup,” as he is the only UW-Madison faculty member to ever win.

“This is our most prestigious award,” Sapiro says. “I can tell you it is incredibly competitive, as all books on politics, whether they are scholarly or not, come under the scrutiny of the committee. The competition is very intense.”

In awarding the Dogan award, the Society for Comparative Research says Beissinger’s work “provides a masterful case study building and extending modern political sociology.”
Centennial Celebration Plans, March 26-27, 2004

Come join old friends and faculty on March 26-27, 2004 in Madison to celebrate one hundred years since the establishment of the UW-Madison Department of Political Science. The Wisconsin Alumni Association and the Department are jointly inviting all Political Science alumni and former faculty to return to campus to renew ties, meet with classmates and former teachers, and celebrate the Department’s past and future.

The festivities will begin with a mini-conference in the afternoon of Friday, March 26th at the Pyle Center devoted to the history of the Department, with presentations and discussions led by former and current Wisconsin faculty involved in the Department History Project headed by Crawford Young. We will be holding a series of addresses and panels on contemporary issues on Saturday, March 27th and have invited many of our most prominent alumni (among them, Charlene Barshefsky, Tom Barrett, Lawrence Eagleburger, Russ Feingold, Herb Kohl, David Obey, and Tommy Thompson) to participate. The celebrations will be topped off with a Gala Dinner on Saturday night. In addition, we are planning a number of informal get-togethers over the course of the weekend.

More information will be sent to you about these events and local arrangements in the coming months. In the meantime, please be sure to set aside these dates for the Political Science Centennial Celebration. Come help us celebrate a century of outstanding scholarship, education, and service!

Letters to Wisconsin Political Science

Dear Mark,

I just received my copy of the Fall 2002 Wisconsin Political Science Newsletter. I am saddened to read the news of Professor Fowler’s retirement. He truly is a UW teaching icon and will be missed. The funny thing is, the other day I was regaling to my wife (UW grad as well) about the most influential teacher of my life--Professor Fowler, an intellectual giant and an inspirational speaker.

Thank you for your retirement article. It was greatly appreciated.

Best wishes to a wonderful man, please convey my warmest felicitations.

Christopher A. McConville
1983 Poli. Sci. Grad

The following contribution comes from Mark G. Michaelsen, UW 80
BA Poli Sci (Honors)/Economics

Among UW Political Science graduates, I do not consider myself exceptional in either accomplishments or acumen. However, my choice of Political Science as one of my majors (Economics is the other), my choice of public service as a career, and how I practice my craft all can be attributed to the influence of UW Political Science professors. I learned a lot from all my Political Science professors, but three pivotal events stand out.

First, like many freshmen shaped by Watergate, I intended to major in Journalism, but because my last name begins with M, I couldn’t get past the waiting list for the prerequisite elementary reporting course. To fill in my second semester schedule, I registered for Poli Sci 101, taught by Ed Friedman. That made all the difference.

The three texts for the course examined the same issues from conservative, liberal, and Marxist perspectives. I, who had been so sure of one version of the truth, was suddenly challenged to think about three apparently equally valid versions of the truth. I had never before considered that where one stands depends on where one sits.

Now a Political Science major, the second pivotal event came in the context of Poli Sci 502, taught by Charles Anderson. One of Anderson’s rhetorical questions-- “Do you understand
the objective reality?"--has stayed with me for a lifetime. In preparing for a course paper, I discovered Milton Friedman and Michael Oakeshott and was electrified by both thinkers. The third pivotal event came during my senior year, when I took graduate courses to qualify for Honors in the major. That’s when I took Poli Sci 979, taught by visiting professor Alex Radian. (Classmate Milwaukee Mayor John Norquist has informed me that Radian has passed away.) I was perplexed by Radian’s lecture style, but found an epiphany in Wildavsky’s Speaking Truth to Power, the essence of the art and craft of policy analysis to which I’ve tried to live up to all these years.

Each of these three learning experiences--sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously--shaped my behavior as a legislative and executive policy jock and manager in Michigan state government for 15 years. They influenced the way I spoke in public and wrote for publication.

Now I’m living in Alabama and studying for my Masters in Public Administration at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. A masters degree will provide me with the opportunity to teach at some state four-year universities and all two-year schools. Maybe some day, I’ll have an opportunity to provide a similar pivotal experience in a student’s life. I can think of no greater tribute to the UW professors who had such an influence on my life.

Dear Professor Beissinger:

It was a real surprise to receive the Poli Sci alumni newsletter and to discover that there was even such a group as Poli Sci alumni. It certainly brought back a flood of great memories. Reading of Booth Fowler’s retirement sent me scurrying for my diploma to see how long it’s been since I graduated. While the ink is barely dry on my sheepskin, it still amazingly insists that I graduated in 1978. That might also explain why I’m taking my daughter, who is also unbelievably a high school junior, on a road trip to visit colleges (including UW).

As trite as it sounds, it really seems just like yesterday that I was an undergrad. The Poli Sci Department (more specifically, professors like Booth Fowler, Ed Friedman, Pat Riley, and Peter Eisinger, just to name a few) were all extremely influential in my personal and intellectual development. Courses on political thought with Professor Fowler, an independent study on Kant with Professor Riley, and working with Professor Friedman on my senior honor’s thesis on the economic roots to America’s involvement in the Vietnam war led me to apply to graduate school at Yale in Political Science. I left Yale and grad school before completing my degree and entered law school in Chicago, and for the last 20 years I have been practicing labor law, representing labor unions and their trust funds. Another influence in Madison was my involvement in “MULO” (Memorial Union Labor Organization) at its inception, which included participating in negotiations with the UW that resulted in two work stoppages. As a student/worker, I also was a bartender, among other odd jobs, at the School for Workers. Anyway, to say the least, Madison and my experiences at North Hall are forever a part of me, and I hope my daughter and my other children will someday enjoy similar experiences somewhere, if not at the UW.

In closing, I would be very interested to know if there are any get togethers of Poli Sci alumni. And as I mentioned, I will be visiting the campus sometime this fall with my daughter; I would love to see old friends at North Hall and show Rachel where her “old man” used to hang out. Thanks for reaching out.

Best regards,
Jon Karmel (UW 1978)
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Help us keep our educational research programs first-rate!

Please consider making a tax-deductible gift to the University of Wisconsin Foundation for the benefit of Political Science Department. Even small donations help keep efforts like this newsletter going. Your contribution is fully deductible, and many employers have matching gift programs that can double the effect of your gift. Thanks for your help!

☐ Yes! I would like to make a gift of $500 or more to the Centennial Fellowship Fund (see page 11). Please include me among those who are to receive a copy of the History of Wisconsin Political Science upon publication (Note: If you are making a gift of $500.00 or more and wish to receive a copy of the History of Wisconsin Political Science upon publication, the amount of your charitable tax deduction must be reduced based on the value of the book you will be receiving. The value of the book is estimated to be $75.00).

☐ Yes! I want to help support the Political Science Department at University of Wisconsin, My gift of $_______ payable to the University of Wisconsin Foundation is enclosed.

☐ Please use my contribution for:

☐ Centennial fellowship fund  ☐ General department support
☐ Graduate program and student support  ☐ Undergraduate and student support

☐ My employer has a matching contribution program

☐ Please contact me about a major gift to Political Science now or as part of my estate planning.

Name:_____________________________  Degree/Class:_____________________________

Address:___________________________  Home Phone:_____________ Work Phone:___________

____________________________________  Email:______________________________

City:___________State:__________Zip:__________

Please make checks payable to: The University of Wisconsin Foundation. All contributions should be sent to the following address: Ann Lippencott, University of Wisconsin Foundation, P.O. Box 8860, Madison, WI  53708-8860

Please use the space below to send us news about yourself, recollections of your experiences in the department, or suggestions on future issues of the Political Science