

STEP AHEAD

Newsletter of the Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy Section
American Political Science Association
Volume 2, Issue 2: Fall 2004

Contents

Notes from the Editor.....1

Forum Opinion

Kim Quaile Hill, William Jacoby, Jan Leighley, and Lee Sigelman: *Writing for the General Journals in Political Science*.....2

Zachary A. Smith: *Placing the Environmental Policy PhD*.....4

Michael M. Gunter, Jr: *Landing the Big One: A Junior Professor's Take on the Job Interview*.....5

Dissertation Summaries.....9

Betsi Beem, University of Washington
Frederick D. Gordon, USC
Peter Troilo, Georgetown University
Chris Weible, UC Davis

Book Reviews.....12

Reviews of winners and finalists for the Don K. Price Prize and Lynton Keith Caldwell Award.

News of the Discipline.....21

Notes from Editor

This edition of *STEP Ahead* started out with the ambition of a "graduate student" theme highlighting the research of up-and-coming STEP scholars. The original ambition was only moderately successful, but the contributions from other sources should make this issue very useful to people involved in the job market from the faculty or graduate student side.

The initial ambition was moderately successful because only a few graduate students submitted a dissertation summary. Their summaries show that there is some interesting research happening at the graduate level. Surely there must be other graduate students out there with research job ambitions? The future of the sub-disciplines represented by STEP hinges on the next generation of scholars, so please continue to encourage graduate students.

On the other hand, the issue has succeeded in bringing together several perspectives on the political science job market and publishing in political science journals. These perspectives should greatly aid young STEP scholars in pursuing research relevant to the discipline, and also presenting that research to potential employers in an effective manner. Overall, these articles are well-suited to the mission of *STEP Ahead* of increasing the visibility of STEP scholars in mainstream political science.

The next issue of *STEP Ahead* will be in Spring 2005. I don't currently have a "theme" for this issue, but I'm open to any ideas. Please send any ideas or submissions to the editors.

Editor

Mark Lubell (mlubell@ucdavis.edu)

Assistant Editor

Chris Weible (cmweible@ucdavis.edu)

Science/Technology Book Review Editor

John Hardin (JHardin@ncommerce.com)

Environment Book Review Editor

Pamela Stricker (stricker@csusm.edu)

FORUM OPINION

Writing for the General Journals in Political Science

Kim Quaile Hill, Co-Editor American Journal of Political Science

William G. Jacoby, Editor Journal of Politics

Jan E. Leighley, Co-Editor American Journal of Political Science

Lee Sigelman, Editor American Political Science Review

Professional journals serve as the primary means of communication within scholarly disciplines. This is not to denigrate the importance of books. But, the relatively concise format in which journals present new information and interpretations, along with their wide circulation and relatively fast production timetables make them a – and, we think, *the* – vital link in the scholarly communication network.

Within each discipline a small handful of top-level, high-impact publication journals stands out, because of the quality and breadth of the work that consistently appears in their pages (although much excellent research is also published in other journals). These top-level journals use rigorous reviewing procedures to ensure that high standards are maintained throughout the publication process, and they are extremely selective. In the cases of the *American Political Science Review* (APSR), the *American Journal of Political Science* (AJPS), and the *Journal of Politics* (JOP), acceptance rates for submitted papers are in the neighborhood of 10 percent of submissions.

Articles that appear in these journals should appeal to a general, discipline-wide or even interdisciplinary audience rather than a particular disciplinary subfield. It is this latter characteristic, above all others, that sets outlets like the APSR, AJPS, and JOP apart from other, more highly specialized, political science journals. At the same time, it is this characteristic that can create the biggest headaches for authors because we all tend to be specialists, focusing our research on topics

within fairly narrowly-defined subfields of political science.

Articles accepted in these journals are expected to make unusually notable contributions to knowledge. For STEP scholars, who – we presume – are typically students of the public policy process, this most likely means that a paper should make a significant contribution to general theoretical knowledge about some aspect of the policy process. Yet exceptional contributions to applied public policy knowledge or normative understandings of policy would also be appropriate. We emphasize, however, that all three of these kinds of contributions – whether in basic research, applied research, or normative understandings – must be judged by our peer review panels as of exceptional merit and general interest before we can render a positive publication decision.

In this respect, the challenge that STEP scholars face with respect to publishing in these general-readership political science journals is not remarkably different from the challenges that most other scholars face. First, not every paper is well suited for a general-readership journal. Thus, scholars should think strategically about the appropriate publication venue for their work when they are designing a project, writing up the results or arguments, and assessing the nature of the contribution to knowledge that the resulting paper makes. It may be helpful to ask a trusted “nonspecialist” colleague for comments on the paper and for advice about whether the paper would be of interest to a wide audience. Is the research question developed in such a way that it would be of interest to scholars in more than one subfield? If not, what could be done to enhance the paper’s appeal to a broad audience? Do the findings in the paper make a remarkable contribution to theoretical, applied, or normative understanding of the subject?

Second, the framing of the paper’s introduction and literature review sections is critically important. This may be especially true for STEP-related scholarship, because normative and applied concerns about particular policy matters are especially likely to motivate and emanate from the work. The best frame for a general journal,

however, is one that raises general theoretical issues, problems, or controversies. The “specific instance” or “case” is rarely the important point – the general contribution or advance is.

Third, when writing for a general-readership journal one must take more than normal care with the technical level of the presentation, defining terms clearly and using them sparingly. Placing technical material (e.g., proofs, measurement details, explanations of terms, or dates) in an appendix can be an effective means of making the main text accessible to a wide variety of readers and can markedly improve the flow of the manuscript.

Fourth, you may have to provide rationales for research approaches or decisions that may be taken for granted within your particular subfield. STEP scholars, for example, may be analyzing decision-making on environmental policy. If analysts of environmental policy were the target audience, it would not be

necessary to explain a focus on environmental policy. But for a general-readership journal, an explanation of the decision to analyze environmental policy rather than, say, defense policy or health care policy might be necessary: that is, why does environmental policy provide a good avenue from which to approach the theoretical questions of interest? Along with this explanation, an acknowledgement of both the advantages and potential disadvantages of your particular focus might help to persuade reviewers of the appropriateness of the topic for a general readership journal. Can the conclusions you have drawn from the case(s) analyzed in your paper be presumed to hold for other cases as well?

Fifth, and along the same lines, you need to be aware of “standard practices” in your subfield that may bear further explanation or justification when writing for general journals. For example, meta-analytic literature reviews are common in some fields but virtually unheard of in others. The challenge for authors is to find some happy medium

– not taking too much for granted but also not getting too bogged down in basics.

So – the paper is framed properly, makes appropriate use of technical terms, covers the relevant details, and makes a strong case for its general contribution. Now what? First, keep your expectations reasonable. The fact that only about one out of ten submitted papers are accepted at the *APSR*, *AJPS*, and the *JOP* should forewarn you of an unfortunate, but unavoidable, reality: the chances are very high that your paper is going to be rejected. If this happens, try to learn as much as you can from the editor’s letter and the reviewers’ commentaries. Our editorial decisions rely heavily on the assessments of the review panel. Occasionally you may find in the reviews a particular comment or interpretation that seems incorrect or even silly. Rather than (or after) cursing the reviewer, ask yourself what in your paper could have led the reviewer to this erroneous idea.

"Why does environmental policy provide a good avenue from which to approach the theoretical questions of interest?"

Then, rework that part of the paper to clarify your intended meaning, so that other readers won’t be able to go down that unfortunate path to misunderstanding. Rather than focusing on a particular comment within a review, try to distill the general sense of the criticisms, do

whatever you legitimately can to make appropriate revisions, and try again at another journal.

An additional editorial consideration is whether the paper seems suitable for the journal. It is more likely to reject papers because they seem unimportant or uninteresting to a wide audience to warrant publication in a top, general-readership journal-- *not* because there is anything fatally “wrong” with them. If that seems to be the message in the reviews or the editor’s letter, then it is time for you to think about (a) whether you should rework your paper for submission to a more specialized journal or (b) what you could do to enhance its appeal for a general-readership journal. A recent decision letter from one of us to the other, for example, indicated that the paper was rejected in part because the reviewers “lacked sufficient enthusiasm” to justify continuing in the review

process. Again, nothing fatal – but not strong enough reviews.

On a more positive note, when you submit a manuscript to one of our journals you can expect relatively rapid processing of your submission. The peer review process takes time, but the *APSR*, *AJPS*, and *JOP* all average about a two-month turnaround time from the day they receive a paper until the day they complete the review process on it. You should recognize, of course, that the two-month estimate is an average; sometimes the process goes faster than that, and sometimes it goes much slower. If you have yet to hear an editorial decision after three months have passed, you shouldn't assume that anything has gone wrong; it simply means that yours is one of the papers that is taking longer than average. After three months, however, you should feel free to query the editors by e-mail about the status of your paper.

And, finally, keep in mind that neither our editorial offices nor the peer review process is flawless. But in making decisions on hundreds of manuscripts each year, we think that, generally, good things happen. Hopefully your best work will appear in one of our journals. But, if we make a mistake and say “no” to one of your papers, then there is an excellent chance that it can be published elsewhere. In any case, we hope that the review process ultimately enhances our collective research efforts wherever the work might be published.

FORUM OPINION

Placing the Environmental Policy PhD
Zachary A. Smith, Northern Arizona University

In the fifteen years I've been teaching environmental and natural resources policy in the Northern Arizona University Political Science Department, I have supervised and chaired the dissertation committees of roughly 20 PhD students who have specialized in environmental policy. During ten of those years, I served as the department's PhD placement advisor. All of those environmental policy PhDs (mine, and others) have

secured tenure-track teaching positions in well-respected universities in departments of political science, public administration, public policy, and environmental science (with the exception of a few miscreants who, through the Presidential Management Intern program, work for the federal government).

My experience with these students has given me, I think, a good understanding of what it takes to become a marketable environment policy PhD. In this essay, I'd like to share with you some of what I've learned.

Successful environmental policy PhD candidates have some combination of the following attributes: they have a strong multidisciplinary background; they have broad training within their discipline; they've identified a recognizable area of expertise; they have established themselves professionally through research and publication; they have unsupervised teaching experience; and they have developed good interview skills.

To develop each of these six attributes, one must start at the beginning of one's graduate career. We'll discuss each individually below.

Most old-timers (like myself) received all of their graduate training in a single department. Some of us picked up a little environmental economics or a little ecology on the side but, for the most part, we were delivered to the outside world as scholars of whatever department produced us. Today foundations (and other who have money to give), universities, and government agencies expect that students of environmental policy will have a primary focus in one discipline but that they will be familiar with discourses in several disciplines that relate to their area of expertise. What multi-disciplinary training means to an environmental policy PhD student depends in large part on what they want to specialize in. A student who, for example, is interested in water policy generally, with a specific specialization in pollution and a further interest in endocrine disruption might take chemistry, microbiology and hydrology or a student interested in waste management with a specific interest in urban hazardous waste management might take chemistry, bioremediation, and geology

among other courses. A specific combination depends on the student and the expertise being developed. In addition to these kinds of specialized courses necessary background courses include environmental history of some sort as well as either environmental or ecological economics.

A very high percentage of PhD students, even those coming out of the most elite universities, will be entering institutions

where they will be expected to teach a variety of courses. The candidate that can teach a wide range of classes has an advantage. What that mix might be, of course, will depend upon the individual student, but candidates that can teach only environmental policy, for example, are going to be at a disadvantage when competing with candidates who can also teach public administration, some subspecialty in political science or survey courses in the natural sciences (in the case of environmental science placements).

Although it seems to conflict with the point made in the preceding paragraph, the best candidates also have a well-established area of expertise within environmental policy. This might be a broad area of specialization, like air pollution, that would encompass the specific focus of the dissertation and current research (e.g. administrative behavior and setting standards for particulate matter).

Perhaps the attribute that frightens graduate students most, although it shouldn't, is getting established professionally (i.e. attending conferences, and publishing research in refereed journals). This is also a difficult one for the advisor as in many cases students will require rather specific and detailed help that can be very time consuming. I have co-authored publications with many PhD students over the years to get them

started on their research programs and teach them the process. Presenting their research at professional conferences is equally as important, both to develop those professional skills and to learn how to socialize with the types of people they hope to someday call colleagues.

Independent teaching experience has proven, in my experience, to be crucial for college employers. Employers that place a high premium on classroom teaching

are often skeptical of candidates whose only classroom experience has been as the TA for someone else.

Finally, interview skills. When students get to this point, they are really on their own. I feel that if I worked with a student for a number of years, often the better part of a decade, and I can help them secure three or four interviews with good schools, then I've done all that I can do. Developing the right kinds of interpersonal skills that will make one successful in the job market is beyond my ability. There are, however, a number of steps students can take to prepare themselves for the interview. The Chronicle of Higher Education has published numerous articles that deal with this topic. One place to start is, "Preparing for Campus Interviews", by Kimberly Delgizzo and Laura Malisheski, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 17, 2003.

To the student who may be reading this and thinking to him or herself "but I'll be on the market soon and I haven't done all these things" I would say two things. First there is nothing magic about these suggestions. Many successful PhD students have not done all these things. And second, you can improve your vita by making some foray into each area. So, for example, if you haven't published anything, try to do a short article for a reference book or a book review. Or if you've never taken

Successful environmental policy PhD candidates have some combination of the following attributes:

- (1) They have a strong multidisciplinary background;**
 - (2) They have broad training within their discipline;**
 - (3) They've identified a recognizable area of expertise;**
 - (4) They have established themselves professionally through research and publication;**
 - (5) They have unsupervised teaching experience; and**
 - (6) They have developed good interview skills.**
-

anything out of the social sciences, pick up an undergraduate class in ecology, which you will then be able to mention in the narrative description of your background. And, finally, don't give up—it's worth it.

FORUM OPINION

Landing the Big One: A Junior Professor's Take on the Job Interview

Michael M. Gunter, Jr., Rollins College

You have toiled as an academic apprentice for three, four, five or more years. You have your newly minted Ph.D. in hand or are ABD with your dissertation nearing that all important stage – completion. You are a doctoral student looking back on what may very well feel like a lifetime of work and, after long, countless hours for little pay, it's time to take a much needed sabbatical. After all, your dissertation has just addressed the most pressing issue of our time. It's time to recharge. Well, even if your dissertation will be read by more than your significant other and the six members of your committee, before you can even begin to consider such thoughts, you first have to land that increasingly elusive full time academic position. You have to land the big one, a tenure track job.

Not to discount other hurdles along the academic sojourn, from graduate school to tenure to promotion and beyond, but perhaps the most exasperating component of a life in academia today is the job hunt. The numbers simply are not in your favor. There are too many applicants and far too few choice positions. Plenty more pitfalls will follow, of course, but let's not get ahead of ourselves here. Let's take this career path you have chosen step by step. More specifically let's focus on one specific aspect of the job hunt, the job interview itself. The interview, after all, is the single most important component of the entire exhaustive job hunt process. It is essentially the one moment, aside from the largely inconsequential APSA meat market, where political science candidates meet face-to-face with their prospective

colleagues. With that in mind, the objective of the next 1,500 or so words is two-fold. For one, I hope to shed light on what can be a somewhat mysterious rite of passing in academia by describing the typical components and expectations of the job interview. For another, the next few pages also offer a few words of advice for the aspiring job candidate. It is hoped that this advice will help enhance your marketability and limit the apprehension that surrounds “the process,” at least as much as this is possible.

The following paragraphs are based on my personal experience with academic job interviews – from the perspective of both the interviewee and the interviewer. Twice in a three year period I was on the job market myself, participating in on campus job interviews for full time positions at nine different institutions, seven of those being tenure track slots. I have also had one taped, off campus interview for a tenure track position and three different adjunct job interviews in that same time period. From the interviewee perspective, I have sat on the search committee for seven different positions over the last four years, four of these being tenure track (one of which was outside my department of political science). While I am only a junior professor, I believe it is safe to say I've had a unique opportunity to view the job interview process from both perspectives in a short amount of time. Here's what I have gathered from that experience.

Let me first offer three general pieces of advice before addressing specific suggestions over the course of your campus visit. First and foremost, be yourself. You are selling yourself on the job interview. Don't try to sell someone or something else. Be genuine. Sell yourself – and do so in as congenial manner as you can honestly muster. Secondly, but at times just as important as the first recommendation, remember that you are not the only one being interviewed over the next 24 to 48 hours. You are also interviewing the department and institution at large. Any department or school that does not realize this should set off alarm bells for you, even if you are only considering a one-year visitor position. When faculty or administrators are

not forthcoming with answers to your questions, take note. That said, even when faculty and administrators are forthcoming, take note. Gather as much information as possible on the individual faculty, department, campus at large, and even the city in which you will live and work. That means, of course, not only compiling notes while on campus or in your hotel room the night or two that you visit the campus. It means you need to get started well before your visit.

You should already have prepared a preliminary dossier on the school and department when you first applied for the position. This folder will include description of the overall mission of the college (particularly the relative emphasis between teaching and research) as well as available resources (i.e. overall endowment, annual research and professional development funds, etc), and any notable specialization in majors, minors, areas of study, or interdisciplinary programs. Once the department notifies you that you are on their short list, your homework expands to more detailed information, including biographies on specific individuals, types of courses needed, etc. Also be sure to ask around your graduate program and conferences you attend while on the market. Get as much information, from as many sources as possible, on your prospective employer.

Third, one final piece of general advice is to be aware of potential divisive issues, either within your prospective department or on the campus at large. Every campus has them, whether they are disagreements over departmental growth strategy (i.e. what the precise requirements for a new line should be), fundamental turf battles between different departments (or even perhaps within, i.e. should a certain sub-discipline of be emphasized in the graduate program over others), conflicts over merit vs. egalitarian pay raises on the campus as a whole, lingering disagreements over the relative emphasis between teaching and research in both tenure and promotion decisions, conflict over how to count and compare research and publications, or simply personality conflicts amongst campus and/or department leadership. One of the great ironies of academia is that while we study truly pressing

global issues of our time, more often than we care to admit, we get sidetracked by parochial (perhaps even petty) political battles that tend to be even more intense, or at least more prolonged, than those in the real world.

These generalities established, there are several specific components of the interview to consider as well. In rough terms, the conventional interview schedule may be broken down into three main components: a research talk, teaching presentation, and series of personal one-on-one interviews. All of these reinforce one basic point about the entire interview process. While the job hunt often drags on for months, sometimes years, the interview itself occurs with lightning speed. Precisely how your on-campus itinerary finally takes shape will vary of course depending on the size of the department as well as the size and mission of the school you are visiting. Still, in most cases, the interview for an entry level, tenure-track position will last between only 24 to 48 hours. Time is truly of the essence in this situation. Those interviewing you have very little time to accomplish their task. And as we have already established, you in turn have very little time to return the favor to them. Fortunately, as noted earlier, you have done a substantial amount of homework before even stepping foot on campus – and hopefully your counterparts have as well! Remember, though, because the on campus (and perhaps drive to the airport) component of the interview will only last 24 to 48 hours, nearly every conscious minute will be allotted to the process.

In some ways the interview, then, is yet another step in the academic “hazing” process. Appointments during the interview are stacked one on top of the other, and breaks are few and far between. In short order, you will meet roughly a dozen different faculty and administrators, perhaps twice that number at larger research universities. This series of individual interviews then spills over to meals, often including one or two dinners with department faculty members and perhaps a lunch with a small group of students. It goes without saying that each of these meetings, including the meals themselves, represents an opportunity to

distinguish yourself as a teacher, researcher, and colleague. With the sole exception of the traditional human resources visit, then, each separate interview at least partly influences the decision on whom to hire for the position you seek. At each stop along the way, you will be asked to explain your research agenda, your teaching philosophy, awkward moments in the classroom, etc. – and again all in a relatively short amount of time. Typical one-on-one interviews with faculty and administrators last only between 30 and 60 minutes.

A second major component of the academic job interview is the research talk, which generally lasts one to two hours and includes an audience of all available members of the department as well as perhaps an administrator and even some interested faculty from outside the department. Plan ahead for any visuals you may require here, taking care to notify the search committee chair of your needs well in advance. And be sure to save time for Q&A at the end of your talk – but don't be caught off guard if questions pop up early in the presentation as well. They often do. All this will develop much more smoothly if you practice once or twice before leaving for your interview. Ideally you should have your graduate department schedule a luncheon presentation for your research talk the week before you leave. Here, in a dry run of sorts, faculty will critique your work both substantively and stylistically.

The third and final component, particularly at smaller, liberal arts colleges is typically a teaching presentation, which generally lasts 30 to 75 minutes, depending on any number of variables, including the type of institution, type of class, point in the semester, and perhaps even whims of the professor whose class you are visiting. These are all details you should clarify when the first phone call to set up your interview arrives. You should also confirm the precise topic and appropriate mix between lecture and discussion in the course for which you will be serving as guest instructor. Other helpful characteristics to request include a student profile of the class, i.e. year in school for the average student and previous coursework most have had in political science, environmental policy, etc.

That is, you should have some idea of what foreknowledge to anticipate. By the way, be sure to practice your teaching presentation before leaving for your interview as well. If you do not have your own class to use as guinea pigs, your advisor would likely welcome you to their classroom for a day.

Finally, as you prepare to end your visit those final conversations on the trip to the airport are obviously the last impression you make on your prospective colleagues. Try to make them a lasting impression as other candidates may follow you in the next week or two. When saying good bye be sure to determine the time frame for the search committee to make a final decision and reiterate your excitement about the position (if in fact you are). Hopefully you will have a ballpark salary figure, but not always. Unfortunately, no consensus exists as to when the right time to broach this sensitive topic really is. Do follow up with a thank you letter or email, noting what the best way to reach you is. And do politely update the department with any new information that develops in the weeks after your visit, i.e. a new publication, another job offer. Other than that you are at the mercy of the search committee – and sometimes entirely unforeseen circumstances. Searches can get held up due to Board of Trust adjustments in annual budgets, administrative turnover, family emergencies amongst search committee members, and even poor weather. The point is to be prepared for the unexpected, from the first mailing of your application to your follow-up thank you letter after your interview. Diligently preparing in this manner will take a good portion of the mystery out of the entire interview process and give you the best chance to land the big one, that tenure track line that has your name on it.

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

Fisheries Policy Learning: The Interplay of Information, Institutions, and Interests
Betsi E. Beem, University of Washington

In the development of policies for the environment, policymakers are called upon to make decisions based on highly technical information-- often fraught with varying degrees of uncertainty and conflict, sophisticated assessments of the environment, and limited understandings of the distribution of costs and benefits. Creating and disseminating policy relevant information are members of the policy community: which include scientists, lay experts, interest groups, and administrative agencies. Discerning the degree to which learning occurs within this subsystem and what factors contribute to or frustrate learning can help us design processes that lead to better policies.

This research develops an analytic framework that provides a basis for examining factors that enhance or limit opportunities for various forms of learning in calling attention to the roles of information, institutions, and interests. Institutions are central to the framework as they shape who gets involved and how they are involved. This draws attention to the complexities of multiple venues and their concomitant variations in decision-making and participation rules, the degree to which different types or sources of information are privileged in different contexts, the structure of the relationship of the scientific community to the policy process, and how interests shape and are shaped by diverse sets of rules.

This framework is used to compare decision processes and learning in the development of fishery management plans for blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) fisheries in North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland. These settings provide a basis for systematic comparison – through content analysis, interview data, and personal observation – of differences in variables that are central to propositions about policy learning being examined in this research.

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

Interstate Water Accords: A Quantitative and Qualitative Exploration into Reducing Regional Water Scarcity
Frederick D. Gordon, University of Southern California

Water scarcity is an increasingly complex political phenomenon of the twenty first century. Traditionally viewed as a source of tension between societies and nation states, empirical data suggest that pronounced conflict generally has been avoided. Of the 152 water disputes documented in the twentieth century, only seven have resulted in armed conflict.

Yet, water scarcity is definitely going to increase in many regions of the world during this century due to increased population growth and development as well as increased pollution levels and we need to study what has worked and what has not worked in order to be able to know what nations can do to further future cooperation.

While empirical evidence suggests that states have been able to work together to resolve water conflicts, it is not clear whether all interstate water accords are equally resilient. Up until now, there has not existed a comprehensive mechanism for understanding and evaluating the level of cooperation within existing accords. Research has not been conducted on understanding the underlying motivations for creating interstate water accords and a thorough assessment in understanding the level of cooperation within water accords is currently lacking. Therefore two central research questions will be answered in this study. How are nation states able to overcome collective action problems and achieve measurable water accords and what factors make fresh water accords so resilient?

Common pool resource theory is the central focus of this study. It posits that nations can overcome collective action problems and achieve accord resiliency based upon political trust and open communication between disputing parties. Due to the multiple dimensions within interstate

water accords, an epistemic community approach and traditional international relations theories have also been selected to provide a comprehensive perspective toward interpreting and evaluating interstate freshwater accords.

Several hypotheses will be tested in this study. They include H1: the more political trust between contesting parties, the stronger the accord (common pool resource theory), H2 Accords that are supported internally are likely to be more stable than sole external support (common pool resource theory), H3 The greater the role of a neutral third party, the stronger the accord (negotiation theory), H4, The greater the ecological value the more resilient the accord (epistemic community approach) H5, The lesser the threat to a contiguous border, the more likelihood for achieving an accord (geopolitical theory).

The research design entails both quantitative and qualitative methods. First, I create an index of interstate water accord cooperation of the latter part of the twentieth century (1950-2000) by assigning value as to whether an accord was merely signed or ratified and assess a value regarding whether water quantity was equitably redistributed through an accord. This study is augmented by a qualitative exploration into three cases reflecting varying levels of cooperation. They are the Danube River Basin Accords (high cooperation), The Lesotho Highlands Water Project (medium cooperation), and the Israeli-Palestinian interim water agreement (low cooperation). This study includes basic bivariate and multivariate analysis and makes an integral contribution toward understanding the mechanisms of successful interstate water accords. Such an understanding will be needed as global demands continue to place increasing pressures on existing freshwater resource and close cooperation between nations will be necessary to address serious scarcity issues.

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

Security, Technology and Organization: An Evaluation of the American Security Regime's Pursuit of Integration

Peter Troilo, Georgetown University

Increasingly aware of the presence of unconventional threats in a globally interconnected world, the United States Government has undertaken a major reevaluation of the American security regime. By mandating the most dramatic restructuring of the Federal Government in history and redeploying vital resources toward the mission of homeland security, the US has acknowledged the insufficiency of the status quo and the incapacity of reactive strategies.

Information analysis is the centerpiece of a new proactive homeland security strategy based on prevention. Used effectively, information can dictate appropriate security strategies throughout the US and around the world. In particular, access to real-time information, the ability to manage information and share that information among appropriate parties have become rigid security requirements. Previously, national, regional and local US Government agencies were independent owners and controllers of information without the procedure, technology or willingness to communicate with one another. Following September 11th however, policy has required that all agencies at all levels be equipped with the tools to share real-time information. The fulfillment of this requirement will build a more capable American security regime and reflect the character of the asymmetric and decentralized terrorist threat that the US confronts.

Fully capitalizing on the relationship between information analysis and security, however, is a demanding process. With this in mind, many proposed solutions have been based on advanced information technology. US technological superiority has been identified as America's principal advantage in the fight against global terror and the American security regime has

acknowledged a unique reliance on innovative information technology systems to combat post-September 11th security challenges.

The existence of unconnected technology systems incapable of sharing real-time information, however, falls far short of America's security objectives. The American security regime's capacity to secure the homeland will depend largely on its choice of technical architecture. In particular, the post-September 11th system architecture will require replacing outdated, discrete and centralized security mechanisms with an integrated network that assures both real-time information sharing and interoperability. The actual implementation process surrounding the complex US initiative, however, is challenging and deserves significant attention.

Implementing an integrated network architecture not only involves technical challenges, it poses organizational difficulties as well. Technology is embodied in and mediated by organizational structures (232 Constant). For a technological platform to be employed successfully, it must be compatible with a pre-existing organizational structure and culture. Oftentimes, for example, when an advanced information technology system or network is transferred from one context to another, organizational components must be transferable as well (67 Hughes). Absent this transfer and compatibility, a painstaking reconstruction of the organizational environment will be necessary for the system to operate as conceived.

Given the interrelationship between technological systems and organizational structures, some important questions about the US Government's proposed system must be raised. In particular, what kind of organizational changes will be required to successfully implement an integrated network architecture? Additionally, what steps if any is the Government taking to ensure the compatibility of technological and organizational change?

This paper hypothesizes that compatibility gaps between the technical and organizational components of the American security regime's technology implementation process do exist and

will likely cause significant security complications and risks. Most notably, the pursuit of an integrated network architecture is unsuited for the traditional alignments and structures of the US Federal Government. The complications and risks, however, can be mitigated or resolved by addressing technical and organizational issues simultaneously. Reconciling this delicate relationship between technology and organization will enhance and maximize post-September 11th US security strategies and programs.

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

Establishing Marine Protected Areas in California:
An Advocacy Coalition Approach
Chris Weible, UC Davis

My research goal is to use scientific methods of data acquisition and analysis to improve both public policy theories and natural resource management.

For my dissertation research, I studied the policy conflict of establishing Marine Protected Areas in California. Marine Protected Areas are a spatially-based management strategy that restricts the access to, and use of, ocean resources. The research design was largely framed by the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF).

Some of the research questions included: Do stakeholder beliefs affect evaluations of a top-down scientific approach and expectations for a collaborative approach to decision making? Do stakeholders interact in networks based on congruent beliefs or with actors who are perceived as influential? Are there structural differences among ally, coordination, and information/advice networks?

The dissertation research used original data collected in the spring/summer of 2002. The target population was stakeholders who were actively involved in, or knowledgeable about, California Marine Protected Area policy. The methods of data collection included in person interviews (n=47), a mail-in questionnaire (n=193, 62% response rate),

and analyses of documents/ reports. The methods of data analyses included network analysis, structural equation analysis, and multivariate analysis (logit, OLS, etc.).

The dissertation findings have made several contributions to public policy. For example, this research refined and clarified key components of the ACF, such as (i) modeling the ACF's presumed hierarchical belief system and (ii) testing the ACF's predicted network structure of coalitions. This research also provided a rare comparison of collaborative institutions versus a more traditional top-down approach and showed that normative beliefs constrained preferences for either process.

BOOK REVIEWS

This issue reviews the 2003 Winner Lynton Keith Caldwell Prize along with two finalists, and three finalists for the Don K. Price Award. The winner of the Don K. Price Award was reviewed in the last issue of *STEP Ahead*. The Don K. Price Award is considered every year for the best book on science and technology policy published in the three years prior to the year of consideration. The award is named in memory of Don K. Price, scholar, public servant, and author of seminal books in the field including *Government and Science* (1954) and *The Scientific Estate* (1965). The Lynton Keith Caldwell Prize is given for the best book on environmental politics and policy, published in the past three years.

Johann Peter Murmann, *Knowledge and Competitive Advantage: The Coevolution of Firms, Technology, and National Institutions* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

The synthetic dye industry was the first industry in which scientific research was systematically linked to new product development. Although the initial chemical inventions were made in Great Britain in the 1850s and the first start-up firms were founded to exploit them there, German firms came to dominate the field by 1870. In the early years of the twentieth century, the German

share of the world market was roughly 90%, while the British fell to barely 3%. American firms entered the market after those in Europe and managed to capture less than 2% before World War I. *Knowledge and Competitive Advantage* explores this pioneering case of international high-technology competition in exquisite detail and derives from it important theoretical conclusions.

The empirical enterprise underlying the book is impressive. Johann Peter Murmann (with Ernst Homburg) has assembled a comprehensive database of every firm that entered the industry between 1857 and 1914. This body of evidence reveals that Germany's macro-success depended heavily on micro-failure; many more firms started and failed in Germany than elsewhere. The global analysis is beautifully complemented by detailed longitudinal case studies of six companies, two from each of the three countries mentioned above. The cases bear witness to the crucial institutional innovations that set the dominant German firms apart from their rivals both at home and abroad, especially their creation of systems to organize and exploit research.

Firm strategies in this industry were enabled by public policies in such areas as higher education, intellectual property, and trade. For political scientists, Murmann's most important contribution may be the connection that he demonstrates between national organizations representing science and industry on the one hand and the policy choices made by the three countries on the other. The British dye industry, for instance, failed to mobilize effectively enough to call forth a national pipeline of chemical talent, and the British textile industry opposed tariffs that would hamper its access to cheap and high-quality German dyes. The lack of a supportive policy environment doomed the initial leader to second-rank status.

That is not to say, however, that the public officials, industrialists, and academic scientists who joined together in the German "triple alliance" were omniscient. Sometimes they were just lucky. For instance, the unification of Germany came at just the point in the industry's evolution when it was most able to benefit from an effective patent law.

Squabbling among the 39 precursor states to the German Empire limited intellectual property protection before that time. The ease of imitation in this early period fostered prolific entry into the industry, which in turn allowed a wide range of nascent technological opportunities to be pursued. Enacted just as the entrepreneurial frenzy was giving way to a shake-out, the new imperial patent law encouraged the most successful entrants to make the massive follow-on investments that assured them of global leadership.

As a theorist of technological, organizational, and social evolution, Murmann has a prominent place in his analysis for such accidents of timing. His conclusions blend together chance and choice, convincingly interpreting the case as one in which national populations of firms and institutions help to constitute the selection environment for one another. Over time, this coevolutionary process created self-reinforcing patterns of technological leadership in the case of Germany, decline in the case of Britain, and stagnation in the case of the U.S. Only the cataclysm of world war would disrupt this robust outcome.

The synthetic dye case is important in its own right, as Murmann might have discussed in more detail. Germany's success in the science-based industries of the "second industrial revolution" fed the ambitions of its leaders and the fears of its rivals. War, when it came, fed on science and industry, as the graves of the gassed mutely attest.

Murmann, though, is more interested in the case's generalizable implications, and these, too, are significant. In the international dynamics of contemporary high-technology competition, one can see patterns of institutional and technological innovation and lock-in that echo those of their chemical antecedents. Most important, the underlying principles of organizational and institutional ecology translate effectively across time. Whether the selection environment for firms and institutions, especially national institutions, has changed fundamentally in the era of globalization and the Internet is one of the great puzzles of our new century.

This book deserves wide attention in the science and technology policy community. It is an exemplary piece of scholarship in both content and form.

- Reviewed by David M. Hart, School of Public Policy, George Mason University

Jennifer S. Light, *From Warfare to Welfare: Defense Intellectuals and Urban Problems in Cold War America* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 287pp., \$42.00 hardback, ISBN No. 0-8018-7422-X.

Jennifer Light has written a fine book on the influence of defense intellectuals on urban planning after World War II. The historical narrative is interesting and the scholarship is sound. However, a number of arguments in the book are not persuasive. Most importantly, several of the alleged legacies of the ideas of defense intellectuals may have been the legacies of something else.

Light states the main thesis of the book in the introduction: "...during the cold war, strategies for urban problem solving were heavily influenced by, and in some cases directly derived from, military techniques and technologies originally used against America's foreign enemies" (p. 7). She argues further, "the application of military innovations and expertise to urban problems rarely served as sources of solutions" (p. 8). She then goes on to demonstrate how specific innovations, particularly ideas about population dispersion, computer simulations of urban dynamics, programmed planning and budgeting systems (PPBS), remote sensing of geographic information by aircraft and satellites, geographic information systems (GIS), and cable television, came out of the cold war defense effort and were applied (or misapplied) to the solution of urban problems. Light correctly identifies the late 1960s and early 1970s as a period of intensified efforts to apply these innovations because of a heightened concern about eradicating "urban blight" in the wake of the riots and increased crime levels of that period. She

concludes by noting that defense intellectuals “have left indelible marks, for better or worse, on the nation’s urban past.” (p. 237)

Light’s main thesis is somewhat surprising since one would not expect defense intellectuals to have much to say about urban planning. But in light of the importance of the role of defense in the long history of the city as an institution, this is perhaps not so surprising. In any case, Light documents well the role of defense think tanks like RAND and MITRE in influencing urban planning in New York, Pittsburgh, and Los Angeles. Their main lasting impact, however, seems to have been in convincing urban planners to collect quantitative data that would permit them to project demographic changes and to maintain the physical infrastructure of the city.

My main complaint is not with the main thesis so much as with identifying the ideas and technologies applied in urban contexts as essentially “cold war” or “military.” It may be true, as Light claims, that computer simulation, PPBS, and GIS were first used in military settings, but in fact most of these technologies are “dual-use” — that is, they can be applied to both civilian and military applications, unlike “sole-use” technologies such as land mines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, or nuclear submarines. The use of defense spending to subsidize the development of dual-use technologies has a long history that predates the cold war. Examples include the development of propeller aircraft and photographic reconnaissance during World War I, and computers, radar, and powerful jet engines during World War II. Just because a simulation model employs computers does not necessarily make it a cold war technology.

Light implies that the reason many of the ideas and technologies that came from defense intellectuals failed when urban planners tried to employ them is because they were designed for military purposes, not for solving urban problems (which she claims are more complex). However, some of her cases are really examples of failure in applying a dual-use technology before it is ready to be applied to civilian applications, either because it is still too expensive or because it needs further

development. GIS is a perfect example of a tool that is widely employed in urban governments now that it is easier to use and less expensive than when it was first introduced. One of my colleagues successfully uses an inexpensive commercial computer simulation, *SimCity*, to teach her students about the problems of managing a metropolitan region.

The underlying tone of the book is one of regret that anyone ever tried to adapt a dual-use technology funded by the military for civilian use. In my view, this is wrong-headed. If we had followed that in advice in the 1990s, we would have missed the benefits of the dot.com revolution and the Internet. Since the U.S. government is rarely empowered to fund technological development other than through the funding of basic research (with the notable exceptions of health, agriculture, and defense), it would be unwise to avoid any technology that has received defense dollars — just as it would be unwise to avoid health technologies funded by the National Institutes of Health.

Still, Light is correct in arguing that a cold war *zeitgeist* seeped into all sorts of non-military and non-defense activities and institutions. The stress on military spending during the cold war created a demand for finding civilian applications for military technologies to justify that spending even where employing those technologies was not appropriate. Her book is, therefore, an important contribution to the growing literature on the history and culture of the cold war. It would have benefited, however, from a broader and more historical view of the role of defense spending in U.S. technology policy.

- Reviewed by Jeffrey A. Hart,
Indiana University.

Frank N. Laird. 2001. *Solar Energy, Technological Policy, and Institutional Values*. New York: Cambridge University Press. (248 pp.)

Whatever happened to solar energy and those other “alternative fuels”? Crude oil prices recently soared past a ten-year high, deflating the

Dow and awakening another fitful media discussion of national energy policy. Those persuasive arguments for a viable national policy promoting alternatives to America's fossil fuel dependency have momentarily resurfaced. Again, one wonders: Why does a national solar energy policy remain such a chimera?

Frank N. Laird has an answer. In *Solar Energy, Technology Policy, and Institutional Values* he argues that solar energy has failed to become a national policy priority not "for simple reasons of untested technology or economic cost, but for complex reasons that include a failure to institutionalize new ideas about the energy problem at the top executive levels of government." And *that* failure, he maintains, betrays the primal flaw in past solar power advocacy. The struggle between solar energy advocates and proponents of conventional energy policies is fundamentally a conflict between different "normative framings" of technology. The ability to institutionalize these 'framings' determines the outcome. Partisans of fossil fuel technologies have won this institutional contest and solar advocates have yet to comprehend the implications.

To make his case, Laird borrows heavily from constructivist approaches to policy analysis. He argues that the half-century discourse inside the federal government between advocates of "renewable" and conventional energy technologies gradually evolved into an embedded a contest between two normative "framings" or social visions. By the early 1970s, policy elites "who thought about the future and about new energy sources conceptualized their problems in terms of economic benefits and national security," he suggests. In sharp contrast, he argues, activists for solar and other renewables "came to the technology from a part of the environmental movement that believed that the fundamental structures of society and politics...were in some deep sense flawed...They sought technologies that would reinforce and be more compatible with a qualitatively different society and politics..." In the end, the conventional vision, freighted with all its implicit (if often unarticulated) normative

presumptions, was institutionalized within the Executive Office of the President (EOP) and—equally important—embraced by policymaking elites in their technological conception of energy production. All of this, in Laird's opinion, demonstrates (to reverse Langdon Winner's well-known axiom) that different technologies require different visions of social and political life for their realization.

Laird, a member of the Technology and Public Policy faculty at the University of Denver, argues his case by meticulously—at times relentlessly—following the evolution of federal solar energy policy from its faint inception in the Truman Administration, through its deceptive ascendancy during Jimmy Carter's administration, to its precipitous decline thereafter. Using extensive information gleaned from the presidential libraries of every Chief Executive since Harry Truman, Laird enriches his narrative materials with intimate communications and back-channel discussions within the White House, illuminating the style and pervasiveness of the "normative framing" of conventional energy technologies dominating policymaking during this period. His larger purpose, however, is not solely to demonstrate that "normative framing" can become a highly discriminating tool of policy analysis. He also believes his historical case study demonstrates that explaining policymaking outcomes, in general, *must* take account of more than the dynamics of pluralistic interest group struggles, differential stakeholder access, and economic calculation. Policymaking must also be understood as a strategic interaction between normative framings of policy issues, however deceptively they may be packaged as "facts." Moreover, Laird believes that the capacity of this framing to shape federal solar energy policy implicitly critiques theories that maintain that pluralistic competition, expanded public involvement, and even democratic institutional procedures are sufficient to insure normatively acceptable public policy making.

The book will appeal to academics and policy practitioners interested in energy policy, environmental issues, technological decision

making and the policy process. It is probably too long and technical for the average reader. Still, it is a paradigm for conceptually rigorous policy analysis: a productive synthesis of historical narrative, qualitative research technique, and political science methodology; a counter-intuitive explanation for solar energy's failed promise; and a thoughtful critique of pluralist theory. It also invites all the customary reservations about constructivist theories applied to technical policymaking.

- Reviewed by Walter Rosenbaum,
University of Florida

David M. Driesen, *The Economic Dynamics of Environmental Law*, 2003, MIT Press, Winner of the 2004 Lynton Keith Caldwell best book award, Science, Technology, and Environmental Politics organized section, American Political Science Association.

It has become the conventional wisdom that environmental regulation (and most other forms of regulation) be guided by the goal of promoting economic efficiency. Environmental policies are expected to produce economically efficient policies, and the regulatory instruments and tools are expected to be market-based approaches such as emissions trading for air pollution, water markets for reallocating scarce resources, and wetland banks to offset those lost to development. Economic efficiency has come to dominate policy debate to such an extent that it is now virtually politically impossible to consider environmental policy options without presuming that they will be based on some kind of market-based incentive. This should come as no surprise, since the regulatory reform mantra for three decades that calls for more efficient regulatory policies has been strongly endorsed by regulated industries.

A few scholars have challenged the idea that economic efficiency ought to be the primary goal of environmental policy and that there are other public interests besides making regulation more efficient. There are thoughtful critics of cost-benefit analysis who have focused attention on the difficulties in

valuing environmental variables that are often downplayed in analyses that seek to quantify and monetize all variables. David Driesen, an environmental lawyer and law professor has joined the debate with an extraordinarily important book that challenges the prevailing regulatory reform wisdom. Driesen begins by accepting the view that markets have features that policy makers should emulate, but asks if efficiency is really the characteristic of markets that we ought to pursue. Economists recognize that market efficiency is a theoretical construct that does not actually describe markets in practice, yet they are happy to compare the efficiency of regulatory policies to the ideal of efficient markets, rather than how markets work in practice, making efficiency a problematic criterion for guiding policy design. More troubling is the static nature of efficiency, which seeks an equilibrium between supply and demand for a given set of technologies, rather than encouraging the development of new technologies. Efficiency may lead to an optimal distribution of existing goods and services and low prices for consumers and low profits for producers, while doing little to stimulate investment in technological innovation.

Driesen argues that the market virtue of greatest interest to us is not the static equilibrium of costs and benefits and efficiency but, rather, economic growth, innovation, and material improvement in the lives of people. Stimulating technological change and innovation, rather than matching marginal production costs and marginal consumption benefits, is a much more important benefit of markets. Static efficiency can occur without contributing anything to innovation and can even threaten it by reducing the profits available for funding innovation. Economic dynamics, rather than static efficiency, is the real promise of markets. As a result, we need to replace regulatory reform's obsession with economic efficiency with a much broader and more ambitious analysis of how to achieve environmental goals more effectively.

The goal for Driesen is not simply economic growth and bigger markets but more effective protection of critical ecosystems and natural resources over time. Markets provide a steady

incentive to take natural resources, convert them into marketable products, and degrade the environment. Marketing and advertising, along with population growth, also stimulate consumption that puts further pressure resources. There are no corresponding incentives to develop innovations that improve environmental quality. While government regulation tries to counter these trends, since there are many, many more market-based decisions that degrade the environment than regulators can monitor and shape, long-term environmental degradation is almost inevitable.

Environmental quality depends, in the long run, not so much on making each regulation as efficient as possible, but on changing the overall dynamic of the economy and reaching many more of the private decisions than the relatively few shaped by regulation. Rather than centering on how to ensure that the compliance costs imposed on regulated entities are efficient, environmental law must take on a much broader and ambitious task of making regulation itself more effective, more able to respond quickly to changes in the marketplace, and more able to reach the innumerable decisions made each day that affect environmental quality.

Driesen seeks to reshape the way we think about environmental law and policy in ways that increase the likelihood that we will be able to achieve the ambitious normative goals of environmental law, such as securing clean air and water for all residents, that largely remain unfilled. Economic dynamic analysis draws upon institutional economics and its emphasis on the limitations of institutions and on how change occurs over time, ecological economics and its focus on valuing ecological services, and public choice theory and the attention it gives to the influence of economic interests on policy making. Dynamic analysis does not ignore efficiency. For example, Driesen argues that, because of the resources available to industry lobbyists, the existing regulatory system overestimates the cost of compliance and regulations are weaker (i.e. less efficient) than the problems warrant, and the process could be improved by providing funding for

more participation by other interests such as environmental advocates.

Economic dynamics suggest that we focus on how to ensure environmental law does not discourage the advancement of technology and does create incentives for environmentally-friendly innovation, addresses growing population and consumption pressures, and reaches more and more of the private decisions that affect environmental quality. With such a perspective, policy makers, scholars, and the public are better equipped to explore difficult issues such as whether environmental law should be more privatized, how the process of making environmental decisions could be made more fair, how environmental policy making can take into account a broader set of forces that shape it, and how the debate over environmental policy design can move beyond the command-and-control versus market incentives dichotomy to find ways to shape a dynamic economic market in ways that are more environmentally friendly.

The Economic Dynamics of Environmental Law is not an easy read. It is a dense, technical discussion of the details of environmental policy design. Driesen recognizes the considerable political barriers to changing the way in which regulatory agencies think about and write environmental regulations and the level of opposition they will engender, and he does not examine the kinds of political changes required to produce more ambitious and effective environmental policies. But his analysis is provocative and sure to be pathbreaking and influential and deserves a wide audience and joins a list of distinguished books recognized by the Caldwell award.

- Reviewed by Gary Bryner,
Brigham Young University,
Chair of the Lynton Keith
Caldwell Award Committee.

Edward Weber, 2003, *Bringing Society Back In: Grassroots Ecosystem Management, Accountability, and Sustainable Communities*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Over the last decade, scholars, policymakers, and many activists have embraced the idea of local, collaborative environmental problem solving as an alternative to more traditional top-down, adversarial rulemaking. But critics of devolved, participatory approaches have questioned whether a small group of local stakeholders can legitimately make public policy decisions. They have worried, in particular, that narrow, private interests are likely to dominate such initiatives. In *Bringing Society Back In*, Edward Weber confronts this concern directly, asking: Can local, collaborative, environmental problem solving be accountable to broad, public interests, as well as to more local ones? Based on a close examination of three prominent cases of grassroots ecosystem management (GREM) in Washington State, he concludes that these new kinds of governance arrangements *can* be accountable to individuals, communities, and the nation. Furthermore, he argues, they can enhance communities' capacity for and commitment to sustainability.

In order to answer "yes" to his overarching research question, Weber must reconceive democratic accountability, drawing partly on a synthesis of existing literature and partly on his empirical observations of the Henry's Fork Watershed Council, the Applegate Partnership, and the Willapa Alliance. Accountability, Weber points out, is "a system, or set of mechanisms, designed to make sure promises are kept, duties are performed, and compliance is forthcoming" (11). Traditionally, scholars have focused on formal institutional accountability mechanisms, such as authority relationships, legal obligations, and the rules and punishments that induce a desired behavior. In a discussion that should be familiar to those who have read the civic environmentalism literature, Weber explains how a host of unconventional institutional structures and processes—including a collaborative,

nonhierarchical design; direct, participatory decision making; advisory, coordinative role; etc.—foster accountability in GREM.

Weber's more original contribution comes in his explication of how a host of informal institutions, "such as participant norms, the enculturation of specific virtues, and a credible commitment to accountability by leaders," enhance GREM's accountability. Participant norms include civility, respect for others and their interests, integrity and honesty in communication and action, and a commitment to seek "balanced" solutions to problems. They also include inclusiveness and honoring one's public commitments. According to Weber, adherence to these norms eventually promotes trust among participants and trust in the collaborative approach itself. GREM initiatives also foster civic virtue, which is characterized by such qualities as law-abidingness, civility, willingness to work hard, the capacity to delay gratification, and independence. Civic virtue, in turn, is essential to public-spirited (and hence accountable) self-governance. And finally, GREM leaders ensure accountability by being credibly committed to doing so. As Weber explains, "The behavior of leaders—or more specifically, reputation, rhetoric, and actions—weaves a discernible pattern that signals the degree of their commitment" (95).

These attributes are obviously appealing, but GREM could easily fall into the trap of being all talk—albeit friendly talk—and no action. Thus, Weber emphasizes that all three of the initiatives he examines also rely on performance-based mechanisms to ensure accountability. First, he finds that in each case, participants approach problems in a productive way: They emphasize on-the-ground ecosystem conditions as a primary basis for making decisions and evaluating success; they adopt a holistic approach and thereby apparently avoid the pitfalls of the traditionally fragmented, media-by-media approach; they incorporate the full variety of knowledge—including social science and local ecological knowledge—into their decision-making processes; and they assert a commitment to adaptive management. Second, he finds that a

majority of the 30 decisions made in all three cases display strong accountability across four levels: the diversity of representation in processes and outcomes; the relationship of choices to existing laws, regulations, and agency programs; the extent to which choices benefit a broad array of interests; and the effect of choices on individuals within the community.

Before concluding, Weber submits his three cases to a final test: He asks whether they are accountable to future generations—that is, whether they are devising solutions that are sustainable. He finds that each initiative is infusing its community with the value of sustainability and providing an institutional framework for addressing problems at an ecosystem scale. In addition, these efforts are creating unified, integrated, community-based networks that enhance their respective communities' capacity for collective action. And they are promoting sustainability by educating and reaching out to citizens, creating incentives for individuals to act sustainably, and tapping into local sources of knowledge.

Weber's study is important because it systematically investigates, and thereby illuminates, the mechanisms by which collaborative decision-making produces accountability. He makes a serious effort to document some elusive qualities, such as the credibility of leaders' commitment to accountability. Skeptics will find some of his findings unpersuasive, however; for example, an apparent commitment to sustainability is a far cry from the serious and ongoing changes in behavior that will be required to achieve the genuine environmental protection that underpins sustainability. Furthermore, as Weber acknowledges at the outset, his conclusions apply to an important but quite narrow slice of the world: rural, western communities whose economies depend heavily on natural resources. Thus, his research provokes further questions about which of the informal institutions he describes would emerge in different contexts. Weber also emphasizes that the norms that are created are quite fragile and may not be widely shared outside the collaborative group itself. So although his informants clearly were

deeply committed to bringing about change in their communities, it remains unclear how much these initiatives can actually accomplish. But the biggest challenge to both Weber's conclusions—and to GREM itself—is the apparently ephemeral nature of these initiatives: Two out of the three he investigated were no longer meeting by the time his book was published. Ironically, the one that continued to operate was the least obviously "grassroots" of the three. If such efforts are only temporary, one is left wondering what kind of impact the norms and networks they produced will have on local decision making over time.

- Reviewed by Judy Layzer, M.I.T.,
Member, Caldwell Award
Committee.

Kent E. Portney, 2003. *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

A quite substantial literature on sustainability has emerged in recent years, evidence of the extent to which the idea has taken hold within environmental thought and action. No surprise: everyone knows that sustainability--whether expressed as subject, verb, or adjective--is good, even if there is notably little consensus on what it means, how it works, or, how we should measure progress to whichever short, intermediate, or long-term goals we are seeking by doing it. But still it animates attention, probably because it is the only apparent legitimate (in the U.S., at least) riposte to liberal economic orthodoxy.

An important subgenre of the literature on sustainability focuses on metropolitan areas, where most people actually live, recognizing that true environmental progress is a chimera unless we address the environmental, economic, and social challenges facing our densest and most resource-intensive areas. Policymakers recognize this as well, and more than a few cities in the U.S. (and many more elsewhere) have expressed at least symbolic or rhetorical commitment to some variant

of the sustainability ethos by generating sustainability plans of varying scope and depth.

But to what effect? We have many examples of sustainability initiatives pursued by public and nonprofit entities in urban areas across the United States, Kent Portney points out, but remarkably little good evidence of the extent to which cities are taking sustainability seriously. That is, are these various sustainability initiatives really seeking to address challenges of environmental protection, economic and social inequality, and democratic participation that arguably comprise the core of the sustainability value system, or are they simply local economic development efforts dressed up in newer, slightly greener clothes?

So Portney wants to know whether there is anything to sustainability beyond the rhetoric. Which cities take sustainability seriously, why, and how do we know? The first challenge in answering these questions begins with the definition of sustainability itself, which as Portney reminds us can mean many different things to many different people. To get at this problem he reviews the already expansive literature on sustainability, looks at a wide variety of sustainability initiatives taken by American cities, and comes up with a set of indicators that reasonable people would accept as part of any serious sustainability agenda. In the process, he also takes the reader on a very useful journey through the major controversies at hand, in particular the fundamental tension between the individualism embodied in classical economics and American notions of rights and a communitarian value system that many argue is essential to any sustainability ethos. Portney recognizes that this tension is nowhere close to being resolved, especially in the U.S., so he settles (rightly, I think) for a city's commitment to "smart growth" as a reasonable substitute.

The second challenge lies in assessing the seriousness of a sustainability initiative. Here Portney applies his index of indicators to the two dozen U.S. cities he identifies as having produced some kind of formalized sustainability or smart growth initiative. This exercise generates a relative

handful of cities that, on paper, seem to lead the pack in thinking about the interconnections among environmental, economic, and community needs. Some of the leaders (e.g., Seattle, Boulder) probably will come as no surprise, but others (e.g., Scottsdale, Tampa) seem counterintuitive, particularly if one automatically equates seriousness about sustainability with a progressive (or at least liberal) local political culture.

Portney wonders about that as well, so he then tries to parse out the commonalities among those cities that appear to take sustainability most seriously. After wrestling with incomplete and inadequate data, mismatched criteria, and all of the other usual matters that bedevil any dedicated empiricist, Portney is forced to conclude these cities have relatively little of common, except perhaps for location (heavy on the west coast), the median age and educational level of the population (an older and more educated citizenry is more serious), and the extent to which manufacturing or extractive industries do not dominate the local economy. Beyond that, he concludes, we get into the central role of local political leaders and institutions, the stuff of urban governance that still matters forty years after Robert Dahl wrote *Who Governs?*

Is Portney ultimately successful in his task? I doubt he would think so, admitting that his findings are inconclusive and that many methodological issues still need to be worked out. In this sense, then, the book is more valuable as a heuristic, a plan of action for additional research, than a conclusive analysis in its own right. But that's OK. Portney took on a big task, and this is such a clear-eyed and methodologically thorough bit of comparative policy analysis that the journey is well worth it. More important, it is the kind of work that should prompt others to take up where Portney leaves off.

Taking Sustainability Seriously will provoke arguments about what we mean, how we mean it, and how we are going to get there. Its combination of thorough literature review, useful case studies, and empirically-based comparative policy analysis make it a valuable addition to any graduate or upper-level undergraduate course in public policy

analysis, environmental politics, or urban politics and policy.

*- Reviewed by Christopher Bosso,
Northeastern University, Member,
Caldwell Award Committee.*

NEWS OF THE DISCIPLINE

Upcoming Request for Proposals

NSF Supports Research on Decision, Risk and Management Science: Program Seeks to Increase Understanding and Effectiveness of Decision-Making by Individuals, Groups, Organizations and Society [*Proposals Due January 15 and August 15 Annually*]

NSF's Research on Gender in Science and Engineering Supports Research That Enhances the Multidisciplinary Understanding of Science and Engineering Learning to the Extent That Differences are Based on Gender: Behavioral, Cognitive, Affective and Social Differences May be Investigated Using Methods of Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology, Economics and Statistics Disciplines [*Required Preliminary Proposals Due October 18, 2004; Full Proposals Due February 1, 2005*]

Upcoming Conferences

American Society for Public Administration National Conference:

Milwaukee, WI April 2-5, 2005
Proposal Deadline: Closed

Western Political Science Association

Oakland, California: March 17-19, 2005
Proposal deadline: September 10, 2004

First National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration

Orlando, Florida: December 6-10, 2004
Proposal Deadline: Closed

*American Public Health Association Annual Meeting:
Public Health and the Environment*

Washington, D.C.: November 6-10, 2004
Proposal Deadline: Closed

Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management

Atlanta, GA: October 28 - 30, 2004
Proposal Deadline: Closed

Other Annual Political Science Meetings can be found at: <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/conferences/index.cfm>

STEP Panels at APSA 2004, Chicago

- 39-3 Revisiting Policy Learning
@ Thursday, Sep 2, 10:15 AM
- 39-7 Perspectives on Biotechnology
@ Thursday, Sep 2, 2:00 PM
- T-13 Theme Panel: The Environment and Global Inequalities
@ Thursday, Sep 2, 4:15 PM
- 39-9 Explaining Biotechnology Policy: Country and Issue Comparisons
@ Friday, Sep 3, 2:00 PM
- 25-12 Protecting the Commons: Emerging Strategies in Natural Resource Management
@ Friday, Sep 3, 4:15 PM
- 43-6 New Fronts in the Struggle for Environmental Justice and Global Equality
@ Saturday, Sep 4, 8:00 AM
- 39-6 Environment, NGOs and Global Advocacy
@ Saturday, Sep 4, 2:00 PM
- 39-5 Comparative Politics @ Sat Source: Seattle, P.I., July 16, 2000
- 25-10 Policy Tools and Styles: What Fosters Environmental Protection?
@ Sunday, Sep 5, 8:00 AM

