



# Law & Courts

NEWSLETTER OF THE LAW & COURTS SECTION OF THE  
AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

## A Letter from the Section Chair

Sue Davis  
*University of Delaware*  
[suedavis@UDel.edu](mailto:suedavis@UDel.edu)



The work of the awards committees is now nearly complete. All the work went well thanks to the enthusiasm and cooperative spirit of the committee chairs and all of the committee members.

I hope you all have a productive summer and I look forward to seeing everyone in Chicago.

The recipients of the awards for the Law and Courts Section are as follows:

### **Lifetime Achievement Award**

The Lifetime Achievement Award honors a distinguished career of scholarly achievement and service to the Law and Courts field.

**Stuart Scheingold, University of Washington**

### **C. Herman Pritchett Award**

The C. Herman Pritchett award is given annually for the best book on law and courts written by a political scientist and published the previous year.

**Thomas Ginsburg, Associate Professor of Law and Political Science, and Director, Program in Asian Law, Politics and Society at the University of Illinois College of Law.** *Judicial Review in New Democracies: Constitutional Courts In Asian Cases* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

### **CQ Press Award**

The CQ Press Award is given annually for the best paper on law and courts written by a graduate student.

*The winner will be announced in July*

continued on page 4

**SPRING 2004**

**VOLUME 14 No. 2**

**CLICK HERE TO  
NAVIGATE  
TO TABLE OF  
CONTENTS ON  
PAGE 2**

---

## Table of Contents

*Point and Click to Navigate to Article*

**L***etter from the Chair* page 1-4

**A***rticles:*

*Crossing Over: Citation of Public Law Faculty in Law Reviews* page 5-10

**B***ooks to Watch For...* page 11-13

**A***nnouncements...* 14

**U***pcoming Conferences...* 15

*Instructions to  
Contributors*

### General Information

**Law and Courts** publishes articles, notes, news items, announcements, commentaries, and features of interest to members of the Law and Courts Section of the APSA. **Law and Courts** is published three times a year in Winter, Spring, and Summer. Deadlines for submission of materials are: November 1 (Winter), March 1 (Spring), and **July 1 (Summer)**. Contributions to **Law and Courts** should be sent to the **NEW** editor:

John B. Gates, Editor  
Law and Courts  
Department of Political Science  
University of California, Davis  
One Shields Avenue  
Davis, CA 95616-8682  
[jbgates@ucdavis.edu](mailto:jbgates@ucdavis.edu)

### Articles, Notes, and Commentary

#### UPDATES!!

We will be glad to consider articles and notes concerning matters of interest to readers of **Law and Courts**. Research findings, teaching innovations, or commentary on developments in the field are encouraged.

Footnote and reference style should follow that of the *American Political Science Review*. Please submit two copies of the manuscript electronically as either an MS Word document or as a PDF file. Contact the editor or assistant editor if you wish to submit in a different format. Graphics are best submitted as separate PDF files. In addition to bibliography and notes, a listing of website addresses cited in the article with the accompanying page number should be included.

### Symposia

Collections of related articles or notes are especially welcome. Please contact the Editor if you have ideas for symposia or if you are interested in editing a collection of common articles. Symposia submissions should follow the guidelines for other manuscripts.

### Announcements

Announcements and section news will be included in **Law and Courts**, as well as information regarding upcoming conferences. Organizers of panels are encouraged to inform the Editor so that papers and participants may be reported. Developments in the field such as fellowships, grants, and awards will be announced when possible. Finally, authors should notify:

*Keith Bybee, [kjbybee@maxwell.syr.edu](mailto:kjbybee@maxwell.syr.edu),*

of publication of manuscripts or works soon to be completed.

### Officers LAW AND COURTS SECTION

#### Chair

Sue Davis  
*University of Delaware*

#### Chair-Elect

James F. Spriggs, II *UC Davis*

#### Executive Committee

Mark Graber, *University of Maryland*

Donald Songer, *Univ. of South Carolina*

Susan Sterett, *University of Denver*

Maolcom Feeley, *UC Berkeley*

Elliot Slotnick, *Ohio State University*

#### Secretary/Treasurer

Christine Harrington, *NYU*

#### Program Chair

Laura Langer, *University of Arizona*

### Editorial Board LAW AND COURTS NEWSLETTER

**Editor** John B. Gates, *UC Davis*

**Assistant Editor** Elizabeth Mazzara, *WSU*

Lawrence Baum, *Ohio State University*

Frank Cross, *University of Texas*

Roy B. Flemming, *Texas A&M University*

William Haltom, *Univ. of Puget Sound*

Stacia Haynie, *Louisiana State Univ.*

Valerie Hoekstra, *Arizona State Univ.*

Kevin T. McGuire, *University of North Carolina*

James Rogers, *Texas A&M University*

Mark Tushnet, *Georgetown Law School*

#### Books and Articles Columnist

Keith Bybee, *Syracuse University*

---

## American Judicature Society Award

The American Judicature Society Award is given annually for the best paper on law and courts presented at the previous year's annual meetings of the American, Midwest, Northeastern, Southern, Southwestern, or Western Political Science Associations.

**J. Mitchell Pickerell and Cornell Clayton, Washington State University** "*The Rehnquist Court and the Political Dynamics of Federalism.*" Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2003.

## Wadsworth Publishing Award

The Wadsworth Publishing Award is given annually for a book or journal article, 10 years or older, that has made a lasting impression on the field of law and courts.

**Rogers M. Smith, University of Pennsylvania** "*Political Jurisprudence, the 'New Institutionalism,' and the Future of Public Law,*" 82 *American Political Science Review* 89 (1988).

## McGraw Hill Award

The McGraw Hill Award recognizes the best journal article on law and courts written by a political scientist and published during the previous calendar year.

**Paul Frymer, University of California, San Diego.** "*Acting When Elected Officials Won't: Federal Courts and Civil Rights Enforcement in U.S. Labor Unions, 1935-85,*" 97 *American Political Science Review*, 1-17 (2003).

Honorable Mention: Tamir Moustafa, University of Wisconsin-Madison "*Law Versus the State: The Judicialization of Politics in Egypt,*" 28 *Law and Social Inquiry*, 883 (2003)

## Teaching and Mentoring Award

The Teaching and Mentoring Award recognizes innovation in instruction in law and courts.

**Jerry Goldman, Northwestern University and Christine Harrington, New York University**

Professor Jerry Goldman created the Oyez website which has made available to thousands of teachers, students, and scholars more than 2000 hours of oral arguments before the Supreme Court.

Professor Christine Harrington's innovative pedagogy is indicated by The Global Sweatshop, a course that involves students in trans-disciplinary and trans-national research, study, and travel, which she developed as Founding Director of New York University's Institute for Law and Society.

## CROSSING OVER: CITATION OF PUBLIC LAW FACULTY IN LAW REVIEWS

KEITH WHITTINGTON  
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
kewhitt@princeton.edu

A frequent complaint among political scientists who study law and courts is that we and our work do not receive sufficient attention from our colleagues in the law schools. Undoubtedly we could all stand for more attention and recognition in general, but the lack of recognition of our scholarship by law professors often seems particularly grating. The reasons for this state of affairs are myriad. Academic networks facilitate the communication of information among those within them, but they can also obstruct the flow of information from those on the outside. Far too much scholarship is produced than can possibly be read by any given individual, and we often have difficulty enough making ourselves heard by other political scientists putatively studying the same subject let alone scholars who stand on the other side of a disciplinary divide. The peculiar position of law schools within the university community encourages further isolation. Not only are law schools often physically separated from the rest of campus, but they operate by different professional standards. The academic training of future professors is little different than the academic training of legal practitioners. Student-edited law reviews are the primary publishing outlet for scholarship produced in the law schools, and law professors and their research assistants seldom venture beyond the law library and the legal databases, even though JSTOR may be piped directly to their desktop computers.

The immediate professional consequences of the disciplinary divide are relatively small, but the intellectual consequences are somewhat larger. Professional advancement depends on one's reputation among one's peers, who are generally defined by disciplinary boundaries. Even so, it might be hoped that new scholarship would build effectively on the old. Intellectual advances necessitate taking account of what is already known and avoiding errors that could have been anticipated. Certainly our own work as political scientists would be better if it were informed by relevant scholarship produced in cognate disciplines, and one imagines the same would be true for scholarship produced in the law schools.

It might be useful for crossing that interdisciplinary divide to know who, or what, has already made the leap. Who are the political scientists who are being cited in the law reviews now, and what kind of political science crosses over and wins attention from law professors? Is it the case, for example, that political scientists who publish only in peer-reviewed political science journals are doomed to obscurity in the eyes of legal academia? Must political scientists publish in law reviews in order to be noticed? Is legal scholarship more likely to take account of work produced by political scientists that is most similar to that produced by law professors? Or, alternatively, does intellectual trade across the disciplines depend on the exploitation of comparative advantage.

To get at such questions, I turned to cite counts. Rankings and cite counts have become a cottage industry in law schools (for an overview, see Caron and Gely 2004). *U.S. News & World Report* provides the most well-known and influential ranking of law schools, but Brian Leiter of the University of Texas Law School produces a more respected *Educational Quality Rankings of US Law Schools*.<sup>2</sup> Various efforts have been made to measure law school and individual faculty quality on more specialized dimensions. One such measure is scholarly impact as captured in citations. This article follows what has become a fairly standard approach to measuring scholarly impact in law reviews (Eisenberg and Wells 1998; Leiter 2000). This measure counts all mentions of a given individual in works contained in the Westlaw Journals and Law Reviews database. The Westlaw database is the most comprehensive full-text collection of relatively recent law journals. Westlaw somewhat outpaces Lexis-Nexis and far outpaces the *Social Science Citation Index* in its coverage of law journals. In May

2004, I searched the full Westlaw Journal and Law Reviews database for all mentions of individual political scientists with expertise in law-related subjects.

To make such a search somewhat manageable, I drew a list of approximately 260 current faculty in political science departments in the United States that appeared in the top eighty Ph.D.-granting departments in a recent reputational ranking of public law programs, in the top twenty-five departments in a recent quantitative ranking of such programs (Whittington 1998; Kuersten 1998), in the *U.S. News & World Report* top twenty liberal arts colleges, or in the top eighty of a recent “global ranking” of political science departments (Hix 2004), as well as a handful of other individuals who seemed especially likely to have had such an impact. Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member who listed “law,” “courts,” “constitution,” “human rights,” or similar term as an area of interest on departmental websites was included. Emeritus faculty or faculty appointed in political science departments only by courtesy were excluded, when they could be identified. Of course, political scientists without an appointment in a political science department were not included (e.g., Martin Shapiro). This sample is obviously not comprehensive in ranking public law scholars, let alone political scientists, who might be cited in the law review literature, but it should be sufficient to give a sense of the type of scholars and scholarship who cross that disciplinary divide.

Following Leiter, I searched for individuals by first and last names appearing within two words of one another (e.g., “Keith w/2 Whittington”), unless another method was appropriate for a given individual. To exclude false positives, I then reviewed forty of the “hits” for each name and counted the proportion of correct hits and multiplied the whole by that proportion. Each hit counts one article that included at least one reference to the scholar being searched, whether the scholar in question was the author of the article, cited in the text or footnotes, or thanked in the acknowledgements. Thus, this method does not identify how many scholarly citations in the law reviews an author has actually received, but only the number of articles in which an author’s name appears. The results for all those with more than 200 such citations are in Table I, with citations rounded to the nearest ten.

**Table I: Public Law Faculty Most Cited in Law Reviews (over 200 cites)**

RANK	NAME	INSTITUTION	CITES
1	Sunstein, Cass	Chicago	7890
2	Ackerman, Bruce	Yale	4040
3	Levinson, Sanford	Texas	2300
4	Sarat, Austin	Amherst	1500
5	Sandel, Michael	Harvard	1070
6	Jackson, Thomas	Rochester	1010
7	Elster, Jon	Columbia	980
8	Slaughter, Anne-Marie	Princeton	840
9	George, Robert	Princeton	800
10	Rosenberg, Gerald	Chicago	770
11	O’Brien, David	Virginia	630
12	Weingast, Barry	Stanford	570
13	Ferejohn, John	Stanford	540
14	Irons, Peter	UCSD	520
15	Kritzer, Herbert	Wisconsin	510
16	Epstein, Lee	Washington U.	500
17	Smith, Rogers	Pennsylvania	410
18	McCubbins, Mathew	UCSD	400
19	Spaeth, Harold	Michigan State	390
19	Holmes, Stephen	NYU	390
21	Powe, Lucas	Texas	380
22	Horowitz, Donald	Duke	370
22	Macedo, Stephen	Princeton	370
22	Clinton, Robert	Southern Illinois	370
22	Segal, Jeffrey	SUNY-Stony Brook	370

---

26	Kagan, Robert	Berkeley	340
26	Kommers, Donald	Notre Dame	340
28	Graber, Mark	Maryland	320
28	Goldman, Sheldon	UMass-Amherst	320
28	Baum, Lawrence	Ohio State	320
31	Gillman, Howard	USC	290
31	Cohen, Joshua	MIT	290
31	Lofgren, Charles	Claremont	290
31	Lippman, Matthew	Illinois	290
35	Rabkin, Jeremy	Cornell	280
36	Lutz, Donald	Houston	260
36	Melnick, Shep	Boston College	260
38	Arkes, Hadley	Amherst	240
39	Walker, Thomas	Emory	230
40	Beres, Louis	Purdue	220
40	Grossman, Joel	Johns Hopkins	220
42	Barber, Sotirios	Notre Dame	210
42	Knight, Jack	Washington U.	210

There are obvious limitations to such an approach. I do not, for example, count retired or deceased scholars or those working in other fields (such as democratic theory or Congress) who may have had a substantial impact on scholarship published in law reviews. Although an adjustment to the cite count is made to address the fact that some names are fairly common, the final count is necessarily imprecise. For law professors, such studies have usually been concerned with measuring “academic quality” through cite counts, and there are familiar problems with such a measure, some of which Leiter (2000, 469) notes (e.g., the “classic mistake,” the “industrious drudge,” the “treatise writer,” the “academic surfer,” the “once-productive dinosaur”). Leiter also observes of his ranking of the impact of law professors that once we get below the highest levels of citations, the impact becomes somewhat more idiosyncratic and the obvious correlation between impact and scholarly quality becomes more contestable. As we will see, nearly all political scientists fall below these highest levels, and idiosyncrasies can have a dramatic impact on placement within this list. Law reviews also have a field bias, favoring fields such as constitutional law and critical theory over other fields such as comparative law and philosophy of law. Since law reviews are the primary scholarly vehicle for law professors and Westlaw is extremely inclusive, however, this measure does a reasonable job of capturing how widely discussed work by active public law scholars in political science might be among law professors.

One immediately striking lesson of Table I is that it helps to be a law professor. Eleven of the top twenty, and seventeen on the total list, currently have, or recently had, affiliations with law schools. For some, the law school affiliation is clearly relevant to explaining the influence in the law reviews. The top three, for example, are well-established law professors who have primarily made their careers in law schools, and two others in the top ten (Anne-Marie Slaughter and Thomas Jackson) spent the bulk of their careers in law schools before accepting administrative posts (and political science appointments) elsewhere. These scholars are not crossing a disciplinary divide at all when being cited in a law review. In some cases, the relationship between the affiliation and the volume of citations is less clear. For some, the law school affiliation may well come later, in recognition of the influence that the political scientist has had on legal scholarship. For others, however, being an integrated member of the law school community may well drive up citations in law reviews. Beyond its relationship to employment in a law school, whether a political scientist holds a formal degree in the law appears to make no difference to scholarly impact in the law reviews.

When contrasted to Leiter’s tabulations of most cited law professors, it is also obvious that political scientists have had only a limited influence on the law reviews. Leiter’s most recent ranking of law professors dates from the summer of 2002 and can be found at [www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/most\\_cited.html](http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/most_cited.html). Leiter ranks 120 of the most cited law faculty. The least cited member of his list comes in at 1010 hits. The bottom ten law professors in his rankings average 190 more cites now than they did in 2002, however, so the new bottom may now be roughly 1200 hits. By that standard, only one of the “pure” political scientists would make the cut into Leiter’s ranking – Austin Sarat – who would probably appear in the bottom half of an updated law professor ranking.

---

We might imagine age affecting impact in the law reviews. More senior political scientists have had more time to produce a larger quantity of work that might get cited, and perhaps have the professional maturity (and security) to produce a different kind of work that is more likely to cross disciplinary boundaries. More senior faculty may also simply have more visibility and thus disproportionately attract the attention of a wider audience. This group of well-cited political scientists is relatively senior. In terms of years since they received their Ph.D. (or equivalent degree), they range from a low of fifteen years to a high of forty-eight years with an average of twenty-nine years. Within this group, however, there is no correlation between time since degree and ranking ( $r = .09$ ). Leiter's ranked law professors are somewhat more senior than are this set of political scientists. The top 120 law professors ranged in age between forty-one and seventy-four years old, with an average age of fifty-seven (perhaps four to eight years older than the political scientists). Leiter's law professors also show no correlation between age and ranking ( $r = .01$ ). On his website, Leiter also lists the top fifty most cited law faculty who had been teaching ten years or less (at the time of his ranking in 2002). Those fifty young scholars range in number of cites from a low of 230 to a high of 860. The top political scientists are more competitive with that group, though the political scientists have an average time from Ph.D. (a comparable measure of time in the scholarly community) of nearly thirty years. (The highest ranked political scientist within ten years of Ph.D. was forty-ninth, and there were only three such political scientists in the sample with over 100 citations.)

It is also notable that traditional "law and court" scholars do not dominate the top of the list. The top ten includes (in addition to five law professors) two political scientists who are not strongly associated with law and courts, though they obviously have some interest in legal subjects. Law-and-courts scholars are more heavily represented in the remainder of the list, but there is a sprinkling of others as well.

There is a perhaps surprising degree of substantive diversity in the scholars in the ranking. The "law and courts" community in political science is a highly fragmented one. Although one could reasonably argue that none of the pure political scientists on this list are merely playing what Martin Shapiro (1983, 543) once derisively called "little law professor," some political scientists come closer to competing in the same scholarly market as law professors while others are more clearly differentiated, producing informative but non-competing scholarly goods. Both strategies appear to be viable in gaining influence in the law reviews. This set of public law faculty includes specialists in constitutional and jurisprudential theory, constitutional history, judicial politics, law and society, and comparative and international law. The scholarship reflected here also embodies a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches, though more qualitative and philosophical approaches are predominant on the list as a whole. Indeed, it seems likely that a wider array of political scientists have won some influence in the law reviews than have won influence in the political science journals.

Given that Leiter's study of individual law professors began as an effort to rank law schools, it is interesting to observe the distribution of these forty-three scholars across schools. Very few schools are represented by more than one faculty member. One department (Princeton) has three scholars in this set, six departments (Amherst, University of California-San Diego, Chicago, Stanford, Texas, and Washington University) have two, and the remaining twenty-eight have only one. It is interesting of those seven departments with multiple, ranked faculty members, four have the benefit of a law school and its joint appointments (though arguably only two benefit heavily from that affiliation). Amherst, notably, does not have a graduate program either. No doubt this lack of concentration of well-cited faculty reflects the relative paucity of public law scholars in any given department. Those departments that do have multiple individuals working in this area, moreover, often do not have multiple senior scholars. This diversity also suggests the difficulty of accumulating multiple law-and-courts scholars of high stature (at least relative to influence in the law reviews) in any single political science department.

While a variety of research strategies seem capable of reaching a law review audience, a somewhat smaller variety of publication strategies may be successful in reaching that audience given the research habits of law professors. Is it necessary to publish in law reviews in order to be noticed in the law reviews? In order to gain some leverage on that question, I sampled the particular works being cited in one hundred of the hits for each of individuals on the list (laying aside the five current or former law professors in the top ten). I distinguished between citations to authored books, to edited books or chapters in such books, articles in law reviews, articles in interdisciplinary peer-reviewed "law and" journals (e.g., *Law and Society Review*, *Jurisprudence*), articles in the journals of the three biggest political science associations (i.e., APSR, AJPS, JOP), and other forms of work.



---

**Table II: Publications (by Public Law Faculty) Most Cited in Law Reviews**

<b>PUBLICATION TYPE</b>	<b>PERCENT OF CITES</b>
Authored Book	51%
Edited Book or Chapter in Edited Book	13%
Law Review Article	19%
Interdisciplinary Legal Journal Article	6%
“Top” Political Science Journal Article	5%
Other	7%

The most common form of publication by one of these scholars to be cited in the law reviews is an authored book, which received roughly half of all the citations in the sample. A distant second at 19 percent was citation to law review articles written by these political scientists, and a close third at 13 percent was citation to edited books. Least cited were interdisciplinary journals and the prominent political science journals. Those numbers are little changed if the averages are taken by individual rather than by the pool of cites as a whole.

For this group of scholars as a whole, publishing in books and, to a lesser extent, law review articles are the primary paths to influence in the law review literature. It would appear that there is little added benefit in terms of law review visibility to publishing in legally oriented social science journals or high-prestige political science journals as compared to any other political science journal (though it seems likely that on a per-article basis, those journals do relatively well). Even so, individual results vary. For several of these individuals, a single big hit accounts for a disproportionate share of all their citations. Often that big hit is a book; political scientists appear to be less successful in producing the canonical article that single-handedly elevates them up the rankings. For several of these individuals, citations to books account for nearly all the citations to them in the sample. For five of these individuals, citations to authored books accounted for 90 percent or more over their citations in law reviews. By contrast, only two of these scholars had over 90 percent over their citations to law review articles, and only one of had over 80 percent of his citations to edited volumes. A handful of individuals did manage to achieve a more balanced approach, with no single type of publication accounting for more than 40 percent of their total citations.

While the law review literature is presumably not the primary audience for political science research on law and courts, it is clearly a relevant one. Law faculty and legal scholarship produced in law schools are increasingly interdisciplinary. In some areas, such as legal history, law schools have largely absorbed the scholarly field. In other areas, such as law and economics, there is a lively exchange between law schools and other areas of the university. Political science and legal academia have not reached those levels of interdisciplinary exchange, but at least some political scientists have had some influence in the law reviews (and increasingly individuals with political science Ph.D.'s are being hired onto law school faculties [Solum 2004]). While reaching the law reviews may not require radically altering the kind of research political scientists produce, it would be facilitated by attention to where that research is published and how it might be made more visible in the law schools.

## **References**

- Caron, Paul L., and Rafael Gely. 2004. “What Law Schools Can Learn From Billy Beane and the Oakland Athletics,” *Texas Law Review* 82:1483-1554.
- Eisenberg, Theodore, and Martin T. Wells. 1998. “Rankings and Explaining the Scholarly Impact of Law Schools,” *Journal of Legal Studies* 27:373-413.
- Hix, Simon. 2004. “A Global Ranking of Political Science Departments.” <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/HIX/Working%20Papers/Hix-Rankings-30Jan04.pdf>
- Kuersten, Ashlyn. 1998. “A Quantitative Analysis of Public Law Programs,” *Law and Courts* 8(4):17-19.

---

Leiter, Brian. 2000. "Measuring the Academic Distinction of Law Faculties," *Journal of Legal Studies* 29:451-494.

Leiter, Brian. 2002. "Most Cited Law Faculty." [http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/most\\_cited.html](http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings02/most_cited.html)

Shapiro, Martin. 1983. "Recent Developments in Political Jurisprudence," *Western Political Quarterly* 36:541-548.

Solum, Lawrence. 2004. "Legal Theory Blog: Entry Level Hiring, May 14, 2004." <http://lsolum.blogspot.com>

Whittington, Keith E. 1998. "A Reputational Ranking of Public Law Programs," *Law and Courts* 8(3):4-5.

#### **Footnotes**

<sup>1</sup> I thank Kim Pearce for her research assistance.

<sup>2</sup> [www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings](http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/bleiter/rankings)

---

# BOOKS TO WATCH FOR

KEITH J BYBEE

*Syracuse University*

kjbybee@maxwell.syr.edu

Due for release this June by Stanford University Press is *Risks, Reputations, and Rewards: Contingency Fee Legal Practice in the United States* by **Herbert M. Kritzer** (University of Wisconsin). *Risks, Reputations, and Rewards* presents a portrait and analysis of contingency fee legal practice in the United States, relying on data collected from contingency fee practitioners in Wisconsin and supplemented by a variety of materials collected by other scholars and researchers. Using a theoretical framework based on portfolio theory, the book looks at a variety of interrelated questions about contingency fee legal practice: What are the nature of contingency fees that lawyers charge? How do lawyers get and screen potential cases? What does the work of handling contingency fee cases involve? How do contingency fee lawyers interact with their clients and opponents? What is involved in settling contingency fee cases? What types of returns do contingency fee cases produce? What roles do reputation play in contingency fee practice?

What shapes popular images of and opinions about litigiousness and litigation? **William Haltom** (University of Puget Sound) and **Michael McCann** (University of Washington) address this question in *Distorting the Law: Politics, Media, and the Litigation Crisis*, forthcoming from University of Chicago Press this spring. The authors argue that images and opinions have been shaped by (1) the politicking of tort reformers, scholars, and plaintiffs' lawyers; (2) depictions of civil disputing and products-liability law in newspapers and other mass media; and (3) individualism and other enduring ideological mainsprings in U. S. legal and political culture. **Haltom** and **McCann** analyze the strategies and tactics of pop tort reform, trial lawyers' organizations, and academic debunkers. They also summarize coverage of products-liability suits over 20 years of the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post*, *Christian Science Monitor*, and *Los Angeles Times*. In addition, the authors explore the interplay of politics and journalism in the McDonald's Coffee Case and tobacco litigation. The book concludes with a novel interpretation of the moralistic character of popular discourse about law, the complex ways in which legal lore has been produced and reproduced in mass culture, and how this distinctive legal knowledge matters for contemporary social and political practice.

*Legal Reform in Korea*, edited by **Tom Ginsburg** (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), is due out from Routledge this July. Each of the essays in this volume employs a socio-legal perspective to analyze particular aspects of Korean law since the 1987 transition to democracy. Compared with a decade ago, Koreans are more likely to rely on legal mechanisms to solve disputes and to seek redress from the government. Whole areas of legal practice have emerged from the shadows, including administrative law, bankruptcy, and corporate mergers and acquisitions. Political discourse has also shifted in more legalistic directions, as the courts have become a central arena for dealing with popular demands against corruption and the abuses practiced by the former regime. At the same time, reform of legal institutions has become a major political issue. The authors in this volume use the Korean case to draw broader lessons about the dynamics of national legal and social transformation in a global political economy.

This spring the Russell Sage Foundation will publish *Overcoming Apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation?* by **James L. Gibson** (Washington University). *Overcoming Apartheid* reports on the largest and most comprehensive study of post-apartheid attitudes in South Africa to date, involving a representative sample of all major racial, ethnic, and linguistic groups. Grounding his analysis of "truth" in theories of collective memory, **Gibson** discovers that the process has been most successful in creating a common understanding of the nature of apartheid. His analysis then demonstrates how this common understanding is helping to foster "reconciliation," as defined by the acceptance of basic principles of human rights and political tolerance, rejection of racial prejudice, and acceptance of the institutions of a new political order. **Gibson** identifies key elements in the process – such as acknowledging shared responsibility for atrocities of the past – that are

---

essential if reconciliation is to move forward. He concludes that without the truth and reconciliation process, the prospects for a reconciled, democratic South Africa would diminish considerably. The author also speculates about whether the South African experience provides any lessons for other countries around the globe trying to overcome their repressive pasts. This book is the second entry in Gibson's "Overcoming Trilogy" (the first was *Overcoming Intolerance in South Africa: Experiments in Democratic Persuasion*, Cambridge University Press).

In the five decades after the Civil War, the United States witnessed a profusion of legal institutions designed to cope with the nation's exceptionally acute industrial accident crisis. Jurists elaborated the common law of torts. Workingmen's organizations founded a widespread system of cooperative insurance. Leading employers instituted welfare-capitalist accident relief funds. And social reformers advocated compulsory insurance such as workmen's compensation. In his book, *The Accidental Republic: Crippled Workingmen, Destitute Widows, and the Remaking of American Law* (Harvard University Press, 2004). **John Fabian Witt** (Columbia University) argues that experiments in accident law at the turn of the twentieth century arose out of competing views of the loose network of ideas and institutions that historians call the ideology of free labor. These experiments a century ago shaped twentieth- and twenty-first-century American accident law; they laid the foundations of the American administrative state; and they occasioned a still hotly contested legal transformation from the principles of free labor to the categories of insurance and risk. In this eclectic moment at the beginnings of the modern state, **Witt** describes American accident law as a contingent set of institutions that might plausibly have developed along a number of historical paths. In turn, he suggests, the making of American accident law is the story of the equally contingent remaking of our accidental republic.

Judicial opinions written by Justices of the United States Supreme Court are readily available to all citizens: decisions are announced from the bench, full text opinions are available in print form from sources such as the United States Reports, on line or via email through various electronic resources, and decisions are widely reported on in the mainstream media. Yet few citizens will ever read a Supreme Court opinion, much less examine an opinion's full substance. **Paul I. Weizer** (Fitchburg State College) responds to this fact with his book *The Opinions of Justice Antonin Scalia: The Caustic Conservative*, published by Peter Lang Publishers in February 2004. Reading Supreme Court opinions for students, particularly undergraduate students with no real expertise (or interest) in the law, can be an overwhelming and laborious process. The opinions of Justice Scalia are different. Scalia is often times sarcastic, smug, and self assured. He does not hesitate to take his colleagues to task when he feels they are wrong and does not mind stooping to ridicule and personal attack when it serves his point. In short, whether a reader agrees or disagrees with the points that Scalia seeks to make through these opinions, they are not boring. **Weizer's** book is designed to show the general public that the words of Justice Scalia are well worth reading.

Ever wonder how to run a moot court simulation or how to improve the simulations that you have conducted in the past? Peter Lang Publishers this April will publish *How To Please the Court: A Moot Court Handbook*, edited by **Paul I. Weizer** (Fitchburg State College). This volume brings together prominent moot court faculty who share their collective years of experience in building a successful moot court program. Touching on all aspects of the moot court experience, the authors guide the reader through conducting legal research, the structure of an oral argument, the tournament experience, and the successes and rewards of competition. This book provides a valuable resource for anyone in the scholarly community who has an interest in using moot court simulations as an educational exercise. Contributors include Kimi King, Charles Knerr, Lewis Ringel, William Schreckhise, and Andrew Sommerman.

Do oral arguments influence the decisions of Supreme Court justices? **Timothy R. Johnson** (University of Minnesota at Twin Cities) takes up this question in *Oral Arguments and Decision Making on the United States Supreme Court*, to be published by SUNY Press this May. **Johnson** focuses on an all-too-often ignored aspect of the Supreme Court's decision-making process by providing a systematic explanation of how justices use oral arguments to make substantive legal and policy decisions. Using the arguments filed to the Court in legal briefs, oral argument transcripts, notes taken by Justice Lewis F. Powell during oral arguments, conference notes and internal memos of justices, and Court opinions, the book analyzes justices' behavior during these proceedings. The result is an account demonstrating that justices use oral arguments to gather information about legal and policy options in a case, the preferences of competing political institutions and actors, and the institutional rules that might affect the choices they make.

---

*Women in the Barracks: The VMI Case and Equal Rights* (University Press of Kansas, 2002), by **Philippa Strum** (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars) has just been released in paperback. The book details the politics as well as the legalities of the case in which the Supreme Court told the all-male Virginia Military Institute that it had to admit women and, in so doing, changed the law of gender equality in the U.S. It is based on extensive examination of documents and newspaper accounts as well as interviews with such key players as the Justice Department and VMI lawyers, VMI administrators, and Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Antonin Scalia. It was named as an outstanding academic book of 2002 by Choice and received both Honorable Mention, American Bar Association Silver Gavel Awards, and the Scribes Merit Award for outstanding legal writing from the American Society of Writers on Legal Subjects.

Fifty years after the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, the debate still rages over the consequences of this momentous ruling. In his book, *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality* (Oxford University Press, 2004), **Michael Klarman** (University of Virginia) considers how and whether *Brown* matters. For the justices, *Brown* posed a conflict between law and politics. Traditional sources of constitutional interpretation seemed to indicate that school segregation was permissible. But most of the justices found that practice deeply abhorrent. In creating new precedent in *Brown* the judges relied on their personal values, values heavily influenced by larger historical forces. The consequences of the *Brown* decision are similarly entangled in the context of the time. According to **Klarman**, *Brown* unquestioningly had a significant impact — it brought race issues to public attention and it mobilized supporters of the ruling. It also, however, energized the opposition. **Klarman** argues that *Brown* was more important for mobilizing southern white opposition to racial change than for encouraging direct-action protest. The violent suppression of civil rights — vividly captured on television — ultimately transformed northern opinion on race and led to the enactment of landmark civil rights legislation in the mid-1960's.

The development of social welfare programs in the United States has been the subject of much recent scholarship. In *Public Pensions: Gender and Civic Service in the States, 1850s-1937* (Cornell University Press 2003) **Susan M. Sterett** (University of Denver) contributes to this body of scholarship by tracing the legal and constitutional structures underlying early social welfare programs. **Sterett** explains the status of state and local government payments for public servants and the poor from the mid-nineteenth century until the Great Depression. The most visible public payments for service in the United States were directed to soldiers, who risked death for the nation. However, firemen, not soldiers, first captured local governments' attention; social welfare programs for soldiers were modeled on firemen's pensions. The dangerous work of firefighting and of combat provided the fundamental legal analogy for courts as governments expanded pensions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Nothing about the state court doctrine approving payments for dangerous, local service would allow pensions for indigent mothers and for the elderly, which states began to consider after 1910. Counties and railroads that objected to the new taxes could fight programs based on the old doctrine, established for firefighters, soldiers, and finally civil servants. State litigation provided one of the many grounds for contesting expanded welfare states in the early twentieth-century United States. **Sterett** demonstrates that state courts maintained a gendered division between the service that marked citizenship and the dependence that marked indigence, even during the promising ferment of the early twentieth century.

### Seeking Authors

Howard Ernst (United States Naval Academy) and Larry Sabato (University of Virginia) are co-editors of *The Encyclopedia of American Parties and Elections*, to be published by Facts On File in 2005. Ernst and Sabato are currently seeking contributors for the encyclopedia. The single volume, A-Z encyclopedia will include 450-550 entries, providing numerous opportunities for emerging scholars to publish on topics in their areas of expertise. Entries will be original works provided by graduate students and Ph.D.s in relevant fields of study. More information regarding the project is available at ([www.partiselections.com](http://www.partiselections.com)).

---

# Announcements

## APSA Centennial Center for Political Science & Public Affairs Visiting Scholars Program

The American Political Science Association recently opened the Centennial Center for Political Science & Public Affairs in its headquarters building in Washington. As part of its programs, the Centennial Center assists scholars from the United States and abroad whose research and teaching would benefit from a stay in and access to the incomparable resources available in the nation's capital. The Center provides Visiting Scholars the infrastructure needed to conduct their work, including furnished work space with computer, phone, fax, conference space, and library access.

The Center has space to host 10 scholars for extended periods of time, ranging from weeks to months. Space for shorter "drop-in" stays is also available. Scholars are expected to pursue their own research and teaching projects and contribute to the intellectual life of the residential community by sharing their work with Center colleagues in occasional informal seminars.

Eligibility is limited to APSA members. Senior or junior faculty members, post-doctoral fellows, and advanced graduate students are strongly encouraged to apply. A short application form is required and submissions will be reviewed on a rolling basis. Positions are awarded based on space availability and relevant Center programming.

For more information and an application please visit the Centennial Center web site [www.apsanet.org/centennialcenter](http://www.apsanet.org/centennialcenter) or call Sean Twombly at 202.483.2512.

## Announcing the S. Sidney Ulmer Project

[www.as.uky.edu/polisci/ulmerproject](http://www.as.uky.edu/polisci/ulmerproject)

In collaboration with Michigan State University, the University of Kentucky announces the development of the S. Sidney Ulmer Project for Research in Law and Judicial Politics. Named after UK Professor Emeritus S. Sidney Ulmer (2003 Law and Courts Lifetime Achievement Award recipient), this program aims to promote quality research in law and judicial politics - a goal to which Professor Ulmer devoted his esteemed career. As such, the new research project will assume responsibility for electronically distributing databases on judicial politics (formerly performed by the Michigan State Program for Law and Judicial Politics) and offers an archive of working papers for research on law and judicial politics.

Kirk A. Randazzo, Assistant Professor at the University of Kentucky, will maintain the website and ensure the following datasets remain accessible in a variety of formats: the U.S. Supreme Court Databases (compiled by Harold J. Spaeth), the U.S. Appeals Court Database (compiled by Donald R. Songer), the Attributes of U.S. Appeals Court Judges (compiled by Gary Zuk, Deborah J. Barrow and Gerard S. Gryski), and the Lower Federal Court Confirmation Database (compiled by Wendy L. Martinek). Scholars interested in storing their databases at the S. Sidney Ulmer Project may contact Kirk Randazzo for more information.

It is our hope that you all will join UK and MSU in supporting this endeavor and will adjust your web browser bookmarks to the new S. Sidney Ulmer Project for Research in Law and Judicial Politics ([www.as.uky.edu/polisci/ulmerproject](http://www.as.uky.edu/polisci/ulmerproject)).

---

# Conferences & Events

**AMERICA POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION** (<http://www.apsanet.org/mtgs/index.cfm>)  
SEPT 1-5, 2004 CHICAGO IL

**PACIFIC NORTHWEST POL SCIENCE ASSOC** (<http://www.lclark.edu/~pnwpsa/>)  
NOV 4-6 PORTLAND, OR  
JUDICIAL POLITICS: STEPHEN SHAW [SKSHAW@NNUNEDU](mailto:SKSHAW@NNUNEDU)

**SOUTHERN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOC.** (<http://www.spsa.net/conference05.htm>)  
JAN 6-8, 2005 NEW ORLEANS, LA  
JUDICIAL POLITICS & PUBLIC LAW: JUDITH BAER [JBAER@POLITICS.TAMU.EDU](mailto:JBAER@POLITICS.TAMU.EDU)

**WESTERN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOC.** (<http://www.csus.edu/org/wpsa/callpapers.stm>)  
MAR 17-19, 2005 OAKLAND, CA  
JUDICIAL POLITICS & PUBLIC LAW: RENEE CRAMER [RCRAMER@CSULB.EDU](mailto:RCRAMER@CSULB.EDU)

**LAW & SOCIETY ANNUAL MEETING** (<http://www.lawandsociety.org>)  
JUNE 2-5, 2005 LAS VEGAS, NV