

V O X P O P

The Newsletter of

Political
Organizations &
Parties

A Continuing Subfield of the American Political Science Association

Vol. 5, No. 3

Winter, 1986

CHAIR:

William Crotty,
Northwestern University

NEWSLETTER EDITORS:

Ann Elder
Illinois State University
Sandy Maisel
Colby College

PROGRAM CHAIR:

Alan Gitelson,
Loyola University

From the Editors

This issue is largely given over to the events of the annual meeting held in conjunction with the APSA meeting in Washington, D.C. We hope that for those of you who were able to attend this will be a pleasant reminder of the expanding role of the section. We sponsored or co-sponsored ten panels or roundtables. In addition, our business meeting initiated the presentation of annual awards for excellence in the field. Awards were presented for the outstanding book in the field, outstanding article in the field, and for an exceptional contribution by an individual over time. Thanks to the members who were willing to contribute their summaries of panels and roundtables are in order. We also appreciate the time taken by the presenters of the awards to write their remarks for inclusion here. We will resume in the spring with an edition that contains the abstracts and other news of the subfield.

From the Chairman

To the POP Membership:

This past year and the 1986 American Political Science Association Convention proved to be exceptionally good ones for the Political Organizations and Parties Organized Section. We sponsored or co-sponsored twelve panels and roundtables. Significant excerpts from several of the roundtables will appear in Vox Pop and Joseph Schlesinger is preparing a summary of his roundtable "Conceptual Developments in the Study of Political Parties" for PS. The roundtable featured, in addition to Professor Schlesinger, Professors Robert Jackman of Michigan State University, James G. March of Stanford University, Mancur Olson of the University of Maryland and Kenneth A. Shepsle of Washington University.

A particular thanks to Alan Gitelson, Matthew Holden, Tom Mann, Norinne Hessman and Catherine Rudder for their help and contributions at various stages in making a go of these.

The major achievement of the meeting was the inauguration and award of the Political Organizations and Parties Career Achievement Award and First Annual Book and Published Paper Awards. These were awarded to Samuel J. Eldersveld, Leon Epstein, and Joseph Schlesinger for their outstanding contributions to the field. The awards were introduced and presented by, in order, John S. Jackson III, Kenneth Janda, and Gerald Pomper. Their comments on the occasion appear elsewhere in this edition.

It is our hope that the quality of the recipients and their work will set the standards for academic accomplishments that future awards will strive to recognize.

As to future business: First, my term will be up at the next (1987) APSA meeting, as well as that of Alan Gitelson as Secretary and APSA Program Coordinator, and all eight members of the Executive Committee. At present the Executive Committee includes Paul Smith, Frank Sorauf, Cornelius Cotter, Gerald Pomper, Kenneth Janda, Laurence Longley, Key Lawson and Leon Epstein, as well as Alan Gitelson and myself and Ann Elder and Sandy Maisel who have served as editors of Vox Pop.

All terms are for a two-year period.

Anne Hopkins of the Provost's office of the University of Tennessee has agreed to chair a nominating committee to recommend a new slate of officers. All suggestions for nominees should be sent to her there before January 15, 1986. The committee's decision will be made prior to March 1, 1987, and will appear in the Spring edition of Vox Pop. Those nominees will be voted on at the business meeting at the 1987 APSA.

Second, John S. Jackson III has agreed to chair a committee to a) recommend the recipients of the 1987 Political Organization and Parties awards, b) decide on permanent names for the awards, and c) find permanent funding for the awards. All suggestions should be sent to

Dean John S. Jackson III
College of Liberal Arts
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

before January 15, 1986. Decisions as to the award recipients and a permanent name for each of the awards will be made prior to March 1, 1987, and will be published in Vox Pop. The awards will be made at the 1987 APSA convention.

Third, at some point in the near future, a decision is going to have to be made as to the name of the organization. The need is to clarify the fields represented by our group within the APSA to minimize duplication and specify exactly who and what we represent within the APSA as an organized section. The decision, while not arousing much interest, is not a trivial one. The future of the Organized Section, which looks very good at present, depends on our ability to both grow and adequately represent a significant and relevant proportion of the discipline. The name "Political Organizations and Parties" does not, in my opinion, meet this need and may, in fact, confuse matters.

The alternatives, as I see them, are:

1. retain the present name of "Political Organizations and Parties", or
2. change the name to one more descriptive or appropriate for what and whom we intend to speak as an Organized Section. Candidates for a new name would include:

Parties, Interest Groups, and Elections (PIE) Organized Section

Parties, Interest Groups and Voting Behavior Organized Section

Parties and the Electoral Processes Organized Section

I am sure others can think of other, equally relevant names.

I am going to propose, for sake of decision-making and debate, that we adopt the name "Parties, Interest Groups, and Elections Organized Section" and schedule a discussion and vote on this, or other names that may be proposed at the next business meeting. Meanwhile, the pages of Vox Pop can be used for other proposals and discussion along these lines.

Finally, at some point in the more distant future, the Organized Section will have to decide whether it wants to publish a journal or an annual yearbook or not. The matter has been discussed in depth before and is not pressing. In fact, our decision has been to put off a decision for at least three years (from 1985) and possibly into the indefinite future. There are a multitude of journals now, some of which (American Politics Quarterly?) might be receptive to an affiliation with the group. I would think such a future step would depend on the continued expansion of our membership (now 412) and the success of Vox Pop as a vehicle of scholarly communication in the field. At any rate, decisions in this area will be left to the next administration or one of its successors.

Bill Crotty
Chair/President
Political Organizations and Parties

And Now for More Business....

From John S. Jackson III, Chair of the Awards Committee:

The Awards Committee wishes to announce that nominations are now open for the three awards that Political Organizations and Parties will make next fall. These are:

1. The Career Achievement Awards - for outstanding achievement over an entire career dedicated to the study of political organizations and political parties. The first winner of the awards was Professor

Samuel J. Eldersveld.

2. Annual Award for Best Published Paper - this award is established for an outstanding paper or article written on the subject of political parties and organizations. This can be any article or paper contributed to the field and is not limited to this past year. The first winner of this award was Professor Joseph Schlesinger.
3. Annual Book Award - this is for a single book which has made a significant contribution to the study of political organizations and parties. This first winner of this was Professor Leon Epstein.

Nominations should be received no later than January 15, 1986. Nominations should be submitted to Dr. John S. Jackson III, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, IL 62901. The nominating committee also consists of Dr. Robert Harmel of the Department of Political Science at Texas A&M University and Dr. Sandy Maisel of the Department of Politics at Colby College.

PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL AWARDS - 1986

Annual Book Award
In Honor of Leon D. Epstein
Remarks by Kenneth Janda

It is a great honor to participate in the first Annual Award Ceremony of the Political Organization and Parties Section of the American Political Science Association. It is a special pleasure to be asked to present the first Annual Book Award to Leon D. Epstein for his celebrated study, Political Parties in Western Democracies, which was first published in 1967 by Praeger and published in a new edition in 1980 by Transaction Books.

I take special pleasure in my responsibility because of the great impact that Political Parties in Western Democracies had on my own thinking and research. To demonstrate its influence in a very personal way, I even brought the eight pages of single-spaced typewritten notes that I took on the book shortly after its original publication. I credit two books for shaping my thoughts on comparing political parties. The first is Maurice Duverger's classic Political Parties, which I value for its framework of analysis and theoretical structure. The second is Epstein's for explaining that Duverger was wrong.

Let me review the structure of the study that we are honoring today. Epstein focused on political parties in twenty Western nations. His was not a quantitative study but a qualitative one, consisting of a thorough canvas of modern literature on party politics in these countries. He aimed at producing a frame of reference or set of hypotheses to guide more comprehensive studies to follow.

The argument of Political Parties in Western Democracies is that parties are a necessary but not sufficient condition for democracy, and that even in democratic countries, parties vary substantially in their characteristics and governmental roles. They differ largely in response to their national environments - such as differences in expansion of the suffrage, social structure, federal structure, and (most importantly) the legislative-executive

structure of the state. The book's three major themes were characterized by Epstein himself in its later edition:

1. Parties effectively "structure the vote" in modern democratic nations.
2. Large-membership parties, rather than becoming pervasive (as Duverger contended) are characteristic of certain times and places.
3. Party government is more suitable to political systems outside the United States.

Douglas Rae, who reviewed Political Parties in Western Democracies in the March, 1969, American Political Science Review, noted that Epstein's analysis stands Duverger's work on its head:

For Duverger, politics turns on large deterministic; for Epstein, politics hinges on a collection of not so grand contingencies. For Duverger, parties develop toward an idealization of mid-Century continental working-class parties; for Epstein, they seem currently to be progressing (or regressing) irregularly toward the model offered by American middle-class parties....Epstein quite consciously takes aim on the gospel according to Maurice. (pp. 183-184)

Rae proved that he knew quality in predicting that Epstein's book would become "a standard element in the literature on political parties."

More personally, I wish to credit Epstein's influence on my own research, which I respectfully cite as the most genuine praise that one academic can offer to another. In addition to the many small debts that I owe to Political Parties in Western Democracies, there are two major reorientations in my thinking that it produced on first reading. First, Epstein helped clarify the definition of a political party by stating that sponsoring candidates under a party label is the "crucial defining element" that separates political parties from interest groups. Second, Epstein punctured the logic of Duverger's "contagion from the left," which said that parties would restructure themselves on mass membership in order to contest elections, with his own phrase, "contagion from the right", to symbolize the newer restructuring of parties around mass media in campaigning rather than mass membership.

So, I am also fulfilling a personal debt of gratitude in bestowing, on behalf of the Political Organizations and Parties Section of the American Political Science Association, this first Annual Book Award for Political Parties in Western Democracies to Leon D. Epstein.

* * * * *

Annual Paper Award
In Honor of Joseph Schlesinger
Remarks by Gerald M. Pomper

Major scientific contributions are simple, almost self-evident once stated. After we hear them, we are often led to say, "Why didn't I think of that?". Galileo's concept of the heliocentric solar system was summarized in his bare-faced statement, "Yet, the earth does more," and Newton's gravitational theory was allegedly inspired by the mundane fact that apples fall to the ground.

Joseph Schlesinger's contribution is a paper, "On the Theory of Party Organization," originally presented at the 1983 meetings of the APSA, and published in May of 1984 in the Journal of Politics. It moves a smaller world than the earth, the elementary particle of scholarship on political parties

within the atom of political science. Yet, it also begins with an apparently obvious premise that leads to an elegant theory.

Schlesinger's premise is a truth that we all know in our hearts, that American political parties exist to win elections. That basic fact, enables Schlesinger to cut through the confusions of much literature of recent decades. In his paper, he then goes on to make a number of contributions. First, Schlesinger provides a clear focus for research on parties. His subject - and ours - is party organization. By putting aside the vast, but tangential, literatures on partisanship in the electorate and party in government, he helps all of us to get our eyes back on the ball in play. By insisting on the premise that parties exist to win elections, he is also able to bridge the gap between empirical works on party structure and election campaigning.

Furthermore, he insists that theory must begin with empirical realities, and the construction of explanations of behavior. Normative theory and reform prescriptions are not ruled out, but they must at least acknowledge the empirical realities, even if only to change them.

Schlesinger then imaginatively combines concepts from a variety of authors. These concepts include those of Downs on instrumental rationality, March on organizational behavior, Clark and Wilson on incentives, and Olson on collective goods. These authors are not primarily concerned with party organization, but Schlesinger has been able to take their diverse concepts and apply them coherently.

The substantive body of Schlesinger's paper consists of the application of three conceptual variables to four types of organizations. The organizational types are businesses, interest groups, bureaucracies and, of course, political parties. In the author's scheme, the behavior of these organizations is dependent upon the interaction of three dichotomized variables:

Does the organization exist in a market or non-market environment?

Does it produce collective or private goods?

Do members receive direct or indirect compensation?

This analysis shows parties to be unique organizations. Parties operate in a market environment, like businesses but lack the individual incentives available to corporations. Parties produce collective benefits, like bureaucracies, but are different in lacking a hierarchical control of participants' rewards. Parties provide indirect compensation for their members, like interest groups, yet have a different problem of coping with a competitive environment. Only parties combine the characteristics of a market environment, production of collective benefits, and indirect compensation of members. Their uniqueness is not only intellectually significant; it also justifies our individual research, and even our existence as an independent section.

Schlesinger's work does much for the study of American political parties. It enables us better to understand their behavior, rather than simply describe it, or criticize it. Textbook characteristics, such as decentralization, moderation, and stratarchy become expected consequences, rather than perversions. Further, it allows us to speculate about the likelihood and direction of change in the parties. If parties are becoming more "professional," as they seem to be for example, what are the likely consequences of more reliance on direct compensation for party workers? This analytic scheme allows us to predict such consequences as rationalization of party tasks, increased hierarchy, and more centralized resource management - precisely the trends evident in the national Republican and Democratic organization.

Finally, Schlesinger has helped party specialists - at least this specialist - to overcome past despair about the weakening of party organizations. By focusing on competition in the electoral marketplace, he makes us aware that parties, properly understood, are stronger, rather than weaker, organizations than in the past. He makes this case more fully in another paper, "The New American Political Party," published in the December 1985 APSR, an article which surely will be a major contender for next year's prize.

The work we are honoring fittingly is the first of a series of awards for distinguished papers. It establishes not only a standard of excellence but a set of criteria for judging future submissions, and our own work. Let me conclude with some lessons we can learn from this paper, lessons not about political parties, but about good scholarship.

Schlesinger's paper reminds us that theoretical development is the basic aim of our research. When we get involved in describing a particular campaign, or pursuing a multiple correlation, it is easy to forget that we are really seeking a fuller understanding of the political world. The breadth evident in this work calls us back to these larger concerns. Moreover, Schlesinger's article is good theory: parsimonious, conceptually precise, and capable of operationalization - and therefore worthy of emulation.

Second, this paper is significant for its proper use of quantification. Although not emphasizing statistics, it does bring numerical data to bear, simply and coherently, where relevant. Like good wine, mathematical techniques should be used whenever they contribute to the digestion of the subject at hand, but not used to excess. Schlesinger is good role model for this kind of imbibing.

Finally, Schlesinger recalls for us that we are political scientists. We are concerned with the world of politics, and must begin with its practices, even if we do not approve of such facts as the parties' pursuit of office. We are scientists, seeking knowledge rather than opinion, empirical theory as the grounding for normative prescription. In this sense as well, Schlesinger's paper again reminds us of Galileo and Newton. It is more than enough reason for honor.

Career Achievement Award
In Honor of Samuel J. Eldersveld
Remarks by John S. Jackson III

It is my happy duty to present Professor Samuel J. Eldersveld to the assembled group today. I could just say, "this man needs not introduction", and sit down, but that would not be in keeping with the spirit of this occasion and would violate my agreement with Bill Crotty. So, I am going to make some brief comments about Professor Eldersveld's contributions to our discipline.

I do not know Professor Eldersveld personally although I have met him briefly and have served on one panel with him. Perhaps it is more appropriate for the introduction to be made by someone who does not know personally the scholar who is to receive the Career Achievement Award. In this respect we will focus on the total professional impact of the person in question.

I really do feel, as I am sure all of you do, that Sam Eldersveld is an old friend of mine whom I have known well for 20 years. I first met Sam Eldersveld's writing some 20 years ago at the beginning of my graduate education. Out of Eldersveld's many contributions I plan to focus on two books because I believe they so neatly bracket his career.

When it was published in 1964, his book Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis was then one of the most exciting and stimulating new works in the field of modern approaches to the study of Political Parties.

It is today a true classic, one of the books which has dominated the field for more than two decades. I teach an introductory level graduate pro seminar on the "classics" in American Government and Politics. Whatever other books come and go from my list of classics, this book is invariably on it.

The book is the kind of elegant work we hold up as models for our discipline but which few really achieve. It is:

- (a) Grounded in important empirical theory - especially the theory of party-as-organization with its emphasis on communications patterns, client groups, and leader-follower relations.
- (b) It is well-grounded in a systematic collection of empirical data. As you will remember the study included interviews with precinct and district level organizational leaders and a sample of the mass public from Wayne County, Michigan.
- (c) It had great relevance to the "real world" politics of Wayne County, Michigan, then or Cook County, Illinois, today or even my own home of Jackson County in rural southern Illinois today.

As many of you know Sam Eldersveld also has practiced what he preached. He has actually run for office. Several Political Scientists have run, but few are elected. Sam again is the exception - he won! - having served one term as Mayor of Ann Arbor.

Probably as a result of his participation in the nitty - gritty of politics, Eldersveld's writings have a "real world" quality about them.

When I read through those accounts of the people who operated the precincts in Wayne County of 25 years ago, I see and identify in my mind's eye certain individuals and archetypes who still operate in the Political Parties of Illinois today. I am sure many of you also identify those archetypes with people you know in politics in your own locales today.

When I teach about where research on Political Parties has been and how much it has accomplished over the past 30 years, the landmark is always Eldersveld's seminal work. Although I have not done the footnote count, I seriously doubt if any other single book has received more citations in the literature over the past 20 years than Eldersveld's book.

The book is not only cited, it is used and integrated into the entire intellectual enterprise of our discipline. Listen to Eldersveld's own conclusion about the nature of party organizations and think about how many times you've used these words, or at least these images in your own teaching and research.

"The party is an open, client-oriented structure, permeable at its base as well as its apex, highly preoccupied with the recruitment of 'deviant' social categories, and willing to provide mobility and access for those categories into the major operational and decisional centers of the structure. The party is also a 'stratarchical' control structure, rather than an elitist command structure. Power is devolved and proliferated to echelon commands, decision-making is autonomized at the lower reaches of the

structure, and deference is not exclusively upward but reciprocal."

Source: (Eldersveld, Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964) pp. 526-527.

One quote from the reviewers of that day is useful to show something of how the book was received. A former professor of mine, Avery Leiserson, a demanding critic if there ever was one, said the following in his review of the book which appeared in the American Political Science Review:

"Congressman Neil Staehler, Chairman of the Michigan State Democratic Committee once said that Samuel J. Eldersveld gave up a promising career when he left the mayor's office of Ann Arbor to return to his researches into party memberships and organization in Michigan, the Netherlands, and elsewhere. The present volume gives the author's academic colleagues, at least, ample reason to approve his choice."

Source: Avery Leiserson, APSR, Vol. LIX (March, 1965), p. 141.

His Recent Book

Having been so long indebted to Professor Eldersveld's work, I was delighted to learn about 1980 that he had another book on its way. In 1982, he published Political Parties in American Society (New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1982). This book is an excellent textbook and I have used it as a text in my own courses. It is much more than a text in the sense of being a synthesis of the research and writings on political parties accumulated throughout Eldersveld's long career. This book has been a useful tool to which I have turned again and again in my own research and writing.

Let me note Eldersveld's ambitions for this book in his own words:

"This book emerged after many years of teaching the 'parties course,' an intellectual experience that I have continuously enjoyed. The discussions with students, politicians, and colleagues generated by this experience produced the reflections embodied in this volume. Teaching led also to participation in politics and to my own research into the nature of political parties and their activities. This book, then, attempts to embody both my life experiences and scholarly activities."

(From the Preface to Political Parties in American Society, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1982).

I can only add that if this was his goal in the book, he succeeded admirably. The book is an extraordinary capstone to an extraordinary career. For all these reasons and more, Professor Eldersveld has been chosen for the Career Achievement Award. Let me stress that this is the very first Career Achievement Award made by this organization. Like Washington's first Administration, this selection sets the standard and the precedent for all our future choices. It is fitting that Professor Samuel Eldersveld should be the first recipient of the POP's Career Achievement Award. It gives me great pleasure to present him to you and this Career Achievement Award to Professor Samuel Eldersveld.

Convention Panels and Roundtables

We had hoped to provide you with some vicarious thrills from all of the sponsored and co-sponsored panels and roundtables from the Washington, D.C. meetings, but our very success works against us! Through the effective work of

Bill Crotty and Alan Gitelson, among others, POP was involved one way or another with 15 panels. A lack of both committed reporters and space in Vox Pop limits our coverage, but we hope that this small sampling of the offerings will provide some sense of the richness of the experience.

Panel on the Nexus Between Political Parties and Political Action Committees Reported by Gary D. Wekking, University of Central Arkansas

According to Larry Sabato, the political party system needs to be strengthened through the following actions:

1. Out-parties might offset advantages of incumbency by placing "opposition ombudsmen" in marginal congressional districts to provide "shadow" constituent services, thus strengthening their links with constituents.
2. Parties might attract more members by offering them group benefits (credit cards, insurance, income tax services, travel rates), as many interest groups and some European parties do.
3. Parties might cooperate on an advertising program publicizing the advantages of a party system.

Frank Sorauf discussed the linkages between political parties and PACs. These he saw as relatively distant, with little immediate prospect for change. This relationship might, however, be affected by the recent transformations in electoral politics that have rendered the electoral system volatile.

Burdett Loomis discussed the coalitions of interest groups around interests in a cooperative strategy. These coalitions do exist, but are understudied.

Robert Salisbury presented fascinating data from a study of 800 PAC lobbyists which showed that despite the growth of a "Washington community" of lobbyists, consultants, and party staffers bound together by a common background of involvement in party organizational and campaign activity, "parties are still about elections, and interest groups are still about policy making."

Roundtable on Congressional Candidate Recruitment Reporter: L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College

The Roundtable on Congressional Candidate Recruitment brought together experts from various fields to discuss a topic of common concern. The interchange proved to be tremendously exciting.

Linda Fowler, Syracuse University, and Larry Sabato, the University of Virginia, each discussed their ongoing research and interest in this field. Fowler has been at work on an in-depth study of the 35th Congressional District in New York, the seat which Barber Conable vacated at the end of the 98th Congress. Thus, she brought the perspective of one who has studied decisions to run or not to run in an open seat. Larry Sabato discussed the role which PACs have played, in "winnowing in or winnowing out" those who were considering congressional campaigns.

Tom King, Political Director of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and Russ Schriefer, Northeast Field Manager for the National Republican Congressional Committee, added the views of those actively involved in candidate recruitment and congressional campaigning. They each talked about the limited role that the national parties have been able to play in the last two election cycles, at least in terms of recruiting reluctant candidates. On the other hand, they have played a most active - and an increasing role - once candidates have expressed interest.

Finally, Stu Rothenberg, Editor of The Political Report, and Jeremy Gaunt, Editor of Campaign Practices Reports, discussed candidate selection from the perspective of journalists covering congressional campaigns. Gaunt's comments focused on campaign financing, while Rothenberg provided an overall view of politics in congressional districts.

Members of the audience involved in research in this area contributed significantly to a lively discussion which followed the initial presentations.

Roundtable on Research on Party Organizations

Reporter: Ann Elder, Illinois State University

John Bibby and Neil Cotter delivered a very comprehensive review - complete with paper - of their research on the viability of political party organizations. Their perspective was an optimistic one, emphasizing that political party organizations are still viable and have adapted to the changes in the political environment and the techniques of campaigning. They found that parties have undergone more structural integration, developing more formal roles for state officials. They identified a need to study further the developments in party organizations, notably the career patterns of state and local officials, the role of the national party in state and local affairs, and the relationship of state to county party organizations.

Al Abramowitz suggested the utility of examining the impact of party activists as individuals operating within the party organizational framework. His study of delegates and caucus participants suggested that there were personal characteristics that showed interesting patterns of regularity within each party. For example, activists in each party had similar backgrounds and beliefs. Democrats were, however, more liberal than Republicans. He found that the Republican Party had been aided by nationalization of the parties and migration of party activists from one region of the country to another. Conversion had also helped the Republicans in the South, where a large percentage of Republican party activists were found to have been conservative Democrats.

Malcolm Jewell agreed that more needed to be known about the party activists. This is especially important in light of his findings that party ideologues had the strongest party loyalty; they were found to choose party over pragmatism in responding to questions about party loyalty. This preference for party over pragmatism, however, had little validity when individuals had to make choices. Jewell's concern centered largely around party loyalty and the ways that might be employed to stimulate higher levels of party loyalty among party activists. Parties might, for example, do more recruitment and endorsement of candidates, entering into more competition with non-party organizations. Endorsements of candidates by the party might also be used more frequently.

Cynthia Collela reported on the survey done by the ACIR of the state party organizations. This survey, done in 1983-84, had four themes: resources, roles of elected officials, national content, and state regulation. The findings indicate a trend toward growth in party and resources, but there is great variation among the party organizations in the degree to which they are expanding their resources and institutional capacity.

Jim Gibson harked back to a theme raised by Bibby and Cotter in suggesting that party organizations should be tracked over time to determine the manner in which parties change to adapt to a changing environment. He stressed the difficulty of this task because of the multi-dimensional nature of these

organizations. Both horizontal and vertical linkages should be examined to attempt a whole system analysis of party organizational capacity.

Samuel Eldersveld urged those doing research in party organizations to look beyond the boundaries of the United States, taking account of the comparative work being done. He suggested that we should analyze the relevance of party activity, using longitudinal studies. He also indicated that an in-depth analysis of the motivations of activists and the implication for what they do is in order.

Because Tom Mann is leaving as Executive Director of the APSA to become Director of the Governmental Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, a search has been launched for his successor. For those who might be interested or know someone who would, the announcement for the position is included below.

Executive Director
American Political Science Association

The American Political Science Association invites nominations and applications for the position of Executive Director, beginning in the summer or fall of 1987.

The Executive Director is the chief administrative officer of the Association, with responsibility for a Washington office staff of 20, a \$1.5 million operating budget and \$500,000 to \$1 million in grant-supported activities. The Executive Director works closely with the officers, Council, committees and members to support ongoing scholarly and educational activities and to develop new programs. He or she also represents the Association in COSSA, ACLS, and other social science organizations.

The new Executive Director will be appointed for an initial term of five years and be eligible for reappointment. Salary and conditions of appointment will be negotiated with the approval of the Council.

Candidates should have the appropriate temperament, professional training and experience in political science, administrative and entrepreneurial skills, and demonstrated commitment to the professional well-being of the discipline.

A Search Committee, appointed by President Samuel P. Huntington will screen the candidates and interview the short list of finalists. All equal opportunity and affirmative action rules and guidelines previously adopted by the Association for employment in political science will apply to the selection of the new Executive Director.

All correspondence regarding nominations or applications should be sent before January 15, 1987, to:

Professor Samuel P. Huntington, President
American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Garland Announces Encyclopedia of American Political Parties

Garland Publishing, Inc., has announced their intention to publish a multi-volume Encyclopedia of American Political Parties under the General Editorship of Sandy Maisel of Colby College. The encyclopedia should fill a significant

gap in reference collections by providing both contemporary and historical information about parties and the individuals who have played significant roles in party development. A number of articles exploring current issues in political party research will also be included.

Future issues of Vox Pop will include more detailed discussions on the encyclopedia and a call for contributors.

* * * * *