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We’re into another school year at Ohio State. As you’ve no doubt heard, Gordon Gee has returned as president, bringing a renewed sense of excitement to the university. Our daughter-in-law graduated from Ohio State just after Gee’s first presidency ended, and she complained that he wouldn’t be speaking at her graduation, with his famous lists of the Top 10 Things That Happened When You Were at Ohio State. Well, he’s back now, armed with top 10 lists, energy, and a proper sense of what makes a university great.

This has been a year with many changes in the Department of Political Science. We started this fall with several new faculty additions. Three specialize in American politics: Corrine McConnaughy (gender and politics, PhD Michigan, previously teaching at Texas, Austin), William Minozzi (political institutions, PhD Stanford Business School), and Ismail White (politics of race and ethnicity, PhD Michigan, previously teaching at Texas, Austin). Another new faculty member specializes in international relations, Bear Braumoeller (PhD Michigan, previously teaching at Harvard). Our final new hire is a comparative politics scholar specializing in Southern Europe who will not join us until September 2008, Sara Watson (PhD Berkeley). And we will miss two faculty members who moved on: Brian Pollins retired from our international relations faculty and Clarissa Hayward (political theory) moved to Washington University in St. Louis.
Our faculty members continue to be highly regarded on campus. Emeritus Professor Herb Asher was awarded the university’s Service Award at the autumn 2007 commencement ceremony. In spring 2007, Marcus Kurtz received the Alumni University Distinguished Teaching Award; Ifan Nooruddin received the Distinguished Undergraduate Research Mentor Award; and Richard Herrmann was named a Joan Huber Faculty Fellow for his research on the political psychology of international relations.


To put our undergraduate program in perspective, we had under 400 majors in political science a few years ago, and now we’re up to 1,300 of the best undergraduate majors you can imagine.

Our faculty’s excellence continues to receive recognition across our profession.

And we are pleased to say that we had about 225 majors who joined the ranks of our alums in the 2007 spring commencement in the Shoe. They were a great set of students that our faculty have enjoyed working with the past four years. As usual, they come from all around Ohio and as far away as Beijing, and many headed off this fall to law school, some to graduate school, and others (hopefully) to their first real jobs. To put our undergraduate program in perspective, we had under 400 majors in political science a few years ago, and now we’re up to 1,300 of the best undergraduate majors you can imagine.

My own area of study is American politics, but I’m equally proud of our department’s international breadth. This summer I was invited by one of our alumni from Taiwan to visit and give some talks in Taipei. And this fall we hosted a talk by another alumnus from Taiwan who is its new representative to the United States. Buckeye Nation is actually Buckeye International.

Chairing the department remains a fascinating experience for me, with new challenges and new opportunities every month. We have a great group of faculty, staff, graduate students, undergraduates, and alumni. What more could a department chair possibly ask for, other than for more money from the dean? Seriously, I hope you enjoy reading this year’s newsletter.
Immigrants, Assimilation, and Cultural Threat

by Anthony Mughan

Immigration is perhaps the most controversial political issue in the United States and Western Europe today. In the United States, it divides the Democratic and Republican parties alike and in Western Europe it has contributed significantly to the emergence and persistence of numerous far-right parties, including the National Front in France, the Vlaams Belang in Belgium, and Dansk Folkeparti in Denmark. This kind of negative reaction to immigrants is far from new. In 19th-century America, for example, "Americans pictured the Irish as rowdy, ne'er-do-wells, impulsive, quarrelsome, drunken, and threadbare." The traditional explanation of such anti-immigrant sentiment has been economic. Immigrants are resented because they take natives' jobs, depress wages, and so on. More recently, however, this economic explanation has taken on an added cultural dimension. Immigrants are not welcome to natives because they are seen as being reluctant to assimilate in the sense of adopting the cultural norms and lifestyle of their new homeland. Taken to extremes, this argument sees contemporary patterns of immigration as a threat to the unity of receiving countries themselves. In the words of 2004 Reform Party presidential candidate, Pat Buchanan: "Uncontrolled immigration threatens to deconstruct the nation we grew up in and convert America into a conglomeration of people with almost nothing in common—not history, heroes, language, culture, faith, or ancestors."

Moreover, the essence of this commitment was widely shared and there is no more succinct a summary of it than that offered by an Ohioan: "language, employment, and citizenship."

These are controversial and important claims indeed, but what is remarkable about them is their weak empirical grounding. Little evidence is presented to show that immigrants are not assimilating. Indeed, it's hard even to know whether they are or are not doing so since the academic literature is silent on both what assimilation means for natives and what are the principal immigrant behaviors consistent with it. Put differently, how should immigrants conduct themselves if they are to be seen as assimilating, thereby avoiding the cultural resentment of natives? These two questions are at the heart of my current research.

The first step in this research was to determine what assimilation means for Americans. I worked with Pamela Paxton of the Department of Sociology on two strategies to find the answer. The first was for us to devise survey questions that reflected what we thought it meant for them. The second was to allow people to discuss their own beliefs and opinions in focus groups. We would then devise survey questions based on the content of these discussions. We opted for the second strategy and commissioned four focus groups, two in Columbus, Ohio, and two in Los Angeles, California, using the same protocol and same moderator for all of them.

Participants were first asked directly: "What does that term assimilation mean as it relates to immigrants? How would you define it?" There was general agreement about its meaning and it is best captured by the notion of "blending in": "Assimilation is trying to blend in with society and culture." Interestingly, becoming American did not entail immigrants' total rejection of their heritage, but, at the same time,
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magnanimity had its limits. No one saw assimilation in terms of the existence of multiple, independent cultures: “I can live with differences, but not to the extent of like not knowing the language.” Instead, discussion in all four groups revealed clear expectations of value and behavioral adaptation in certain cultural areas if immigrants are to become successfully assimilated into American society. Indeed, there appeared to be a widely shared hierarchy of expectations of immigrants with the most important being nonnegotiable. They were welcome to keep their own cuisine, for example, but more important was their demonstration of a manifest commitment to their new country. Moreover, the essence of this commitment was widely shared and there is no more succinct a summary of it than that offered by an Ohioan: “language, employment, and citizenship.” Each of these requirements for assimilation will now be discussed more fully.

Effective communication was not enough for some group members, however. While not everyone agreed, some also felt the need to dictate where and to whom immigrants spoke English.

Language
The importance that English-speaking Americans attach to language for successful assimilation cannot be overstated. Without English, the social interaction underpinning assimilation—be it on the street, in the store, the workplace, or at social events—simply cannot take place. Moreover, explicit in group discussions was the understanding that speaking English meant not just being able to “get by” in the language, but rather being able to communicate effectively in it. A humorous example of ineffective communication that resonated very strongly was the experience of a Los Angeles man who went into a Burger King and ordered a (emphasis in original) hamburger, only to be given eight of them. Effective communication was not enough for some group members, however. While not everyone agreed, some also felt the need to dictate where and to whom immigrants spoke English. It was generally agreed, for example, that immigrants should speak English “in public places,” but the feeling that they should do so was especially strong when English-speaking Americans were present. Otherwise, “it gives you a feeling like you’re not even there, like you’re not important. Even included (in the group), you’re not a part of it.” More controversial was the view that immigrants should speak English at home. Several group members thought this an unreasonable imposition, but others endorsed it if only because “if you don’t speak it at home, you’re probably never going to do it well enough to speak it well in public.”

Productivity
In regard to the second dimension of immigrant commitment, “employment,” the general emphasis was less on simply having a job and more on being productive, or contributing, member of society. Just as newcomers are expected to have well-developed English-language skills, they were unanimously expected to contribute to their new homeland and not just take from it. For one Columbus man, assimilation itself means “being productive in the community.” As with speaking English, however, “productive” is too general an expectation of immigrants to have much discriminatory power in and of itself. Instead, three more specific expectations of immigrant productivity could be detected: (1) having a job; (2) educating themselves and their children; and (3) giving back to society. We take the expectation of employment first.

Citizenship
The final dimension of commitment involves immigrants showing formal and manifest respect for, and identification with, their new homeland. Its more formal manifestation is that the immigrant should be in the country legally and that she should proceed expeditiously to citizenship. Generally, however, while being seen as a sine qua non for immigrant assimilation by virtually everybody, legality was not enough in and of itself. There was also widespread sentiment that immigrants should signal their “Americanness” by “study(ing) and becom(ing) a citizen during the time allowed.”

It is the perception of immigrants’ reluctance, or failure, to master English, be productive, or take out citizenship that makes up the sense of cultural threat felt by many Americans. The next step in this research project is to use the focus group discussions to formulate survey questions that can be used for a more systematic investigation of the causes and consequences of cultural threat in contemporary America and Western Europe.
Partisan Polarization in America

—by Paul A. Beck

Since at least the mid-1990s, by most accounts American politics has been polarized sharply between liberal Democrats on one side and conservative Republicans on the other. This partisan polarization is most visible among political leaders and political activists, on talk radio and television, and in election campaigns, although some signs of it appear in the electorate as well. It has continued into 2007 at the national level in the disputes between the Democratic Congress and the Republican president over the war in Iraq, federal spending, and a variety of other issues. Is the impression of this period as especially polarized along partisan lines accurate? If so, what accounts for heightened partisanship and what impact does it have on governance and policymaking?

The most visible evidence of partisan polarization is provided by the extent of party voting in the U.S. Congress. Party voting is measured by calculating the percentage of congressional votes where a majority of one party opposes a majority of the other party—and by the loyalty of legislators to their party on these votes. Year-by-year figures for party voting in the House of Representatives are available dating back to the 1830s, when the American two-party system was established. They show mostly high levels of congressional party voting and its attendant polarization throughout the 19th century. A surge in the 1930s was followed by a decline in party polarization that reached historic lows in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Since then, House party votes and representatives’ loyalty to their party on these votes has climbed into the 2000s, thus fostering the impression of increased partisan polarization at the national level.

Two caveats about these figures need to be considered, however, in drawing conclusions about party polarization. First, congressional party polarization, then and now, is modest by international standards. In many of the world’s democracies, the parties divide much more sharply in their legislative voting patterns than the majority vs. majority yardstick used in characterizing the United States. Most divide votes in the British House of Commons, for example, have historically had at least 90% of one party voting in opposition to at least 90% of the other. On most important votes in the Canadian House of Commons, the parties vote unanimously together; the few members who occasionally dare to defect are removed from the parliamentary causes of their party by the party leader and become independents. If such exacting standards were applied to the U.S. Congress, it would show modest partisan polarization at any time. Second, while current levels of party polarization in Congress are high relative to earlier years in the 20th century, they do not come close to attaining the levels of the most partisan polarized periods in American political history—the 1840s and the 1890s.
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Candidate, party, and interest group campaign appeals seem stridently partisan these days, with opponents often demonized in both policy and personal terms.
Increased levels of partisan polarization in recent years have been evident beyond the U.S. Congress. Many state legislatures, including Ohio's, have been deeply divided along party lines in the last decade or so. Candidate, party, and interest group campaign appeals seem stridently partisan these days, with opponents often demonized in both policy and personal terms. The current conflict between the Bush Administration and the Democratic-led Congress signifies a deep inter-branch partisan divide in Washington. A conspicuous exception to the prevailing pattern has emerged right here in Ohio, where the bipartisan cooperation in 2007 between Ohio's Republican legislature and Democratic governor stands in stark contrast to the sharp partisan divide in the legislature of previous years.

Scholars and others who have studied the recent surge in partisan polarization offer a variety of explanations for it. The surge in partisan polarization is much more pronounced among the so-called "political class" (politicians, activists, interest groups) than the general public. Although many ordinary voters are intensely partisan, their share of the electorate has not grown in the last decade, and even the partisans among them are not noticeably more polarized than before. Indeed, the relative number of Americans who claim to be either Democrats or Republicans is lower than it was as recently as the 1960s. Moreover, many Americans, and not just self-proclaimed independents, voice dismay over the recent surge in partisanship. They react negatively to the shrill partisan rhetoric of the campaigns and the talk shows and the incessant partisan infighting among policymakers.

Why is the political class more partisan these days? In the Congress, the changes can be traced back to the breakup of the solidly Democratic South after the 1950s, largely as a result of the civil rights revolution and the enfranchisement of black voters there. The result has been a tightened connection between ideology and party in that region and nationwide. A half-century ago, congressional Democrats included large blocks of both conservatives (mostly southern) and liberals (mostly northern). The congressional Democrats are more homogenously liberal today, just as congressional Republicans (also reflecting changes in the South) are more homogenously conservative. Another contributing factor has been the decennial redrawing of district lines to make legislative seats safer for incumbent officeholders and parties. Legislators from "safe seats" are much more likely to raise funds to support their activities and to mobilize their supporters in elections grows with the threat, real and imagined, that their causes face. The increased dependence of candidates on campaign funds and the deregulation of independent spending in political campaigns have enabled these cause groups to become even more influential in defining the nature of campaigns. American political campaigns often have been "rough and tumble" affairs, with some from the 19th century making modern campaigns seem altogether civil. Nonetheless, there does seem to have been an increase in so-called "negative" campaigning, especially venomous personal attacks, in recent times. After participating in such campaigns, it is understandable that elected political leaders might have difficulty cooperating across the partisan divide.

To this mix of polarization-inducing forces should be added the proliferation of highly partisan and ideological talk shows on radio and television since the early 1990s. They tend to inflame partisans by reinforcing extreme views and whipping up the partisanship of their audiences, rather than exposing them to the more balanced commentary of the traditional news sources. Even if there is some validity to the charges from ideological liberals and especially conservatives that the conventional media are biased, their biases are and were far more subtle, and thereby less effective, than those of the most partisan and ideological talk show hosts. Even the widespread adoption of primaries for the nomination of party candidates, which occurred at the presidential level only in the 1970s, is seen by some observers as contributing to increased partisan polarization. Even if they might not be as electable in the general elections, ideological candidates often have an advantage over moderates in competing for the nomination among the party faithful, the most partisan and ideological of whom participate in the primaries. Before primaries became dominant, party leaders selected the nominees, and they were more likely
to be moved by practical election considerations than ideological purity in making their choices.

Is this increased partisan polarization in our politics necessarily something to deplore? More sharply polarized parties and party candidates clarify the differences between what you will get in voting for a Democrat or a Republican. For ordinary citizens to play the role ascribed to them in a democracy, it is crucial that they be able to connect opposing parties and candidates with different policy preferences outcomes. Muted differences between the parties, choices between "Tweedledum and Tweedledee" as one third-party candidate once put it, make that connection difficult. Additionally, the most difficult public policy issues, which are the kind that require political resolutions, often require the challenging and sharpening of alternatives that spirited partisan debate produces before satisfactory resolutions can emerge.

On the other hand, many Americans recoil from highly partisan politics. They tire of the incessant "spinning" and bickering and turn away from politics rather than remain involved in it, leaving the field more and more to their more partisan and ideological colleagues. High-quality potential candidates for office in both parties often are not willing to compete for office because of the personal and negative attacks that they may have to endure. Some of the nation's most respected political leaders leave office early because their interest in good policymaking is overwhelmed by partisan animosities and battles. In the end, of course, our politics should be judged by its outcomes. Does the practice of politics lead to the development of policy solutions to the major problems of the day? Many thoughtful observers have concluded that our current system does not measure up very well by that standard—that it favors "scoring partisan points" over sharing the responsibility across party lines for finding solutions to the nation's most vexing problems.

Can a better balance be achieved between partisan differences that clarify alternatives in policy debates and the strident partisan polarization that prevents feasible policies from being fashioned from these alternatives? There already are some signs of movement in this direction—for example, in the recent cooperation between the Democratic governor and the Republican legislature here in Ohio. Whether such a dampening of partisan polarization will continue, even accelerate, is an important question for the future of American politics. American voters can play a role in achieving a better balance by deciding for themselves what kind of politics they want to reward. If they keep supporting candidates who wave the partisan flag above all else or who demonize those who disagree with them, such candidates will populate, even dominate, our policymaking bodies. If voters instead favor moderates over ideologues and shun candidates who run negative campaigns and make sharp partisan or personal attacks, then such candidates and candidates will flourish. Yet, there are powerful forces promoting partisan polarization in contemporary times, and it will take considerable efforts to overcome them.

---

**UPSO Launches Undergraduate Research Journal**

On the first day of classes of autumn quarter 2007, the Undergraduate Political Science Organization (UPSPO) published the first ever *Journal of Politics & International Affairs*, a goal the group had been working toward for over a year. The brainchild of UPSO president Eric Hoover, the journal was edited by Benjamin Presson, assisted by Scott Hubay, Dante Marinucci, Austin Opalich, and Rachel Szala. Professor Marcus Kurtz served as the publication's faculty advisor.

We would like to have space to publish the complete text of one of the articles, but 20 or more pages is somewhat daunting. Instead, below is a passage from Grant Marlier's essay, *Insecurity, Scarcity, and Violence*. All of Mr. Marlier's academic apparatus has been removed—with his approval—for the sake of *PostScript*'s publishing convenience.

**From Insecurity, Scarcity, and Violence: The Social Construction of Scarcity**

"Scarcity" is often used as an independent variable in causal theories of violent conflict. It is generally accepted as a "natural kind" rather than a "social kind." Yet, although there are certainly physical aspects of scarcity as a measurement, it is in fact that—a standard of measurement. Standards are inherently socially constructed. According to Alexander Wendt, "standards are in fact always constituted by shared understandings that vary by cultural context." In the international system, scarcity means many different things to many different states. One state may define clean air as scarce, through a speech act, and mobilize institutions to protect it. Another state, however, may not share the same understanding of what constitutes a scarcity of clean air. Although the air may be a natural kind, the standard for
measuring it is socially constructed. Even if the measurement is based on physical science, the authority granted that measurement is socially influenced. Although the *thing* considered scarce may be a physical object, the relationship of that thing to humans is based on perception.

The physical aspects of scarcity, however, should not be ignored. An intersubjective understanding of the objective supply of a resource is critical. The limited quantity or objective scarcity of something, however, may mean nothing without a "speech act" to make it understood as scarce. A speech act is the key aspect in any understanding of politicized and securitized scarcity. Significant political or security actors must accept these qualifications. This may be problematic because these actors are often influenced by power and insecurity, not necessarily rational economic cost-benefit analysis.

Many of the most important scarcity designations are left up to the state. A resource or good must be perceived to be of enough importance, however, that its relative scarcity would be of political concern. A relative shortage of 8-track players may go completely unnoticed by most people; however, a shortage of fresh water would not. The more important society deems the resource, the more attention will be paid to its supply. States are probably still the most effective actors in mobilizing effective institutions to protect, or secure resources. In the international system, the implications of state perceptions of scarcity can be problematic. Considering a resource scarce may lead to exploitation and/or conflict for its possession if it is securitized by the state. In contrast, the risk of not qualifying some *thing* as scarce may lead to its depletion, which could cause harm and/or violence. The implication of the meaning of scarcity is important, and, therefore, the ethics involved in the construction of the standards are vital.

Recognizing the needs of those affected by legitimate scarcity, and responses to it, may be crucial in avoiding violence. Put another way, there are many "Others" affected by the various subjective meanings of scarcity. Ethically, therefore, we may want economic or politicized scarcity designations, yet, avoid securitized scarcity designations. How culture and insecurity influence state perception or acceptance of scarcity qualifications, therefore, needs to be explored much further.

### Why States Want What They Want

According to basic economic theory, scarcity arises when the demand or desire for a resource outpaces the supply. Desires are subjective. Or, as Wendt says, "we want what we want because of how we think about it." The nature of a state's and individual's desires is generated by culture. State cultures vary. Most states, however, seek some sort of physical security for their citizens. Even a state that exploits many of its citizens generally will still be concerned with providing security for at least some of its citizens. Part of the idea of providing physical security in most states revolves around its perceived control of scarcity. Certain resources like fresh water are often managed by the state in order to control their supply. Citizens will not feel secure if they believe they may die due to a scarcity of fresh water. In the interest of security, therefore, most states seek to effectively manage scarcity. A state often must balance this desire to secure its citizens from scarcity, however, with more traditional military security concerns.

The meaning of scarcity is produced endogenously by the culture and identity of each individual state. Yet, it is also influenced by the dominant culture of the international system. In the past, the Great Powers competed around the world for colonies, or, more recently, "spheres of influence," which were generally countries exploited by the Great Powers for their raw materials. Often this competition became a sort of resource-race—similar and perhaps predicated on an arms race—with states seeking to gain the upper hand in access to raw materials and cheap labor. The resource-race between the United States and the Soviet Union during the cold war led to a competition for "spheres of influence" encompassing much of the world. Many assert this resource-race helped justify U.S.-backed violence in resource-laden countries like Vietnam, Chile, and the Congo.

The culture of many states, and perhaps the entire international system, still revolves around securing access to more and more resources. The more resources a state secures, the stronger it is perceived. The culture of many states, and perhaps the entire international system, still revolves around securing access to more and more resources. The more resources a state secures, the stronger it is perceived. Most states want to be perceived as strong in order to avoid being vulnerable to exploitation. This desire is influenced by the dominant international economic culture, which is rivalrous despite its increasing economic interdependence. Capitalism, which dominates the system, is also inherently rivalrous because it depends on competition between producers. Yet state insecurity constrains truly "free market" capitalism; therefore, trade barriers and protectionism are still very much a part of international economics.

Therefore, power is just as valuable to most states within the international economic culture as the security culture. A state identified as a legitimate "economic power" will invariably control access to a relative abundance of resources. Further, the state will usually seek to secure its identity as an "economic power" in order
to attract investment, ensure credit, and be less vulnerable to exploitation in trade negotiations—all of which further enhances its powerful status.

Controlling an ever-increasing supply of resources, or capital, is generally perceived to be as important for a state as providing military security. For instance, an "economic power" must not rest on its laurels, for it risks losing currency value, investment, bargaining power, and status. Therefore, it must perpetually drive and grow its economy in order to maximize its economic power. Unless the "economic power" reconceptualizes its economic security it will continue to seek ever-increasing resources, possibly creating what many might consider an objective scarcity of certain natural resources in the process. Yet, the state may not politicize, securitize, or even recognize this objective scarcity because of its concern with economic security. Most states view their economic security to be just as vital to their survival as their traditional military security.

**Construction of Scarcity Through Performance**

The meaning of scarcity is also constituted through interaction. In a traditional arms race, for example, the more weapons required the more metals, capital, labor, and energy needed. The perception of the amount of metals necessary is subject to the *performative process* of the arms race. Each increase in resources for state A creates a relative scarcity for state B. A "missile gap" is only understood as such through the performance of the arms race. Moreover, *arms races and resource-races inherently produce scarcity.*

Perhaps the biggest question for the "scarcity is socially constructed" idea to answer is: what about famine? A famine is considered a severe scarcity of food. Yet, is there really a scarcity of food? Nobel laureate Amartya Sen answers:

"Starvation is the characteristic of some people not *having* enough food to eat. It is not the characteristic of there being *not* enough food to eat. While the latter can be a cause of the former, it is but one of many possible causes....Food supply statements say things about a commodity (or a group of commodities) considered on its own. Starvation statements are about the *relationship* of persons to the commodity (or that commodity group)."

Therefore, our perception of scarcity is built on another performance—ownership. The relationship of the people to the food is the key for Sen. He calls this an "ownership relationship." Ownership is a social construct. How does one *own* a thing? It is a socially constructed relationship based on one's ability to secure something for one's own use. It is easier to explain that someone owns her fingers; it is much more difficult to say someone owns a piece of land. Likewise, it is somewhat problematic to say there is a "scarcity" of grain in the Sudan while there is a "surplus" of grain in France. The relationship of the grain in France to the people in the Sudan is a relationship based not just on spatial distance, which is important, but also on the social institution referred to as ownership. Owning a resource is the relationship of a human to a thing, and, therefore, socially constructed. This is not to say famines do not have physical factors; it is only to say that orthodox notions of scarcity do not always explain famines. A state's ability to control resource supplies is constrained by natural and social constructs. Physical limitations should not be ignored; yet, perhaps more emphasis on the social construction of scarcity is warranted.

**Self-help Culture vs. Collective Security Culture**

There is much to be gained by examining how culture might affect the social construction of scarcity. In particular, how does the dominant security culture of the international system affect states' ideas of scarcity? Do states in a collective security arrangement share the same understanding of scarcity as self-help states? I argue that a state's perception of scarcity is heavily influenced by the dominant security culture of the state, region, or system, and that different security concerns produce varying ideas, or understandings, of scarcity.

In a self-help culture, there is an inclination to secure resources for the Self, often at the expense of the Other. A self-help state is primarily concerned with its own survival. Therefore, it stands to reason that a self-help state would be primarily concerned with securing resources for itself. The self-help state must secure its own resources, because it cannot be dependent on cooperation with another state. Yet in a "Kantian," or collective security, culture there is more incentive to cooperate or share resources. States participating in a collective generally rely on it for security, and typically view the security interests of the collective as their own. The security of the collective is paramount; therefore, securing resources individually for the sake of security is less necessary. The idea of a "common fate" is shared among the collective. Arms races and security dilemmas, which inherently produce scarcity, are unlikely within a legitimate collective security arrangement.

The legitimacy of the collective security arrangement, however, is crucial. Compare the legitimacy of the League of Nations versus the European Union, for example. While in the EU, Britain and France have not competed against each other for oil resources, and in fact have a collective energy agreement (European Commission – Energy). While in the League of Nations following the First World War, however, Britain competed with France for control of oil fields. The relative success of the EU's economic agreements also seems to indicate that the closer a collective security arrangement comes to forming a collective identity, the greater the chance for sharing resources amongst the collective.

In summary, if scarcity is socially constructed, then it must not be treated solely as a natural or physical standard. The subjective nature of human desire is key in constituting the meaning of scarcity. States' subjective desires, or self-interests, vary according to individual and systemic culture and context. A self-help actor may have different desires from an actor that is part of a collective identity. Further, the meaning of scarcity is often constituted through a performative process. For example, arms races and resource-races inherently produce scarcity. Finally, if scarcity is subjective then how actors decide to manage resources is not simply a materialist dilemma, but an ethical dilemma. Therefore, ethics must enter into the process of qualifying scarcity. It is not only a matter of why a resource is scarce, but why it is understood as such, and who is affected by that scarcity.
Make a Gift to the Department of Political Science

University funds are always scarce, so the successes of the Department of Political Science—the support of important scholarship, the education of our undergraduate and graduate students, the presence of visiting speakers and distinguished scholars on campus—all these and more are supported in greater numbers by the generosity of our alumni.

We invite you to make a gift to the department through one of our existing funds, which we describe below. Please use the check box on the return card to indicate the fund to which you are donating.

And also please let us know about yourself so we can share with your colleagues in our next issue. You will find space for that on the reverse side of the response card.

Political Science funding opportunities

Jacobina Aman Award
Established January 12, 1959, with a bequest from Katherine A. Seibert in memory of her mother. Income provides a student award recognizing good will, understanding, and practical cooperation in international affairs and/or race relations among fellow students.

Francis R. Aumann Fund
Established February 4, 1983, by alumni, friends, and associates of Dr. Aumann, professor emeritus. Income rewards scholastic excellence of political science students and promotes academic goals of the Department of Political Science.

William Jennings Bryan Prize
Established July 20, 1898, by Mr. Bryan. Income supports a prize for the best essay on The Principles Which Underlie Our Form of Government. If no prize is awarded, income is reinvested to principal.

Lawrence J.R. Herson Fund
Established May 7, 1999, by alumni, friends, and associates of Professor Herson, in honor of his retirement and distinguished career in the Department of Political Science. Income enhances academic goals of the department and promotes scholarly excellence among political science majors.

Madison H. Scott Memorial Fund in Political Science
Established April 4, 1997, by family, alumni, friends, and associates of Mr. Scott, former vice president for human resources and former secretary of the Board of Trustees. Income provides research grants and scholarships for minorities in the Department of Political Science.

Walter J. Shepard Foundation
Established June 30, 1936, by friends of Dean Shepard. Income supports lectures by distinguished scholars in political science.

Henry Russell Spencer Fund in Political Science
Established July 11, 1949, by friends, colleagues, and former students of Professor Spencer. Income supports lectures or fellowships in political science.

Harvey Walker Sr. Memorial Fund in Political Science
Established September 8, 1972, by family, colleagues, and friends. Income funds fellowships for outstanding students in political science for purposes of advancing the study of political science.

Political Science Advancement Fund
At the discretion of the chair, the income from this fund is used to support student and faculty educational activities for the advancement of the department.

Political Science Development Fund
At the discretion of the chair, this fund’s income is used for teaching, research, faculty travel and recruitment, student aid, public service, publications, and other similar purposes.

GRADUATE STUDENTS

Gifts That Keep on Giving

Graduate students Vonna Adams, Aldous Cheung, Zoltan Buzas, and Joshua Kertzner unexpectedly received Derby Fellowships from the Graduate School this fall—and the department was equally surprised since we had never heard of the Derby Fellowship. It turned out that an endowed scholarship fund had been set up back in 1908, to be awarded at a maximum of $400 to students in the liberal arts or education. Apparently the funds had languished for a while because of the small amount of the award, but the Graduate School decided a couple of years ago to start using it to “top off” some fellowships, and this was the year for awards in the liberal arts. An inflation calculator on the Web shows that $400 in 1908 is equivalent to $9,237 in 2007 dollars. The students received only $400, rather than $9,237, but this was still a pleasant surprise on graduate student salaries. And it nicely illustrates that gifts can keep on giving long after they are given.

Amanda Rosen was chosen by Ohio State’s Graduate Associate Teaching Award (GATA) selection committee as one of this year’s TOP 10 GTAs at the university. Out of the approximately 2,500 GTAs at Ohio State this year, 224 were nominated for the GATA. The application and selection process is extremely rigorous. To be chosen as one of the top 10 is truly an honor.
At our autumn graduate student reception in September, Zach Mears earned the Henry R. Spencer Award for distinguished teaching, and Chryl Laird and Carla Jackson received the Madison Scott award. The Jacobina Aman award for the best class paper went to Fernando Nunez, and Todd Makse was honored for the best conference paper with the Francis R. Aumann award.
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Michael D. Ondrick II, a junior double-majoring in philosophy and political science, has been named a 2007 Beinecke Scholar. The Beinecke awards $32,000 in graduate funding to students planning to pursue terminal degrees in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Ohio State may nominate one student each year; 20 Beinecke Scholarships are awarded annually at the national level. Ondrick will be completing two theses, one in each major. Advised in political science by Larry Baum, his thesis examines discrepancies between economic growth rates among Eastern European countries transitioning from communism to capitalism. His philosophy thesis, under the direction of Donald Hubin, explores the ethical status of lying. Fluent in Hungarian, Michael is planning to pursue a PhD in political economy at either Harvard or Central European University in Budapest and become a political economy faculty member, focusing on Eastern Europe.

Majors Nafisa Akbar, Laura Tompkins, and Megan Wiegand were awarded Fulbright Fellowships in May 2007. Fulbright is the largest U.S. international exchange program offering opportunities for students, scholars, and professionals to undertake international graduate study, advanced research, university teaching, and teaching in elementary and secondary schools worldwide.

Professor Emeritus Herb Asher received Ohio State’s Distinguished Service Award at the autumn 2007 commencement. This award was established in 1952 to recognize individuals whose service is truly distinguished. Asher started at Ohio State in 1970. He officially retired in 1995 but has continued teaching his popular Campaign Politics and Ohio Politics courses. He has worked with Undergraduate Student Government, advised student groups, and mentored students after their graduation. He served as special assistant and advisor to four Ohio State presidents and was the founding director of the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy (now the John Glenn School of Public Affairs). Asher continues to represent the university through his presentations to community organizations and is frequently interviewed by local and national media.
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media on politics and elections. He was chair of the Ohio Ethics Commission, is on the board of trustees of the Columbus Metropolitan Club, and is a member of the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission. Asher also continues to publish new editions of his book *Polling and the Public*.

**Professor Larry Baum** has received the C. Herman Pritchett Award from the Law and Courts section of the American Political Science Association for his book *Courts and Their Audiences* as the best book published in 2006 on law and courts written by a political scientist.

**Dean Paul A. Beck** was recently selected to receive the Samuel I. Eldersveld Career Achievement Award from the American Political Science Association (APSA). This award honors a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field. Dean Beck was presented with this award at the APSA Annual Meeting on August 31, 2007.

**Professor Janet Box-Steffensmeier** is current president of the Society for Political Methodology. She is Vernal Riffe Professor of Political Science and author of *Event History Modeling*. She has twice received the Gosnell Award for her work in political methodology.

**Professor Emeritus Aage Clausen** is enjoying a second career as a volunteer tutor helping Buckeye Middle School students with their math from a desk in the school’s hallway. The unusual setting helps students who might not be comfortable asking for extra help in class. Buckeye Middle School principal Marianne Minshall says the school struggles with high absenteeism among students, making Clausen’s role invaluable. His ability to help students catch up allows math teacher Marci Gorenstein to keep the rest of the class on schedule.

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences selected **Professor Richard Herrmann** as one of the Joan N. Huber Faculty Fellows for 2007. Huber Fellowships are awarded annually to full professors, in recognition of their first-rate scholarship. The fellowships are named in honor of Emeritus Professor Huber, who served as dean of SBS from 1984 to 1992 and as senior vice president for academic affairs and provost until her retirement in 1993. She is also a past president of the American Sociological Association. Herrmann joined the Ohio State political science faculty in 1981, and he currently serves as director of the university’s Mershon Center for International Security Studies. He has written on the role of perception and imagery in foreign policy and on the importance of nationalism and identity politics in world affairs. His areas of interest include American foreign policy and the politics of the Middle East and Russia. He has served as a Council on Foreign Relations Fellow on the Secretary of State’s Policy Planning staff in Washington, D.C., and is the author of *Perceptions and Behavior in Soviet Foreign Policy*. Herrmann’s work has put Ohio State on the national and international map in the international security field and in the study of the political psychology of international relations.

**Associate Professor Marcus Kurtz** won the 2007 Alumni Award for Distinguished Teaching, the top recognition of teaching at Ohio State. Kurtz studies comparative politics, with a focus on Latin America. He teaches across the curriculum, from the freshman level to advanced graduate courses. His course evaluations are among the very highest at the university, and spontaneous comments by his students repeatedly describe his classes as intellectually stimulating.

**Assistant Professor Jennifer Mitzen**’s article on “Ontological Security in World Politics” was awarded the prize for the best article published in the *European Journal of International Relations* in 2006. The prize was awarded at the European Consortium for Political Research’s conference in Turin, Italy, in September. Mitzen studies international relations, with emphasis on IR theory, global governance, and post-conflict reconciliation.

**Professor John Mueller** is the recipient of the first Warren E. Mitofsky Award for Excellence in Public Opinion Research for his book *Wars, Presidents and Public Opinion* (New York: Wiley, 1973). As stated in the award committee’s citation, “In the field of political science and public opinion research, Mueller was the initial leader in analyzing the effect of wars on public opinion, the effect of casualties on public support for wars, and how wars, casualties, economic conditions, and political conflict that occur over time affect support for American presidents. The ideas and arguments about how economic slumps and casualties affect public opinion, and the ‘rally round the flag’ effect that we take for granted in public discourse owe much to Mueller’s seminal book.”

**Assistant Professor Irfan Nooruddin** was recognized for his exceptional service as a faculty research mentor for undergraduate students at the Denman Undergraduate Research Forum held May 16, 2007. More than 40 student presenters submitted nominations for the new Distinguished Undergraduate Research Mentor awards. Student nominators consistently described the outstanding support and guidance they received from Nooruddin, as well as the life-changing educational and personal

continued on page 14
impact that conducting research as an undergraduate creates. The award is based on nominees’ mentor qualities; examples of how each actively encourages inquiry and creates opportunities for students to do research; how they provide guidance in research ethics, presentation and publication opportunities, and planning for continuing research and/or graduate studies; and how each professor advocates for undergraduate research. Nooruddin is among five faculty earning the newly established award.

**Associate Professor Brian Pollins** retired at the end of winter quarter 2007 after 25 years of service at Ohio State. Pollins was a faculty member in the Department of Political Science since 1983 and a research associate at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies since 1993. During that time, he wrote two dozen articles and edited a book, as well as oversaw the creation of several social science databases. Pollins has also worked on several research projects at the Mershon Center, most recently including “International Security in the New Global Economy” (originally with Edward D. Mansfield and later with Daniel Verdier), and “Global Economic Change, International Conflict and Cooperation.” Pollins serves as president of Peace Science Society (International) and associate editor of the journal Conflict Management and Peace Science. He is past editor of International Studies Quarterly (with Richard K. Herrmann and Goldie Shabad) and past president of the International Studies Association/Midwest. He has also been on the editorial boards of the Journal of Politics, International Interactions, and the American Journal of Political Science. Pollins won the department’s Distinguished Teaching Award in 2000 and is a five-time winner of the President’s Recognition for Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching.

Assistant Professor Alexander Thompson’s article “Coercion through International Organizations: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission” was awarded the Robert O. Keohane Award for the best article published in International Organization in 2006 by an untenured scholar. Thompson studies international relations, with emphasis on international organization and political economy.

**NEW FACULTY IN 2007**

**Bear Braumoeller**
Assistant Professor

Professor Braumoeller’s interests include the sources of war and conflict, international relations theory (in particular, systemic theories of international relations), political methodology (tailoring statistical methodology to fit the particular needs of students of world politics), and Russian foreign affairs (especially the relationship between belief systems and foreign policy behavior). His work has been published in journals such as Political Analysis, International Organization, American Journal of Political Science, and International Studies Quarterly. Professor Braumoeller is on the editorial boards of the American Journal of Political Science and Political Analysis.

**Corrine McConnaughy**
Assistant Professor

Professor McConnaughy’s principal research interests are in identity politics, focusing primarily on the roles race and gender play in American politics, and in the development of political institutions. She is completing a book on the partisan politics of state decisions to expand voting rights to women. Other current research projects include a study of the role of gender identity in shaping the gender gap, an investigation of political interest in legislative redistricting commissions, and a project on the development of state legislatures, centering on the representation of urban interests and the rise of professional practice. Professor McConnaughy also has research and teaching interests in methodology, particularly in the design of social science research for causal inference.

**William Minnoci**
Assistant Professor

Professor Minnoci studies positive political theory, mass media, legislatures, and the presidency. His dissertation, Ideas for Sale, examines how think tanks acquire and disseminate information.
Chris Cupples, (BA 2006) serves as Ohio Governor Ted Strickland’s personal assistant. Chris served as an intern with a Washington, D.C.-based Latino policy group while studying at Ohio State, and it was during this time that he met Strickland, then a Democratic member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Cupples started as a part-time volunteer on the Strickland campaign before the race heated up against Republican J. Kenneth Blackwell. In March 2006, Cupples became a paid, full-time campaign worker and became part of Strickland’s staff once he took office.

Robert W. Edmund (BA 1995) received the 2007 Thompson Alumni Award from Ohio State’s Alumni Association for distinctive achievement in a career and civic involvement. Edmund is a labor and employment partner in the Columbus offices of Porter Wright Morris & Arthur, LLP, and an adjunct professor at Capital University Law School. He is co-founder of the SBS Alumni Society and served as the society’s first president from 2004-2006.

Mark C. Miller (PhD 1996), Clark University associate professor of government and international relations and director of Clark’s Law and Society Program, received a Fulbright Distinguished Chair Award for 2007-2008. Miller will teach at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands during the spring 2008 semester, holding the Thomas Jefferson Distinguished Chair in the American Studies Program, which is one of the largest American studies programs in Europe.

PhD student Stephanie Peters (BA 1986) received the department’s Distinguished Alumni Award at our annual undergraduate honors reception on the Saturday before the spring 2007 commencement. After being president of the senior class council at Ohio State and receiving the Black Student Leadership Award here, she went on to receive her law degree from Georgetown University. Peters supervised the U.S. Office of Personnel Management’s responsibility under the Voting Rights Act and she was a minority counsel for the House Judiciary Committee at the time of the impeachment hearings of President Bill Clinton. She is now a counsel in the law office of Patton Boggs in Washington, D.C., where she provides legal advice and legislative counsel on international trade, intellectual property, and immigration issues. She also devotes significant time to pro bono efforts related to refugees, human rights, and global development.

Carter G. Phillips (BA 1973) received the 2007 Professional Achievement Award from Ohio State’s Alumni Association for a distinguished career and for outstanding contribution to the legal profession. He is the managing partner of the law firm Sidley Austin and one of the “100 Best Lawyers in America” (National Law Journal). He has argued more cases before the U.S. Supreme Court than any active lawyer in private practice. Phillips visits Ohio State several times a year and meets with students in the Politics, Society, and Law Scholars Program to help mentor them on their way to becoming lawyers.

Matt Schuler (BA 1990), the chief of staff for the Ohio Senate, has been honored by Ohio State’s Alumni Association in recognition of his distinguished career in public service to the state of Ohio. Schuler was recognized at June’s Alumni in Government luncheon, hosted by the Alumni Association. He started his career in public service as a legislative aide to Senator Ted Gray, chair of the Senate finance committee. He then served as director of public policy services for the Ohio Manufacturer’s Association, before returning to the Ohio Senate in 1998 as a clerk. Schuler moved into his current position in 2005.

Jausheih Joseph Wu (PhD 1989) has been named Taiwan’s representative (Ambassadorial equivalent) to the United States. Wu visited campus, hosted by the Department of Political Science, on September 28, 2007. After receiving his PhD, Wu returned to Taiwan where he was associated with the National Chengchi University in Taipei. He published actively, including his 1995 Oxford University Press book, Taiwan’s Democratization, as well as monographs on “Divided Nations” and “China Rising.” In 2002, Wu became the deputy secretary-general to the president of Taiwan. In 2004, he was appointed chair of Taiwan’s Mainland Affairs Council, where he had principal responsibility for relations between Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China. He spoke at Ohio State on “Taiwan and the U.S.: Allies of Interest in Security, Prosperity, and Democracy,” after which he was presented with the department’s Distinguished Alumni Award.