

# International Political Science Review

<http://ips.sagepub.com/>

---

## In this issue

Mark Kesselman

*International Political Science Review* 2010 31: 403

DOI: 10.1177/0192512110374864

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ips.sagepub.com/content/31/4/403.citation>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



International Political Science Association (IPSA)

**Additional services and information for *International Political Science Review* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://ips.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ips.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Sep 10, 2010

[What is This?](#)



## In this issue

International Political Science Review

31(4) 403–404

© The Author(s) 2010

Reprints and permission:

[sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav](http://sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav)

DOI: 10.1177/0192512110374864

[ips.sagepub.com](http://ips.sagepub.com)



Articles in this issue of *IPSR*, like others published since the journal switched from thematic issues of commissioned articles and began publishing peer-reviewed articles, highlight the great diversity of significant issues currently studied in political science. Topics studied in this issue include alternative ways to measure state power in the international arena (Kim), the relative influence of institutional versus cultural factors in shaping voting turnout (Freitag), the impact of international economic sanctions on press freedom (Peksen), factors influencing the granting of rights (such as voting abroad and dual citizenship) to emigrants (Rhodes and Harutyunyan), and the reasons that governing political parties make unpopular choices (Cooley and Hopkin). What a rich and ambitious research agenda!

Hyung Min Kim's 'Comparing National Power' leads off the issue with a comparison of two approaches to measuring national power. Kim challenges the conventional way to measure national power within international relations, the Correlates of War Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC), because it measures power in a non-relational fashion. He prefers the measure designated as the Structural Network Power Index (SNPI) because it highlights various dimensions of a state's position within a network of other states. Statistical comparisons of the two measures suggest that the SNPI is a superior model. Surely, some scholars will disagree – so, let the debate begin!

Markus Freitag's 'Structure versus Culture' also compares two approaches, in order to determine which one better explains variations in voter turnout in Swiss cantonal elections. He seeks to help arbitrate an illustrious and long-standing debate among comparativists: the relative importance of culture versus structure (which he defines as institutions). Swiss cantons provide a fine setting for a natural laboratory experiment to assess whether political institutions or political culture have a greater impact on differential turnout rates. Freitag's answer: in the cases he studies, culture trumps institutions. And so: let the debate continue!

Dursun Peksen's 'Coercive Diplomacy and Press Freedom' develops the disquieting argument that economic sanctions imposed on governments violating international laws and norms diminish press freedom in the sanctioned country. The explanation for this outcome is that sanctions reduce a country's interaction with the outside world as well as the resources that are available to maintain an independent press. Sanctions also give an authoritarian regime greater license to limit press freedom. Peksen finds that the extent of repression varies with the severity and scope of sanctions: broader sanctions have a greater impact than do targeted ones; multilateral sanctions have a greater impact than do unilateral ones. A question suggested by this article: if economics is the dismal science, where does this leave political science?

Sybil Rhodes and Arus Harutyunyan's 'Extending Citizenship to Emigrants' is a partial antidote to the gloom that Peksen's article may provoke. Rhodes and Harutyunyan find that there is a

significant trend around the world for states to grant expatriates significant forms of citizenship rights, for example, voting rights. They suggest that the process is reminiscent of the process by which previously excluded groups, notably the poor, racial minorities, and women, have gained political inclusion in democratic regimes. Why do states grant at least some citizen rights to emigrants? Rhodes and Harutyunyan consider the most prevalent explanations in the literature and find that robust political competition in both young and established democracies is most likely to account for why inclusion is broadened.

Alexander Cooley and Jonathan Hopkin focus on political parties in a relatively young democracy. 'Base Closings' seeks to explain why governing political parties may make unpopular choices. The case study that they select for an answer is the issue of American military bases in Spain and their use in support of unpopular military campaigns. The puzzle they seek to resolve is why, despite the fact that public opinion polls repeatedly document that a majority of Spaniards support closing US military bases and restricting their use for US military campaigns, governing political parties in Spain have varied considerably in the extent to which they have pressed the issue? Cooley and Hopkin reject explanations involving the ideology of governing parties, the intensity of public opinion, and security-related concerns. Instead, they suggest that the most likely contender is the extent to which political parties and the party system are institutionalized. In a word, apparently: Michels, Huntington, and Rokkan all over again.

A reminder that *IPSR* has initiated an electronic feature designated Online First. A month or more before articles are published in the print edition of the journal, they will be electronically posted. Online First can be accessed from *IPSR*'s home page. Articles posted in Online First will be identical in all respects to the version published in the journal, save that they will not have pagination corresponding to the print edition. Note that posting articles in Online First does not replace their eventual publication in the journal; posting is a supplement to publication in *IPSR*. In order to access articles in Online First, check into the journal's homepage at <http://ipsr.sagepub.com> and click on Online First. Online First articles can be referenced using their unique Digital Object Identifier (DOI) number. This number stays with the article throughout, even after it has been assigned to a particular issue. The editors are delighted that Sage has developed Online First; posting articles in this way will significantly shorten the gap between acceptance of an article and its dissemination.

Mark Kesselman