

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

THEME – PARTISAN CHANGE

What Comes Next?: Party Troubles in the Late 1990s

John Kenneth White, Catholic University of America

In the last issue of *Vox Pop*, I described the emergence of a Cold War party system beginning with Dwight Eisenhower's election in 1952 that saw Republicans become a presidential party ready to assert the national interest against those enslaved by communism behind the Iron Curtain. The prolonged and emotionally-charged Cold War allowed the Grand Old Party to recoup from the devastating defeats it suffered at the hands of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s, thanks to a foreign policy-based Cold War agenda that quickly overtook the New Deal as controlling issues in presidential contests. Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Barry Goldwater, and Ronald Reagan became the founding fathers of a "modern Republicanism" that cast hapless Democrats as naive party-waists who were "soft on communism." The persistence of the New Deal as a largely *congressional* (rather than a presidential) program, combined with the incumbency advantages Democrats held after the landslides of 1958, 1964, and 1974, allowed them to control Congress for much of the Cold War.

The emergence of a Republican congressional majority in 1994, and the 1996 retention of back-to-back Republican congresses for the first time since 1926-1930, are encouraging signs that Republicans can keep the gains made during the Cold War. This rosy scenario is augmented by the fact that Republicans occupy thirty-two of the fifty state governorships, have gained four-hundred-sixty five state legislative seats since Bill Clinton became president in 1993, and control forty-six state legislative chambers. The issues also seem to be with the Republicans. Much to the irritation of the GOP establishment, Clinton often takes credit for things that have long been standard party doctrine. For example, Clinton boasts that his administration has the fewest number of federal employees since John F. Kennedy; he proudly notes that he is the first president since Lyndon Johnson to submit a balanced budget to Congress; he brags that

his 1996 signature on the Republican-sponsored welfare reform bill has resulted in the lowest welfare rolls in twenty-seven years; and when Republicans tried in 1997 to make an issue of the taxpayer abuses by the Internal Revenue Service, Clinton promptly acted to make the IRS more consumer-friendly.

Clinton's me-tooism (so reminiscent of Republican cries of "me too" during the New Deal era) has created *two* Republican parties; a liberal Republican party led by Clinton's New Democrats that is somewhat more tight-fisted than its New Deal/Great Society predecessors, yet is strongly inclined to keep government out of people's bedroom when it comes to advancing social policy. Opposing the Clinton-led liberal Republicans is an array of conservative Republicans who are also tight-fisted spendthrifts, yet will yield on that score when the choice is between saving a few dollars and cutting taxes. But when it comes to advancing traditional social values, these same tax-cutting conservatives want a more proactive government. The bright line between these two

continued on page 3

THEME: PARTISAN CHANGE

From Headquarters.....	2
From the Field	4
Special Interests	7

Chair: Ruth Jones, Arizona State University

Secretary-Treasurer: Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico

Program Chair: Anthony Corrado, Colby College

VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron

Executive Council: Barbara Burrell, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Bruce Caswell, Rowan College of New Jersey; Debra Dodson, Rutgers University; Robin Kolodny, Temple University; John Shockley III, Western Illinois University; John Coleman, University of Wisconsin, Madison; David Farrell, University of Manchester; Bob Harmel, Texas A&M University; Anna Harvey, New York University.

**Political Organizations and Parties Organized Section of the
American Political Science Association Annual Business Meeting
Boston, MA, Wednesday, September 4, 1998**

The section meeting was called to order by POP Chairperson Ruth Jones. The following business transpired:

1. A. **Minutes:** 1997 POP Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously.

B. Treasurer's Report

Funds on Hand July 1, 1997	\$7,384.59	
Revenue Generated:		
APSA section dues	\$ 1,176.00	
Interest income	88.36	
Other revenue:		
mailing labels	<u>201.46</u>	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$1,465.82	\$1,465.82

Expenditures:*

Bank service fees	(10.00)	
1997 Awards-deposit	(229.98)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	(239.98)	(\$239.98)

Net Activity for the Period \$ 1,225.84

Funds on Hand June 30, 1998** \$ 8,610.43

* Copying, printing, postage, telephone, and staff provided gratis by the California State University, Chico, Arizona State University and the University of Akron

** NationsBank funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking (\$5,566.39) and nonprofit savings (\$3,044.04).

C. Membership Data

<i>Year</i>	<i>POP Membership</i>
1998	565
1997	505
1996	519
1995	589
1994	571

2. **POP Awards Ceremony:** Awards reported on page 8.

3. **Nominating Committee Report:** The committee (Sandy Maisel, Chair, Barbara Burrell, Susan Scarrow and Ken Kollman) presented the following slate of candidates (all terms expire in the year 2000):

Secretary-Treasurer: Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico

Council Members:

John Coleman, University of Wisconsin, Madison
David Farrell, University of Manchester
Bob Harmel, Texas A&M University
Anna Harvey, New York University

The slate of candidates was elected unanimously. Ruth Jones thanked the outgoing Council Members (John Jackson of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale and Candice Nelson of American University) for their outstanding service to POP.

4. Announcements

Tony Corrado of Colby College, 1998 POP Program Chair, reported that the 1998 program went well. The Wednesday Workshop on "The Politics of Campaign Finance Reform" was also quite successful. He noted that many people are choosing POP as a second or third choice when they submit their proposals to APSA and that POP should encourage its members and others to list POP as first when submitting paper and panel proposals.

POP Chairperson Ruth Jones thanked Tony Corrado for an excellent job on the 1998 program and announced that Candice Nelson of American University will be next year's program chair. She also announced that Paul Beck of Ohio State University will serve as program chair for the year 2000 with the special focus that year on the 50th Anniversary of the APSA Report, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System."

Ruth Jones thanked outgoing Council members for their service: Bruce Caswell, John Jackson and Candice Nelson.

Bruce Caswell of Rowan College noted the success of the POP Wednesday Workshop and thanked Diane Dwyre for help in organizing the event.

Ruth Jones asked that proposals be sent for next year's Wednesday Workshop as soon as possible so that we can begin planning the event and meet the various deadlines.

5. **POP Celebration Committee** for the 50th Anniversary of the APSA Report, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System."

POP member and former Executive Council member Paul Herrnson and POP Newsletter Editor John Green are the co-chairs of the POP Cele-

continued on page 3

continued from page 2

bration Committee. They are designing an impressive program to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the report of the APSA annual meeting in the year 2000. The plans include a Wednesday Workshop with keynote address, special roundtables on parties, panels dedicated to the topic and an edited volume that will include the best presentations from this celebration.

POP and the Celebration Committee are currently raising money for these events. Ruth Jones asked that POP members tell colleagues who are not necessarily connected to POP about the event and to encourage them to get involved. Contact Paul Hermson (301-405-4123; phern@bss2.umd.edu) or John Green (330-972-5182; jgreen@uakron.edu) to learn more about the Celebration, suggest a panel or workshop, and/or contribute to the effort.

6. APSA Centennial Celebration

POP Chairperson Ruth Jones discussed POP's role in the APSA Centennial Celebration in 2000. She noted that some sections (e.g., Presidential Studies) have an earmarked contribution to set up an endowment to be used for fellowships, travel to the meeting, or something else. A \$50,000 fund will produce about \$2,000 per year endowment. She welcomed suggestions for doing something like this for a POP endowment by 2003 or some other proposal for the Centennial Celebration and cautioned members not to get the Centennial Celebration and the POP Celebration Committee for the 50th Anniversary of the APSA Report, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System" confused.

Debra Dodson noted that the Women and Politics Section has some endowed awards and this helps bring attention to the section and the awards.

Nancy Zingale cautioned that we may not want to tie up a lot of money in the endowment, for we may want to change what we want to do with the money in the future and will have already committed it to this long-term plan.

7. New Business

Suggestion for "Best Paper Award" Sponsored by the journal *Party Politics*.

David, co-editor of *Party Politics*, suggested that POP offer an award for the best paper presented at the APSA annual meeting on parties and interest groups. He noted that such an award will stimulate more paper proposals, encourage more top quality work, motivate more graduate student participation and increase the profile of POP. The best paper could be published in *Party Politics* (once peer-reviewed).

Ruth Jones suggested trying the award for 2 or 3 years as a pilot program.

Mac Jewel noted that the recipient of the award should have the "option" of publishing the paper in *Party Politics*, for he/she may have prior obligations for the piece.

A show of hands indicated virtual unanimous support to go ahead with the award.

Respectfully Submitted,
Diane Dwyre
POP Secretary-Treasurer
California State University, Chico

continued from page 1

Republican parties is abortion. Liberal Republicans (alias New Democrats) are uniformly pro-choice; conservative Republicans are solidly pro-life.

Republicans scorn Clinton's me-tooism, noting that Democrats are without a guiding ideology and must rely on the adroit maneuvering of their leader. Surely, they say, once Clinton leaves the White House, the presidency will be theirs. There is some evidence to substantiate the Republican claim. In the 1997 off-year elections, Republicans captured the governorships of Virginia (by a wide margin) and New Jersey (by a close one) and reelected New York City Mayor Rudolph Guiliani (the first time a Republican has won that job twice since Fiorello H. La Guardia). The Republican National Committee crowed: "Our victories last night prove that the Republican message of lower taxes is just as strong

today as it was in 1994; each of these races was won on the principle of putting more money in the hands of families, and less in the pockets of politicians. These are Republican issues that will reverberate into 1998 and beyond." Republicans also proudly point their increasing strength south of the Mason-Dixon line. In March 1998, Republican National Committee Chairman Jim Nicholson welcomed Alabama State Representative Tim Parker into the GOP ranks. Parker is the 363rd elected Democrat to defect since Bill Clinton and Al Gore were elected in 1992.

But these straws in the wind do not bode well for the Republican Party come to the new millennium. The 1994 and 1996 elections have been characterized by a lose-to-win calculus that voters

continued on page 5

Cooperative Effort Focuses on Administration and Costs of Elections Major Online Electoral Resource Schedule for Launch

Michael D. Boda

Representatives from the International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES), the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA), and the International Institute of Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) will gather at the UN Headquarters in October 1998 to launch a draft version of the Administrative and Cost of Elections (ACE) project. Over the coming months, the project team intends to seek input on a draft version of the publication before releasing a final version.

The first of its type in the world, ACE will contain over 3,000 pages of text written specifically for the publication and a wide array of sample materials from around the world. The publication will be available, without charge, via the World Wide Web at www.aceproject.org. For those without access to the Web, a CD-ROM version will be available.

The ACE publication represents a milestone contribution to the strengthening of the democratic process. It will provide election administrators, legislators, bilateral and multilateral assistance agencies, and academics all over the world with analytical and comparative texts and good-practice examples for use in organizing, supporting, or studying free and fair elections. By highlighting ways of reducing the costs of administering elections, ACE will assist in increasing the sustainability of electoral processes.

The need for a widely- and easily-accessible and comprehensive collection of information on the myriad alternative approaches to all aspects of election administration from the drafting of constitutional language to the counting of the votes has been evident for some time. Significant advancements in electronic publishing, and sharply reduced costs for production and distribution of CD-ROMs, now make this project feasible.

In developing the strategic plan for the project, the ACE Steering Committee and Project Management Team laid out a variety of objectives: to increase knowledge and enhance learning about democratic electoral processes; to promote transparency, accountability, professionalism, and efficiency in electoral processes with the broader context of democratic development; to provide alternative frameworks and guidance of election of-

officials and policy makers seeking to strengthen national electoral systems; to encourage the use of good practices in electoral administration; to identify elements in electoral system design and administrative practice that are cost-effective; and to highlight country innovations in electoral administration.

The partner organizations identified nine broad topic areas associated with electoral administration to be covered by the project. Each organization has agreed to research and create the documentation in three topic areas, while a joint management team ensures consistency and completeness of the information compiled. IFES is completing work on Electoral Administration, Voter Registration and Voter Education, while UN-DESA is responsible for Legislative Framework, Boundary Delimitation, and Polling Operations, and IDEA for Vote Counting, Regulation of Candidates and Parties, and Electoral Systems.

The joint agreement heralded a new cooperative approach in electoral assistance and will result in a far wider range of resources for election administrators than is currently available. In March 1998, the ACE Project Management Team and lead writers assembled at Christ College, Cambridge University, to review the primary text and ensure consistency between topic areas. While the full version of the product will not be available online until October 1998, a pilot project on Vote Counting can currently be viewed at www.aceproject.org.

Michael Boda is Deputy Director of Informational Resources at IFES and serves as an ACE Project Manager Officer.

continued from page 3

have rigorously applied to both parties. Americans like divided government, and see no reason why they should not use the two increasingly squabbling Democratic and Republican parties in government to check and balance each other.

In 1998, Republicans also seem likely to maintain their congressional majorities for another reason: the Lewinsky scandal. Clinton's dalliance with the White House intern and the widespread disappointment across the political spectrum that he has let the voters down and done harm to the institution of the presidency, have mobilized the Republican base to march to the polls on Election Day. Prior Democratic hopes of winning the eleven seats needed to forge a majority in the House have faded. Ironically, the Lewinsky scandal may hurt *Republicans* in the long-run. There is no sign that the party is getting ready for 2000. There is virtually no activity in the Republican-oriented think tanks to generate a governing program should the voters abandon their lose-to-win calculus and the Republicans win both the presidency *and* the Congress. Instead, Republicans prefer to leave issue-agenda development to their prospective presidential candidates. In this way, Republicans are emulating the Democrats during the Watergate era. Democrats sensed that Nixon's foibles gave them a unique opportunity to win the White house during the Cold War years. They were right, but just barely. Carter's narrow victory and the Democratic party's failure to develop a post-New Deal/Great Society program meant that Carter had problems governing. Until the Republicans grapple with the after effects of the Cold War, the voters will stick with their lose-to-win calculus.

In a precinct article in the *Wall Street Journal* titled "What ails Conservatism?" (September 15, 1997), William Kristol and David Brooks write that "something is missing" at the core of Republican conservatism. Indeed, something more is missing than Ronald Reagan. Kristol and Brooks argue that conservatism is empty if it exists merely to mobilize hatred of all governments. Now that Republicans are in charge of two branches of the federal government (the Congress and the judiciary), it has become more difficult for the party to put government on its "Most Wanted" list. Reagan polltaker Richard B. Wirthlin urges his fellow conservatives to be more "even-handed" in their approach toward government "even if it does not always support the programs that any one particular group might like." Kristol and Brooks agree: "A conservatism that organizes citizens' resentments rather than informing their hopes will always fall short of fundamental victory."

A muscular Republican party must be one that appeals to greatness. Abraham Lincoln once said that American nationalism is rooted in "an abstract truth, applicable to all men at all times." Ronald Reagan understood this aspect of Americana quite well. In a 1986 national television speech, Reagan extolled the American Way of Life: "Think for a moment how special it is to be an American. Can we doubt that only a Divine Providence placed this land, this island of freedom, here as a refuge for all those people in the world who yearn to be free?" Today some Republicans have shield away from Reagan's optimism—more concerned with protecting the integrity of American territory from illegal immigrants and preserving traditional family values considered to be under attack by liberal Democrats, the media, and Hollywood moguls. This group of conservatives, led by commentator Patrick J. Buchanan and former vice president Dan Quayle, advocates a European nationalism that focuses on the "blood and soil" of the land. Until and unless Republicans enlarge the country's sense of greatness, and bring forth articulate leaders who can reinforce the vision, the presidency may prove to be an elusive prize.

Democratic Trouble

In March 1998, Democrats were feeling confident. Their president, despite the swirl of sexual allegations surrounding him, had a job approval rating that exceeded Ronald Reagan's at the height of his power. Adding to the good news was a Democratic congressional victory in Ronald Reagan's district. Lois Capps was the Democratic candidate to succeed her late husband, Walter, who was the first Democrat to represent the district since World War II, only to die of a heart attack less than a year after taking office in 1997. In a bitter campaign against conservative Republican Tom Bordonaro that saw outside interest groups waging war against each other, Capps won decisively in a district that Clinton narrowly lost to Dole. Democratic General Chairman Roy Romer exalted: "This should have been a relatively easy victory for the Republicans but they had to scramble to keep up with Lois Capps' winning agenda and ideas. We won this race in the Republicans' backyard, and in November we'll win across the country."

Democrats were also doing better in an area that had long been a party weakness: raising money. During the last six months of 1997, the Democratic National Committee collected nearly \$23 million from approximately 250,000 contributors whose average contribution was less than \$100. But breaking into another chorus of "Happy Days Are Here Again" seems premature. Since Clinton first won the presidency in 1992, 20 percent of the then-Democratic House members have departed, 20 percent of the then-sitting Democratic Senators are gone, and 38

continued on page 6

continued from page 5

percent of the then-Democratic governors have left office. In addition, the Lewinsky scandal has hurt Democrats on the all-important values issues. Ever since the sexual revolution of the 1960s, voters have distrusted Democrats when it comes to defending traditional values. In 1972, Richard Nixon ridiculed George McGovern as the "triple AAA" candidate, meaning that McGovern stood for amnesty for Vietnam deserters, acid (LSD), and abortion. By 1992, a poor economy and Clinton's support for such things as the death penalty and tough crime laws that put more police on the streets neutralized the GOP values advantage. Dan Quayle could wail about Murphy Brown having a child out-of-wedlock on television, but the complaint seemed irrelevant in light of real problems that real Americans faced. The Lewinsky scandal has highlighted the electorate's past misgivings about the Democratic party and its ability to stand for traditional family values.

Instead of having a strong electoral base, Clinton's New Democratic Party has profited from the divisions that plague the GOP. Democrats have welcomed the end of the Cold War, since they can feed the disintegrating carcass of the Republican electoral coalition that the Cold War built. But Clinton's predilection for tactically outwitting the Republicans leaves many of his fellow Democrats frustrated and confused. In a December 2, 1997 speech delivered at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt took aim at Clinton's willingness to listen to advice given by his strategist Dick Morris: "Too often, our leaders seem enamored with small ideas that nibble around the edges of big problems." Gephardt admonished his fellow Democrats to become a party "where principles trump tactics": "We need a Democratic party that is a movement for change--and not a money machine." Responding to similar complaints, Clinton testily told a reporter: "What we have done is both progressive and effective."

Gephardt, a likely challenger to Vice President Al Gore for the 2000 Democratic presidential nomination, represents the old liberalism that remains popular among his house colleagues. That was not always the case. First elected in 1976, Gephardt ran as a reformer and styled himself as a different kind of Democrat. He supported Ronald Reagan's 1981 tax reform plan in 1986. He also differed with his fellow Democrats on such issues as abortion, busing, and raising the minimum wage.

But as Gephardt climbed the party leadership ladder in the House, his positions began to change, a reflection of the increased ideological solidarity within the Democratic ranks as conservative Dixiecrats bid their party adieu. Gephardt altered his stance on abortion from pro-life to pro-choice, supported increasing the minimum wage, and fervently backed the big government-oriented Clinton health-care plan. Such votes earned him an 85 percent approval rating from the liberally-oriented Ameri-

cans for Democratic Action in 1995. Just as Clinton moved to occupy the center with his New Democratic initiatives, Gephardt moved into the opposition denouncing the Clinton-sponsored North American Free Trade Agreement, refusing to give Clinton "fast track" authority in seeking new trade agreements with Latin America, and voting no on the welfare reform bill that Clinton signed into law in 1996. In May 1997, Gephardt denounced the balanced budget plan (which passed the House with support from 132 Democrats) as "a budget of many deficits--a deficit of principle, a deficit of fairness, a deficit of tax justice and, worst of all, a deficit of dollars." Gore, meanwhile, has been a loyal vice president, not allowing an iota of public disagreement to separate him from Clinton. Thus, the 2000 Democratic contest is likely to be as much as a referendum among the party faithful on Clinton as it is on their prospective nominee.

Still, the duality of views that persist among the old liberalism and the New Democratic (read Liberal Republican) philosophy cannot last forever. California State Senate President Pro Tempore John Burton exclaims: "I don't get this 'New Democrat' b---s---. There are only so many ways you can feed hungry people, or get jobs for people who don't have them, and get kids a good education." Republican polltaker Wirthlin notes that the Democratic divisions make the party's 2000 presidential contest an important one: "In the next election, whoever leads the Democratic party must reconcile the competing approaches that Clinton has adroitly managed to straddle. Ultimately, the party has to decide which side of the fence it's going to come down on."

Clinton's redrawing of the electoral college maps during his two presidential campaigns favors his party (despite the Republican gains in Dixie), but hardly signifies a new Democratic era. Given the likelihood of continued Republican control of the Congress, Democrats are not poised for a significant increase in partisan identifiers. Instead, they seem likely to become the kind of "top-down" party that Republicans were during the Cold War, profiting from internal Republican divisions and the GOP's inability to win public confidence on a majority of the issues that determine the outcome of presidential contests in the post-Cold War era (especially entitlements, education, and the environment). Unlike the Cold War Republican presidents, the next Democratic chief executive will have little more than his own persona from which to construct a winning coalition. Lacking a crisis and a solid base of party support both in the electorate and in Congress, this Democratic president won't be another Franklin Roosevelt or Lyndon Johnson. Clinton's legacy to his party is a dubious one, indeed.

Excerpted from John Kenneth White, *Still Seeing Red: How the Cold War Shapes the New American Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998 paperback edition).

Papers of Interest
1998 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting

- "Die Grunen: Ideology and Political Reality." Irene Barnett, Kent State University.
- "The Norwegian Labor Party and the European Issue, 1989-1994." Jo Saglie, University of Washington.
- Coping With Mass Politics: Electoral Institutions, Party Innovation, and Liberals in France and Germany, 1870-1939." Marcus Kreuzer, Columbia University.
- "How Much Have They Changed? The Evolution of the Rhetorical Strategies and the Communist Successor Parties." John T. Ishiyama, Truman State University.
- "Adaptation Strategies of Formerly Dominant Political Parties." Sahar Shafqat, Texas A&M University.
- "Success and Failure: A Comparative Study of the Communist Successor Parties in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria." Jefferey Stevenson Murer, University of Illinois, Chicago.
- "How the Former Ruling Communist Organizations of East-Central Europe Transformed Themselves into Electoral Parties." Daniel F. Ziblatt, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Organizational Sources of Differences in the 'Public Face' of the Communist Successor Parties: A Comparison of the Czech and Slovak Cases." Anna Grzymala-Busse, Harvard University.
- "Divided Government: The Public Preference for Limited Power." Diane Hollern Harvey, University of Maryland.
- "The Media and Insurgent Success." Richard Jenkins, University of British Columbia.
- "Competing Explanations of Split-Ticketing Voting in American National Elections." Franco Mattei, SUNY at Buffalo.
- "The Role of Perot Supporters in the Elections of 1992 and 1996." Andrew R. Tomlinson, Ohio State University.
- "Party Support in the U.S. House of Representatives: A Case Study of the 104th Congress." Scott McClurg, Washington University in St. Louis.
- "Party Unity Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives." Jennifer Saunders, George Washington University.
- "Generational Change' and Party Voting in the House of Representatives." Jay A. DeSart, Florida Atlantic University.
- "Parties Without Partisans: The Decline of Party Identifications Among Democratic Republics." Russell Dalton, University of California, Irvine.
- "Party Decline at the Grassroots? A Comparative Analysis." Susan E. Scarrow, University of Houston.
- "Economic Voting From the Middle: Groups in a Dynamic Perspective." Michael Taylor, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- "The Response of Intraparty Coalitions to Bandwagon and Tradeoff Strategies: Social Democratic Party Cues and Reactions in the Era of New Politics." Michael R. Wolf, Indiana University.
- "Party Switchers v. Loyalists in the U.S. House of Representatives: A Comparison By State Delegations." Andree Reeves, University of Alabama.
- "Party Apostasy : The Case of Ben Nighthorse Campbell." Martin Gruberg, University of Wisconsin.
- "Dynamics of Congressional Loyalty: Party Defection and Roll Call Behavior, 1947-1997." Timothy Nokken, University of Illinois.
- "Changing Minds or Just Changing Parties? Assessing the Voting Behavior of Congressional Party Switchers." Eric Heberlig, Ohio State University and Peter Radcliffe, Ohio State University.
- "Congratulations, It's a Party! The Birth of Mass Political Parties in Russia, 1993-1996." Joshua Tucker, Harvard University and Ted Brader, Harvard University.
- "Who Votes By Mail? A Dynamic Model of the Individual-Level Consequences of Vote-By-Mail Systems." Adam Berinsky, University of Michigan and Michael Traugott, University of Michigan.
- "The Consequences of State Election Laws for Minor Parties." Elisabeth R. Gerber, University of California, San Diego.
- "The Effect of the National Voter Registration Act on the Social Composition of State Electorates in 1996." David Hill, University of Florida.
- "Unresolved Dilemma: Removing State Barriers to Registration Amidst Declining Voter Turnout." Patti Thacker, Vanderbilt.
- "Comparing Coalitional and Solo Advocacy: A Study of How Organizations' Advocacy Efforts Change in Coalition." Marie Hojnacki, Penn State University.
- "Political Geography, Counter-Coalitions, and Interest Group Influence in U.S. Trade Policy." Wendy Schiller, Brown University and the Brookings Institute.
- "Legislators as Agents of Lobbyists." Richard Hall, University of Michigan.
- "Interest Group Use of the Media." Beth Leech, Texas A&M University.
- "Do Parties Matter?" Barbara Sinclair, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "Institutional Change in the House of Representatives, 1867-1986: A Test of Partisan and Median Voter Models." Eric Schickler, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Measuring Conditional Party Government." John Aldrich, Duke University and David Rhode,

continued on page 8

Michigan State University.

"The Independent Effect of Party on Roll Call Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives." Greg Hager, University of Kentucky and Jeff Talbert, University of Kentucky.

"Extremity and Voter Turnout: The Effects of Isolation and Intensity." Dennis Plane, University of Texas at Austin.

"The Impact of Attitude Accesibility and Extremity on Political Participation." William Morgan, Indiana University.

"Overreports of Voting and Theories of Turnout: The Nonvoting Voter Revisted." Carol Cassell, University of Alabama.

"Deciding to Vote, Deciding to Tell." John Baughman, University of Chicago.

"Democratic and Republican Intra-Elite and Elite-Mass Linkages, 1980-1992: Toward an Institutional Explanation." Douglas Usher, Cornell University.

"The Political Role of Philanthropy: Private Foundations, Interest Group Representation, and Public Policy." Brent Andersen, Brigham Young University.

"Of Hogs and Men: Environmental Racism and the Pathologies of Interest Group Organization." Michael Dimock, North Carolina State University.

"Medicare: A Creature of Markets and Politics." Thomas Schlesinger, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

"No 'Balance in the Equities': Union Power in the Making and Unmaking of the Campaign Finance Regime." David Sousa, University of Puget Sound.

"Planned Strategic Litigation in Reproductive Right Cases: Webster to Casey." Susan Taylor, University of Denver and Steven Puro, St. Louis University.



Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics
Akron, OH 44325-1914

1997 POP AWARDS

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

Special Recognition: Louise Overacker

Committee: Debra Dodson, Michael Malbin and Malcolm Jewell, Chair

Giovanni Sartori, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for *Parties and Party Systems* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

Committee: John Coleman, Anne Costain, Steve Wolinetz and John Kessel, chair.

Robert Salisbury, winner of the Jack Walker Award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for "Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions," *American Political Science Review* 78 (March 1984): 64-77.

Committee: John Coleman, Anne Costain, Steve Wolinetz, chair.

Lonna Atkeson and Kenneth Kollman, winners of the Emerging Scholars Award.

Honorable Mention: David Farrell and John Gering

Committee: Richard Herrera, Ronald Rapoport and Robert Harmel, chair.

First Class
U.S. Postage Paid
Akron, Ohio
Permit Number 222