

VOX POP Newsletter

of Political Organizations and Parties

An official section of the American Political Science Association
Produced by the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron

REVIEW ESSAY — WILLIAM C. BINNING, YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

WHY PARTIES? THE ORIGIN AND TRANSFORMATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN AMERICA

By John H. Aldrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995

In this work, John Aldrich sets forth an important new theory of the development of American political parties. This book will have a significant influence on party research, and his theories will be debated and tested in future party scholarships. His analysis of parties relies heavily on rational choice theory to explain the need for electoral and legislative majorities that create the incentives for the formation of Parties. His central argument is that the forms of parties have changed, and it is the office-seekers who are the creators of parties, and it is they who alter the forms of parties to resolve problems that confront them.

The first form of the American parties was created by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and others who organized their supporters in the legislature to address the social choice problem of majority instability. The party was an institutional solution to the inherent instability of majority rule. They sought a more durable solution to the great principle of how powerful the new federal government should be. Aldrich relies on available roll call data to document the formation of parties by the third Congress.

The mass-based party, the second form the parties took was created by Martin Van Buren. This party form was created by Van Buren intentionally to address the collective action problem of electoral mobilization. This party form was based upon party in control, no person was more important than the party. Aldrich offers excellent work in this section for the book, integrating the historical literature, state election results, and the use of rational choice theory to explicate his theory. In this context, he presents a new explanation for the rise of the Republican party. He argues that it was not only the issues of the day,

particularly slavery, but the ambition of mid-level office-seekers calculating that it was in their career interest to move to this new party. Aldrich expands on Joseph Schlesinger's ambition theory to explain that party choice is based on choices made by others. He makes the point that it was the choices of congressional candidates that led to the emergence of the Republican party; it was not the figures that would later gain prominence. The key figures followed, rather than led, in the creation of the Republican mass-based party. It was the office-holders and office-seekers who created the party.

(continued on page 2)

THEME: New Literature

From Headquarters 2
Scholarly Precincts 5

Chair: L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College
Secretary-Treasurer: Diana Dwyre, University of Maryland
Program Chair: Jeffrey Berry, Tufts University
VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron
Executive Council: Everett Ladd, University of Connecticut; Jerome Mileur, University of Massachusetts; Maureen Moakley, University of Rhode Island; James Reichley, Georgetown University; Harold Bass, Quachita Baptist University; John Green, The University of Akron; Anthony Gierzynski, University of Vermont; Kay Schlozman, Boston College.

Review Essay (continued from page 1)

The most important argument made by Aldrich in this book is that the old form of the party, Van Buren created mass-party, has collapsed. It collapsed in the 1960s, and a new form of party emerged. He takes up the widely accepted Key-Sorouf trilogy, a concept useful for the mass based party form. Aldrich maintains that Key's party-in-the-electorate should be called party-in-elections. Aldrich cites the gulf that now exists between the parties and the voters, who now act as consumers. It is this separation between the party and the voter that has buttressed the decline of parties argument. Aldrich does not treat lightly the decline of partisanship in the electorate. He presents a careful analysis of what occurred to party identification in the 1960s, and he points to the Martin Wattenberg thesis that the parties have simply lost relevance to the voters. Voters do not see very much of the parties at all; their focus is on the candidates in this candidate-centered era of parties.

Aldrich addresses the puzzle of the recent party scholarship which documents and decries the decline of voter attachment to parties, then cites the large body of work that points to the strengthening of parties-as-organizations. In the 1960s, party organizations underwent significant changes. The parties were nationalized and institutionalized. The new form of the party is top down. Each party took a different path and mimicked each other along the way. The National Democrats adopted primaries for nominating their national ticket. The Republicans undertook institutionalization through the development of large, professional staff and a strong financial base. Legislative campaign committees, and state and local parties have taken on greater importance, enhanced resources, and have been subjects of a great deal of study. The puzzle is that voter attachment to parties has declined and party organizations have become stronger. The solution to the puzzle for Aldrich is simple, they are both characteristics of the new party form that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s. This party form is "in service" to the candidate-centered era of politics.

In the 1960s, the parties lost their monopoly over access to public office. The presidential campaigns of Goldwater, Rockefeller, the Kennedys, and McCarthy all point to the loss of control over the nomination by the party. The candidates could develop alternatives to the party centered campaign because of available technology. A new form of the party evolved out of this change.

The benefit-seekers, a key element of the party, that offer energy, support, and partisan cleavage to the parties changed in significant ways. The dominant campaign activists of the new party era are Wilson's "amateurs" and Wildavsky's "purists"; some examples are Goldwaterites, McGovernites, and Buchananites. They derive benefits from the policies they promote. They do not seek the selective benefits that the activists of the old mass-party era sought. These new party activists view candidates as instruments for achieving their goals, and they constrain candidates from moving to the center. The support of these benefit-seekers must be continually sought by the politically ambitious office-holders and office-seekers.

The chapter on "Political Parties and Governance" is

one of the strongest chapters in the book. Students of parties often leave thorough treatment of this element of parties to those who study Congress. Aldrich demonstrates a grasp of the literature and provides the reader with a great deal of insight. Aldrich maintains that party-in-government has consequences, and in fact party-in-government have become more significant in recent decades. Aldrich presents a strong argument on how the committee structure and the rules the party creates helps to resolve the collective action problem. Party in government is conditional on the preferences of its members. Members preferences are affected by the type of elections that are conducted. Nationalized legislative elections "... help induce greater similarity among partisan victors and greater dissimilarity between the two parties" (p.240). This type of election created the conditions for policy change. The characteristics of party-in-government, like all elements parties, are formed by the ambitions of office holders.

The House Democratic reforms of the 1970s combined with the homogenous preferences of the House Democrats of the 1980s allowed the Speaker of the 100th Congress to set out a ten point agenda and pass most of it. Aldrich points out that it was important to keep the items as a whole since as it drew support from all elements of the party. Wright used his leadership to keep attention on the agenda. Aldrich quotes David Rohde who said "The majority party in the House can propose a program different from that offered by the president, the Democrats did so in the One Hundredth Congress. Moreover, under divided government the House majority can challenge (and defeat) the administration" (p. 239). The book does not take into account events in the 104th Congress, but in this work Aldrich gives the reader an excellent guide to follow in studying party-in-government.

In the concluding chapter, Aldrich argues that the expectation of a realignment in the 1960s, due to historical patterns, was not achieved because realignment is a characteristic of the mass-party form which had collapsed. The significant event in the 1960s was a change in the partisan institutional form. Aldrich argues that "punctuated equilibrium" is a more useful tool than realignment for understanding American political history. We are in a stable era (equilibrium) that began after the equilibrium was punctured in the 1960s. A new form of the major American party has been developing from that period, and in this book Aldrich has begun to describe what the characteristics of that new form of party are. The problems that the ambitious office-seekers and office-holders are confronted with determines the form that the party will take. For Aldrich, the principle problem for the contemporary form of the party is providing an orderly access to office, and achievement of desirable policy outcomes.

This book will be very influential as other students of parties join Aldrich in attempting to understand and explain this new form of the major American party. John Aldrich has punctured the equilibrium of the study of American parties with this book, and has set off a debate about the way we understand parties that is long overdue.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

To the members of POP:

Some of you have commented that my letters to the membership of POP have become something of a personal travelogue. I suppose I should not disappoint you in my final Chair's letter, but in fact I have stayed very much in one place—only the seasons and another academic year have gone by as I remain in my office/porch overlooking the Belgrade Lakes' Great Pond, today made turbulent with a Memorial Day storm.

I would like to take this final opportunity to address you to review some of the history of our organization and of how we and the other organized sections now fit into the APSA. I believe I was a charter member of POP. I remember the early Executive Committee debates over our name, over the name of our newsletter, and mostly over the direction our section should take. I remember Business Meetings attended by only a dozen or so committed members. And I remember hearing views from some of the same individuals on whom I have relied heavily for advice these past two years. Plus ca change, plus ca meme chose.

POP began in September of 1983, one of the first of the Organized Sections. We began with strength, and we have continued to be healthy. In the early days our concerns included how to forge an effective communication link among those of us interested in studying political organizations and parties and how to assure that we had ample opportunity to present our research at APSA Annual Meetings. We discussed the possibility of a journal on many occasions and pursued annual book ideas and eventually an annual issue of a journal. Other sections were following the same courses of actions—as were the new groups that emerged. Many of us remember the debates within the APSA over allocation of program slots and over the naming of section representatives to the APSA Program Committee, Ted Lowi's ill-fated "Rule of Three."

As my term ends, I can look back and see that many of the early organizational issues are settled and that we are now a firmly established enterprise with our own modes of operation, norms, and traditions. VOXPOP is a most effective communications tool; it has become especially so under the editorship of John Green. Our share of the APSA Program has been extremely strong in recent years; Marjorie Hershey and Jeff Berry have done particularly outstanding jobs, and I am certain Barbara Burrell will follow their leads for the 1996 Meeting. We have established prizes named for some of our most eminent colleagues, and the awards bearing their names are coveted recognition of our best work. We have developed a corps of new leaders anxious and able to take over the care and running of this organization; as an example, we are fortunate to have Diana Dwyre willing to assume the treasureship, handled so ably by Charles Hadley for many years.

And, of course, we are about to assume sponsorship of our own journal, a dream of many of the founders of this section. (An article of the state of the ARP sponsorship appears elsewhere in this issue.) Our willingness and ability to sponsor a journal has raised interesting questions for the

APSA, and the leaders of the national organization rightly question the relationship between the central organization and its component parts. As in the past, we have been one of the leaders in this endeavor, but other sections will not be far behind. A number of the respondents to our questionnaire commented that they would prefer a specialized journal with articles of interest to them to the APSR, which is less satisfactory and useful for at least some. Others worry that a large number of APSA organized section-sponsored journals might eventually detract from the APSR, which as the premier scholarly journal in our field deserves not only our intellectual support but also the support of advertisers who might well see more specialized journals as providing them a better medium for their messages. These kinds of issues will remain on the agenda in the years ahead.

As I look back, my conclusion about the dozen year history of POP is that we have been successful beyond our wildest dreams. Essentially the organized section movement has caused the national organization that spawned us to reexamine how it relates to its constituents—and that is a good thing. Among other things, that means that we have succeeded in providing our membership with services and products that meet their needs.

When Ruth Jones, as chair of the Nominating Committee, asked me to assume this post just over two years ago, I accepted with little knowledge of what would be involved. In these two years I have worked with a wonderful group of people, cemented old friendships and forged new ones, and come away with increased respect for those whose work involves the study of political organizations and parties. I won't name individuals for fear of forgetting some, but all of those who have helped over the years, on the Executive Committee, on the annual program and our workshops, on our other POP committees, on VOXPOP, as we have debated and negotiated over the ARP, and as I have sought advice on various issues have my deepest gratitude and thanks.

I believe that each of my predecessors as POP chair has left to their successor an organization stronger than it was when they assumed leadership. I only hope that you and my successor will view my tenure in the same way. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve as Chair for the past two years.

Sandy Maisel

Nominations

Report of Nomination Committee:

The nominating committee offers the following recommendations for POP officers:

President (two-year term):

John Bibby, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Council Members (two-year term):

Paul Herrnson, University of Maryland
Andrew McFarland, University of Illinois
Chicago Circle
Walter Mebane, Cornell University
Nancy Zingale, St. Thomas College

Hal Bass, Chair

POP to Assume Sponsorship of American Review of Politics

For much of the last year, the leaders of POP have been in discussion with Walter Beach of Heldref Publications, the editors of the American Review of Politics (ARP), and the APSA as we have developed a plan for POP to assume sponsorship of the ARP.

The discussions and negotiations have involved four very separate steps. None could be completed until the previous one had been finished, though some have proceeded while others are still underway, hoping that anticipated results eventuated. Gary Wekkin and Charles Hadley have been negotiating with a number of publishers concerning the ARP for some time. At the 1994 Business Meeting, we raised the question of POP sponsoring the journal, under a number of possible scenarios. Those of you at that meeting remember that the discussion was active and pointed. The Executive Committee decided to poll the members to see what their views were on this issue. We needed a concrete proposal to take to the membership—first from the editors of the ARP as to the content of the journal we would be sponsoring and second from the perspective publisher as to what it would cost our organization to sponsor this journal and what our members would receive in exchange for assuming these costs.

While each set of negotiations took some time, each reached a conclusion with which the Executive Committee was comfortable. The ARP editors agreed that the journal would become one devoted exclusively to political organizations and parties (after a very brief transition period during which they would clear their backlog of accepted articles). They also agreed that VOXPOP would be included into two of the four quarterly issues; while not committing beyond that, they are also looking at book reviews for the other two issues. We mutually concurred that after the agreement takes effect, the editor(s) will determine if they want to have annual theme issues, as we have contracted for in the past, or if they choose not to devote one issue to a specific topic. Similarly, the editor(s) will decide whether the results of the annual POP workshop at the APSA Convention merit publication. The agreement calls for the editor or editors to be appointed by POP (in a manner to be determined by the Executive Committee) and approved by the publisher. The editor(s) are to appoint the Editorial Board from among members of POP, with the POP Chair serving as an ex officio member. We also agreed that Charles Hadley would be the first editor appointed by POP.

The negotiations with Heldref were begun by Gary Wekkin and concluded by me. To reduce contract language to simplest terms, Heldref agrees to publish the ARP to their normal professional standards, with the material provided by our editors. Each member of POP will receive an annual subscription to the journal as part of their POP membership. In return, POP will pay Heldref \$5 for each member (at the time of renewal); the Bliss Institute at the University of Akron will also contribute to the journal at twice the rate POP members are paying, up to a maximum contribution of \$5,000 a year. (Bliss will, of course, cease publishing

VOXPOP and the annual proceeding of the POP Workshops). The agreement is for a three-year period, with either side having the ability to withdraw with one year's notice should the arrangement not be seen as beneficial. POP would raise membership dues from \$5 to \$10 in order to meet our share of the costs; this raise would still leave us far from the most expensive of the organized sections.

With these arguments established in principle, we polled POP members to ascertain:

1. Whether you thought this was a good idea in general.
2. Whether you would maintain POP membership if the dues were raised (and you received ARP as part of membership).
3. Whether you thought that a quality journal concentrating on political organizations and parties could be maintained (with the additional caveat that Sage is commencing what might be considered a competitive—at least in terms of content—journal).
4. Whether you would contribute to that journal and under what circumstances.
5. Whether you would work on that journal as a board member or reviewer.

We had two primary concerns. First, the APSA has the right to discontinue any organized section that falls below 250 members. While we have over 550 members as of now, we felt we would be derelict in our duties if we considered a proposal that had any chance of reducing our membership to that level. More to the point, we wanted to serve the needs and desires of our current members, not just some minimum number. Second, none of us on the Executive Committee wants to be associated nor wants POP to be associated with a journal of less than first quality.

On each count the results of the questionnaire were most encouraging. (Unbelievably, results are still dribbling in, months after the deadline not only for response but for action.) We have had responses from nearly 200 members. All but a handful said that they intended to continue membership in POP; fewer than 5 percent said that they might drop their membership if the dues were raised and we offered the ARP. A vast majority (approaching 80 percent) said that they felt enough articles could be generated to ensure a quality journal specializing in political organizations and parties; a few, but not many felt that two such journals would make quality more difficult. Many, however, offered interesting comments on how our journal and the Sage journal, with which many POP members and leaders are also associated, would approach the subject differently and attract different contributors. A number responded that association with POP could only enhance the ARP, drawing on the LSQ model as one to emulate (though many differences are apparent in the two models, not the least of which is that the LSQ is not sponsored in any way by the Legislative Studies Section of the APSA). A large percentage of the respondents said that they would submit articles to a revised ARP, though most of those opined that it would

(continued on page 5)

FROM HEADQUARTERS

POP to Assume Sponsorship (continued from page 4)

not be the first journal to which they would submit. Impressively, nearly 30 percent of the respondents said that they were willing to serve on the Editorial Board or as a reviewer for the ARP—and these names have been forwarded to the editors (except, of course, those who chose to remain anonymous).

With these results in hand, the Executive Committee met in Chicago at the Midwest Meeting and voted unanimously to raise our dues from \$5 to \$10 and to assume sponsorship of the ARP, each action to take effect once the APSA has approved.

That brings us to our current position. The APSA Council approved a rule some years ago prohibiting organized sections from accepting advertising in their newsletters. While we do not feel that our arrangement with Heldref violates this rule (Heldref intends to run a limited number of advertisements aimed at those with interests in political organizations and parties in the ARP), I as chair—and I believe the rest of the Executive Committee—do not want to violate the even spirit of an APSA Council directive.

Thus, I wrote to Cathy Rudder asking that the Council reconsider their previous position in light of our proposal. (I should point out that at least one other section has an “arm’s length” arrangement with a journal that parallels ours in virtually every aspect and does include the accep-

tance of advertising and at least two other sections are carefully watching our progress with thoughts of following a similar path). Michael Brintnall of the APSA staff has worked closely with us throughout this process. The APSA Lawyers reviewed our proposed contracts and made a couple of very helpful suggestions, all of which Heldref accepted. The APSA Committee on Organized Sections met the end of June to consider a number of matters, including this one. Mike Brintnall judges that this matter should be a cakewalk. In fact, the item on the Organized Sections Committee’s agenda calls for proposing new rules to permit this kind of activity for sections. The full Council will take up this proposal in September. We hope to sign our contract with Heldref shortly thereafter and have POP as sponsor of the winter issue of the ARP.

Those of us who have been involved with these negotiations have approached this topic with extreme care, guarding the interests of the APSA and of POP as we worked toward our goal. We strongly believe that the agreements we have reached meet our expectations and protect all of our mutual concerns. And we are most pleased that the ARP will continue to survive and thrive, and that we as POP members will at long last have our own journal in which to share our work.

Sandy Maisel

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Political Parties and the Law

1995 POP WORKSHOP

August 30, APSA, Chicago • 9:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M.

9:00-10:30 **Political Parties and the Right of Association**

Daniel Lowenstein, School of Law, UCLA
Gerald Pomper, Political Science, Rutgers University

10:30-12:00 **Alternatives to the Major Parties**

Richard Winger, Editor, *Ballot Access News*
Douglas Amy, Political Science, Mt. Holyoke College

12:00-1:30 **Lunch**
State Party Nominations by Convention

Mark Braden, Attorney, Baker-Hostetler, Washington

1:30-4:30 **Parties and Patronage**

Cynthia Grant Bowman, School of Law, Northwestern
Arnette Hubbard, Commissioner, Chicago Board of Election Commissioners

3:00-4:30 **Roundtable: Trends in Party and Election Law**

Mark Braden, Attorney, Baker-Hostetler, Washington
William Crotty, Political Science, Northwestern
Howard Scarrow, Political Science, SUNY-Stony Brook
Jerome M. Mileur, Political Science, University of Massachusetts

Registration

Make checks payable to “APSA POP” and forward them to Jerome M. Mileur

Contact: Jerome M. Mileur
Department of Political Science
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003
(413) 545-1354

Charges: \$15 for faculty
(\$25 if lunch included)
\$5 for graduate students
(\$15 if lunch included)

NOTICE: Late APSA Listings

Hyde Park Session I:

"Is There a Right to Discriminate against Gays and Lesbians?" Friday, September 1, 3:30-5:15, Normandie Lounge, Chicago Hilton

Moderator: Professor Martin Shapiro, University of California Law School Berkeley

Commentators:

Professor David Novak, Religious Studies
University of Virginia

Professor Martha Nussbaum, Law School
University of Chicago

Professor Ken Sherrill, Hunter College, CUNY

Hyde Park Session II

"How Angry is the Electorate?" Thursday, August 31, 3:30-5:15, Normandie Lounge, Chicago Hilton

Moderator: Catherine Rudder, Executive
Director, APSA

Commentators:

Professor Sue Carroll, Eagleton Institute, Rutgers
Professor Mike Dawson, University of Chicago

E.J. Dionne, Columnist, Washington Post

Recent Papers of Interest

"Substance vs. Packaging: An Empirical Analysis of Parties" Robert Harmel, Texas A & M University; Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University; Alexander Tan, Texas A & M University

"Changing Roles for Political Parties in the Modern Liberal State" Kay Lawson, San Francisco State University

"Continuity and Change in Parties and Party Systems" Anne Bennett, University of Michigan

"Change Comes to Steeltown: Local Political Parties as Instruments of Power" Melanie J. Blumberg, University of Akron; William C. Bining, Youngstown State University; John C. Green, University of Akron

"Parties, Candidates, and State Electoral Politics" Alan Gitelson, Loyola University; John P. Frendreis, Loyola University

"Can They be Serious?: Minor Parties and Candidates in Congressional and State Legislative Elections" Christian Collet, University of California, Irvine; Jerrold R. Hansen, University of California, Irvine

"Pre-primary Endorsements: An Asset or Liability for State Political Parties?" Malcolm E. Jewell, University of Kentucky; Sarah Morehouse, University of Connecticut

"Trade Association PACs, Access, and Allocative Strategies Over Time" Kim Hedden, George Washington University

"Free Riding or an Arms Race?: Variations in PAC Formation Among Institutions, Associations, and Membership Interest Organizations" David Lowery, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Virginia Gray, University of Minnesota.

"The End of the Cold War and Defense PACs" Eric Mlyn, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Jonathan Gordon, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

"The Time to Give: PAC Motivations and Electoral Timing" Nolan McCarty, University of Southern California; Lawrence S. Rothenberg, University of Rochester

"Lobbying Allies in Congress" Scott Ainsworth, University of Georgia; Itai Sened, Tel Aviv University

"Countervailing Power: The Creation of Government Coalitions in Response to Corporate Monopoly" Jameson W. Doig, Princeton University

"Organized Interests as Coalition Members" Marie Hohnacki, Pennsylvania University

"Friends of the Court or Friends of Each Other: The Group of Ten as an Interest Group Coalition" Andrew Whitford, Washington University

"Social Movements and Theories of American Politics" Andrew McFarland, University of Illinois, Chicago

"Collective Action and Resource Mobilization Theories of Social Movements" Mark G. Lichbach, University of Colorado

"What Do Social Movements, Interest Groups and Political Parties Do? A Synthesis" Paul Burstein, University of Washington

"The Interest Group-Political Party Connection: Fundamentals of the Relationship" Clive S. Thomas, University of Alaska, Juneau; Ronald J. Hrebendar, University of Utah

"Citizens Groups, Political Parties, and the Decline of the Democrats" Jeffrey M. Berry, Tufts University.

"The Religious Factor in Assessing Current Trends in Republican Party Strength" Steven Yonish, University of Wisconsin.

"Interest Groups and Political Parties: The Odd Couple" Yael Yishai, University of Haifa.

(continued on page 7)

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Recent Papers (continued from page 6)

"The Dynamics of Party Activism: The British Labor and Conservative Parties" Paul F. Whiteley, University of Sheffield; Patrick Seyd, University of Sheffield.

"Motivations for Political Activism: Elite Rationality, Childhood Socialization, Insider Recruitment, or Social Movement Mobilization" Denise Baer, American University.

"Public Participation in Policy Development in Canada's Liberal, Reform, and Progressive Conservative Parties Prior to the 1993 Election" Bill Cross, University of Western Ontario.

"Interrelationships Among Individual Attitudes, the Organizational Context, and Party Activity for Southern Grassroots Party Activists" Charles Prysby, University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

"Public Opinion, Party Platforms, and Public Policy, 1980-1992" Alan Monroe, Illinois State University.

"Was 1994 a Return to Party-Centered Campaigning?" Diana Dwyre, University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

"The State of the Parties: Party Salience in the Contemporary State" John J. Coleman, University of Wisconsin.

"Interest Groups and the Rulemaking Process: Who Participates? Whose Voices Get Heard?" Marissa Martino Golden, University of Pennsylvania

"Major Higher Education Associations and Their Federal Relations Role" Constance Cook, University of Michigan

"More Empty Cores? Environmental Politics in Washington" Debra Salazar, Western Washington University

"Electronic Advocacy: Interest Groups and Public" Darrell West, Brown University; Richard Francis, Brown University

"Mobilizing and Sustaining Grassroots Dissent" Laura Woliver, University of South Carolina

"How Environmental Groups Recruit Members: Does the Logic Still Hold Up?" Paul Johnson, University of Kansas

"Abortion Policy in New York and Pennsylvania" Rosemary Nossiff, Rutgers University, Newark

"Political Opportunity in the United States: Tracking the Hunger Lobby Since the War on Poverty" Doug Imig, Harvard University

"When Waves Collide: The Meeting of the New and

Old Women's Movements in Switzerland" Lee Ann Banaszak, Pennsylvania State University

"Women's Movements and Women in Movements: Political Opportunities in Context" Karen Beckwith, College of Wooster

"Missed Opportunities: Social Movement Abeyance and Public Policy" David S. Meyer, City College of New York; Tracy Sawyers, City College of New York

"Presidents, Party Systems, and Civil Rights: Historical Opportunity Structures Under Clinton and Truman" Scott C. James, University of California, Davis

"Party Out of Power: Democratic Strategies After 1896" Kenneth Finegold, Eastern Washington University

"Party Reform as a Failed Effort at Political Renewal" David Plotke, New School for Social Research

"A Little Something for the Ladies: The Impact of Suffrage Campaigns on Protective Legislation for Women Workers in the Progressive Era" Cheryl Logan Sparks, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Peter R. Walniuk, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

"Was Susan B. Anthony Wrong? State Public Policy and the Representation of Women's Interests" Susan B. Hansen, University of Pittsburgh

"Explaining Women's Interest Group Mobilization in the Fifty States" Lael Keiser, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

"Socioeconomic Diversity and Organized Interests in the American States" William Benfanti, University of Maryland

"Variation in the Membership of Interest Groups in an Issue Network" Donald P. Haider-Markel, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

"The Partisan Theory of Legislative Organization and the Rise of Senate Party Leadership, 1930-1070" Richard Forgette, Miami University; Brian Sala, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

"The Effect of Single-Party Dominance on Legislative" Jay P. Greene, University of Houston

"Theories of the Party in the Legislature and the Transition to Republican Rule in Congress" John Aldrich, Duke University; David Rohde, Michigan State University

"House Republican Leadership: Changes in the New Majority" Douglas Koopman, Office of Representative Richard Arney

1994 POP Awards

Gerald Pomper, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.

James MacGregor Burns, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for *The Deadlock of Democracy*. (Prentice Hall, 1963.)

Gerald Pomper, winner of the Jack Walker Award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for "From Confusion to Clarity: Issues and American Votes, 1956-1968." *American Political Science Review*." (1966).

Philip Klinkner, winner of the Emerging Scholars Award.



Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics
Akron, OH 44325-1904

FIRST CLASS
U.S. Postage Paid
Akron, Ohio
Permit Number 222