

The Federalism Report

CONTENTS

CSF NOTEBOOK	2
IACFS NEWSLETTER	10
APSA FEDERALISM/INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SECTION UPDATE	13

CSF NOTEBOOK

CENTER HONORED BY TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

The Center for the Study of Federalism has been named to the 1997-1998 Templeton Honor Rolls for Education in a Free Society. Named for the financier and philanthropist, Sir John Templeton, the Honor Rolls are a series of awards which identify and publicize outstanding individuals and institutions in American higher education. The honorees were chosen for their commitment to excellence in teaching in the Liberal Arts tradition. An awards luncheon was held in May 21 in the Russell Senate Office Building in Washington, DC, where Daniel Elazar and Paul Neal represented the Center.

Center News

1. Center Continues Work in Turkey

Ten mayors from the Southeastern part of Turkey traveled to the United States in March to participate in a workshop and study tour on regional cooperation and local government reform. The mayors visited five U.S. cities. A follow-up conference is planned for October in Turkey.

2. Center Expands Work in Cyprus

The Center is preparing for a one-week workshop in Philadelphia for ten Greek Cypriots and ten Turkish Cypriots. This is a high level delegation that will study Federalism as a means to securing a peaceful resolution to conflict. This project developed out of Daniel Elazar's most recent visit to Cyprus and is part of what should be a series of week-long workshops.

3. New Center Fellowship Created

The Center has named J. Wesley Leckrone as a Center Research Fellow. Wesley Leckrone came to the Center as a work-study student and then was appointed an H.B. Earhart Fellow. Mr. Leckrone will continue his research program and will serve as the Center's librarian and archivist.

4. Earhart Fellow Named

Gary Saylor has been appointed as an H.B. Earhart Fellow for 1997-1998. Mr. Saylor was an undergraduate student at Temple University. He has been admitted to the graduate program in education at the University of Pennsylvania.

5. Cities of The Prairie

The Center held the third and final conference on Civil Community as part of a three year project on the Cities of the Prairie. The Conference was held in Rockford Illinois, June 7-9, 1997. Sponsored by the Bradley Foundation, the theme of this conference was "Implementing Local Constitutional Change." A group of researchers met with local community leaders. A book is planned for 1998 to complete this third round. For information contact the Center.

Book Reviews

Alan Rosenthal. *Drawing the Line: Legislative Ethics in the States*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. 1996.

Alan Rosenthal tackles the difficult issue of legislative ethics with an unemotional candor that allows him to expose and examine the misperceptions surrounding elected state government officials. Rosenthal argues that vast improvements in legislative operations and procedures from the 1960s through the 1980s have resulted in a body of state legislators who are considerably less corrupt than in the past. Despite the substantial improvement of ethics, Rosenthal claims that the press, the public, and many scholars cling to the misperception that state legislatures are still dens of corruption. He also contends that ethical questions are frequently posed by both the press and the public in terms of black and white solutions. Rosenthal counters this approach by showing that there are no absolute solutions because new ethical laws often involve tradeoffs of values that are important to the democratic system of government. Rosenthal argues that progress in the legislative ethics field will only result through more critical evaluations of reform laws, citizen education and most importantly, consensual norms within the legislature that allow members to police themselves.

The transformation of institutional political cultures in the fifty state capitols over the past thirty years has produced mixed results in terms of legislative ethics. Rosenthal argues that laws and regulations governing legislative ethical behavior have profoundly changed the institutional political culture in many states. Legislators have become more aware of conflicts of interest and have established rules defining proper relationships with lobbyists and campaign contributors. These positive changes, in Rosenthal's view, have been tempered by the breakdown in institutional capacity for self-regulation on issues of ethics. Scrutiny arising from increased prosecution, attack-dog media and public outcries has put the state legislatures on the defensive. The present culture of mistrust, in which the press and the public believe that every legislator is a potential felon, sensationalizes a system in which the corrupt are the exception rather than the rule. Rosenthal claims that in the transition from an isolated and insular capital culture to an open, very public culture, state legislatures have lost their autonomy to regulate their internal affairs. Legislators can no longer rationally deliberate on ethical situations, but must rather create laws which satisfy the public and the press. These efforts to show that legislators are taking action are meant to restore public trust in state government institutions. However, Rosenthal argues that new laws have a snowball effect: each creates standards, that when broken, lead the legislature to pass more laws to satisfy public outcries. Rosenthal claims that this "constant resort to regulation is enervating, demoralizing and dysfunctional." (p. 218)

The debate over legislative ethics, Rosenthal argues, must progress beyond simple black and white solutions and instead rationally explore the effects of new laws on the institutions they seek to regulate. Pragmatism and deliberation show that every law or regulation produces consequences that may damage democratic norms. To examine the implications of proposed legislation, Rosenthal creates a model that evaluates each law on three different ethical standards: appearance, fairness and representation. He claims that most current laws are created to eliminate the appearance of improper behavior. However, by conforming to the appearance

standard laws often adversely affect standards of fairness to legislators and inhibit groups right to be represented. For instance, conflict of interest regulations often are unfair to the part-time legislator who may find his means of employment in conflict with his legislative duty. Additionally, campaign finance reform aimed at lobbyists and large donors may inhibit a group's right to engage in the electoral process and have their views heard. Rosenthal claims that all three standards of ethics must be explored when creating new laws and regulations. While he believes that the appearance standard is over-indulged, Rosenthal believes that it is the primary standard that must be used if state government is to win back the public trust.

Drawing the Line bridges the gap between Rosenthal's theoretical ethics and practical application of those standards. He argues that laws regulating lobbying, conflict of interest and campaign finance are helpful in reforming the capital political culture. New laws have provided guidelines of appropriate behavior for legislators and have helped reform state legislatures where corruption had reached extremes. However, Rosenthal argues that laws and regulations are not sufficient to reform the system and to restore public trust in state institutions. He states that "[i]n the legislative system, the more law and sanctions can be kept in the background and the more regulation can be transacted through moral suasion, the more effective they will be." (218) Rosenthal's solution is the establishment of professional norms like those of the law and medical field. A new system of self-regulation, built on consensual values, would not only be more widely accepted by legislators, but would go a long way to win back public trust. Rosenthal provides several keys to the enforcement of such standards. First, legislative leadership must be exemplars of ethical standards, thus leading by example. Leaders also cannot wait for formal investigations to rebuke other members, but must proactively counsel other legislators who they believe are behaving in unethical manners. Third, continual training sessions in legislative ethics will result in better conduct and help forge consensus on norms. Finally, Rosenthal argues that legislators must educate the public in its institutional methods of policing itself so that misperceptions can be eradicated.

In *Drawing the Line*, Alan Rosenthal shows that debates over legislative ethics raise numerous dilemmas for the practice of democracy. Rosenthal illuminates the tradeoffs that are made every time a law regulating ethics is passed by legislatures. He correctly argues that new laws are good guides for legislators, but will not solve long term crises of confidence in government institutions. Rather, legislators, like other professionals, must enact institutional codes of propriety if they want to win back public trust. Finally, in rising above the hysteria in the discussion of legislative ethics, Rosenthal accurately argues that citizens are partly to blame for the present state of mistrust because they have failed to learn about their governments. Ultimately citizenship is more than just voting; it is a responsibility to understand the policy process and institutional standards. A polity educated in the ethical advances of the last thirty years would allow state legislatures to spend less time combating misperceptions and more time on legislative business.

J. Wesley Leckrone
Temple University

University Frederick K. Lister, *The European Union, the United Nations and the Revival of Confederal Governance* (Westport, CT, Greenwood Press, 1996).

With this book Frederick Lister joins the small but growing list of scholars who have come to identify confederal governance as a new or more accurately a revived phenomenon in new form in the post modern world. Foremost among are the late Ivo Duchacek and British scholar Murry Forsythe. Many of the same factors that brought them to this recognition have been influential on this writer who has joined the ranks of those who see confederal arrangements as once again a reality on the world scene.

Lister's is the first effort of which this writer is aware that comes at the issues of confederation from confederal governance from the international relations perspective rather than from studies of federalism. It is true that Ivo Duchacek, who bridged both fields himself, was the first to note these confederal trends. Even so, to bring him to address the question of confederal arrangements directly, he needed my additional encouragement as editor of *Publius*.

Lister's book is part of a larger as yet unpublished work of his on confederal governance from earliest times. This slender volume presents the idea of the revival of confederal governance, and examines two examples in depth: the European Union, which Lister sees as a full blown confederacy, and the United Nations which he sees as a potential confederal arrangement. This book, then, foreshadows what promises to be a major work for whose timing is likely to be quite right.

Elsewhere, I have suggested that what the United States was to the invention of federation in the modern epoch, the European Union is to the reinvention of confederation in the post-modern epoch, that is to say, a model and pace setter, just as modern federation was the most suitable application of federal principles in its epoch, post-modern confederation is likely to be the most suitable application in a time of greater. It will not be the only one, but will be one of a range of federal arrangements that together transform the statist model, that has provided the world's major form of government present since the mid seventeenth century, and replace it with the new federalist one. Lister's work seems to endorse that view without doing so specifically. He also suggests that states will not disappear but will be transformed, and that while preserving their own integrity will become linked within larger confederal frameworks.

Lister's book is weak on distinguishing between old and new style confederations. The former emphasized comprehensive governmental frameworks, while the latter emphasize linkage through functional authorities, single or multi-purpose. In my opinion, this difference is a major one and has profound implications for the successful spread of the new confederalism.

This writer happily welcomes Dr. Lister into the ranks of students of the new confederalism. The opportunities provided by the revival of confederalism will open up many new vistas and many new opportunities for observation and study. They will be needed to help this new form of governance fulfill its potential. One can only eagerly await the larger work.

Daniel J. Elazar
Temple University

AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

INFORMATION BRIEF

What is the status of the US ACIR?

Based on language in the Fiscal Year (FY) 1996 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Act, the US Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) has ceased regular operations. Although the National Gambling Impact Study Commission Act (Public Law 104-169), enacted in August 1996, directs ACIR to conduct research for the Gambling Commission, that Act did not explicitly modify the FY 1996 appropriation language. To clarify the situation, Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK), Chairman of the Senate Government Affairs Committee, made two attempts in the final day of the 104th Congress to pass language specifically extending ACIR's existence. First, an attempt was made to enact FY 1997 appropriation language calling for ACIR's continued existence but without federally appropriated funding. Although the Senate agreed, the House of Representatives refused to accept the proposed appropriations language. Lacking a resolution, prior to the end of FY 1996, ACIR ceased operations after September 30, 1996.

Before the end of the 104th Congress, however, Senator Stevens and Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY) tried again. They sponsored S.2198 which says: *the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations may continue in existence solely for the purpose of performing any contract entered into under section 7(a) of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission Act.* The bill passed the Senate and the House and, on October 19, 1996, was signed by President Clinton. It is Public Law 104-328.

ACIR, therefore, still exists as a federal agency solely for the purpose of the Gambling Commission research. It is anticipated that the 105th Congress will hold hearings on options for ACIR's future. Proposals could include the creation of a modified

federal commission or the establishment of a congressionally chartered agency similar to the National Academy of Public Administration. Comments on ACIR's status should be directed to President Clinton or to your respective Senator or Representative.

What is the American Council on Intergovernmental Relations?

The American Council on Intergovernmental Relations is a nonprofit organization incorporated for charitable and educational purposes. The council, which began operations in October 1996, is performing activities similar to those previously conducted by the US ACIR. The Council has acquired ACIR's publications inventory and other information resources and will continue distribution of intergovernmental relations materials. The Council is working with the General Services Administration (GSA) on unfinished ACIR business and the Federal Information Center is referring intergovernmental relations issues to the Council.

The Council is updating a volume of *Significant Features* and is developing an intergovernmental information network. A conference of State ACIR's is being planned along with other activities aimed at improving federal, state, and local government cooperation, building public understanding of intergovernmental issues, and stimulating public debate on federalism and related matters.

Council operations are totally dependent on contributions, grants, contracts, and product and service fees. The council has no federal funding; but, some state, city, county, and other government entities have agreed to provide funding to the Council. In addition, contributions have been made by other organizations and individuals.

Abstracts from
Publius: The Journal of Federalism
 26 (Spring 1996)

The Political Constitution of Federalism in Antebellum America: the Nullification Debate as an Illustration of Informal Mechanisms of Constitutional Change

Keith E. Whittington
 Catholic University of America

The requirements of the U.S. Constitution are often assumed to be either clear or defined by the judiciary through interpretation, or both. Examination of the nullification crisis of 1833 indicates that this view of the U.S. Constitution is misleading. The nullification crisis provoked three competing visions of the appropriate understanding of federalism in the context of textual ambiguity and judicial activity. The subsequent development of federalism was determined by that political conflict and compromise. The nullification controversy provides an important example of the openness of constitutional norms, the significance of political debate in the shaping of constitutional meaning, and the complexity of antebellum political thought.

Reversing Directions: A Ranking and Comparison of Key U.S. Intergovernmental Events, 1960-1980 and 1980-1995

Richard L. Cole University of Texas at Arlington, Carl W. Stenberg, University of Baltimore, Carol S. Weissert, Michigan State University

Based on surveys of scholars and practitioners, this article ranks and evaluates the significance of intergovernmental events and trends of 1980 to 1995, and also compares these with similar rankings for 1960 to 1980. The most important events of the 1980 to 1995 period were found to those that generally diminished, or potentially may diminish, the role of the federal government in intergovernmental affairs. It was also found that the events and trends that seem important and influential at this point in time probably will remain comparatively significant, even when evaluated in the context of the passage of time.

Environmental Commitment among the States: Integrating Alternative Approaches to State Environmental Policy

Scott P. Hays, Southern Illinois University, Michael Esler, Ohio Wesleyan University, Carol E. Hays, Southern Illinois University

This article examines variation in state commitment to protecting the natural environment. We contribute to theoretical and empirical research in this area in two primary ways. First, our dependent variable consists of a general measure of state commitment to the environment. Second, we develop a causal model that integrates six major explanatory approaches to state environmental policy. Our results show that states with liberal public opinion, strong environmental interest groups, liberal legislatures, and professionalized legislatures are the most committed to environmental protection. States' manufacturing interests and economic resources play a relatively minor role, and states' environmental conditions and the influence of the federal

governmental play virtually no role in explaining variation in general state commitment to environmental protection.

Accountability Expectations in an Intergovernmental Arena: The National Rural Development Partnership

Beryl A. Radin, University of Albany-State University of New York, Barbara S. Romzek, University of Kansas

This article explores the expectations and accountability relationships present in an intergovernmental experiment known as the National Rural Development Partnership (NRDP). As such, this study extends earlier analyses of accountability dynamics beyond the bounds of a single agency into the organizationally less tidy realm of intergovernmental relations. This research focuses on the unique expectations and accountability dynamics facing participants in the NRDP and identifies gaps between expectations at the corporate (agency) and individual levels and between arenas in the intergovernmental system. These gaps complicate the accountability dynamics for NRDP participants and contribute to the challenges of operating within the rural development policy arena. The NRDP is designed to emphasize the relationship between processes and substantive outcomes. It has developed a tendency to rely on professional and political accountability relationships that have little to do with formal responsibilities.

The Effects of the Canadian Supreme Court's Charter Interpretation on Regional and Intergovernmental Tensions in Canada

Shannon Ishiyama Smithey, University of Pittsburgh

Canada's adoption of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 had a number of unexpected consequences. Many Canadians hoped that the Charter's adoption would help unify the country by creating a shared set of civil liberties; yet, it was also feared that the Charter would tip the balance of federal power in favor of the federal government because it allowed the national Supreme Court to oversee provincial policy making. Neither of these predictions has come to pass. In its Charter cases, the Supreme Court has neither made the national government its constitutional favorite nor helped to unify Canadians. The Court's language-rights cases helped catalyze Québécois resentment toward the rest of Canada. Its preferential treatment of laws and court decisions from Ontario has the potential to increase Canada's regional antagonisms as well. These findings demonstrate that judicial power can have significant political effects that are not anticipated by constitutional reformers or the constitutions they adopt.

The Council of Australian Governments and Intergovernmental Relations: A Case of Cooperative Federalism

Marin Painter, University of Sydney

A series of Special Premiers' Conferences begun in 1990, and the establishment of the Council of Australian Governments in 1992, signaled a phase of "cooperative federalism" in Australia. Joint schemes of policy and legislation and new national

intergovernmental bodies were made by a series of formal agreements. The conditions and circumstances are appraised in a discussion of the nature of intergovernmental coordination and cooperation, and from the critical perspective of a model of competitive federalism. It is concluded that the initiatives, largely, did not represent a centralizing process, nor did they override strongly articulated claims for diversity. This is made clear following an analysis of the processes occurring in the newly established federal institutions and from a series of brief case studies. They expressed the continuing interdependency and underlying autonomy of state and Commonwealth.

Local Revolutions in Central Europe, 1990 to 1994: Memoirs of Mayors and Councilors from Poland, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic

Wisla Surazska, University of Bergen

The consequences of the introduction of municipal autonomy in Poland, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia as analyzed from the memoirs of 131 mayors and councilors concerning their first electoral term during the period 1990 to 1994. The analysis focuses on the mechanisms of mobilization and selection of a new local elite. Subsequently, the most frequent motive of the memoirs is discussed, namely, the want of local integration and tactics applied by local leaders to enhance integration. The recovery of local roots and traditions is the most frequent way to reach this objective, but it appears to have two-sided consequences. On the one hand, the fostering of local identity enhances communal integration and active citizenship. On the other hand, it initiates a drive toward municipal fragmentation. Also, the situation of local minorities may worsen in the process. Thus, the study demonstrates some more general phenomena coming from the assertion of local autonomy in Central Europe.

Abstracts from
Publius: The Journal of Federalism
 26 (Winter 1996)

Federal Systems in the Global Economy: Research Issues

Keith Boeckelman, Louisiana State University

The emerging global economy has altered the makeup of federal systems and set the stage for new international institutions. This article identifies key research issues that bear upon the connection between federalism and globalism.

Five specific research questions are considered. The first concerns the impact of global economic change on the sovereignty of national and Subnational governments. Second, the effect of the global economy on intergovernmental relations is considered. Next, the question of placement of economic policy responsibilities in a federal system is posed. Finally, the article asks whether federalism eases adaptation to the global economy and protects democratic values.

State Governance and Financial Market Integration: The Politics and Consequences of Interstate Banking Deregulation

Andrew Skalaban, University of California, Davis

This study examines the debates surrounding interstate banking reform in the 1980s and the effect of geographic deregulation on the availability of credit in the states. Deregulation does have a significant and positive impact on the amount of total commercial and industrial loans made by banks. The pro and con arguments about deregulation are then reconsidered in light of this finding. The study concludes that states can help stimulate economic growth through regulatory policy, though the total impact is relatively small. This research also suggests that the veracity of policy arguments can be judged by the richness of the institutional context in which they are grounded.

Economic Globalization and the Shifting Boundaries of German Federalism

Richard Deeg, Temple University

As in many other nations, economic globalization undermined the economic policy making autonomy of the German federal government. At the same time, it prompted decentralization of other kinds of economic policy making authority within the federal system. Thus, the Länder have assumed increased responsibility for regional economic adjustment through the expansion of regional economic policy networks. The economic impacts of globalization and the decentralization of economic policy making, however, combine to promote greater disparities among the Länder. These disparities exacerbate growing competition among the Länder for investment and public resources. This, in turn, creates deeper conflict among constituent governments that threatens to weaken further the problem-solving capacity of cooperative federalism.

Interstate Cooperation and Territorial Representation in Intermestic Politics

Franz Gress, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität

Both the American and the German federal systems are acting under the impact of increasing globalization and are involved in process of macro-regional integration. These developments are of vital interest for the constituent members of both federations. In such transformations, the nature of the representation of Subnational units is a pivotal element. The crucial point is whether the federation and/or the new transnational regimes provide for the representation of Subnational territorial units and give space for their horizontal cooperation.

Spinoza and The Federal Polity

George M Gross, Temple University

In his Political Treatise, Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677) describes a frame of government for a federal polity whose members are neither "confederated" nor "united" but are "mutually associated and united." Spinoza regards the federal polity as the preferred mode of republican government. His Political Treatise marks the

turn in political science from the classic polis to the extended republic of modern times. His argument converges with and illuminates that of The Federalist in several respects. This article discusses Spinoza's contributions to the federal idea, and shows the importance of federalism for understanding Spinoza.

"Europe with the Regions": Channels of Regional Representation in the European Union

Liesbet Hooghe, University of Toronto
Gary Marks, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

One of the most important consequences of European integration is the multiplication of extra-national channels for Subnational political activity. Territorial relations are being transformed: national states are losing control over important areas of decision making, a variety of new channels have been created for regional mobilization, and Subnational governments are engaged in innovative, transnational, patterns of interaction. Regions, however, do not engage in these activities equally. There is no congruence in the political role of cities, municipalities, and regions in the European Union. On the contrary, there are enormous differences in the level of organization, financial resources, political autonomy, and political influence of Subnational governments across Europe. The result is the unfolding of common thread

Second Thoughts on Europe's "Third Level": The European Union's Committee of the Regions

Thomas Christiansen, University of Essex

The Maastricht Treaty provided for a consultative Committee of the Regions to bring the European Union's "third lever" into the deliberation of legislation. It began to operate in early 1994. This article assesses its creation and recent activity against the expectations and demands that were expressed at the outset, looking in turn at the representative, advisory, and symbolic functions the new body can perform. What emerges is a largely symbolic body that suffers from entrenched internal divisions and functional overreach in the absence of any real influence on the Union's policy making process. The danger is a downward spiral of progressive obscurity and the frustration of its members' aspirations.

PUBLIUS TABLE OF CONTENTS

Available on Disk

Order Directly from the Center

for \$10.00

Call: 215/204-1480

RESEARCH NOTE

The Hellenic-Ionian Leagues: The First European Confederations

Daniel J. Elazar

While the idea of covenant was a minor theme at best in Greek and Roman political thought, the application of federal devices in their real world was more widespread. In the fourth century BCE, the growing power of the Macedonian kingdom put an end to the independence of these Greek city-states, bringing them under Macedonian imperial rule. But as John Ferguson states in *The Heritage of Hellenism*: "Cosmopolis did not destroy the polis." The Macedonians were, after all, Greek, and they had certain Greek sensibilities. Thus, they developed an imperial style which the Romans were shortly to copy. That style strongly resembled imperial federalism, albeit without its democratic elements, at least on the imperial plane.

Indeed, in theory, Alexander the Great established his world empire as president of a league of Greek states: the Corinthian League. In 311, Antigonos, his successor, negotiated a treaty with his rivals recorded on a marble column which stated: "We have declared in our treaty that all Greeks shall bind themselves by oath to the mutual defense of their freedom and autonomy." This treaty became the basis for the post-Alexandrian empire in Ionia and Asia Minor, whereby the empire formally continued to be a league of cities, now with one imperial ruler, while the cities kept their local autonomy and their right to create regional confederations within the imperial domain. This and other treaties essentially relied upon the traditional communal liberties of each city to determine its precise status within the overall *imperium*. In a sense, this represented a merger of the Canaanite-Phoenician city-state culture with the Hellenic polis culture to form the local basis of the Hellenistic polity.

New cities were founded on this Alexandrian quasi-federal model. Wherever Alexander and his successors went to conquer, they consolidated their control by establishing new politeia with the same system of government. Cities where Hellenistic ideas and behavior could flourish would be autonomous within the imperial structures and, at the same time, help consolidate and preserve those structures.

This pattern of imperial quasi-federalism persisted through the Hellenistic period and well into the Roman Empire. The Seleucid ruler were particularly notable for the freedom they allowed the cities within their empire, albeit requiring each of them to have a Greek constitution. For example, the Hasmonean revolt began when the Seleucids intervened to force the small province of Judea to reconstitute itself as a Greek polis.

When possible, the anchor of these local liberties was to be found in the principle of respect for the ancestral laws of each city, but it was extended beyond this because the age was one of the foundation of new cities for which constitutions were written and which were given the same autonomy as the old, established ones, much in the way that those American states admitted to the union after the adoption of the federal constitution were deemed the equals of those which had established the federal republic in the first place. To the

extent that cities were founded and refounded, they acquired constitutions and had contractual elements in them, but no theory of political compact developed as a result. The form of government was some combination of democracy and oligarchy, whereby all adult male citizens had full political rights, including eligibility for office, but more often than not the offices tended to be in the hand of the wealthy.

Within the context of these empires. Cities were encouraged to form confederacies. As indicated above, the original empire itself grew out of the League of Corinth, of which Philip of Macedonia served as *hegemon*, or president, and which comprised all the states of Greece except Sparta. Alexander followed this form and the league was reorganized in 302 and continued formally as the linking vehicle for the empire. Foreign and military policy was concentrated in the hands of the *hegemon*, although there was no common citizenship. On the other hand, common citizenship was in the League of the Islanders, built around a religious center on Delos.

The third century BCE became a century of confederacies, including the Ionian League; the Boetian League, dominated by Thebes; the Aetolian league, which had a strong primary assembly for the entire confederacy and involved three arenas: cities, tribal districts, and the confederacy as a whole, in effect, a federal constitution. Such, too, was the Achaean League. When not fighting one another, the two confederacies established a common superleague.

Perhaps the most federal of all was the Lycian league. Located in the mountains of Asia Minor. The Lycians were not Greeks. Under Greek influence, they fashioned a federal constitution which developed to the point where the federal assembly was a representative body whose seats were distributed approximately in proportion to the population of each member city. On a circumscribed basis, this constitution survived well into the period of Roman rule.

The closest to a prefiguring of the federal principle as vital for freedom came in the history of the second Achaean League. The first Achaean League had been established in the fourth century BCE, but collapsed shortly after 300 BCE. It was revived in 281-280 BCE and rapidly consolidated its power vis-a-vis Macedonia and the city-states surrounding it.

A generation later, in 251, Aratus led the citizens of Sicyon, his native city, in their successful effort to overthrow its dictator, and brought the city into the Achaean League. Perhaps because Sicyon was not an Achaean city, Aratus had wider ambitions than the older members of the confederacy. Loathing dictators and Macedonian rule, he saw the league's task as that of liberating Hellas from both by instituting federal democracy. In 245 BCE, he was elected the general of the league's armies and became its dominant figure. His first great victory was in 243, when he liberated Corinth. The league then expanded for a while, but by the end of the decade, Aratus had reached the limits of his powers and the league had failed to absorb either Athens or Sparta. Clemonomes of Sparta took the lead opposing Aratus and became his *bête-noire*.

Aratus, who has been described by Ferguson as being "incorruptible, adventurous, persuasive, skilled in diplomacy, passionately attached

to freedom, and implacably ambitious," was the partisan of federalism, but opposed social revolution. Clemonomes was not only a Spartan nationalist, but also a social revolutionary. In a sense, their struggle was a prefiguring of the struggle between the federalists and the Jacobins in determining the course of the democratic world two millennia later.

In the end, in order to preserve the federation, Aratus had to invite the hated Macedonians to intervene, and Clemonomes was defeated in 222 BCE. Although the Achean League was allowed to retain limited local liberty, it was restored firmly to Macedonian suzerainty. It survived until 146 BCE.

The Achean League was governed by a primary assembly of all male citizens over the age of thirty, which met to deal with major constitutional issues, and an elected council of several hundred, which met regularly and elected the magistrates. The league adopted common gods and, at its greatest extent, controlled the whole of the Peloponnesus.

Roman Foederatii

In the Battle of Pydna in 168 BCE, the Romans triumphed over the allied Greek cities. In its wake, the walls of the conquered cities were razed and the Greek confederacies were dissolved. Thus the history of classical Greece came to an end just as the Jews of Judea launched their successful revolt against the Seleucid extension of Alexandrian Greece in western Asia.

Nevertheless, the rise of Rome did not alter the Greek emphasis on the *polis* and confederations of like *politeia*. The Romans, like their Greek predecessors, were colonizers, planting cities wherever their armies trod. Under them, the *polis* became the *municipium*. Citizens of the *municipium* had a double loyalty, to their city and to Rome. It has been stated that: "Rome conquered by force, but ruled by consent." Indeed, the Roman Empire was originally constructed out of a network of treaties, presumably among equals, between Rome and her allies, the *foederatii*, which further encouraged this duality.

The Roman *municipium* became part of a political-juridical constitutional order based upon a public social contract. As Walter Lippman put it: "In this way, freedom emanating from a constitutional order has been advocated, explained, and made real to the imagination and the conscience of Western men; by establishing the presumption that civilized society is founded on a public social contract." Lippman's rather optimistic analysis of the Roman public philosophy of contract reflects what has earlier been stated in this book, namely, that "a contract is an agreement reached voluntarily, *quid pro quo*." It has a narrowness that distinguishes it from covenant in its practical rather than moral foundations and its *quid pro quo* character. Still, as Lippman suggests, it helped to advance the idea that "the first principle of the civilized state is that power is legitimate only when it is under contract."

The reality of municipal liberty, federal treaties, and the contractual public philosophy disappeared in the Roman Empire to be replaced by a European version of Oriental despotism. At most, echoes of the theory lived on, reflected in the continuing use of the terms *foedus*, *foedere*, and *foederatii*, in medieval Latin to describe covenantal and oath-based linkages among individuals and groups. While the Church may have tried to absorb a version of covenantal thinking into its theology, when it came to matters of governance, it followed the Roman imperial model and built a hierarchy. The idea of Christian republicanism was preserved by a chain of Christian political theorists throughout the Middle Ages. Although their theories had some covenantal overtones, it would be hard to describe them as covenantal *per se*. Nevertheless, with the demise of the Roman Empire, the way was open to new arrangements which combined the Roman experience with hierarchy with others derived from covenant and contract.

Visit the Center at our Website:

WWW.TEMPLE.COM/FEDERALISM



IACFS

NEWSLETTER BULLETIN d'INFORMATION RUNDSCHEIBEN

Minutes

Annual Meeting of the Directors of the International Association of Centres for Federal Studies-short version-Hannover (Germany), October 8, 1996.

The 1996 annual meeting of the IACFS was held on Tuesday evening, October 8, 1996 in Hannover, in the meeting room of the Deutsches Institut für Federalismusforschung, under the presidency of Ronald Watts.

Members Present:

Ronald Watts, President
Cliff Walsh, Vice President
Nicolas Schmitt, Secretary/Treasurer
Peter Pernthaler (Austria)
Christine Fletcher (Australia)
Cheryl Saunders (Australia)
Diogo Lordellor De Mello (Brazil)
Harvey Lazar (Canada)
Frederic Lepin (France)
Hans-Peter Schneider (Germany)
Jutta Kramer (Germany)
Rudolf Hrbeck (Germany)
Abdulrahim Vijapur (India)
Viacheslav Seliverstov (Russia)
Jabu Sindane (South Africa)
Eliseo Eja (Spain)
Thomas Fleiner (Switzerland)
Daniel Elazar (U.S. & Israel)

Excused Members:

Isawa Elaigwu (Nigeria)
Slava Shealo (Russia)

1. Welcome by the President and Introduction of Members and guest:

The President welcomed the participants and stated that 14 Centres were represented, which was well over the quorum and was a good sign. The Centres represented were: Adelaide and Melbourne (Australia), Innsbruck (Austria), Kingston (Canada), Nice (France), Hannover and Tübingen (German), New Delhi (India), Jerusalem (Israel), Novosibirsk (Russia), Pretoria (South

Africa), Barcelona (Spain), Fribourg (Switzerland), Philadelphia, (USA).

He then noted a certain number of changes, the saddest of them being the death of Professor Rasheduddin Khan. The President asked for a minute of silence in memory of the former Director of the Indian Institute. Moreover, he informed the audience that Bertus de Villiers had left the HSRC for the National parks Board, that ACIR was moribund and that Isawa Elaigwu's Institute had been closed by the Nigerian Government.

The President expressed then the gratitude of the Association to Hannover for hosting the IACFS annual meeting. He reminded members that originally this meeting was to be held in Nigeria, but that due to tragic events the Committee had to relocate it. Moreover, the President formally appreciated the fact that the generosity of Hannover Institute exceeded what was the normal, as it also covered transportation costs and not only ground costs.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The President asked if all member Centres and Institute had received full documentation for the meeting, with a copy of the Agenda, Minutes of 1995 Meeting, financial statement (with "Smileys") etc. *Nobody wishing additions or deletions, the agenda was accepted.*

3. Minutes of 1995 Meeting in Philadelphia (PA, United States):

The President reminded that the minutes had been distributed some time ago and that they have also been published in the "Federalism Report," Volume 21, Number 1, Winter 1996, pp.8-12.

Considering the question raised in Philadelphia by Jutta Kramer about special rate for the Oceana publication "Constitutional of the World" (see point 10 of 1995 minutes), the president answered that it has not been possible to get that kind of special rate. *Nobody wishing additions or deletions, the minutes were unanimously adopted.*

4. Report on IACFS Projects

• Publication of IACFS Booklet (previously distributed)

Nicolas Schmitt reported that the final cost of the leaflet was US \$2,358.83 for the printing. The budget at disposal was US \$ 3,000, but the postage amounted to US \$ 847.54. The secretary

hoped that everybody was satisfied with the leaflet's design and that it provides very useful information on the Association.

Ronald Watts asked everybody to provide Nicolas Schmitt with updated information and corrections they would like to see added. A list of amendments will be published every year for loose insertion in the booklet and a new booklet published every three years when the list of officers changes.

Rudolf Hrbek asked whether amendments should concern address only or also the centres' work and new publications. The result of the discussion was that it was decided that it would be too long to not anything else other than amendments concerning: name of Director, address and telephone/fax/e-mail numbers.

• **Completion of Statement of Objectives and By-laws (previously distributed)**

This was distributed in Fribourg and was on this agenda in case some members had not received a copy. The President mentioned that it was a great achievement and took a lot of work. He reminded members that it had been done with the aim of encouraging new members.

• **Progress on publications of previous Conference Proceedings**

- *Fribourg Conference 1994:* Thomas Fleiner presented the new book entitled "*Vers une Constitution europeenne-Towards a European Constitution.*" He explained that the delay in the publication has been due to the long and unfortunately unsuccessful process to get some funding from the Swiss National Fund for Scientific Research.

- *Philadelphia Conference 1995:* Daniel Elazar explained that only one paper had not arrived so far. He hoped that the book would be available for next year's meeting. Ronald Watts added that he had spoken to John Kincaid, who was planning to publish some of the papers in *Publius*.

- *Plans for Hannover Conference 1996:* Jutta Kramer explained that proceedings would be published in the series *Federalism Studies of the DIF*, volume 10 or 11, including abstracts from the discussion, which was recorded. National papers will have to be published from issue to issue, in order to facilitate the comparative work.

• **Progress on International Bibliography of Federalism**

Ronald Watts explained that this work had taken much more time than he would have hoped. Douglas Brown wrote a one-page report on this.

Concerning dissemination, the President suggested that CD ROM might be the best way and that there would not be a printed version because of printing costs.

Thomas Fleiner introduced then a large discussion (involving all members) about the utility of CD-ROM versus floppy disk or even Internet. The discussion could be summarized by Cheryl Saunders' comment, explaining that it would be productive and good for IACFS' image to be put on Internet.

The President asked for a vote: *IACFS members unanimously voted in favour of a presence of the Association on Internet through a Homepage*. A sub-committee was elected, whose work would be to define a concept for use by IACFS of the Internet including the following points: establishment of homepage, maintenance, development. The sub-committee was asked to make its proposals at the next meeting in Adelaide. It is composed of: Thomas Fleiner (Chairman), Harvey Lazar, Viacheslav Seliverstov and Cheryl Saunders.

• **Proposed Handbook on Fiscal Federalism**

Cliff Walsh explained that the 1997 Adelaide Conference would be conceived as the initiation of a proposal handbook, and that he would come back later on this topic.

He then added that he would also be interested in subsequently publishing another handbook devoted to the topic: *Reforming Intergovernmental Relations Towards 2000*. Ronald Watts asked whether it would be too much for the IACFS to manage two projects. Dan Elazar suggested that we should encourage such comparative work. The President concluded by suggesting that any other good idea for a project needing cooperation be brought to Adelaide.

Hans-Peter Schneider finally noted that - even if it was not IACFS business - his Institute was preparing a textbook for students and would welcome any other Institute interested in participating.

5. **Report on Operation of European Consortium for Regional and Federal Studies (ECRFS):**

Rudolf Hrbek, current Chairman of the Consortium presented the booklet ECRFS has published in order to introduce itself. There are currently two proposals for concrete projects, but this has not yet materialized. The demand for expertise in Brussels seems not to be so high. Nevertheless, most institutes will be present for the annual meeting on Wednesday, October 9.

6. **Future Annual IACFS Conferences:**

• **1997 (April): Adelaide**

Cliff Walsh explained that there would be a major conference to celebrate the Centennial of the 1897 pre-federal convention in Adelaide. The main organizer (and sponsor) of the Conference should be the Constitutional Centennial Foundation.

That Conference would be held from Sunday, April 20, 1997, to Wednesday April 23. It would then be followed by the IACFS Annual Meeting, taking place from Thursday April 24, 1997 to Saturday, April 26.

In its first part (20-23) the Conference would focus on the set of principles Australia needs for the next millennium. Among other topics, there will be for example the challenges to government and the impact of globalization, but the main part will be devoted to the workshop on principles themselves. The final goal is to be able to give this set of principles to the next conference organized within the frame of this Centennial. In the second part (24-26), the IACFS Conference would focus on fiscal federalism, meeting the challenge of globalization.

Cliff Walsh added he would send more information to all centres if Adelaide is confirmed as organizer of IACFS 1997 Annual Meeting. IACFS members are invited to participate in both conferences. For those who are interested, there will possibly even be a pre-conference. Concerning travel expenses, Cliff Walsh's aim is to get funding including travel expenses for one participant from every Centre. Nevertheless, ground costs for two delegates per centre will be covered as usual for the whole week.

The President asked them Cliff Walsh to send a formal invitation for Centres to enable them to plan funding. The motion to approve holding the 1997 IACFS Conference in Adelaide (South Australia) April 24-26, 1997, was unanimously accepted.

• **1998 Jerusalem (Israel)**

Dan Elazar suggested Jerusalem for the 50th Birthday of Israel. He added that the theme could be "*Federalism and Peace-Making*".

both at the domestic and international levels, and that it could be held in May. This was tentatively agreed.

• **1999: Tubingen (Germany)**

Rudolf Hrbeck reminded members that 1999 would mark the 50th anniversary of the German Constitution, and that such a celebration was a good opportunity to get funding. From that point of view, he thought that for 1999 Tubingen was more appropriate than Nice.

• **2000: Nice (France)**

Ronald Watts explained that the Association did not have to plan that so far in advance, but that nevertheless it could be useful to mention tentatively 2000 for Nice (as well as 1999 for Tubingen) so that members can think ahead.

• **2001: Australia**

Brian Galligan had made this proposal a few years ago on behalf of the ANU Centre to mark the first Centenary of the Australian Constitution. As the Centre has been closed the year 2001 now has become an open date. Moreover, Cheryl Saunders expressed her doubts that it could be as interesting as 1997.

It has then been confirmed to Rudolf Hrbeck that Tubingen would be chosen for 1999 and that he could go ahead with planning accordingly.

7. Financial report:

The Secretary/Treasurer presented the list of the members having (or not having) paid their annual memberships. Despite the cost of the leaflet (see above No. 4), and without counting some US \$500 – fees which should be paid soon, the annual balance is US \$3,127.59. He then made three further comments.

- The annual fee is US \$100 for all Centres paying directly by bank, but US \$110 in case of payment by checks, as the bank charges about US \$10 for every international check.

- The grey "Smiley" for the Institut d'Estudis Autonòmics means that this Centre claims to have concluded, many years ago, an agreement with the Past President Daniel Elazar, according to which they have the right to be a member without paying any fee. But as Daniel Elazar did not remember such an agreement, the President noted that every member Center must pay dues. The Barcelona Centre's situation will be checked.

- The second grey "Smiley" concerned the Novosibirsk Institute, which has asked the Secretary/treasurer whether it would be possible to pay "cash" in Hannover. Following the affirmative answer, Viacheslav Seliverstov paid his three year term fee in Hannover.

The President concluded this presentation in noting that IACFS was still in a very healthy situation. A copy of the financial statement will be sent with the minutes to all member Centres and Institutes. A Motion for approval of the financial report was unanimously carried.

8. Review of IACFS Membership:

• **Current Status of Membership**

Information on membership can be found in the new leaflet. The President explained that the two Brazilian Institutes were not in the leaflet, as it had been impossible to get in touch with the, having tried all mean of communication. Also not listed is ANU in Canberra since it has ceased to operate.

Since the leaflet was published, NCIR ub Abuja has been closed by the Nigerian government. Nevertheless, the President

explained hat Isawa Elaigwu was in the process of establishing a new Institute in Jos.

There are 16 very active members, but there are also some quite inactive members. The Leicester Centre has been transformed into a Centre for European Studies. ACIR (USA) is about to "die" due to withdrawal of Congressional funding. Two Centres in Barcelona had seemed to be quite dormant (but for the first time in some years there was a Barcelona ICPS representative attending this meeting). Regarding he Centre in Brussels, Frank Delmartino explained that there were some communication problems with this Centre (which has no Secretariat) and that he would try to get in touch with Prof. Gonzales d'Alcantara, its current Director.

• **Application for membership**

The President stated that there had been many requests for information, but that he had not received any formal application in time for this meeting. Interest has been expressed by Isawa Elaigwu (Jos), Carolina de Bolivar (Mexico), an Argentinean Centre, and Jim Seroka's Institute for Local Government at North Florida University.

• **Prospective applications for membership**

There are two objectives to be followed:

- Reactivate those Centres which are not fully active;
- Broaden IACFS representativity through including Centres from (more or less) federal countries like Mexico, Venezuela, Malaysia, Ethiopia, China etc.

9. Notice of elections due 1997 and agreement on process to be followed:

The current three-year term of the officers of the Association lasts until the end of 1997. Elections will then have to take place in 1997 (Adelaide). Ronald Watts reminded members that it was good to have a change, but that a regular change did not prevent measures of continuity.

Concerning the election process, the President suggested that an intercontinental nomination committee be established. It would be wise to have among its members the Past President and the retiring President. And he would welcome any suggestions for others. Daniel Elazar suggested private talks to be held by the President and in the end this was the process agreed to.

10. Brief Report by each individual Centre on its work and recent major developments in its country:

As usual, due to lack of time, this section of the agenda could not be dealt with.

11. Other business (if any) raised by the members:

The President suggested the assembly be closed at 20:00 for dinner. Nevertheless, reports of Centres' particular activities would be welcomed. Hans-Peter Schneider suggested that any such points could be dealt with during the rest of the conference. This pragmatic reflection concluded the 1996 IACFS Directors' meeting in Hannover.

See you all next year in Australia!

The Secretary-Treasurer

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION ORGANIZED SECTION ON FEDERALISM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Chairperson (1996-1998)

Robert Agranoff
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Bloomington

Council (1994-1997)

Franz Gress
GOETHE UNIVERSITY
Frankfurt, Germany

Council (1995-1998)

David R. Beam
ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Chicago

Council (1996-1999)

Susan B. Hansen
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Secretary-Treasurer (1995-1999)

Michael A. Pagano
MIAMI UNIVERSITY
Oxford, Ohio

Joseph R. Marbach
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
South Orange, New Jersey

Ann O'M. Bowman
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Columbia

Marian Leif Palley
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
Newark

G. Alan Tarr
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
Camden, New Jersey

Carol S. Weissert
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
East Lansing

Alvin D. Sokolow
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Davis

COMMITTEES SET FOR 1997

1. Distinguished Scholar Award

As mentioned in the last newsletter, Alvin Sokolow, University of California, Davis, will chair the Distinguished Scholar Award Committee. Other members of the committee include Joseph Marbach of Seton Hall University and Susan Hansen of the University of Pittsburgh. Send nominations to the Chair, Department of Social and Behavioral Science, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95816 (Phone: 916-752-0979) or to other members of the committee.

2. Best Book Award

Susan McManus, University of South Florida, will chair this committee that includes Marian Leif Palley of the University of Delaware and Franz Gress of Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany. The award is for a book published over ten years that has made a lasting contribution to federalism and IGR. Send nominations to the Chair at the Department of Government and International Affairs, University of South Florida, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, SOC 107, Tampa, FL 33620. Phone: 813-974-2384.

3. Nominations Committee

G. Alan Tarr will chair this committee, which will be electing three new council members at the 1997 Annual Meeting. The other two committee members are Bev Cigler, Penn State, Harrisburg, and Ron Watts, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. The Section Chair, Bob Agranoff, serves as an ex-officio member of this committee. Send nominations to Prof. G. Alan Tarr, Department of Political Science, Rutgers University, Camden, NJ 08102. Phone: 609-225-6084. Fax: 609-225-6084

4. Best Paper Award

The award committee for the best paper in the field of federalism and intergovernmental relations at the 1996 Annual Meeting has completed its deliberations. The Committee was headed by the 1996 Program Chair, Joseph F. Zimmerman, State University of New York, Albany. Other committee members were Sarah Liebschutz, State University of New York, Brockport, and Carl Stenberg, University of Baltimore. Thanks for your timely work.

5. 1997 Program

Program Chairperson, Ann Bowman, University of South Carolina, reports that the section will sponsor seven panels at the 1997 meeting in Washington, DC, August 28-September 1. The panel titles are as follows:

1. "Federalism: What Does It Mean?"
2. "Interactions in Multi-level Systems"
3. "State Innovations in the Devolution Era"
4. "Round table on Devolution and the Consequences for Local Autonomy"
5. "(Re)Distribution of Authority and Multi-level Governance: A Cross-Regional Perspective"
6. "Federalism in Action: New Approaches, New Problems"
7. "The Intergovernmental Context of Local Government Decisions"

In addition to the panels, there will be five Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations papers presented as part of the American Politics Poster Session.

6. 1997 Short Course

The section is sponsoring a pre-conference professional development short course immediately before the APSA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. The short course, "Implementing Devolution: Federal, State and Local Perspectives," will be held on the afternoon

(1-5 p.m., following a 12:00 noon lunch) of August 27 at the Hall of States, 444 North Capitol Street, in Washington, DC. The course will feature federal officials, along with representatives of state and local government associations, to assess progress in implementing the two major devolution initiatives of the 104th Congress: Welfare Reform and the Unfunded mandates Relief Act. In addition, the significance of the Supreme Court's rulings in the *Mack v. US* and *Printz v. US* (regarding 10th Amendment challenges to the Brady Bill) will be discussed. A portion of the short course will be devoted to other recent developments in judicial federalism. Course instructors include (some awaiting confirmation) Paul Posner of the GAO, Teresa Gullo of CBO, Scott DeFife of the NCSL, Barry Van Lare, Welfare Information Network, Steve Bell of the Urban Institute, and Howard Ralston, USDHHS. The luncheon speaker will be James Martin of the National Governor's Association.

The fee for the workshop is \$25 which covers course expenses and lunch. Please mark your calendars and make your travel plans accordingly. To register, contact the course organizer, Tim Conlan of George Mason University, (703)993-1427, E-mail: tconlan@gmu.edu.

7. 1996 Panel Attendance

APSA headquarters reports the following attendance at Section and affiliated panels:

- Federalism and Equality: Comparative Reflections on Individual Rights in Canada and the United States: 32
- Intergovernmental Relations in Federal Systems: 14
- Metropolitan Government and Governance: A Roundtable in Honor of Victor Jones: 45
- Reducing Poverty Through Welfare Reform and Local Economic Development: 22
- Judicial Federalism: Emerging Trends: 28
- University of Nebraska Press American States Series: Recent Developments in State Legislatures: 18
- Roundtable on Publius' Annual Review of American Federalism: 25

8. Section Meeting/Awards Ceremony/Reception

The Section business meeting, including the awards ceremonies, will be held Thursday, August 28 at 12:30 p.m. Also, the Section will be co-sponsoring a reception with the Sections on Public Administration, State Politics and Policy, and Urban Politics on Friday, August 29 at 6:30 p.m. Check the final program for place. Mark your calendars and plan to attend these sessions.

9. 1998 APSA Annual Meeting

Carol Weissert, Michigan State University, has been selected as the Sections representative on the 1998 Annual Meeting Program Committee and organizer of the section's track of panels. The 1998 meeting will be held from September 3-6 in Boston, Massachusetts. The Conference theme is "Community, Communities and Politics." Professor Weissert has prepared the following charge for the Sections panels: the recent interest in devolution, dubbed by some the Devolution revolution, has highlighted an area that has always been central in the study of federalism and intergovernmental relations—the role of communities in defining, shaping and implementing public policy. Proposal that highlight the theme of the conference—particularly how recent rhetoric and action in

Washington have really engendered changes in the community's intergovernmental role—are encouraged.

Proposals that deal with both new and emerging federalism issues and those that concern issues of long-standing interest to students of federalism and intergovernmental relations are encouraged. For example, the popularity and degree of success of the devolution approach in European and Latin American countries would be an appropriate topic for discussion. Trends in judicial decisions, the intergovernmental implications of implementing welfare reform, the impact of the unfunded mandates legislation, continued federal preemption, state-local fiscal relationships, and changing political roles of institutions and actors would be examples of emerging issues. Given the overall theme of the convention, papers that address the role communities play as actors in the intergovernmental system will also be welcomed.

Proposals that apply inventive analytical methods are welcome as are those that can be generalized across issues and jurisdictions. Proposals should include a one to two page abstract summarizing details of the topic, methodological and theoretical approaches employed, data sources and relationships to the conference theme. Preference will be given to papers that are in progress as of the proposal deadline. Proposals should be sent to APSA Headquarters in Washington, DC. Check PS for announcement of the deadline.

CSF PANELS

Title: The State of American Federalism

Chair: Dr. Daniel Elazar,

Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University

1616 Walnut Street

Suite 507

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Papers:

"Policy Role of States Attorney Generals"

Professor Joseph Zimmerman

Department of Political Science

College of Public Affairs & Policy

University at Albany - SUNY

Albany, NY 12222

Tel: 518/442-5378

Fax: 518/442-5298

Eml: zimmer@cnsvox.albany.edu

"German Federalism"

Dr. Franz Gress

Executive Director

Center for North American Studies and Research

Munchner Strabe 48

D-60000 Frankfurt am Main

GERMANY

Tel: 4969 798 8521

Fax: 49 69 798 8527

"Overview of American Federalism, 1996-1997"

Sanford F. Schram
Department of Political Science
University of Hawaii
2500 Campus Road
Honolulu, HI 96822
Tel: 808/956-6239
Fax: 808/956-5964
Eml: schram@hawaii.edu

Professor Carol Weissert Michigan State University
Department of Political Science
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
Tel: 517/353-3292
Fax: 314 747-6367
Eml: weissert@pilot.msu.edu

"Demise of ACIR"

Dr. Bruce McDowell

Title: University of Nebraska American States Series: States in the Federal System

Chair: Dr. John Kincaid
Meyner Center for the Study of
State and Local Government
Lafayette College
Easton, PA 18042-1785
610/250-5598
610/559-4048

Papers:

"Arizona"

David Berman
Arizona State University
Political Science Department
Tempe, AZ 85287
602/965-1303

"Hawaii"

Richard Pratt
Political Science Department
University of Hawaii
2500 Campus Road
Honolulu, HI 96822

"Idaho"

James Weatherby
Political Science Department
Boise State University
1910 University Drive
Boise, ID 83725

"New York"

Sarah Liebschutz
Political Science Department
SUNY - Brockport
Brockport, NY 14420
716/395-2584

**DEADLINE for the Summer Issue of the *Federalism Report* is
August 15, 1997**

The Center welcomes contributions from its readers.

For advertising information, please contact the Editor.

Temple University
1616 Walnut Street
Suite 507 (300-00)
Philadelphia, PA 19103

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
PHILADELPHIA, PA
PERMIT NO. 1044

TO:

The Federalism Report is published by the Center for the Study of Federalism

DIRECTOR:	<i>Daniel J. Elazar</i>
EDITOR:	<i>Paul T. Neal</i>
ASSISTANT EDITOR:	<i>Kimberly J. Robinson</i>



CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF FEDERALISM, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
1616 WALNUT STREET • SUITE 507 • PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103
Tel: (215) 204-1480 • Fax: (215) 204-7784 • Email: V2026R@VM.TEMPLE.EDU