

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 — CAMPAIGNS AND ELECTIONS

LOSING TO WIN: THE 1996 ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLITICS

James W. Ceaser and Andrew E. Busch
(Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1997. \$16.95 pbk.)
Reviewed by Melanie J. Blumberg, Kent State University

Losing to Win: The 1996 Elections and American Politics is the second book in what is hoped to be a series of national election analysis by James W. Ceaser and Andrew E. Busch. Many publications on election outcomes tend to focus on the quantitative side, that is, polling and demographic data without offering overarching explanations of the results. Although statistics must necessarily provide the foundation for election studies, it appears that a certain richness is lacking in much of the work which comes on the heels of presidential contests. The more insightful analysis often are years in the making. Ceaser and Busch's *Upside Down and Inside Out: The 1992 Elections and American Politics* and their newest offering are exceptions to the trend. The authors, like other students of electoral politics, provide a detailed analysis of the major candidates' election strategies and outcomes, but the similarity stops there. They call into question various unidimensional explanations of election results and set forth an insightful, thought-provoking reason for success at the polls.

Ceaser and Busch begin their analysis of the 1996 presidential election by suggesting that American voters, in the 1990s, have been willing to "experiment" (p. 1) with various permutations of unified and divided government, all except for allowing the Republicans full reign. This explanation in itself is not unusual, and has been forcefully argued by a number of scholars. More interesting is their argument that victory may be dependent upon how

well or, more precisely, how poorly a party has performed in the previous election.

George Bush's 1992 defeat, which denied him a second term as president, paved the way for the Republican takeover of Congress just two years later thus ushering at least two years of divided government. And, although few scholars, journalists, or pundits would have given Bill Clinton an even chance to win in 1996, Republican control of the House and Senate laid the foundation for his success. According to Ceaser and Busch, media consultants, especially through the technique of morphing, made Bill Clinton the enemy in the 1994 midterm election and Newt Gingrich the enemy in the 1996 on-year election.

continued on page 2

THEME: Party Factions

From Headquarters.....	3
From the Field	5
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: John S. Jackson III, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale; Ruth Jones, Arizona State University; Candice J. Nelson, American University; 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

continued from page 1

Scholars have explained the “losing to win” phenomenon in at least three ways: First, victors tend to self-destruct as their shortcomings are exposed. This problem is similar to Theodore Lowi’s claim that candidates raise expectations to levels which are impossible to attain thereby setting themselves up for sure failure. Second, savvy officeholders after suffering defeat at the polls are able to capitalize on their political skills and learning capabilities to reinvent themselves. Third, because voters are so disillusioned by both political parties, there is “a structural advantage to losing” (p. 6), namely, the party out of power can run against the incumbent whether it is the President or the Congress. Visibility had deleterious consequences for both Clinton and Gingrich who sought to set ambitious agendas, neither of which the electorate was willing to embrace. Clinton handed the Republicans Congress and Gingrich handed Clinton the White House.

Although the authors do not recommend losing to win as a campaign strategy, it appears that consultants utilized it effectively in the 1996 election cycle. Two models have been set forth to explain the relationship between presidential and congressional campaigns: “Attraction” (p. 8) is when candidates of the same party have a positive effect on each other, characterized as either a coattail or reverse coattail effect. “Separation” (p. 8), on the other hand, is when a weak presidential contender affects candidates of the same party negatively. “Repulsion” (p. 8) is yet another model which better explains the 1996 election results: As a presidential candidate’s chance of winning increases, the likelihood of the same party winning control of Congress decreases and vice versa. The reason why American voters chose to return to divided government in 1996 is not altogether clear but, according to Ceaser and Bush, it seems that “they feared the excesses” (p. 10) of both parties.

Electoral fortunes of presidential and congressional hopefuls are dependent on decisions made by “floating” (p. 17) voters, individuals who often make their choices based on short-term factors such as personalities, events, and issues. How these individuals will respond to outsiders – presidential contenders such as Ross Perot – remains a key question. There are two distinct trends: Republican congressional gains may signal a realignment heretofore only seen during the modern era at the presidential level. And, the importance of non-aligned voters who feel no qualms about split-ticket voting and who have demonstrated interest in minor party or independent candidates may support Walter Dean Burnham’s dealignment hypothesis.

Ceaser and Bush continue their election analysis by carefully documenting the Democratic and Re-

publican presidential campaigns as well as Perot’s Reform Party effort. Clinton essentially had two presidencies his first term in office, one as an “agent of change”: (p. 27) and the other as protector against “revolutionary changes” (p. 27). It was the second role which all but sealed his reelection fate. Although he had an 86 percent success rate in Congress and he governed during a period of slow but “steady economic growth” (p. 27), questions about his character and ideology persisted. His low popularity among the party faithful affected both fundraising and turnout and, perhaps even more critical, there was only a small pool of quality congressional candidates to run against stronger Republican challengers. Ceaser and Busch, however, do not believe these factors themselves account for the significant Republican gains; rather, the take-over was due in large measure to “the national, thematic, and ideological nature” (p. 39) of the election. Much like Thomas Edsall and Mary D. Edsall’s argument in *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics*, they explain how the GOP stirred voter unrest by blaming the other side for big government, social and moral decay, and the absence of individual responsibility. The loss of both the House and Senate, through, was a blessing in disguise for Clinton because he probably would have been defeated in 1996 if the Democrats had maintained control of one or both chambers. Following the midterm election, Clinton reinvented himself. He moved toward the center of the ideological spectrum and used his veto power to create wedge issues. He successfully used a strategy of “triangulation” (p. 41) in which he “sought to mute or co-opt the social issues and size-of-government proposals while emphasizing pocketbook issues” (p. 41). And, the Oklahoma City bombing allowed Clinton the opportunity to appear presidential and, at the same time, tie extremists to the Republican Party. Modest foreign policy successes added to his comeback as well. Ceaser and Busch credit Clinton with waging a permanent campaign, a technique which may change all future races.

There were basically six stages of the Dole nomination: Colin Powell’s withdrawal from the process, the rise and fall of four contenders – Steve Forbes, Phil Gramm, Pat Buchanan, and Lamar Alexander – and Bob Dole’s survival. Dole benefitted from not having strong opposition or contenders who stayed in the battle for the long-run. For various reasons, more formidable challengers such as Dick Cheney, Jack Kemp, and Dan Quayle opted not to enter the fray.

The Forbe’s candidacy was one of the more interesting of the campaign due to his vast financial resources and “outsider” appeal. Outsiderism, however,

continued on page 4

POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PARTIES ORGANIZED SECTION OF THE
 AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
 Washington, D.C., August 29, 1997

The section meeting was called to order by John Bibby, Chair, at 12:37 p.m. The following business transpired:

1. A. **Minutes:** Printed in *Vox Pop*, Volume 15, Issue 2, pgs. 2-3. Approved unanimously.

B. Treasurer's Report

Funds on Hand July 1, 1996		\$6,542.71
Revenue Generated:		
APSA section dues	\$1,151.00	
Interest income	53.61	
Other revenue: mailing labels	<u>341.98</u>	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$1,546.59	\$1,546.59
Expenditures*:		
Bank service fees	(5.00)	
1996 awards plaques	(239.40)	
1997 Awards – deposit	(200.00)	
Lunch – 1996 workshop participants	(110.31)	
1996 APSA-POP panel expenses	<u>(150.00)</u>	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$(704.71)	<u>\$(704.71)</u>
Net activity for the Period	\$841.88	
Funds on Hand June 30, 1996**		<u>\$7,384.59</u>

*Copying, printing, postage, telephone, travel and staff provided gratis by the California State University, Chico, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the University of Akron.

**NationsBank funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking (\$4,428.91) and nonprofit savings (\$2,955.68).

C. Membership Data

Year	POP Membership
1997	505
1996	519
1995	589
1994	571

Diane Dwyre noted the drop in POP membership and urged POP members to encourage their colleagues, graduate student and others to join.

2. **POP Awards Ceremony:** Awards reported on page 5.

3. **Nominating Committee Report:** The committee (Bill Crotty, Chair, Sarah Morehouse, Jerry Mileur) presented the following slate (all terms expire 1999):

Chair: Ruth Jones, Arizona State University

Council Members:

- Robin Kolodny, Temple University
- Debra Dobson, Rutgers University
- John Shockley, III, Wester Illinois University
- Barbara Burrell, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- Bruce Caswell, Rowan College of NJ

The slate of candidates was elected unanimously. John Bibby thanked the outgoing Council Members for their excellent service.

4. Announcements

John Bibby thanked Burdett Loomis of the University of Kansas for an excellent job as Program Chair for this year's meeting and announced that Tony Corrado of Colby College will serve as the Program Chair for the 1998 annual meeting in Boston.

The all-day POP workshop on "Consultant, Parties and the Conduct of American Elections" organized by Robin Kolodny of Temple University was a great success. Thanks to Robin, the participants and all those who attended.

John Bibby noted that we are blessed with the support of John Green and the Bliss Institute at the University of Akron and thanked John Green for making *Vox Pop* a first-rate newsletter. We are all grateful for the financial assistance provided by the Bliss Institute and for John's energy and commitment.

David Farrell, University of Manchester and Co-editor of *Party Politics*, announced that *Party Politics* is offering a \$250 prize for the best graduate student paper submitted to the journal, and the paper will be published. This year's deadline is November 1, 1997. David also noted that all POP members received a 30 percent discount off a subscription to *Party Politics* (indicate that you are a Pop member on the order form and subtract the 30% from the subscription rate).

John Green of the Bliss Institute of Applied Politics announced the conference on "The State of the Parties" to be held at the Bliss Institute at the University of Akron on October 9 and 10, 1997.

John Bibby announced that POP is working with the APSA on plans for the commemoration at the APSA annual meeting in 2000 of the 1950 APSA report, "Toward A More Responsible Two-Party System" authored by E.E. Schattschneider and the Committee on Political Parties. This 50th Anniversary is an opportunity to reflect on the history and

continued on page 5

continued from page 2

has its limits because mainstream voters, those who are not angry and cynical, tend to feel uncomfortable with candidates who have little, if any, government experience. And, Forbe's personal wealth could not compensate for Dole's support by Governors Steve Merrill (R-NH) and David Beasley (R-SC) who mobilized their respective state party organizations.

Once Dole had a lock on the nomination, he had serious problems keeping the electorate interested in his candidacy. Primary frontloading and a late convention slowed what momentum Dole enjoyed. Meanwhile, Clinton had consolidated his lead, almost ensuring a November win. Save for Dole unveiling his economic program, naming Jack Kemp as his running mate, and getting a positive send off from San Diego, Clinton kept control of the "message" and effectively stopped Dole from capitalizing on potentially harmful issues.

The Clinton campaign was awash in money and Dole had little to spend until after the convention. As crucial, Clinton built his campaign around "micro-issues" (e.g., support for school uniforms and a nationwide hotline for domestic violence cases) in an attempt to link traditional values to an activist government.

Dole had been unable to take advantage of his position as Senate Majority Leader and was perceived as an ineffective insider, according to Ceaser and Busch. Mid-May he announced his retirement from the Senate which allowed him to distance himself from the Washington establishment and have more flexibility. Although Clinton made a number of blunders in May and the administration was besieged by persistent ethical problems, Dole narrowed the President's lead only slightly. Dole had other problems, including his charge that tobacco was not addictive and his refusal to speak to the NAACP. And, Clinton with Congress's assistance, shored up his legislative success rate with the increase in the minimum wage, health care reform, and welfare reform. The performance of the economy and favorable ratings for Democratic leadership prompted some to call for Dole to step down from the top of the ticket. Still, Clinton was not home free. Polling results indicate that Americans supported a conservative position on the vast majority of issues. The authors, however, are careful to explain that "operational liberalism" (p. 14) remains alive because individuals are loath to relinquish the benefits of the welfare state.

Ross Perot's candidacy had significantly less impact than it did four years earlier but he nevertheless fared rather well for a minor party contender. Ceaser and Busch believe that different candidate may have made the contest more interesting.

Ceaser and Busch devote a chapter to the congressional elections, indicating that control of the insti-

tution is valuable because Congress and the President now are perceived as "equal" (p. 119) partners in decision making. As each party attempted to make the 1996 election a referendum on the other, the authors suggest that by fall it became: "To win the presidency you had to lose Congress, and to win Congress you had to lose the presidency" (p. 120). It was the first time the repulsion strategy was used, at least in part, by both parties to secure their positions. Haley Barbour reminded supporters that there needed to be a Republican check on Bill Clinton and Bill Clinton reminded adherents that there needed to be a Democratic check on the Republican-controlled Congress. It was not until the waning days of the campaign that Clinton began to seriously consider the possibility of winning back the House.

The losing to win strategy is evident in the three elections this decade: The Republicans won control of Congress in 1994 by losing the presidency in 1992; Clinton won his reelection bid in 1996 by losing Congress in 1994; and, the Republicans maintained control of Congress in 1996 by losing the presidency the same year. Dole made significant gains toward the end of the campaign but not enough to salvage the election.

Many Americans considered 1996 a rather uninteresting election as evidenced by the lowest voter turnout since 1924. This is not to imply it not important for other reasons. In addition to the structural change of what is tantamount to a permanent campaign, the Democratic hold on Congress was broken for two consecutive elections thus causing scholars to reassess the power and potential of the White House and Congress. There are two negative coalitions, one which wants to block big government and the other which hopes to slow its reduction. Ceaser and Busch explain that the balance between the Democratic and Republican parties is close enough to perhaps reverse this trend and have a government with "a more unified vision" (p. 171). The likelihood of this, however, is very small. "The division and ambivalence of the American people remains the central feature of our electoral politics and an invitation to the formation of negative coalitions that reinforce the incrementalist bent of our institutions. For now the decisive bloc of American voters, convinced with Madison that government is not inhabited by angels, seems content to insist with him that ambition be made to counteract ambition" (pp. 171-172). As such, the losing to win strategy may be a semipermanent fixture of American national elections.

Ceaser and Busch have made a valuable contribution to the literature on campaigns and elections. Their research combines polling and demographic data with an insightful analysis of the nuances of the 1996 presidential and congressional elections.

continued from page 3

the impact of the report as well as the enormous body of research on parties and politics that has been influenced by it. John Green, Director of the Bliss Institute and editor of our newsletter, and Paul Herrnson of the University of Maryland have agreed to serve as co-chairs for the committee. John Bibby has appointed a planning committee that met following the POP business meeting. Your suggestions are welcome.

Please forward any proposals for next year's POP Wednesday workshop as well as any interest in serving on POP committees to Ruth Jones, Arizona State University, incoming POP chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Dwyre, Secretary-Treasurer

1997 POP AWARDS

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

David B. Truman, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for the *Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion* (New York: Knopf, 1951).

James Lengle and Byron E. Shafer, winner of the Jack Walker Award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for "Primary Rules, Political Power and Social Change," *American Political Science Review*, 70 (March 1970), 25-40.

John Coleman, winner of the Emerging Scholars Award.

The Epstein and Walker Awards Committee was composed of:

William Keefe, Chair, Univ. of Pittsburgh

Robert Salisbury, Washington Univ.

Robert J. Huckshorn, Florida Atlantic University

FROM THE FIELD

Party Developments Online

The Center for Party Developments has moved from Washington, D.C., to P.O. Box 2656, Kirkland, Washington 98083-2656. The Center and its news magazine, *Party Developments*, are now on the Web: www.partydevelopment.org.

Party Developments is a 24-page news magazine published every ten weeks. It provides succinct and objective news about U.S. state and national parties, party systems overseas, and transnational parties. *Party Developments* has been referred to as "the poor man's Henry Kissinger." Write all inquiries to the above address or send e-mail to info@partydevelopment.org.

Campaign Management Institute to Conduct First-Ever survey of Campaign Profession

The Pew Charitable Trusts recently awarded a \$1.4 million grant to American University's Campaign Management Institute (CMI) to develop a code of conduct for political consultants and improve the way election campaigns operate.

CMI, party of AU's School of Public Affairs' Center for congressional and Presidential Studies, will launch a three-year study and dialogue with election professionals on how to improve campaign conduct. The CMI program supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts will include six elements:

- Assess the state of the industry by conducting the first-ever survey of the campaign profession;

- Develop a code of conduct through a series of seminars with leaders of the campaign consulting industry;
- Develop a prototype for a biennial award spot lighting a consultant who exemplifies good, aggressive and fair campaigning;
- Develop teaching materials to educate future members of the profession;
- Hold an annual conference to discuss "best campaign practices" and exchange up-to-date information on how to improve campaign discourse;
- Study how political campaigns affect government performances.

"The primary purpose of this program is to improve the quality of our election campaigns, which in recent years have had such a negative impact on political trust in government and the quality of civic discourse," said AU Professor James Thurber, who is director of CMI and the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies, as well as a nationally recognized scholar in the field.

According to Paul C. Light, director of the public Policy Program at Pew Charitable Trusts, "this project is designed to help consultants do well, meaning with campaigns, while doing good, meaning building public confidence in the democratic process. This may be tilting at windmills, but a code of conduct – grounded in election realities and embraced by the industry itself – can be devised that focuses on winning elections without damaging democratic life."

continued on page 7

Call for Papers
Political Organizations and Parties
Anthony Corrado, Colby College

“Community, Communities, and Politics” is a conference theme particularly appropriate to the research questions that inform our area of the discipline. I look forward to proposals for individual papers, entire panels, or roundtables that consider its diverse aspects with respect to the theory and practice of political parties, interest groups, and other political organizations at all levels of government.

Parties and organized groups have been viewed traditionally as the primary means by which individuals are mobilized into the broader communities or collectives that facilitate political activity. Do they still perform this function effectively? Do parties and organized interests encourage citizen participation and collective identities? Do they contribute to the building of political communities, however, defined, or do they tend to divide communities and undermine communitarian attitudes?

These questions are especially relevant given the changes taking place in the political system. Have these changes made elections less community oriented? Are we witnessing the growing nationalization of electoral politics at the expense of state and local organization? Or are local and civic organizations adapting to meet community needs? Do elections provide opportunities to develop communities? For example, do campaigns promote grassroots organization, and if so, is such activity meaningful? Do minor parties represent the potential for new forms of community? Or must we move beyond our current political organizations to revive our sense of community? If so, what should these new political organizations look like?

These suggested avenues of inquiry are not intended to be exclusive. Proposals for topics that explore other issues related to the conference theme or that present new organizational and social behavior are also welcome. Comparative studies are especially encouraged.

Proposal Submission Process

APSA revised the proposal submission process for the 1997 Annual Meeting in order to reduce the administrative burden placed on members of the Program Committee. The effort was successful, therefore for the 1998 Annual Meeting, all proposals should be sent to APSA. The Association meeting staff will accumulate and organize the submissions

for each program division, acknowledge receipt of proposals, and forward the proposals to the appropriate division chairs in December. The division chairs will review proposals and organize panels in January and will begin notifying individuals and panel organizers of acceptance or rejection in February.

Please review “Guidelines for Participation,” and pay special attention to the new submission instructions below.

1. Paper or panel proposals must be accompanied by the appropriate form. You must submit 2 copies of each paper or panel proposal for EACH divisions to which you are submitting. For example, most proposals will have a total of 4 copies. Proposals will NOT be accepted without 2 copies.

2. Electronic submissions will be accepted in the following format: A) sent as a Word Perfect or ASCII text attachment to an email to propoals@apsanet.org, or B) typed into the text of an email message; or C) from the interactive form on the APSA website <<http://www.apsanet.org>>. OR Send written proposals to:

APSA 1998 Proposal
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

NO FAXES WILL BE ACCEPTED. Do not send your proposal twice: by mail and electronic submission.

3. It is VERY important that you indicate the division or divisions to which you are submitting your proposal or proposals. You may submit each panel or proposal to NO MORE than 2 divisions. Two copies of your proposal must be included for each division to which you are applying. Again, proposals will not be accepted without 2 copies.

4. You are limited to the submission of TWO DIFFERENT PROPOSALS – additional proposals from the same author or organizer will not be accepted.

5. All submissions must be postmarked or received electronically by Saturday, November 15, 1997. All submissions postmarked after November 15 will be returned. No exceptions.

6. Electronic submissions will be acknowledged within 24 hours by return email. All submissions, including those sent electronically, will be acknowledged via postcard by December 15, 1997.

7. You will be notified of your proposal's acceptance or rejection by Program Division chairs before February 15, 1998. If you have not received notification by February 15, contact the division chairs directly. (See contact information in the December issue of PS.)

continued from page 5

As the leading graduate program in campaign studies, CMI will work closely with the American Association of Political Consultants, which has endorsed the effort, to discuss the industry's ethical responsibilities in the electoral process. In order to be credible and effective, a professional code of conduct must recognize that winning elections is imperative and that self-regulation will have a far greater chance of success than imposing a set of rules from the outside.

Established in 1979, CMI will continue to offer a range of academic courses, including intensive two-week seminars on campaign management with a focus on ethics; campaign field organization, strategy, theme, and message development; media development; and political writing. Professor Candice Nelson, academic director of CMI and a scholar on campaign finance, will also contribute to the Pew study.

The Pew Charitable Trusts, among the nation's largest philanthropies, support nonprofit activities in culture, education, the environment, health and human services, public policy, and religion. Based in Philadelphia, the Trusts make strategic investments to encourage civic engagement in addressing critical issues and effective social change.

For further information about Campaign Management Institute, visit its home page at <<http://aovm.american.edu/~ccps/cmi.html>>. For media assistance, contact Maureen Jeffreys at (202) 885-5935.

Governmental Process Back in Print

I was extremely pleased to learn that David B. Truman was named the 1997 winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution the field. We at IGS Press felt so strongly about the value of *Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion* that we decided to reprint it when Knopf let it go out of print. Perhaps you could let your readers know that this award winning work is available from IGS Press, 103 Moses Hall, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720. It is \$23.71 plus shipping and handling, and can be ordered by phone and charged to a credit card. The number is (510) 642-6723.

Sincerely,
Gerald C. Lubenow
Director of Publications
Institute of Governmental Studies

SPECIAL INTERESTS

Papers of Interest

1997 Southern Political Science Association Annual Meeting

"Contemporaneous and Cumulative Effects on Corruption News on Political Trust, 1952-1992." Tim Fackler, University of Texas.

"Lobbying Styles: The Case of Gender." Heather Foust, Emory University.

"The Formation of State Level Interest Groups and the Timing of Legislation Adoption." Sarah J. Williams, University of South Carolina.

"Influence of Interest Groups in State Administrative Agencies." Michael Baranowski, Lake Superior State University.

"The State of State Interest Groups: A Comparison of State-Level Interest Groups and Their National Counterparts." Shari Garber Bax and Anthony Nownes, University of Tennessee.

"Interest Group Influence at the Grassroots and Elite Levels: The Christian Coalition in Georgia." Sarah G. Murray, Georgia State University.

"Political Activity Restrictions on Religious and Nonprofit Organizations." Dennis R. Hoover, Oxford University.

"The Christian Right and School Board Elections." Melissa Deckman Fallon, American University.

"Solving the Policy Coordination Problem: Is It Simply the Party?" Mark M. Berger, Duke University.

"The Organizational Strategy of Political Parties: A Comparative Analysis of Party Organization." Doug Perkins, Ohio State University.

"The Fall of the First Party System: Federalist Decomposition and Whig Emergence." Jeffrey Jenkins and Timothy Nokken, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

"Measuring Third Party Strength." Scott Lasley, University of Iowa.

"The Ideological Evolution of the South Carolina Party System, 1980-1996." Robert P. Steed and Laurence W. Moreland, The Citadel.

"Converging Electoral Strategy and Campaign Style: Emerging Ties Between the New Democrats' and 'New Labour'" Ezra Paul, John Hopkins University.

"The Blair Revolution?: Structure and Agency and New Labour's Electoral Success." James Allan, University of Connecticut.

continued on page 8

continued from page 7

"Factionalism and Party Change: A Resource Dependency Perspective." Alex Tan, Southern Methodist University.

"Positive Action: European Parties and Women's Quotas." Rebecca H. Davis, Virginia Tech.

"A Foot in the Door: Do PACs Buy Access?" Michelle Chin, Jon Bond and Nehemia Geva, Texas A&M University.

Southern Mayoral Elections and Two Parties: The Importance of Turnout." Matthew Corrigan, University of North Florida.

"Shifting Partisan Fortunes in Electoral Politics: Winning and Losing in the 1992, 1994, and 1996 State Legislative Elections." John Frendries and Alan R. Gitelson, Loyola University - Chicago.

"Interest Group Politics and the New Immigration Restrictions." Rosanna Perotti, Hofstra University.

"Interest Representation in the Intelligence Subsystem." Kevin Hula, Loyola College.

"The Dynamics of Access: The Use of Inside and Outside Lobbying Strategies by Organized Labor, 1957-1997." Eric Heberling, Ohio State University.

"What the Parties Stand for in the States: Candidate Issue Positions in the 1996 State Legislative Elections." Gerald C. Wright, Indiana University.

"Party Conflict in Transforming Legislatures: The Effect of External and Internal Partisan Development on Internal Party Conflict." R. Bruce Anderson, Auburn University.



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

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