

A Guide to Authors

by

Benjamin Frankel

for contributors to

Security Studies

Version 5.2 / November 2001

1727 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 815, Washington, D.C. 20036

Telephone 202.232.0287 Facsimile 202.265.0799

e-mail or bfrankel@securitystudies.org

Copyright © 2001 by Benjamin Frankel

Anybody can make history, but only a great man can write it.

Oscar Wilde

PRELIMINARIES

Introduction	1
Editorial Statement	1
A Note on Writing for <i>Security Studies</i>	2
<i>Security Studies</i> Article Selection Criteria	5
Publication Process	5
Notice to Contributors	6

STYLESHEET AND CONVENTIONS

Format Conventions	7
Style Conventions	8
Note Format	15
Frequently Used Words and Terms	20

Appendix 1

Stephen Van Evera	
Writing Articles for Publication: The Inside Scoop	23

Appendix 2

Benjamin Frankel	
Abiding Tradition: Writing, Style, and English Usage	27

Bibliography	33
--------------	----

INTRODUCTION

This guide describes the journal's article selection criteria, publication process, and article submission procedure, and explains the journal's style and format requirements. Articles submitted to *Security Studies* must follow the journal's stylesheet (see "Stylesheet and Conventions"), and comply with the requirements described in "Notice to Contributors." Authors should consult the "Note on Writing for *Security Studies*" and "Style Conventions."

The quality of writing plays an important role in our decision whether or not to accept an article for publication. Therefore, in addition to explaining the journal's style conventions, I also highlight a few essential rules of English usage which contributors to the journal should follow. In appendix 2 I explain my approach to English usage, and why we insist on traditional English usage as the correct usage.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sections of this guide (portions of the Article Selection Criteria and Stylesheet and Conventions) are based on materials written by Teresa J. Lawson (formerly Johnson) for "A Workshop on Writing for *International Security*" (October 1990). Lawson wrote a useful article based on these materials.¹ The guide also refers at times to articles in *IS* to illustrate format conventions adopted by *Security Studies*. Please note, however, that *Security Studies* follows the *Chicago Manual of Style*; *IS* does not. I refer to *International Security* for a reason. Exacting scholarly and editorial standards should guide all academic journals, and good work done by one journal should be respectfully acknowledged and followed by other journals. In following the editorial pattern set by *IS*, *Security Studies* is paying a deserved tribute to a very good journal.

I am grateful to Teresa J. Lawson and Sean M. Lynn-Jones for permission to use the workshop materials. As always, I have benefited greatly from the generous advice of Stephen Van Evera. Van Evera's advice to authors are provided in appendix 1, and in a small book he recently published.² I also thank David Yost for his helpful comments.

EDITORIAL STATEMENT

SECURITY STUDIES aims to play an important role in advancing and strengthening security studies. It is dedicated to the careful and focused exploration of the enduring theme of international security: the role of force in international politics. The journal offers theoretical and historical examinations of the contexts, sources, causes, dynamics, uses, ramifications, and outcomes of crisis, conflict, and war.

The journal is a forum for international security scholarship that has regained its vigor and confidence after a period of criticism and introspection, during which the scope, contents, and purpose of the field became a matter of controversy. The significant work done in security studies during the past decade and a half has established the field's scientific credentials, earning it the recognition it deserves and making security studies an integral part of social science in academia.

The purpose of *Security Studies* is to serve scholarship by contributing to cumulative knowledge in security studies, helping deepen and make more robust the field's analytical foundations. The journal's editorial philosophy reflects this commitment:

1. Teresa Pelton Johnson, "Writing for *International Security*: A Contributors' Guide," *International Security* 16, no. 2 (fall 1991): 171–80.

2. Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science* (Cambridge: Defense and Arms Control Studies Program, MIT, 1996; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

The journal encourages the free, unfettered debate of important questions at the core of security studies. The journal welcomes an interdisciplinary approach to security studies and the application of diverse analytical methodologies to the central questions of the field.

The journal publishes empirically grounded, carefully documented work. Anonymous reviews by peers ensure that the material published in the journal's pages meet exacting standards of scholarly rigor and intellectual integrity.

The journal contributes to basic research by publishing works that develop, refine, or test theoretical constructs. Scholarship should also relate itself to problems in the real world and address real-life questions. Accordingly, the journal publishes policy-relevant articles that apply theory to concrete issues. The journal also publishes historical analyses and detailed examinations of historical case studies. *Security Studies* emphasizes articles that offer original analysis, innovative interpretation, and fresh evidence.

We hope that in fostering the authoritative investigation of important international security questions, *Security Studies* will promote progress in scholarship and contribute to the fashioning of informed policies on international security matters.

A NOTE ON WRITING FOR SECURITY STUDIES

“Begin at the beginning,” the King said, very gravely, “and go on till you come to the end: then stop.”

I always listen to what I can leave out.
Miles Davis⁴

Security Studies is dedicated to the proposition that social science writing does not have to be sturgid, pretentious, convoluted, and graceless. Impenetrable jargon and abstruse prose are more often than not a mark of intellectual laziness, not profundity. Complex writing may precisely reflect complex ideas, but it may also gratuitously complicate complex ideas or, worse, gratuitously complicate simple ideas.⁵ Too many scholars ignore Gowers's reminder that “Writing is an instru-

3. Lewis Carroll, *The Annotated Alice (Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass)*, int. and notes Martin Gardner (New York: New American Library, 1960), 158.

4. Quoted in Jon Pareles, “Miles Davis, Trumpeter, Dies; Jazz Genius, 65, Defined Cool,” *New York Times*, 29 September 1991, 1, 36; at 1.

5. Joseph M. Williams, *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), xi.

ment for conveying ideas from one mind to another; the writers' job is to make the readers apprehend the meaning readily and precisely."⁶ They also ignore Donald Holden's admonition:

The star of the book is not the writer, but the reader... Good scholarly writing is... a service you perform for a stranger. To write well, you must put yourself in that stranger's shoes and imagine that you are the reader. Whether that reader is a scholar or a layman, your primary responsibility is to him.⁷

We agree with Gowers, and insist that it is possible to be scholarly and readable at the same time. Accordingly, the quality of writing is important in evaluating an article for publication in the journal. It is not unduly pedantic or persnickety to demand that authors not assume that when they write on important subjects, correctness and precision become less important. "Why must you write *intensive* here?" asked Winston Churchill in a minute to the director of Military Intelligence about plans for the invasion of Normandy. "*Intense* is the right word. You should read Fowler's *Modern English Usage* on the use of the two words."⁸ Five years earlier, in 1939, G. V. Carey, mindful that his guide to punctuation was being offered to the British public "during a time of almost unexampled crisis," correctly observed that "The mind of one who happens to have an eye for a comma is not necessarily incapable of comprehending larger issues or embracing wider interests."⁹

In appendix 2 I offer a list of books and articles on writing and usage. My favorites are the venerable Fowler's *Modern English Usage*; *The King's English* by Fowler and Fowler; *The Elements of Style* by Strunk and White; and Gowers's *The Complete Plain Words*. Four useful additions are Williams's *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace*; Cook's *Line by Line: How to Improve Your Own Writing*; McQuain, *Power Language*; and Ross-Larson, *Editing Yourself*. The *Chicago Manual of Style*, now in its 14th edition, is indispensable.¹⁰ Willard Espy, Laurence Urdang, and William Safire offer helpful lexicographic commentary and advice in their writings.

George Orwell offered these pointers to writers:

- Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print.
- Never use a long word where a short one will do.
- If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.
- Never use the passive where you can use the active.
- Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.
- Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous.¹¹

Orwell added this advice:

A scrupulous writer, in every sentence that he writes, will ask himself at least four questions, thus: What am I trying to say? What words will express it? What image or idiom will make it clearer? Is this image fresh enough to have an effect? And he will probably ask himself two more: Could I put it more shortly? Have I said anything that is avoidably ugly?¹²

Fowler and Fowler, after admonishing writers to "be direct, simple, brief, vigorous, and lucid," offer these principles of good writing:

6. Ernest Gowers, *The Complete Plain Words*, rev. Sidney Greenbaum and Janet Whitcut (Boston: David R. Godine Publisher, 1988), 1.

7. Donald Holden, "Why Profs Can't Write," *New York Times*, 4 February 1978, E19.

8. Quoted in Ernest Gowers's "Preface to the Revised Edition," H. W. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, 2nd ed., rev. Ernest Gowers (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), v.

9. G. V. Carey, *Mind the Stop: A Brief Guide to Punctuation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 10.

10. These books' publication information is provided in appendix 2.

11. George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," in *The Orwell Reader*, int. Richard H. Rovere (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1956), 365–66.

12. Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," 362.

- Prefer the familiar word to the far-fetched.
- Prefer the concrete word to the abstract.
- Prefer the single word to the circumlocution.
- Prefer the short word to the long.
- Prefer the Saxon word to the Romance.¹³

More recently, Safire offered these “Fumblerules of grammar”:¹⁴

- Don't use no double negatives.
- Proofread carefully to see if you any words out.
- Take the bull by the hand and avoid mixed metaphors.
- If I've told you once, I've told you a thousand times, resist hyperbole.
- “Avoid overuse of ‘quotation “marks.””
- Avoid commas, that are not necessary.
- If you reread your work, you will find on rereading that a great deal of repetition can be avoided by rereading and editing.
- Avoid clichés like the plague.
- Never use a long word when a diminutive one will do.
- Avoid colloquial stuff.

When writing for *Security Studies*, follow the advice of George Orwell, the Fowlers, and William Safire: you will be doing your scholarship justice and your readers a favor.

SECURITY STUDIES ARTICLE SELECTION CRITERIA

THE JOURNAL'S editors and reviewers use the following criteria to select articles for publication in *Security Studies*:

THE “SO WHAT?” TEST

Articles must pass the “so what?” test. The test consists of the question: “Even if the author's research is sound and the article is well-written, so what? Have we learned anything important?”

SIGNIFICANT QUESTIONS

Does the article take a position on a significant scholarly or policy question? An article should present, explain, provide support for, or take issue with an important theoretical explanation or a new or significant viewpoint on important policy matters. An article is judged important if it provides insights into an issue of consequence; introduces a new, elegant theory; demonstrates the usefulness of a new method of analyzing a continuing set of problems; convincingly challenges an important theoretical construct; offers fresh evidence that helps in the understanding of an important event or series of events; adds new and significant information to the record; or illuminates background issues that are helpful in understanding current scholarly or policy debates.

Security Studies does not have an editorial line. It encourages critical analyses and serious debate of controversial issues. Positions should be responsibly framed, carefully documented, and argued with discipline.

13. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler, *The King's English*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 3.

14. *Words of Wisdom: More Good Advice*, comp. and ed. William Safire and Leonard Safir (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989), 213.

EVALUATION OF THE LITERATURE

Does the article evaluate the important literature and evidence on the topic under discussion? Does it explain to the reader what is the state of the art on the subject? Does it distinguish between majority and minority views in the literature, tell who is right and why, say who is mistaken and why, and what these distinctions mean for the issue being discussed?

CUMULATIVE KNOWLEDGE

Does the article solve, once and for all, at least part of an important puzzle? An article should help in narrowing disputes on important issues and questions so that unreasonable and ill-founded positions drop out of the debate.

The social sciences are routinely criticized for the absence of the accumulation of knowledge, one result of which is that the same issues often are being argued over and over. *Security Studies* encourages articles that aim to settle disputes definitively. Articles should, therefore, follow standards of presentation and argument that allow knowledge to accumulate. The article should explain the debate of which it is part and specify what previous literature it confirms, refutes, or revises. Arguments should be carefully qualified and defined, and their conditions and limits clearly stated, so that there is no confusion about what is and is not being argued. All factual assertions should be documented. It should be clear that tests and evidence have been used fairly and honestly, and that legitimate counterarguments have been acknowledged and confronted. Footnotes should provide a critical, comprehensive, and definitive bibliography.

QUALITY OF WRITING

Articles should be grammatically flawless and stylistically sound. They should be comprehensible to readers from different disciplinary backgrounds and of different levels of training, including nonspecialists. The author should clearly explain the historical background, technical terms, references to the literature, and theoretical concepts used in the article. A reader should be able to have a clear and accurate idea of the argument after one reading.

REASONS TO REJECT A SUBMISSION

- A mere narrative description and an absence of argument. Research is more than the compilation of information: it requires revising conclusions as a result of newly discovered facts, fresh evidence, original analysis, or innovative interpretation
- An absence of anything but argument, lacking factual support, logic, or both (“boofing”)
- A likely short shelf-life, or too narrow a focus
- A topic which is marginal and unimportant
- Irremediably bad writing

PUBLICATION PROCESS

ALL ARTICLES SUBMITTED to the journal are reviewed internally, and most are reviewed by three or more outside reviewers who do not know the identity of the author. Outside reviewers include members of the editorial board and individuals who are recognized authorities on the subject of the reviewed article. Reviews ordinarily take two to three months.

The editors may return the article to the author with requests for specific changes before circulating it to outside reviewers.

The editors make the decision on acceptance based on their evaluation and the outside reviews. If the editors believe that readers' comments would be helpful to authors whose articles are not accepted, the comments are sometimes forwarded to the authors after being edited and rendered anonymous. Editorial policy does not otherwise provide for transmitting readers' evaluations to authors. Authors of rejected articles are sometimes encouraged to revise and resubmit. Publication schedule means that articles may be edited and revised in a very short period of time between acceptance and transmittal to the typesetter. Authors may be required to revise one or more times after acceptance, in response to reviewers' and editors' suggestions.

Authors receive page proofs of their articles about one month after articles are sent to the typesetter. The authors have about a week to review the articles and make corrections and alterations.

The journal does not pay honoraria. It provides authors with one copy of the journal issue in which their article appeared and twenty-five off-prints of the article. Additional off-prints of the article may be ordered before publication.

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

ARTICLES SUBMITTED to *Security Studies* must be original contributions and should not be under consideration for any other publication at the same time. If an article is scheduled for publication elsewhere (for example, as a book chapter or in a collection of essays), the author should clearly indicate this at the time of submission and provide the details.

To facilitate review, authors should follow these guidelines:

The manuscript should be double-spaced, printed on one side only, and accompanied by a brief abstract (100–200 words) and the manuscript's word or character count. The title page should include an approximate draft date.

Authors should provide:

- Six hard-copies of the manuscript. The first page of the manuscript should carry only the article's title.
- The article's title page, the abstract, and the author's acknowledgments should each be provided on a single page, separate from the manuscript.
- A MS Word for Windows version of the article on disc.
- Self-addressed, postage-paid envelope.
- An e-mail address, and phone and fax numbers.

There is no maximum or minimum length for articles, but 5,000-15,000 words is appropriate. The editors suggest 10,000–12,000 words as the preferable length.

The reviewing of manuscripts is based on the anonymity of the author and the confidentiality of readers' and editors' reports. The author's name should appear only on the title page attached to the article. Authors should refrain from otherwise identifying themselves in their manuscripts (for example, in a running header or with first-person references in the notes to their own previous work). If such identification is unavoidable, authors should tag or otherwise make note of each place in which they are identified. Editorial policy does not provide for transmitting readers' evaluations to authors.

STYLE

There are no style requirements for submitted articles, but authors of articles accepted for publication should make their articles comply with the journal's style and format conventions. *Security Stud-*

ies follows the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993). The journal follows American spelling, as offered in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, unabridged (Springfield: Merriam, 1976).

NOTE FORMAT

1. Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 120-27.
2. Barry R. Posen, "Measuring the European Conventional Balance: Coping with Complexity in Threat Assessment," *International Security* 10, no. 3 (winter 1984/85): 74-75.
3. Charles L. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," in *Realism: Restatements and Renewal*, ed. Benjamin Frankel (London: Frank Cass, 1996), 122-64.
4. John J. Mearsheimer, "Will Iraq Fight or Fold Its Tent? Liberation in Less than a Week," *New York Times*, 8 February 1991, A23.

STYLESHEET AND CONVENTIONS

ARTICLES SUBMITTED for publication in *Security Studies* should follow the journal's style and format conventions.

FORMAT CONVENTIONS

On all matters of usage, format, punctuation, and other questions of style, follow the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th edition.

SUMMARY INTRODUCTION

Authors should open their articles with a summary introduction that tells readers what question they address, what their argument will be, how the argument builds on or takes issue with existing scholarship, what is new about their research or argument, and why it matters. The author should address these topics in the introduction:

- What questions do you address?
- Why and how have these questions arisen?
- What answers do you offer?
- Do you apply, refine, or reject an important theory in the field? If you reject an accepted theory, do you offer one in its place?
- Do you consult new sources?
- Do you consult accepted sources but arrive at radically different conclusions?
- Do your conclusions settle outstanding theoretical or historical questions?
- Do they mandate the rethinking of basic issues?
- Do they suggest certain policy choices or areas for further research?

The introduction should also describe the article's architecture and logic of presentation: "In the first section I will discuss this, in the second section I will discuss that." For good introductions to scholarly articles, see the summary introductions by Lynn-Jones, *ss* 4, no. 4, 660–64; Thayer, *ss* 3, no. 3, 428–31; Hellmann and Wolf, *ss* 3, no. 1, 3–5; Lautenschlager in *is* 11, no. 3, 94–97; Mearsheimer, *is* 11, no. 2, 3–5; Mearsheimer, *is* 15, no. 1, 5–10; and Van Evera, *is* 15, no. 3, 7–11.

NOTES

Notes lend moral authority to scholarship.¹ In *Security Studies* notes should not be limited to citations, but should place the article in context by providing a bibliography of and summarizing the current literature on the subject, directing the reader to the important previous work on the topic.² Early in the article the author should include a note or notes which evaluate the existing literature, telling the reader which works are good, which are poor, and where they stand on the subject of the article.

1. Anthony Grafton, *The Tragic Origins of the German Footnote* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, forthcoming), quoted in William H. Honan, "Footnotes Offering Fewer Answers," *New York Times*, 14 August 1996, B9.

2. We agree with Gertrude Himmelfarb's reminder of the importance of footnotes in scholarship. See Gertrude Himmelfarb, "Where Have All the Footnotes Gone?" *New York Times Review of Books*, 16 June 1991, 1, 24. See also "Letters," *New York Times Review of Books*, 14 July 1991, 29. The criticism of the heavy use of footnotes in scholarship has been under increasing attack since the mid-1980s. See Honan, "Footnotes Offering Fewer Answers"; and letters in the correspondence section, *New York Times*, 19 August 1996, A12.

Emphasize those works with which you agree and those which you criticize. Include arguments as well as sources in your notes. See examples of good notes in: Lynn-Jones, *ss* 4, no. 4, n. 1; Hellmann and Wolf, *ss* 3, no. 1, nn. 1, 3, 52; Tahyer, *ss* 3, no. 3, nn. 5, 44; Blackwill, *is* 12, no. 4, n. 33; Kohn and Harahan, *is* 12, no. 4, n. 6; Posen and Van Evera, *is* 8, no. 1, nn. 7, 13; Lautenschlager, *is* 11, no. 3, n. 37; and Mearsheimer, *is* 11, no. 2, nn. 4, 7.

SPELLING

The journal uses American spelling (defense, mobilization, armor, color). British spellings (defence, mobilisation, armour, colour) should be retained only in quoted material, titles, or names (Labour Party; Ministry of Defence). For preferred spelling, see Webster's *Third New International Dictionary*, unabridged.

OURS AND THEIRS

The journal is an international publication. Avoid references to "us" and "them" or "our" and "their" in favor of specific reference to "U.S. allies," "Russian troops," "Chinese doctrine," "NATO budgets."

EXPLAIN TERMS

The journal's articles will be read for many years. Acronyms, colloquialisms, and terms of art may not be well known in a decade. Provide explanations accordingly. Acronyms must be spelled out where they first appear [Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF)]. Provide definitions of key terms if they do not appear in a collegiate dictionary.

SECTION HEADINGS

Use headings and subheadings to the third level (or to the fourth, if absolutely necessary), especially in longer articles, to help the reader follow your argument. Headings should be short and easy to grasp at a glance. Avoid multipart titles. Capitalize all words of the heading except articles, coordinate conjunctions, prepositions, and the "to" in infinitives, unless they are the first or last word of the title: *To Be or Not to Be*; *The Wind in the Willows*; *A Guide to Authors*.

STYLE CONVENTIONS

GOOD WRITING³

Use vivid verbs and concrete nouns. Do not bolster lifeless verbs and vague nouns with modifiers. "Write with nouns and verbs, not with adjectives and adverbs....The adjective hasn't been built that can pull a weak or inaccurate noun out of a tight place."⁴ My short list of tips for better writing includes the following: 1. Omit needless words; 2. avoid restricting modifiers, hedges, intensive adverbs, emphatics, jargon, vogue words, popular solecisms, and empty words; 3. Follow traditional rules of good writing; 4. Avoid noun clusters; 5. Avoid contractions. Here are the details:

3. See "A Note on Writing for *Security Studies*."

4. William Strunk Jr. and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*, 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1972), 64.

1. Omit Needless Words⁵

A. Prune wordy, baggy, and flabby sentences to make them leaner and clearer, more muscular, graceful and effective. Candidates for deletion, trimming, or rewording:

- *Weak verbs*: An inert verb such as *to be* (am, are, is, were, was, being, been); actionless, vague verbs like *have* or *exist*; the passive form (the verb *to be* plus the *past participle*, for example: is seen, was believed)
- *Ponderous nouns*: Long Latinate nouns with endings like *tion*, *ment*, and *ence*
- *Strings of prepositional phrases*: Consider the following sentence:

How greatly Goethe was under the spell of the single ideal of beauty in his classicistic period is illustrated by the fact that he was pleased when readers could not distinguish between his and Schiller's anonymous publications.

By cutting the number of prepositional phrases from five to two and using the active, we get:

The concept of a single ideal of beauty so captivated Goethe in his classicistic period that he was pleased....

- *Meaningless modifiers and empty prose additives*: See "Avoid the Following" below.

B. Condense. Consider condensing loose sentences.

- Replace nouns or adjectives sandwiched between a weak verb and a preposition with an active verb:

is indicative of	indicates
have an influence on	influence
gives consideration to	considers
make an assessment of	assess
is capable of	can
make use of	use
is of interest to	interests
is a benefit to	benefits
- Convert a prepositional phrase to an adjective or an adverb:

of great complexity	complex
at this point in time	now
of extreme importance	extremely important
on many occasions	often
- When an *of* phrase follows a noun ending in *tion*, change the noun to a gerund:

by the implementation of	by implementing
in the creation of	in creating
in the discussion of	in discussing
by the addition of	by adding
- Examine relative clauses and common prepositional compounds for condensation or deletion.

⁵ Strunk and White, *The Elements of Style*, 17. The examples in this section are from Claire Kehrwald Cook, *Line by Line: How to Improve Your Own Writing* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985), 1–17. Cook offers a useful discussion on how to correct loose sentences.

2. Avoid the Following:

- Restricting modifiers:⁶ Rather, quite, somewhat, fairly, pretty, little, relatively
- Hedges: Usually, often, sometimes, almost, possibly, perhaps, apparently, seemingly, in some ways, to a certain extent, sort of, somewhat, more or less, for the most part, for all intents and purposes, in some respects, in my opinion at least, may, might, can, could, seem, tend, try, attempt, seek, hope
- Intensive adverbs:⁷ Very, really, truly, actually, absolutely, extremely, literally, essentially, basically, importantly, positively, definitely, virtually
- Emphatics: As everyone knows, it is generally agreed that, it is quite true that, it has been argued that, it is clear that, it is obvious that, the fact is, as we can plainly see, clearly, obviously, undoubtedly, certainly, of course, indeed, inevitably, invariably, always, key, central, crucial, basic, fundamental, cardinal, primary, principal, essential, practically
- Jargon, vogue words, popular solecisms, empty words, buzz-words, and meaningless modifiers:

Exercise: “Buzz-Word Generator”

The social sciences are especially susceptible to bloodless jargon, described by Fowler as “words that cloud the minds alike of those who use them and those who read them.”⁸ The Canadian Defense Department has invented a tool useful in detecting jargon. It is called the “buzz-word generator”:⁹

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3
0. integrated	0. management	0. options
1. over	1. organizational	1. flexibility
2. systematized	2. monitored	2. capability
3. parallel	3. reciprocal	3. mobility
4. functional	4. digital	4. programming
5. responsive	5. logistical	5. concept
6. optimal	6. transitional	6. time-phase
7. synchronized	7. incremental	7. projection
8. compatible	8. third-generation	8. hardware
9. balanced	9. policy	9. contingency

The procedure is simple. You think of a three-digit number at random, and take the corresponding word from each column. Thus, 733 gives you “synchronized reciprocal mobility”; 917 gives “balanced organizational projection”; 372 gives “parallel incremental capability,” and so on. The buzz-generator thus gives its users “instant expertise in matters pertaining to defence,” enabling them to invest everything they write, not with any particular meaning, but with “that proper ring of decisive, progressive, knowledgeable authority.”

An article recently submitted to *Security Studies* contained the phrase “integrated policy spectrum,” a phrase that could have been constructed by using the buzz-word generator.

A social science buzz-word generator would include the following words (to mention but a few), which you should avoid: And/or, caveat (as a verb), critique (as a verb), different than, employ (to

6. Strunk and White write that “these are the leeches that infest the pond of prose, sucking the blood of words” (Strunk and White, *The Elements of Style*, 65).

7. Cook writes that authors “should delete all intensive adverbs...The adverbs reduce powerful adjectives to conversational gush, depriving them of their stark force” (Cook, *Line by Line*, 15–16).

8. H. W. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, 2nd ed., rev. Ernest Gowers (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 315.

9. Quoted in Gowers, *The Complete Plain Words*, 89.

mean “use”), experience (as a verb), expertise, finalize, firstly, funds (as a verb), hopefully, impact (especially as a verb), interface (as a verb), interact, kind of, learning curve, monies, narrative, ongoing, overall, opportunity space, preparatory to, previous to, prior to, prioritize, presently, promulgate, purportedly, societal, upcoming, utilize, kind of, generally, certain, particular, individual, given, various, specific, different, for all intents and purposes.

3. *Disputed Usage*

Follow traditional rules of good writing. *Do not* split infinitives; *do not* end a sentence with a preposition; *do not* begin a sentence with “but,” “and,” “so,” “however,” or “for example”; *do not* treat *than* as a preposition taking the object (“smarter than me”), but as a conjunction taking the subject (“smarter than I”); *do not* use the object as a predicate nominative (“it is her”)—use the subject (“it is she”).¹⁰

4. *Noun Clusters*

Avoid. Write: method of reviewing arms control agreements, *not* arms control agreements review method.

5. *Contractions*

Avoid (except if part of a direct quotation). Use do not, cannot, does not. *Do not* use don't, can't, doesn't.

CAPITALIZATION

The journal has a distinct preference for the lowercase; we discourage excessive use of capital letters: President George Bush—but u.s. president Bush, the Bush presidency, the Bush administration, the president argued with the secretary of state and the secretary of defense over the administration's foreign policy.

It is permissible to change the first letter of a quotation (in text or block quotation) from capital to lower case or vice versa to fit the syntax of the sentence or the paragraph, without signifying the change by brackets. Any other change of the first letter of a quotation must be signaled by enclosing the changed letter in brackets.

ABBREVIATIONS

Avoid overuse of abbreviations to represent names of agencies, departments, and organizations. Always spell out first occurrence of an abbreviation. If only a few references occur, use the full title for the first reference, then “the commission” or “the department,” rather than “the FTC” or “DOD.” If an unfamiliar name and its abbreviation appear only once and do not appear until much later, give the full name again. If the name appears soon after it is given in full, the abbreviation alone should be used.

Acronyms. Always spell out first occurrence of an acronym in an article. Form plurals by adding “s” without apostrophe. MIRVS, ICBMS (similarly, MIRved).

Periods. Use only with U.S. and U.K.; do not use periods in abbreviations of agencies, organizations, or institutions (USSR, NATO, DCI, EEC, UN, MIT).

10. See discussion in appendix 2: Benjamin Frankel, “Abiding Tradition: Writing, Style, and English Usage.”

Spaces. In an abbreviation with internal periods (Ph.D., N.Y., U.S.), there should be no space after the internal periods. Initials of personal names, however, are followed by regular word spaces (J. F. C. Fuller; G. D. Sheffield; Ian F. W. Beckett).

Possessive. Do not make abbreviations possessive: the UN action or the United Nations' action, or the action of the United Nations, *not* the UN's action.

SPELL OUT

In text, spell out abbreviations and symbols: use percent, *not* %; for example, *not* e.g.; that is, *not* i.e.; short-title form, *not* op.cit. or loc.cit..¹¹ You may use abbreviations and symbols in notes and tables.

COMPOUNDS

There are three types of compound words¹²:

- *Open compounds.* A combination of words closely associated to constitute a single concept, but that are spelled as separate words (decision making, peace keeping, settlement house, stool pigeon)
- *Hyphenated compounds.* A combination of words joined by a hyphen (war-winning, war-fighting, kilowatt-hour, mass-produced)
- *Solid (or close) compounds.* A combination of two or more elements, originally separate words but now spelled as one word (policymaker, decisionmaker, typesetting, henhouse, makeup, notebook)

The trend in spelling compound words has been away from the use of the hyphen: The tendency is to spell compounds solid as soon as acceptance warrants their being considered permanent compounds, and otherwise to spell them open. In weighing the spelling of a compound, do the following:

Consult the unabridged Webster. Many compounds used as nouns will be found in it.

- The use of a hyphen may be determined by whether the compound is permanent or temporary:
 - A *temporary* compound used as an adjective before a noun is usually hyphenated: short-term effects, six-day war. Thus “a fast-sailing ship” would describe a ship that at the moment is sailing fast (*temporary*), while “a fast sailing ship” would describe a ship with the general characteristic of fleetness (*permanent*).
 - A *temporary object + gerund* compound is spelled open: decision making, policy making, problem solving, coal mining, bird watching. A *permanent object + gerund* compound is spelled closed: bookkeeping, dressmaking.
- An *object + present participle* compound is hyphenated before the noun: decision-making process, policy-making role, interest-bearing account, thought-provoking article.
- A *cardinal number + unit of measurement* compound is hyphenated before the noun: five-year plan, twentieth-century warfare, three-mile limit, seventh-inning stretch.

Word-forming prefixes generate compounds that are nearly always closed, whether they are nouns, verbs, adjectives, or adverbs:

anti — antithesis, antitank (but anti-hero, anti-utopian)

11. See “Note Format.”

12. See discussion in *CMS*, 14th ed., 202–4, 219–31.

co — coauthor, coordinate, coeditor (but co-opt, co-op)
 extra — extraterrestrial, extrafine, extraordinary
 inter — international, interrelated, interregnum
 intra — intrazonal, intraarterial
 non — nonviolent, nonplus
 over — overlong, overanalyze, overeager, overpowered
 post — postdoctoral, postwar, postface
 pre — preempt, precognition
 pro — progovernment, procathedral
 psycho — psychoanalysis, psychodrama
 re — reunify, reexamine, reelect
 semi — semiopaque, semiconductor (but semi-independent)
 socio — sociopathology, socioeconomic
 sub — subbasement, subjacent
 super — supertanker, superpose
 trans — transnational, transsocietal
 under — underused, undersea, underpowered

Exceptions.¹³ The chief exceptions to the closed-style rule are the following:

- Compounds in which the second element is a capitalized word or a numeral: anti-Semitic, un-American, pre-1945, post-Marxian
- Compounds that must be distinguished from homographs: re-cover, un-ionized, re-create
- Compounds in which the second element consists of more than one word: non-English-speaking peoples, post-decision-making period, pre-cold war (note that in the last example an en-dash is used rather than a hyphen, because the prefix is added to an open compound)
- A few compounds in which the last letter of the prefix is the same as the first letter of the word following: anti-inflammatory, post-test (also note examples above)
- When the absence of a hyphen may lead to misleading or puzzling forms: non-native, anti-intellectual, co-worker, pro-union
- When the prefix stands alone: over- and underused, macro- and microeconomics

POSSESSIVE

Add “s” to singular nouns, even those ending in “s,” to form the possessive. For plural nouns, add the apostrophe only: Jones’s remarks, Helms’s staff, the Jones’ house, many officials’ rulings.

PERCENT

Spell as one word, following a figure: 40 percent; 75 percent, *not* 40% or forty percent. The sign % may be used in tables, but not in text. The word *percent* should be used only after a figure; otherwise use *percentage* or *proportion*: A higher proportion (percentage) favors the bill than opposes it, *not* higher percent favors.... Although figures are used with percentages, spell out the numbers for percentage points: A drop in the annual inflation rate from 10 percent to 5 percent is a change of 50 percent or five percentage points.

NUMBERS

13. See *CMS*, 14th ed., 230–31.

Spell out whole numbers from one through ninety-nine, and any of these followed by hundred, thousand, million, etc. (eighty-two, six, seventy-two million). When a choice exists, a spelled out number is preferable (fifteen hundred rather than 1,500).

Use numerals:

- For numbers above ninety-nine (600 ships).
- When spelled out numbers would cluster thickly in a sentence or paragraph (the ages of the supreme court justices are 69, 75, 72, 54, 64, and 43).
- When numbers above and below 100 are used in a sentence (seven warheads were defective, but: of the 233 warheads, 7 were defective; twenty-one accidents, but: 21 of 370 accidents).
- For technical notation: 3:1 force ratio; 3 Mt bomb.
- For percentages, decimals, ratios (32 percent; fifty-nine cents, but: \$0.59; a 5:1 ratio, a score of 5 to 3).

DATES

Designation of dates should follow CMS rules on inclusive numbers: 1986–90, 1914–18, *but* 1900–1901, 1597–1601; from 1986 to 1990, *not* from 1986–90. In decades, *do not* use apostrophes, *do not* drop the first two digits, and *do not* express them in words rather than figures: 1950s, *not* 1950's or the fifties.

All exact dates in the text and notes should be written in the sequence of day–month–year, without internal punctuation: 1 January 1991; 10 December 1990 (exception: when a date appears in a direct quotation, or is a part of a book, article, or document title, the original sequence should be maintained). *Do not* elide digits in the article's title or headings.

COMMAS

Commas should separate a series of three or more: red, white, and blue, *not* red, white and blue. Commas and periods should appear inside quotation marks.

QUOTATION MARKS

Quotation marks should be used sparingly to indicate irony. They should be used only the first time the ironic term appears. They should *not* be used around a term following “so-called” or around rhetorical questions (as in: We must ask, then, Why?).

ITALICS

In manuscripts are indicated by *underlining*.¹⁴

Italics for emphasis should be used sparingly. *Do not* italicize commonly used foreign words (blitzkrieg, a priori, mea culpa, coup d'état, vis-à-vis, status quo, sine qua non, laissez faire), or scholarly abbreviations (et al., ibid., passim). In close cases, or when in doubt (raison d'être, inter alia, glasnost, perestroika), err on the side of italicization.

SPECIAL EFFECTS

We strongly discourage the use of italics or quotation marks to achieve special effects (see the examples discussed above: italics for emphasis, or quotation marks to suggest irony or special usage

14. Exception: In manuscripts submitted in Microsoft Word, *italicized text* should be in *italics*.

of words). Special effects should be obtained structurally—for example, by recasting a sentence. The journal also has a distinct preference for the lowercase; we discourage excessive use of capital letters.

BRACKETS

Use brackets rather than parentheses to enclose interpolations in quoted material: [emphasis added]

LISTS

Lists may be either displayed or run-on. Displayed lists present each item on a new line after either a number (a figure followed by a period) or a small bullet. Bullets are preferred. If the items consist of more than one paragraph each, however, numbers help the reader follow the sequence; if the items are referred to later in the text, numbers help the reader find the correct ones; and if separate lists occur close to each other, numbers show clearly where one list ends and another begins.

Run-on lists present all the items within the same paragraph, with each item following a figure within parentheses and without a period, as in: The following items: (1)...; (2)...; (3)...; *not* (1.) or 1).

In both types of lists, all items must be parallel in construction and styling; if one item is a word, a phrase, or a sentence, all other items in the list must be too. In displayed lists no punctuation follows any item unless the list consists of complete sentences.

NEWSPAPERS

The city is part of the name (*New York Times*), but the “the” is not, and should be omitted from citations. When a reference is made to a newspaper, the “the” should be lowercased and not italicized (as when referring to the *New York Times*).

PRESS, BOOK, PUBLISHER

Generally omit “Publishing Company,” “Press,” etc. and use short form (Ballinger, Westview, Greenwood), except:

- University presses (for example, University of Chicago Press)
- Where confusion might result (Basic Books, Naval Institute Press) or when press name is not well known

STATES

If there is a possibility of confusion regarding the location of publication of a source, a state’s name should be abbreviated and included in footnote reference to place of publication (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger; but: Cambridge: Harvard University Press). A state’s name should also be used to identify a congressman or a senator (Senator Sam Nunn, D-Ga.).

Use *CMS* abbreviations, not postal code. Examples: Calif., *not* CA; N. Mex., *not* N.M.; Colo., *not* CO; W. Va., *not* W.V.. The word *state* is not capitalized: the state of Indiana, state law.

NOTE FORMAT

FULL REFERENCE

A source should be given a full reference the first time it is cited. Items to be included in a full reference in the order in which they are normally given:

Book

Author's full name
 Complete title of the book, underlined
 Editor, compiler, or translator, if any
 Series, if any, and volume or number in the series
 Edition, if not the original
 Number of volumes
 Facts of publication (city where published, publisher, date of publication)—in parentheses
 Volume number, if any
 Page number(s) of the particular citation

Article in Periodical

Author's full name
 Title of the article, in quotation marks
 Name of the periodical, underlined
 Volume number and issue number of the periodical
 Date of the volume and of the issue
 Page number(s) of the particular citation

Shortened References

After the first, full reference in a note, subsequent references to a particular source are shortened. *Security Studies* does not use either *op. cit.* or *loc. cit.*

- A shortened reference to a book includes only the last name of the author(s) and the short title of the book, followed by the page number of the reference.
- A shortened reference to a periodical article includes only the last name of the author(s) and the short title of the article, in quotation marks, followed by the page number of the reference.
- "Ed.," "trans.," and "comp." following a name in the first, full reference may be omitted from subsequent, shortened references. If a work has two or three authors, the last name of each should be given; for more than three authors, the last name of the first author followed by "et al." or "and others."

Examples: Full Reference

1. Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 120–27.
2. Barry R. Posen, "Measuring the European Conventional Balance: Coping with Complexity in Threat Assessment," *International Security* 10, no. 3 (winter 1984/85): 74–75.
3. Charles L. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," in *Realism: Restatements and Renewal*, ed. Benjamin Frankel (London: Frank Cass, 1996), 122–64.
4. Stephen Van Evera, "Causes of War" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1984), 41.
5. Benjamin Frankel, "A New Continent Emerges Full of Old Uncertainties," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 October 1989, M2.

Shortened References

1. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, 150–53.
2. Posen, "Measuring the Conventional Balance," 70, n. 30.
3. *Ibid.*, 72 [where the immediately preceding note contains only the relevant reference].

4. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists," 130.
5. Van Evera, "Causes of War," 100.
6. Frankel, "A New Continent Emerges," M2.

Reference Numbers

The abbreviations p. and pp. should be omitted from page references in source citations unless the number would be ambiguous without it, for example, in a note reference consisting only of a page number (no author or title): 6. P. 7; 10. Pp. 71–75; or in some case when immediately following another number not enclosed in parentheses: Wittgenstien, *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, par. 19, p. 24. Inclusive numbers are separated by an en dash and should be abbreviated as follows:

First Number	Second Number	Examples
Less than 100	Use all digits	3–10; 71–72
100 or multiple of 100	Use all digits	100–104; 200–220; 600–613; 1100–1123
101 through 109 (in multiples of 100)	Use changed part only, omitting unneeded zeros	107–8; 505–17; 1002–6
110 through 199 (in multiples of 100)	Use two digits or more as needed	321–25; 415–532; 1536–38; 11564–68; 13792–803
		If numbers are four digits long and three digits change, use all digits: 1496–1504; 2787–2816

EXAMPLES

The following samples illustrate *Security Studies* note format. When in doubt, check the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th edition.

Books, manuscripts

Book. Note order of items, placement of punctuation, use of the author's full name, including middle initial, and page references. Note reference to page numbers (see explanation above of inclusive numbers):

1. Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 35–45, 100–103, 191–213.
2. Charles L. Glaser, *Analyzing Strategic Nuclear Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 103–4, 266–74.

Article or chapter in edited volume. Note use of book's full title and subtitle; note that in citations of an article or essay in an edited volume, the title of the edited volume precedes the name(s) of the volume's editor(s): When the editor's name comes after the title of the volume, the function is usually abbreviated ed. (here meaning "edited by," and thus never "eds."—even when the volume is edited by more than one editor):

1. Eliot A. Cohen, "Toward Better Net Assessment: Rethinking the European Conventional Balance," in *Conventional Forces and American Defense Policy: An International Security Reader*, ed. Steven E. Miller and Sean M. Lynn-Jones (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 176–215.
2. Robert Jervis, "Domino Beliefs and Strategic Behavior," in *Dominoes and Bandwagons: Strategic Beliefs and Great Power Competition in the Eurasian Rimland*, ed. Robert Jervis and Jack Snyder (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 20–50.
3. João Resende-Santos, "Anarchy and the Emulation of Military Systems: Military Organization and Technology in South America, 1870–1914," in *Realism: Restatements and Renewal*, ed. Benjamin Frankel (London: Frank Cass, 1996).

Volume in a series. Volume numbers for books are always given in Arabic figures even if Roman numerals are used in the cited volume; use chap. (or chaps.) for chapter(s); pt. (or pts.) for part(s); vol. (or vols.) for volume(s) where appropriate; note that in references to an edited volume as a whole (rather than to one of the essays in it), the title of the edited volume follows the name(s) of the volume's editor(s): When the editor's name comes before the title of the volume, the function is abbreviated ed. or eds., depending on the number of editors:

1. Marc Trachtenberg, ed., *The Development of American Strategic Thought*, 6 vols., vol. 3 (New York: Garland, 1988), chap. 4.
2. Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower*, vol. 2, *The President* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1985), chaps. 7, 8.
3. Robert Jervis and Jack Snyder, eds., *Dominoes and Bandwagons: Strategic Beliefs and Great Power Competition in the Eurasian Rimland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Annual. Note the introduction and use of acronym:

1. International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), *The Military Balance, 1987–1988* (London: IISS, 1987), 63.

Translated and edited version; multi-volume work. When the editor's (translator's, compiler's) name comes after the title, the function is usually abbreviated: ed. (here meaning "edited by," and thus never "eds."); trans. ("translated by"); comp. ("compiled by"; never "comps.");

1. Luigi Albertini, *The Origins of the War of 1914*, 3 vols., trans. and ed. Isabella M. Massey (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), 171.
2. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, trans. J. J. Graham, ed. Anatol Rapoport (New York: Penguin, 1981), 136.

Reprint or revised and enlarged edition. Note that "Dell" stands alone without "Books," but full name of University Press is given:

1. Bernard Brodie and Fawn M. Brodie, *From Crossbow to H-Bomb* (New York: Dell, 1962; rev. and enl. ed., Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973).

Paper in a series. Note use of IISS acronym which has been introduced in an earlier note; "summer 1983" per publisher's dating system:

1. Desmond Ball, *Targeting for Strategic Deterrence*, Adelphi Paper no. 185 (London: IISS, summer 1983), 12.
2. Sean M. Lynn-Jones, *International Security Studies after the Cold War: An Agenda for the Future*, CSIA Discussion Paper 91-11 (Cambridge: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, December 1991), 34–38.
3. Dean Wilkening, *A Future Targeting Doctrine for U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces*, CTS-23-90, Center for Technical Studies on Security, Energy, and Arms Control (Livermore, Calif.: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, 18 June 1991), 6–9.

Unpublished paper or dissertation. Note that titles of unpublished ms. are always in quotation marks:

1. John J. Mearsheimer, "The Future of Europe" (paper presented at the Flagstaff Conference, Ditchley, England, 17–19 February 1990), 3.

2. Stephen Van Evera, "Causes of War" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1984), 1.

Government report. Subsequent citations may use U.S. GPO abbreviation:

1. Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger, *Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1984* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office [U.S. GPO], 1983), 127.

Congressional reports. For testimony, list individual first; note use of "p." for page reference to avoid ambiguity resulting from proximity to another number (see explanation of inclusive numbers):

1. Theodore A. Postol, "Lessons for SDI from the Gulf War PATRIOT Experience: A Technical Perspective," testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, 16 April 1991, 2.
2. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *The Mutual Security Act of 1956*, 84th Cong., 2nd sess., 1956, S. Rept. 2273, p. 20.

Archival material. Give title of cited item first and supply all bibliographic data necessary to permit identification and location of source; use consistent format throughout. See, for example, *CMS* 15.374–76. Where there are repeated references to particular archives, introduce a short form for similar references in subsequent notes:

1. Leven C. Allen to Joint Chiefs of Staff, 26 May 1950, and memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, n.d. CCS 383.21 Korea (3-19-45), sec. 21, Records of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, Record Group 218, National Archives.

Periodicals

Journal articles. Note order and punctuation of elements; include the full name of the author, with middle initials where appropriate; full title in quotation marks; volume number (always given in Arabic figures even if the cited journal uses Roman numerals); issue number; and date, per publication's numbering and dating system. Note especially:

- The word "vol." is not used
- The volume number (always in Arabic figures) is separated from the journal's name by one space without a comma
- The "n" in "no." is always in lowercase
- The names of seasons are in lowercase (winter, summer, etc.)
- The colons placed immediately after the closing parenthesis
- Page references are separated from the colons by one space

1. Marc Trachtenberg, "The Meaning of Mobilization in 1914," *International Security* 15, no. 3 (winter 1990/91): 120–50.
2. Jack Snyder, "International Leverage on Soviet Domestic Change," *World Politics* 42, no. 1 (October 1989): 1–30.
3. Robert A. Pape Jr., "Coercive Air Power in the Vietnam War," *International Security* 15, no. 2 (fall 1990): 103–46

Popular periodicals and dailies carrying no volume or issue numbers: Note that parentheses are not needed when full date (day, month, year) is used in citing daily newspapers or weeklies; authors and page numbers should be included where available; punctuation of titles should be copied exactly rather than conform to *Security Studies* style.

Titles: The initial "The" is omitted from the cited newspaper's name; city name is italicized as part of newspaper name: *New York Times*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Sacramento Bee*. If the city's name is not part of the cited newspaper's title, and there is a possibility of confusion regarding the source of citation, add the city's name in parentheses after the newspaper's title: *Times* (London).

1. John J. Mearsheimer, "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War," *Atlantic Monthly* (August 1990): 35–50
2. Gerard C. Smith, "Time is Running Out," *Newsweek*, 31 January 1983, 8.
3. John J. Mearsheimer, "Will Iraq Fight or Fold Its Tent? Liberation in Less than a Week," *New York Times*, 8 February 1991, A23.

General Information on Notes

For less-common citation forms, see the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

State or country name, if ambiguous or not widely known, should follow the place of publication (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger; Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall; but New York: Knopf). Use standard abbreviations (Calif., Mass., Washington, D.C.), rather than zip-code style (MA, CA). Anglicize foreign place names, but retain standard English version of publisher's name (Moscow: Gospolizdat, 1949).

3. Avoid extracts and paragraphing in notes.

FREQUENTLY USED WORDS AND TERMS

Observe the distinctions among the following:

as/because	as/like	assure/ensure/insure
alternate/alternative	anticipate/expect	apt/liable/likely
before/prior to	between/among	compared to / compared with/
for/because/since	forego/forgo	historic/historical
although/while	can/may	contrast with / contrast to
convince/persuade	data/datum	due to/because of
effect/affect	farther/further	fewer/less
impact/affect/effect	infer/imply	may/might
on/upon	oral/verbal	past year/last year
percent/percentage	percent/percentage point	principle/principal
proven/proved	purported/alleged	com- prise/compose/constitute
represent/comprise	shall/will	quote (verb)/ quotation (noun)
should/would	that/which/who	use/utilize/employ
via/through/by		

Administration	<i>not</i> capitalized
Advisers	<i>not</i> advisors
armored-division equivalent	<i>no</i> caps, but acronyms is ADE in caps
author/coauthor	are nouns, <i>not</i> verbs, and "coauthor" is <i>not</i> hyphenated. "He is coauthor of the book," <i>not</i> "He coauthored the book"
Blitzkrieg	lowercase, <i>no</i> italics
cease-fire	hyphenate
cold war	lowercase
Communist party	capitalize "Communism" when referring to a political party, <i>but</i> lowercase when referring to communism, the communist movement, the communist doctrine. Lowercase "party," except where "Party" is used in place of the full name ("Communist party's control," <i>but</i> "the Party's control")
Congress	capitalize, <i>but</i> lowercase congressional, congressional hearings, congressman
decision making, policy making, peace keeping	open compound when used as a noun (these are object + gerund noun compounds) (other examples: problem solving; bird watching)
decision-making process, policy-making agency, peace-keeping force	hyphenated compound when used as an adjective (these are object + present participle adjective compounds) (other examples: interest-bearing account; mind-boggling story)
decisionmaker, policymaker	close compound (<i>but</i> : peace maker should be spelled open)
détente	with accent. <i>No</i> italics
etc.	use only if what it represents is unmistakable. a, b, c, etc., <i>but not</i> : France, Sweden, Spain, etc.
FRUS, IISS	must be fully spelled on first occurrence: Foreign Relations of the United States, International Institute of Strategic Studies. Subsequent citations may use the acronym.
kiloton	is abbreviated lowercase kt
Labour, Labor	observe party's own spelling preference: British Labour Party; Israeli Labor Party
Megaton	is abbreviated Mt, with uppercase M
MIT	for Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or MIT Press, without periods
modeling	one 'l' for this and similar constructs (traveled, <i>not</i> travelled; focusing, focused; toward, <i>not</i> towards)

mujahidin	spelling approved by the <i>Middle East Journal</i>
nautical miles	is abbreviated nmi without period following
nonnuclear	close compound
postwar	close compound
RAND	RAND Corporation, <i>not</i> Rand Corporation. RAND citations should include RAND number if available: Charles Wolf, Jr., et al., <i>The Costs of the Soviet Empire</i> , R-3073/1-NA (Santa Monica: RAND, 1983).
secretary-general (of the UN)	hyphenate
sizable	<i>not</i> sizeable. Webster's preferred spelling
superpowers	lowercase
undersecretary	one word
United States	as a noun; use U.S. only as adjective. <i>Do not</i> use U.S.'s (possessive form)
vice-president	hyphenate
War	generally capitalize: Vietnam War, Second World War (<i>but</i> : cold war)
war-fighting, war-winning	hyphenated compounds
Washington, D.C.	with comma, with periods
West, East	use caps when reference is to political division; Western Europe, the West
World War II World War I	avoid. Use Second World War, First World War

WRITING ARTICLES FOR PUBLICATION: THE INSIDE SCOOP

STEPHEN VAN EVERA

I OFTEN MAKE THE following suggestions to students who are drafting manuscripts for submission to scholarly journals.¹

TOPIC SELECTION

Write about important questions that are relevant to real problems confronting the real world. As Hans Morgenthau laments, many social scientists hide in “the trivial, the formal, the methodological, the purely theoretical, the remotely historical—in short, the politically irrelevant.”² The roots of this dysfunctional conduct are something of a mystery. Being relevant is more fun, better for the world, and a good career move: scholars who advance bold arguments win more plaudits than brickbats if their scholarship is sound. During my days at *International Security*, many submissions bit the dust because they could not pass the “so what?” test—“the author’s research seems sound, but so what? Have we learned anything important?” Even well-done submissions seldom survived if they addressed insignificant questions.

INTRODUCTION FORMAT

Begin your article with a summary introduction. This introduction should answer six questions:

1. What question or questions do you address?
2. Why do these questions arise? From what literature or events? What previous literature has been written on these questions? What is the “state of the art” on the subject?
3. If a substantial literature has appeared on the subject you address, you should list and discuss that literature in an early, lengthy footnote. In these footnotes, explain and distinguish majority and minority views, and the manner in which important relevant controversies have evolved.
4. What answer or answers will you offer? Spell out your answer in a few sentences.
5. What competing explanations, arguments, interpretations, or frameworks will you reject or refute? (You may have already answered this question under #2.)
6. How will you reach your answers? Say a few words about your methodology and sources. If you are doing case studies, explain how they were selected. If you are doing archival research, say so, and explain which archives and sources you used. If your approach is deductive, explain this. If there are methods that readers might expect you to use, but that for some reason you did not use, you may note this and briefly explain your decisions.
7. What comes next? Please provide a roadmap to the rest of the article: “Section I explains how I began my life of crime; section II details my early arrests; section III describes my trip to death

1. This is version 1.7 of this paper. Original version April 1983.

2. Hans J. Morgenthau, “The Purpose of Political Science,” in James C. Charlesworth, ed., *A Design for Political Science: Scope, Objectives, and Methods* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1966), 73. Morgenthau further complained of a “new scholasticism,” in academe—the pursuit of “an intellectual exercise...that tells us nothing we need to know about the real world.” Scholars maintain their reputations by “engaging in activities that can have no relevance for the political problems of the day”; instead they substitute a “fanatical devotion to esoteric terminology and mathematical formulas, equations and charts, in order to elucidate or obscure the obvious.” As a result, social science resembles “a deaf man answering questions which no one has asked him.” *Ibid.*, 74; and Hans J. Morgenthau, *Truth and Power* (New York: Praeger, 1970), 246, 261.

row; section IV offers general theoretical conclusions and policy implications.” Something of that sort. #1 (“What is your question?”), #2 (“Why does this question arise?”), and #3 (“What is your answer?”) are the most important. Make sure you cover them with care. Summary introductions of this sort eliminate confusion about what an article does and does not say. They also serve a diagnostic purpose for the author. A summary introduction is often difficult to write. If so, however, this may indicate that the structure of the article is flawed, or that the argument or evidence have shortcomings. If you cannot write a clean introduction, you should rethink your whole article.

CONCLUSION FORMAT

Many authors use their conclusion to summarize their questions and answers. A good summary introduction, however, makes a summary conclusion redundant. Instead, use your conclusion to explore the implications of your research. What policy implications follow from your discoveries? What general theories does it call into question, and which does it reinforce? What broader historical questions does it raise or settle? What further research projects does it suggest?

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PRESENTATION: OBSERVE CUMULATIVE KNOWLEDGE NORMS

Political science is often criticized because few questions are ever settled, and the same issues are revisited over and over. Things will improve if social scientists observe the norms, widely observed in the hard sciences, that are required for knowledge to accumulate. Please follow these injunctions:

1. Frame your argument clearly. Knowledge cannot accumulate if people are not sure what you have said. If your article proposes, tests, or applies theories, the reader should be able to “arrow-diagram” these theories, in the manner sketched in my handout on “Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User’s Guide.”³ If your hypothesis cannot be reduced to arrow diagrams, then your writing (and probably your thinking) are too muddy. Think your project through again. This advice applies to explicitly theoretical work *and* to policy-prescriptive work. All policy prescription rests on theories; good prescriptive writing frames these theories clearly. If your article is purely descriptive or historical, your main discoveries should be clearly summarized at least once in the article—preferably at the outset.
2. If you are testing general theories or evaluating explanations for specific events, devise and report your tests with care. Avoid the errors in theory construction and selection of evidence that I outlined in “Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories”⁴ (I will not repeat them here.) A theory or explanation is tested by inferring predictions from the explanation, and then asking if the predictions are confirmed or disconfirmed. You should explicate this process for your readers: clearly frame the predictions you infer before presenting your evidence. Do not omit any predictions. If some predictions are disconfirmed, fess up—admit that they did not come true. If some did and some did not prove out, say so and present this discovery as a puzzle if you cannot explain it. Thus your overall format should be (a) frame your theory/explanation; (b) infer predictions from it; (c) perform tests; and then perhaps (d) infer implications.
3. Qualify your propositions. Social science laws never hold all the time. If your article deals with theories, note the conditions required for them to operate.
4. “Argue against yourself.” Acknowledge the questions or objections that might be raised by a skeptical reader, and briefly address them late in the text, at points where this is appropriate.⁵ This shows readers that you have been thoughtful and thorough—that you are aware of possible counterarguments or alternate interpretations, and that you have given these due consideration. It also forestalls baseless criticism

3. See “Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User’s Guide,” in Van Evera, *Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science*, 1–24.

4. Ibid.

5. Often possible criticisms of your arguments are best answered by limiting and qualifying the scope of your theoretical claims—see the previous point above, IV #3.

of your work. Often, of course, the skeptics have a good point, and you should grant it. Do not claim too much for your theories or evidence!

5. Be definitive. Go the extra mile required to make your article the single best work on the subject—the last word for now. Editors will be far more likely to publish you, and readers will appreciate finding the whole story in one place.

To be definitive, your article should reflect a comprehensive survey of literature and evidence relevant to the subject of the article. Your footnotes should provide a comprehensive bibliography to the important literature relevant to your topic. This requires that you have total mastery of all aspects of your subject. Ask reference librarians to help you build your bibliography. They can solve many mysteries. You also may wish to consult Kate L. Turabian, *A Student's Guide to Writing College Papers*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976) for more clues on how to do research.⁶

6. Fully document all sources and statements of fact.

7. Clearly identify any works whose conclusions your article revises, contradicts, or supersedes. If your article is theoretical or policy-prescriptive, identify by name authors whose works you refute. If your article is descriptive or historical, identify exactly which previous accounts or versions you are revising. This may annoy the authors whose work is superseded, but otherwise your readers will continue to quote outmoded work.

WRITING

A well-written manuscript is more likely to be published, quoted, and assigned. Bear the following points in mind:

1. "That which is simple is good." Your article should make a single point or handful of points, and should follow a simple organization. Avoid cluttering your article with extra ornaments and gargoyles, as students often do. Just because you researched something does not mean it belongs in the manuscript. Cutting is painful—"I sweated hours over this!"—too bad! In the world of research, half your work is done to be thrown away, or stored for later. You should pitch your writing at a level appropriate for college undergraduate readers. Do not write at a level that only senior scholars can understand. Scholarship has little effect if it is not used in the college classroom; hence you should take pains to direct your writing to the average student.

2. Break your article into sections and subsections. More sections is better than fewer; sections help readers see the structure of your argument. Label sections with vivid section headings that convey the main message of the section.

3. Each section of your article should have an internal logic. I recommend the following structure:

- Your argument
- Your supporting evidence
- Counterarguments, qualifications, and limiting conditions of your argument
- A transition statement, which may include remarks on the implications of your argument, or may note questions they raise

4. Start each section with several sentences summarizing the argument presented in the section. You may cut these summaries from your final draft if they seem redundant with your summary introduction; but you should include them in your first drafts, to see how they look, and to help your friends understand what you are doing, so they can provide comments. Writing such summaries is also a good way to force yourself to decide what you are and are not doing in

6. Another useful guide, directed to hard scientists but containing good advice for social scientists, is Robert A. Day, *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper*, 3rd ed. (Phoenix: Oryx, 1988).

each section, and to force yourself to confront contradictions or shortcomings in your argument. Often these section summaries are best written after you write the section, but do not forget to add them at some point.

5. Start each paragraph with a topic sentence that distills the point of the paragraph. Subsequent sentences should offer supporting material that explains or elaborates the point of the topic sentence. Qualifications or refutation to counterarguments should then follow. In short, paragraphs should exhibit the same structure as whole sections. A reader should be able to grasp the thrust of your argument by reading only the first sentence of every paragraph.

6. Write short, declarative sentences. Avoid the passive voice.

For more advice on writing see William Strunk, Jr. and E. B. White, *The Elements of Style*, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1979); and Teresa Pelton Johnson, "Writing for *International Security*: A Contributors' Guide," *International Security* 16, no. 2 (fall 1991): 171–80.

STYLE

On all matters of style (for example, footnote and citation format, etc.) consult Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 5th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), in paperback. Also, look at the journal where you hope to publish, and follow their quirks of style (every journal is a little different). You might call their editorial offices and ask for a stylesheet. All journals have one.

VETTING

When you finish your article draft, circulate it to several friends for comments and criticism. Never submit anything to a journal before doing this. The first law of social science is "two heads are better than one." Vetting will greatly improve your work. (Conversely, when others ask you to vet their work, you should make a serious effort. Helping others improve their written work is an important professional obligation).

SUBMISSION ETIQUETTE

You should feel free to call journal editors to find out if they have any interest in the kind of article you are doing. This saves both your time and theirs if the answer turns out to be "no." Do not ask editors for a preliminary reading, however, or for advice on how to fix up your piece for reviewers. This burdens editors unduly, and they will think you are a jerk for asking. Take great care to submit a clean, spiffy copy. Run your spellchecker. Use a copy center that makes dark, clear copy. Send the number of copies that the journal asks for (many want three). A copy that is hard to read or has typographical errors makes readers suspect that you did your research in an equally haphazard manner.

Treat editors with respect. They are people too. They are fallible, and you need not do everything they ask. You should have good reasons, however, for rejecting their advice.

HOW TO LEARN MORE ABOUT HOW TO WRITE AN ARTICLE

Re-read several of your favorite articles. Ask others which articles they most admire, and read these too. Then imitate some of the things their authors seemed to do right.

ABIDING TRADITION: WRITING, STYLE, AND ENGLISH USAGE

BENJAMIN FRANKEL

Good style, to me, is unseen style. It is style that is felt.
Sidney Lumet¹

THERE ARE several good guides to proper English usage and effective writing style. Following my comments on usage, I list the books I have found most helpful as a writer and editor (without necessarily accepting every recommendation their authors make). Any one of these books—certainly any combination of two, three, or four of them—will help you develop, in Samuel Johnson’s words, that “...English style, familiar but not coarse, elegant but not ostentatious.”

The English language evolves continuously, as any other language does, because it is used within a changing culture and applied to new situations. William Safire, in his weekly column on English in the Sunday *New York Times*, offers useful (and always witty) commentary on and analysis of contemporary usage. Safire also collects his columns in books, some of which I include in my list.

I recommend Safire’s column to our readers although I do not agree with him on everything. I am a traditionalist on questions of usage and style, while he is more tolerant of practices which deviate from traditional rules of usage.² He allows the split infinitive, for example, while we avoid it in the journal.³ He endorses the practice of beginning a sentence with conjunctions such as *and* and *but*, while we do not allow it.⁴ I follow the traditional treatment of *than* as a conjunction taking the subject (“smarter than I”), while Safire accepts the more common treatment of it now as a preposition taking the object (“smarter than me”). Safire also allows the use of the object as a predicate nominative (“it is her”), while I see no reason to abandon the use of the subject (“it is she”). There are other examples. These quibbles notwithstanding, Safire’s advice is sound and well-reasoned. Follow it.

THE “ANYTHING GOES” APPROACH TO ENGLISH USAGE

ICRITICIZE SAFIRE for being too permissive, while Steven Pinker criticizes him for being too rigid and unbending on issues of usage and style.⁵ Pinker finds Safire to be too rigid because he—Safire—believes that there are right ways and wrong ways to use the English language. Pinker, an MIT lin-

1. Quoted in Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, “An Insider’s Guide to the Art of Film: A Review of Sidney Lumet, *Making Movies* (New York: Knopf, 1995),” *New York Times*, 30 March 1995, C17.

2. “When established idiom clashes with grammar,” Safire writes, “correctness is on the side of the idiom. (quoted in Louis Menand, “Talk Talk,” *New Republic*, 16 February 1987, 28–33, at 31).

3. We agree with Fowler who said: “We maintain...that a real s.i., though not desirable in itself, is preferable to either of two things, to real ambiguity, and to patent artificiality.” He then hastens to add, however, that “we will freely admit that sufficient recasting will get rid of any s.i. without involving either of those faults, and yet reserve to ourselves the right of deciding in each case whether recasting is worth while” (Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, 2nd ed., 581). Our position is clear: It is always worthwhile to recast a sentence to avoid the split infinitive.

4. Alas, Safire is in good company on many of these issues. Fowler writes: “That it is a solecism to begin a sentence with *and* is a faintly lingering superstition” (Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, 2nd ed., 29). He also brands as “superstition” the rule against beginning a sentence with *but*. *Ibid.*, 69. Williams agrees with Fowler and Safire, dismissing the rule about *but* and *and*—and many other rules—as “folklore” (Williams, *Style*, 181–85, at 182). Still, because *and* is a conjunction used to join sentence elements of the same grammatical rank or function, and because *but* (as a conjunction meaning “on the contrary,” “on the other hand”) is used to connect coordinate elements within a sentence, we avoid using them at the beginning of sentences.

5. Steven Pinker, “Grammar Puss: The Fallacies of the Language Mavens,” *New Republic*, 31 January 1994, 19–21, 24–26; and Pinker, *The Language Instinct* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1994), 370–403, esp. 388–98.

guist, dismisses most of the prescriptive rules of usage (the rules that tell us about the right and wrong ways to use language) as not much more than old wives' tales. He suggests that we accept instead the scientific, or descriptive, view of language: anything is right that can be systematically used by members of a group to communicate with each other.

This is not the place for a detailed response to Pinker. I provide instead an outline of the main arguments that make Pinker's position on English usage untenable. It is important to respond to Pinker, even if briefly, for two reasons.

First, his view of language as innate and structural (some describe Pinker's approach as nativist or modular or mentalist) is fashionable (although not new), and it is being used more and more to explain other social practices.⁶ This radical structuralist-mentalist approach to social practices is analytically appealing. Pinker's view of language and Robert Wright's analysis of human sexuality are also important because they justifiably point to the significant influence innate biological and genetic dispositions exert on our conduct. Taken too far, however, the radical structuralist-mentalist program may have pernicious social consequences. It is always a good time, therefore, to point out the weaknesses and shortcomings of the more extravagant claims of this approach.⁷

Second, and more specifically, the purpose of this Guide is to advise contributors to the journal about the right and wrong ways to use the English language. We owe them an explanation why the prescriptive approach to English usage is not only the correct approach, but the only possible approach to language usage.

THE FALLACY OF THE FUNCTION/NORM DISTINCTION

Pinker's analysis of language is an example of how to confuse levels of analysis. William Dowling pointed out that Pinker imports into the sphere of language the old "is/ought" distinction.⁸ When stripped of its scientific references and witty presentation, Pinker's argument boils down to two simple propositions: First, the function of language is to facilitate communication among people; second, it does not matter, therefore, how people use the language as long as they communicate successfully with each other. Equipped with this view of language, Pinker criticizes Safire and other language "mavens"⁹ for fussing over how people "ought" to use the language, instead of recognizing that the people, however they decide to use the language, are always right if they manage to communicate with each other.

Pinker is right on one level: the function of language is to facilitate communication among members of a group. His assertion that this is all we need to know about language, however, is wrong. Social practices are imbued with normative considerations and significance. It is impossible to divorce function from norm in social practices, and the very term "'function-only' social practice" (whatever that means) is self-contradictory. We may say that for any practice to be termed "social," it must "rise above" its mere "functionality" to occupy a specific place within a socially construed system of meaning and signification. Even this, however, is not accurate: Rather, the functionality and the norm embodied in a social practice are so inextricably intertwined, that efforts to distinguish between them are a priori futile. Even the most refined description of the function of a social practice would be profoundly lacking, if not utterly irrelevant, if it did not include the normative dimensions of that practice. Two examples would suffice.

6. See Robert Wright, *The Moral Animal* (New York: Pantheon, 1995).

7. For an early criticism of Chomskian linguistics, see Ian Robinson, *The New Grammarians' Funeral: A Critique of Noam Chomsky's Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975). For a more recent criticism, see Annette Karmiloff-Smith, *Beyond Modularity: A Developmental Perspective on Cognitive Science* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995); and Jerome Bruner, *Acts of Meaning* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).

8. William C. Dowling, Correspondence, *New Republic*, 28 February 1994, 4.

9. Safire describes himself as a "language maven," from the Yiddish word for expert. Maven (also spelled *mavin*) comes from the Hebrew *le'havin*, "to understand."

We may say that there are two functions to sexual activity: first, to perpetuate the species; second, to provide pleasure to those engaged in the activity. An individual who conducted himself solely on the basis of this functional description of sexual activity would soon find himself in jail. Society has established a complex system of “ought” and “ought not” to regulate sexual activity. Practitioners and students of sexual activity should familiarize themselves with that system: the former to avoid trouble, the latter to have their analysis of it make sense.

Pinker provides another example when he writes that a taxi may obey the laws of physics but break the laws of Massachusetts. It is possible to provide an accurate functional description of the various elements of vehicle locomotion. They would include detailed explanations of how power is generated by internal combustion, how much power is required to ferry certain loads and achieve certain velocities, and more. Imagine a taxi driver who was cited for driving at a speed of one-hundred miles an hour in a residential area in Boston while carrying twenty passengers in his cab. It is not difficult to guess what the judge’s reaction would be if the cabby were to defend himself by claiming that he was merely complying with the laws of physics.

To understand sexual activity in society—let alone practice it without being arrested—it is not enough to know that the function of that activity is procreation and pleasure. To understand how people drive—let alone drive without getting people killed—it is not enough to know the physics of locomotion. To understand linguistic practices in society—let alone engage in them in a meaningful fashion—it is not enough to know that the function of language is communication.¹⁰

Pinker’s assertion that we can derive the “ought” (how people should use the language) from “is” (how they actually use it) is thus naive and sentimental. Social practices are highly normative, comprising both the functions of the practices and elaborate systems of “ought” and “ought not” which are inseparably intertwined with these functions. It is not the case that society *has a “right”* to determine what is proper and improper use of language. Rather, society *is* this very determination—and the sum of the normative determinations of all other social practices. Without such determinations there is no society.¹¹

THE SOURCE OF NORMATIVE DETERMINATIONS

Pinker and Joseph Williams dismiss certain rules of usage as old wives’ tales and folklore. They say, for example, that there is no reason not to split infinitives, and no reason to avoid using conjunctions at the beginning of sentences. In fact, there are good reasons for both, but let us accept for the moment that Pinker and Williams are right to assert that the rules against split infinitives and against conjunctions at the beginning of sentences are arbitrary. The appropriate response to this line of criticism should be: So what? Language is a social practice, and the values of many social practices are intrinsic (that is, arbitrary), not extrinsic. We engage in certain practices not because they manifest some extramundane design or purpose, or because they embody an objective, pure reason; we engage in these practices because this is the way we do things in our society. During centuries of practice our culture has successfully concealed the arbitrary nature of the rules governing it by creating a rich and intricate system of explanation, myth, and, yes, folklore, which now envelopes these practices. In fact, *our culture is* this rich and intricate system of explanation, myth, and folklore. Other cultures have similarly cloaked their (arbitrary) rules and practices with different, but equally rich, systems of explanation, myth, and folklore.

10. This is Gardner’s criticism of Pinker. Gardner writes: “Pinker shows...insufficient interest in...the sometimes powerful effects cultural patterns and values can have on the ways languages are used” (Howard Gardner, “Green Ideas Sleeping Furiously,” *New York Review of Books* 42, no. 5, 23 March 1995, 32–38, at 34).

11. There is a vast literature on this topic. For good discussions of this view of society, see Hanna F. Pitkin, *Wittgenstein on Justice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972); and the essays in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

We earlier described as naive and sentimental Pinker's effort to separate the function of a social practice from the system of meaning in which the practice is embedded. Williams's book on style is an excellent book, and his advice should be followed by writers who want to improve their style. His effort, in chapter ten of the book,¹² to apply cold, objective analysis to specific aspects of language usage, however, is also naive. Language usage is a social practice, and social practices are not measured by how reasonable they are, or how much sense they make. Assuming for the moment that such objective analysis is at all available, the fact that there is no reason (whatever that means in this context) for a certain social practice beyond the practice itself, does not invalidate the practice. We may thus describe the reason undergirding that practice as "arbitrary," but this does not weaken or undermine or delegitimize the practice.

Let us look at two examples.

We do not allow polygamy in our society, while other societies allow the practice. Members of those other cultures (some of them live in Utah) may well describe our rules concerning polygamy as arbitrary. We also do not leave older members of our society on the ice to die, while some cultures do. There is no extrinsic reason why we abstain from leaving senior citizens on the ice (a Swiftian argument can be made that this would go a long way toward solving the looming Social Security and Medicare crises). We cannot appeal to cold, objective reasons to explain why we do not leave old people on the ice or why we prohibit polygamy, because the source of our attitudes to marriage and old people is not cold, objective reason.

It is absurd to subject the rules of the social practice we call language to standards which no other social practice can meet (again, leaving aside the very availability of such standards). Beyond a certain point, the only meaningful thing we may say about our rules of language—and about all the other social practices of which our culture consists—is that this is the way we do things in our society. There is no—there cannot be—any other explanation.

Our social practices cannot be justified by an appeal to logic or to divine design, but this does not weaken society's insistence that members of society faithfully and completely adhere to these practices. To be a member of a society one must internalize these practices and rules and engage in them. To be a member of society is not an abstract idea: it is a practical thing. It means to follow the rules of society. Membership is rule-following.

The social practice of language cannot be reduced to its function as an instrument of communication (Pinker), and not every aspect of it can be subjected too closely to standards of reason and logic (Williams). Of course, language is communication, and many linguistic structures are the picture of logic. Language, however, is more than mere function and less than pure logic. Ludwig Wittgenstein was right to describe language as a form of life. He said: "Und eine Sprache vorstellen heißt, sich eine Lebensform vorstellen."¹³

Pinker begins the chapter on language mavens by inviting the readers to imagine themselves watching a nature documentary depicting animals in their natural habitat. What would it mean, Pinker asks, for the program's host to say that the dolphins do not execute their strokes properly? Or that the panda holds the bamboo in the wrong paw? Or that the song of the humpback whale contains several errors? Would we not think that the announcer had taken leave of his senses? Well, says Pinker, pointing out—let alone correcting—English usage errors is similar to telling the dolphins that their strokes are not executed properly, or telling the whales that they sing off-key.

This, then, is the fatal flaw in Pinker's reductionist conception of society and social practices: He ignores—dismisses would be more accurate—the fundamental differences between schools of dolphins and flocks of geese, on the one hand, and human societies, on the other hand. We said earlier

12. See Williams, *Style*, 181–90.

13. "And to imagine a language means to imagine a form of life" (*Philosophische Untersuchungen* [Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1971], par. 19, p. 24; *Philosophical Investigations*, 3rd ed., trans. G. E. M. Anscombe [New York: Macmillan, 1968], par. 19, p. 8e).

that Pinker confuses levels of analysis, and here is the clearest example: It is true that, on one level, all organisms—including the organisms we call human beings—share certain characteristics: they (and we) all come into the world, sire the next generation, then die. This is indeed an accurate description of both human beings and bees. This description may well capture many of the things we need to know about bees, but it does not even begin to tell us anything of importance about human beings and the societies in which they live.

TWO CHEERS FOR THE LANGUAGE MAVENS

THERE IS NOTHING unusual, then, about prescriptive rules for the use of language. Indeed, language and prescription—more accurately: social practices and prescription—are one and the same. I agree with Williams that our standard for proper English usage should not be Transcendental Correctness,¹⁴ because it cannot be. There is nothing transcendent about the English language in any event: People created it and people may change it (as they have, and as they continue to do). Our standard of good English should rather be derived “from the observable habits of those whom we could never accuse of having sloppy minds or of deliberately writing sloppy prose.”¹⁵ We should also keep in mind William Shawn’s resigned recognition that “the process of falling short of perfection is a never-ending one.”

Pinker and Williams are forceful critics of schoolmarmish pedantry, but even they concede that there are rules of usage that should be followed.¹⁶ The differences between traditionalists and their critics—Pinker’s more radical claims notwithstanding—are thus differences of degree. The question is not whether or not we should have usage rules, but how strict these rules should be. The question is also not whether or not the rules guiding usage should change, because they change and evolve continuously. The questions, rather, concern the pace and quality of change: Where and when do we draw the line, and how firmly do we hold to it?

I offer John F. Kennedy’s description of his political philosophy as a good guiding principle for English usage: “If it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change.” Safire offers a similar principle with regard to changes in usage: “In the face of the language’s weakness of grammatical discipline, what’s a poor usagist to do?” he asks, then answers: “Be a stiff. Make the new form work for its acceptance.”¹⁷

The rules of usage should be flexible to accommodate emerging practices and absorb the contributions different subcultures make to the general culture. Many of these changes replenish and enrich the language, making it livelier and more vivid. They also make it more accurate by allowing us to capture the nuances of new situations (just think of how English has been enriched by linguistic creations of the computer revolution and cybertalk).

It is precisely because the forces of linguistic change exert constant pressure on the rules of usage that there is a need for language mavens to exert a countervailing pressure. Without such countervailing pressure we will have not an evolution, but anarchy and chaos. The abandonment of guiding principles which used to govern other social practices, and the adoption of an anything-goes attitude to these practices, have not made our society better or safer. There is no reason to believe that the abandonment of guides to good usage will improve our language or culture.

ATTAINMENT AND RESTRAINT

14. Williams, *Style*, 179.

15. *Ibid.*

16. See the discussion of the followings in Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, 2nd ed.: “fetishes” (196); “illiteracies” (266); “illogicalities” (266–67); “sturdy indefensibles” (594–95); and “superstitions” (606–7).

17. William Safire, “On Language,” *New York Times Magazine*, 16 July 1995, 12.

There is one more argument for the importance of rule following, and the mavens' task of elucidating and explicating usage rules. Two quotes will help me make the case. On the last page of his book, Williams quotes approvingly from Alfred North Whitehead's "The Aims of Education." Whitehead writes that "there should grow the most austere of all mental qualities; I mean the sense for style.... Style in art, style in literature, style in science, style in logic, style in practical execution have fundamentally the same aesthetic qualities, namely, attainment and restraint."¹⁸ In a recent review of Edward Rothstein's book on the relationship between music and mathematics, the reviewer quotes Rothstein to say that the emotions which both music and mathematics evoke in us have something in common: "...in moments of aesthetic transport we assert the universality of the beautiful: we are feeling something not inchoate but precise and seemingly beyond contradiction."¹⁹

There is always tension between impulse and instinct, on the one hand, and discipline and restraint, on the other hand. An artist who would allow his creativity to gush and erupt uncontrollably, without any discipline or attention to accepted form, would not create great art. Discipline and restraint are as important to the artistic creation as the creative imagination itself. The discipline and restraint are imposed from outside the self, but they are internalized through socialization and acculturation. The disciplining and restraining influence of rules applies with equal force to the aesthetic and moral domains. We said earlier that membership in society means rule-following: members of a society follow the rules of that society. We can now elaborate and say that a true, wholehearted membership in a society is attained by internalizing that society's rules. True membership means following internalized rules. We do not put our parents on the ice when they get old not because we are afraid of the police, but because we cannot do it: a regulating moral rule inside us prevents us from even entertaining the idea. Individuals who do not have such internal regulating mechanisms, and who require the police to force them to follow society's rules, are often denied the benefits of membership in society: we take their freedom away, their right to vote and get elected, and more.

Art and language are more benign domains, but the same principle applies to them. A gushing, erupting, unrestrained, and uncontrolled creativity is inchoate. We would likely call such art indulgent and self-absorbed. A true aesthetic achievement is the result of a creative impulse restrained (but not subdued or repressed) by the discipline of rules and forms. Faced with such an aesthetic creation, we sense that we are, in Rothstein's words, in the presence of something "precise and seemingly beyond contradiction," or, in Whitehead's words, in the presence of "attainment and restraint."

The rules of usage provide the essential discipline and restraint without which good writing is not possible. Such rules may not be necessary for the humpback whale, but this is why the whales have been on earth for millions of years without producing even one Shakespeare. The precise reason for each and every rule of usage (the split infinitive, conjunctions at the beginning of sentences) is also less important than the cumulative civilizing effect of these rules: to restrain us and force us to be more precise and disciplined in our thinking and writing. These rules, like other social rules, force us to move from adolescence to maturity, to realize that we are part of a form of life consisting of social practices. Language is but one of these practices.

TRADITION WITHOUT APOLOGY

THIS IS WHY we adhere, without apology, to the more traditional approach to English usage. Hewing to the traditional line on matters of usage may well be a rearguard action against the trend toward greater usage permissiveness, but it is an action worth taking.

18. Williams, *Style*, 194.

19. Timothy Ferris, "Music and Mathematics as 2 Aspects of One Thing," review of *Emblems of Mind: The Inner Life of Music and Mathematics*, by Edward Rothstein, *New York Times*, 7 June 1995, C18.

I want to emphasize that Pinker's book, although I disagree with much of what it says, is a lively and engaging contribution to an important discussion. I criticized Pinker's conception of language, but I agree with what he says about the written language and how it differs from spoken language. I am gratified, therefore, to be able to end with a quote from Pinker. Readers of this Guide would be justified to conclude that if Pinker and Frankel—one a free spirit, the other a stick-in-the-mud—agree on something, then it must be right. Pinker writes:

Expository writing requires language to express far more complex trains of thought than it was biologically designed to do. Inconsistencies caused by limitations of short-term memory and planning, unnoticed in conversation, are not as tolerable when preserved on a page that is to be pursued more leisurely. Also, unlike a conversational partner, a reader will rarely share enough background assumptions to interpolate all the missing premises that make language comprehensible. Overcoming one's natural egocentrism and trying to anticipate the knowledge state of a generic reader at every stage of the exposition is one of the most important tasks of writing well. All this makes writing a difficult craft that must be mastered through practice, instruction, feedback, and—probably most important—intensive exposure to good examples.²⁰

Pinker's advice to writers is also cogent and wise. He writes that a "universally acknowledged key to good writing is to revise extensively. Good writers go through anywhere from two to twenty drafts before releasing a paper. Anyone who does not appreciate this necessity is going to be a bad writer."²¹ At least on this point, please follow Pinker's advice.

BOOKS

Especially Recommended

- Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
 Cook, Claire Kehrwald. *Line by Line: How to Improve Your Own Writing*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.
 Fowler, H. W. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. 2nd ed., revised by Ernest Gowers. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
 Fowler, H. W., and F. G. Fowler. *The King's English*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
 Gowers, Ernest. *The Complete Plain Words*. Revised by Sidney Greenbaum and Janet Whitcut. Boston: David R. Godine Publisher, 1988.
 McQuain, Jeffrey. *Power Language: Getting the Most Out of Your Words*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.
 Ross-Larson, Bruce. *Editing Yourself: A Manual for Everyone Who Works with Words*. New York: Norton, 1996.
 Strunk, William, Jr., and E. B. White. *The Elements of Style*. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan 1979.
 Williams, Joseph M. *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Also Recommended

- Barzun, Jacques. *Simple and Direct: A Rhetoric for Writers*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
 Bernstein, Theodore M. *The Careful Writer: A Modern Guide to English Usage*. New York: Atheneum, 1977.
 Copperud, Roy H. *American Usage and Style: The Consensus*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1980.
 Day, Robert A. *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper*, 3rd ed. (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1988).
 Elbow, Peter. *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
 Follett, Wilson. *Modern American Usage: A Guide*. Edited and completed by Jacques Barzun. New York: Hill and Wang, 1966.

20. Pinker, *Language Instinct*, 401.

21. *Ibid.*

- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. *The Transitive Vampire: A Grammar Handbook for the Innocent, the Eager, and the Doomed*. New York: Times Books, 1984.
- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. *The Well-Tempered Sentence: A Punctuation Handbook for the Innocent, the Eager, and the Doomed*. New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1983.
- Grammar Smart: A Guide to Perfect Usage*. By the staff of the Princeton Review. New York: Villard Books, 1994.
- Howard, V. A., and J. H. Barton. *Thinking on Paper*. New York: Morrow, 1986.
- Johnson, Edward D. *The Handbook of Good English*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1991.
- Lucas, F. L. *Style*. London: Cassell and Co., 1955.
- Safire, William. *In Love with Norma Loquendi*. New York: Random House, 1994.
- Safire, William. *Quoteth the Maven*. New York: Random House, 1993.
- Safire, William. *Coming to Terms*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Safire, William. *Fumblerules*. New York: Dell, 1991.
- Safire, William. *The Language Maven Strikes Again*. New York: Holt, 1991.
- Safire, William. *You Could Look It Up*. New York: Times Book, 1988.
- Safire, William. *Take My Word For It*. New York: Times Book, 1986.
- Safire, William. *I Stand Corrected*. 1984.
- Safire, William. *What's the Good Word?* New York: Avon, 1983.
- Safire, William. *On Language*. 1980.
- Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Terms Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. 5th ed., revised and expanded by Bonnie Birtwistle Honigsblum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Turabian, Kate L. *A Student's Guide to Writing College Papers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Zinsser, William. *On Writing Well: An Informal Guide to Writing Nonfiction*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

ARTICLES AND ESSAYS

- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. "Where Have All the Footnotes Gone?" *New York Times Review of Books*, 16 June 1991, 1, 24.
- Holden, Donald. "Why Profs Can't Write." *New York Times*, 4 February 1978, E19.
- Johnson, Teresa Pelton. "Writing for *International Security*: A Contributors' Guide." *International Security* 16, no. 2 (fall 1991): 171–80.
- Limerick, Patricia Nelson. "Dancing with Professors: The Trouble with Academic Prose." *New York Times Review of Books*, 31 October 1993, 3, 23–24.
- Mermin, David. "What's Wrong with this Prose?" *Physics Today* (May 1989): 9.
- Orwell, George. "Literature and Totalitarianism." In *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*. Vol. 2, *My Country Right or Left, 1940–1943*, 134–37. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968.
- . "Politics and the English Language." In *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*. Vol. 4, *In Front of Your Nose 1945–1950*, 127–40. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968.
- . "Propaganda and Demotic Speech." In *Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*. Vol. 3, *As I Please, 1943–1945*, 135–41. Edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968.
- . "Why I Write." In *The Orwell Reader*, introduction by Richard H. Rovere, 390–965. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1956.