

# 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

### **The Democrats' "Goldwater Moment"**

*John Kenneth White  
John J. Zogby*

From January to March 2003, Zogby International began polling likely caucus and primary participants in the three earliest Democratic presidential contests - Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina-as well as nationally. These surveys were designed to explore the mood of the Democratic electorate prior to next year's balloting. Voters in these states will assume greater importance than usual, since the 2004 nomination calendar is the most compressed ever devised. Thus, the outcomes of these early races will carry considerable weight in the dozens of primaries and caucuses that immediately follow, and these results should determine the Democratic nominee-a contest likely to be over by March 10, 2004.

Thus far, voters have not focused on the candidates. Indeed, for the vast majority of likely voters, the contenders remain unknowns. The results in South Carolina are typical; 85 percent say they never heard of Wesley Clark; Dennis Kucinich, 84 percent; Howard Dean, 81 percent; Carol Moseley-Braun, 60 percent; Bob Graham, 54 percent; John Kerry 53 percent; Richard Gephardt, 32 percent; Joe Lieberman, 26 percent. Indeed, in the early go-rounds, it is well-known candidates-Lieberman, Kerry, and Gephardt-who lead the pack.

While support for the candidates remains soft (three-quarters say they could change their minds by election day), the electorate's mood is easy to detect. Democrats do not like how George W. Bush is handling his job as president, and they disagree profoundly with his prescriptions for the economy and dealing with the war on terror. In the latest Iowa poll (completed in late April), 71 percent say Bush is doing a fair or

poor job; only 28 percent give him excellent or good marks. The results elsewhere are similar: 74 percent of likely New Hampshire rate Bush negatively; in South Carolina, 63 percent give him a fair or poor rating. It may be that the phrase "Bush Democrat" will become an oxymoron by Election Day.

One primary reason for the Democrats' antipathy toward George W. Bush is the war against Iraq. Large majorities of Democrats—including South Carolina Democrats—strongly opposed the war. Rather than armed combat, Democrats overwhelmingly favored giving United Nations inspectors more time to find the supposed weapons of mass destruction (see Table 1). Unlike George H. W. Bush, who secured strong bipartisan support for the Persian Gulf War, Democrats did not see a compelling need for this war and were loathe to support it. Interestingly, in a second round of Iowa polling conducted in late April after the war ended, 54 percent believe their party should select someone who did support the war—proving the wisdom of the old adage, "Nothing succeeds like success."

*(Continued on page 2)*

<b>From Headquarters</b> .....	<b>2, 3, 7</b>
<b>From The Field</b> .....	<b>4, 5, 8</b>
<b>Scholarly Precincts</b> .....	<b>6</b>

**Chair:** John J. Coleman, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
**Secretary-Treasurer:** John Bruce, University of Mississippi  
**VOX POP Editor:** John Green, The University of Akron  
**Program Chair:** Beth Leech, Rutgers University, New Brunswick  
**Website Coordinator:** Kyle Saunders, Northern Illinois University

**Executive Council:** Linda Fowler, Dartmouth College; Sarah Morehouse, University of Connecticut; Richard G. Niemi, University of Rochester; Jeffrey Stonecash, Syracuse University; Jonathan Bernstein, University of Texas at San Antonio; Pradeep Chhibber, University of California at Berkeley; Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University; and David Lowery, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

Dear Colleagues:

The response to POP's new Proposal Review Service has been very positive. I am sending out this message to remind you about the service and to encourage faculty to volunteer to participate.

The PRS gives graduate students who are registered POP members an opportunity to receive feedback on a dissertation proposal from a faculty member outside their department. This is, obviously, intended not to replace evaluations from within a student's department, but to give the student a mechanism to have another set of scholarly eyes read and comment on the proposal.

Interested grad students will send their proposal to POP. We will send the proposal to a faculty member who has agreed to be one of POP-PRS's reviewers. The faculty member will return the proposal to POP and it will then be returned to the student. This way, we will be able to monitor that proposals are in fact being evaluated in a timely manner. In addition, this process allows for complete anonymity if the two participants prefer that.

Instructions for grad students: Grad students who wish to have a proposal reviewed will mail a hardcopy of the proposal to Professor John M. Bruce, Department of Political Science, 302 Deupree Hall, P.O. Box 1848, University of Mississippi, University MS 38677-1848. If you wish to remain anonymous, do not put your name on the hardcopy (but, of course, supply your name and mailing address to John).

Instructions for faculty: Faculty, we need your help. If you would be willing to serve as a reviewer for PRS, please let John Bruce know at [jbruce@olemiss.edu](mailto:jbruce@olemiss.edu). Provide your mailing address and indicate the areas in which you would be willing to consider proposals. John will do his best to match up proposals with the interests you have listed. We will send you at most one proposal a year, so that this does not become overly burdensome. After you have reviewed the proposal, return your evaluation to John, who will send it to the grad student. As with the grad student, you may choose to remain anonymous or not: it is up to you.

We hope this service provides valuable assistance to grad students in the POP community.

Regards,  
John Coleman, POP Chair

### POP Award Winners

**Leon Epstein Award**, honoring a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties: **Jo Freeman**, *A Room at a Time: How Women Entered Party Politics* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).

**Jack Walker Award**, honoring an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties: **Daniel Tichenor and Richard Harris**, "Organized Interests and American Political Development." *Political Science Quarterly* 117 (Winter 2002-03), 587-612.

**Samuel Eldersveld Award**, honoring a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field: **Kay Lawson**, San Francisco State University.

**Emerging Scholar Award**, honoring a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last five years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise: **Daniel Tichenor**, Rutgers University.

**POP/Party Politics Award**, honoring the best paper presented at a POP-sponsored panel at the previous APSA meeting: **Byron Shafer and Richard Johnston**, "Economic Development, Legal Desegregation, and Partisan Change in the Postwar South."

## POP Short Courses, APSA, 2003

### I. TOOLS FOR COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON POLITICAL PARTIES - THE STUDY OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN WESTERN EUROPE.

**Convener:** Prof. Thomas Poguntke

#### CONTENT:

- Parties as an object of research: How to get information from political parties.
- Coping with language barriers: Standardized approaches (e.g. coding techniques, survey data, quantitative organizational data).
- Quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of political parties.
- Parties as campaign organizations.
- Methodological problems in comparative research on parties.

The course will address practical problems related to research on political parties in Western Europe and include the following presentations (each followed by time for questioning and discussion):

Prof. Thomas Poguntke, Keele University, UK: Parties as an object of research: How to get information from political parties.

Prof. David Farrell, Manchester University, UK: Parties as campaign organizations.

Prof. Robert Harmel, Texas A&M, USA: Standardized approaches: Coping with language barriers (e.g. coding, techniques, quantitative organizational data)

Dr. Karina Pedersen, University of Copenhagen, DK: Survey research on political parties: mail surveys.

Prof. Thomas Poguntke, Keele University, UK: Identify and Equivalence in comparative research on parties.

#### CONTACT DETAILS:

Prof. Dr. Thomas Poguntke, School of Politics, International Relations and the Environment (SPIRE), Keele University, Staffs, St5 5BG, UK, phone: 0044-1782-583591, fax: 0044-1782-583592, Email: [t.poguntke@keele.ac.uk](mailto:t.poguntke@keele.ac.uk), <http://www.keele.ac.uk/depts/spire/>

There is no charge for the course, but participants should pre-register with John Bruce at [jbruce@olemiss.edu](mailto:jbruce@olemiss.edu). Registration forms will also appear in the summer issue of PS.

### POP Short Courses

SC-5: Tools for Comparative Research on Political Parties:  
The Study of Political Parties in Western Europe  
Wednesday, August 27, 1 p.m.

SC-19: A Methodology for Studying Congressional Elections  
Wednesday, August 27, 1 p.m.

POP Executive Council Meeting  
Friday, August 29, 12 p.m.

POP Business Meeting  
Friday, August 29, 1 p.m.

(continued on page 3)

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

(continued from page 2)

### II. A METHODOLOGY FOR STUDYING CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS.

**Participants:** Paul S. Herrnson, University of Maryland  
David B. Magleby, Brigham Young University  
L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College  
Joseph Quin Monson, Brigham Young University  
Darrell M. West, Brown University

**CONTACT:**

Joseph Quin Monson, CSED, 112 KMB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; Email: csed@byu.edu or 801-422-3716.

**REGISTRATION:** No fee, but please register in advance with csed@byu.edu or 801-422-3716.

Recent years have seen an increase in the variety of methods used to study congressional elections from quantitative surveys of congressional campaigns to collaborative case study research. This short course will include presentations by the principle investigators of several prominent studies of congressional elections who will discuss their methods and techniques. The purpose of the course is to broaden the understanding of innovative techniques and help participants to think more broadly about data collection and analysis strategies in their research including the successful mixture of quantitative and qualitative approaches and creative approaches to data collection and analysis that employ methods appropriate to answering the research question at hand. The course will equip attendees a wide variety of different tools for studying elections as well as tips for executing a large collaborative research project. In addition, the presenters will place emphasis on how the methods used in their projects can productively be applied in other settings such as interest group decision-making, state party operations, candidate recruitment, legislative redistricting, PAC decision-making, state policy making processes, and gubernatorial elections.

David Magleby and Quin Monson will discuss a systematic collaborative fieldwork methodology they used to study party soft money and interest group issue advocacy activities in presidential primaries and congressional elections.

Scholars from congressional districts around the country were recruited to follow a common methodology in collecting data for a case study. The methodology included elite interviews as well as data from media outlets on advertising buys and expenditures. A "reconnaissance network" was established to gather political mail and track political telephone calls and personal contacts. Survey data were also collected in selected districts. Sandy Maisel and Darrell West will discuss their research coordinating a team of scholars looking at the content of the discourse in campaigns in a series of congressional and senatorial races. They developed a detailed protocol that permitted scholars across the nation to observe and analyze ads, mailings, news coverage, debates, and Websites through a similar lens. Paul Herrnson will discuss how to use surveys, interviews, and case studies to learn about candidate campaign organizations and strategies, and party and interest group assistance in issue and opposition research, campaign communications, fund-raising, and other aspects of congressional campaigning. These data allow an "insider's perspective" on the nature of congressional elections and comparisons among campaigns waged by incumbents, challengers, and candidates for open seats; campaigns in competitive and uncompetitive contests; and campaigns waged by Democrats and Republicans. In addition to the presenters listed above the format will also involve scholars who have participated in these studies at the state/district level in assessing these approaches.

## POP Panels for APSA, 2003

### WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 27:

1:00 p.m. SC-5 Tolls for Comparative Research on Parties: The Study of Political Parties in Western Europe.

**Presenters:** Thomas Poguntke, Keele University  
David M. Farrell, Manchester University  
Robert Harmel, Texas A & M University  
Karina Pedersen, University of Copenhagen

1:00 p.m. SC-19 A Methodology for Studying Congressional Elections

**Presenters:** Paul S. Herrnson, University of Maryland  
David B. Magleby, Brigham Young University  
L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College  
Joseph Quin Monson, Brigham Young University  
Darrell M. West, Brown University

### THURSDAY, AUGUST 28:

8:00 a.m. 35-6 Strategies for Legislative Advocacy

**Chair:** Marie E. Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University  
**Authors:** "Lobbying in Coalition with Government Allies." Frank R. Baumgartner and Christine Mahoney, Pennsylvania State University.

"Madam Chair, We Respectfully Disagree: Interest Group Competition and Congressional Testimony." Thomas T. Holyoke, George Washington University

"Think Tanks, Expert Advice and the New U.S. Technology Policy Agenda." David M. Hart, Harvard University.

"Organized Interests, Issue Definition, and Congressional Responses to the Supreme Court." Kevin R. den Dulk, Grand Valley State University and J. Mitchell Pickerill, Washington State University.

**Discussant:** Michael T. Heaney, University of Chicago

10:00 a.m. 35-3 Party Change and Adaptation: Implications for Parties and Democracy

**Chair:** Robert Harmel, Texas A&M University  
**Authors:** "Can Party Change Theories Explain Political Suicide? The Case of the Austrian Freedom Party." Wolfgang C. Mueller, University of Vienna.

"Party Membership, Party Democracy, and Party Responsiveness: Implications of Party Change." Piero Ignazi, University of Bologna.

"Parties' Presidential Style: The Changing Nature of German Parties as Campaign Organizations." Thomas Poguntke, Keele University.

"Parties Change: So What?" Robert Harmel, Texas A&M University.

**Discussant:** Richard S. Katz, Johns Hopkins University and E. Gene Frankland, Ball State University

2:15 p.m. 35-2 Parties and Interest Groups in France: In Memory of Frank L. Wilson

### FRIDAY, AUGUST 29:

10:00 a.m. 35-4 Interest Advocacy in Comparative Perspective

**Chair:** William A. Maloney, University of Aberdeen  
**Authors:** "Lobbyists and Lobbying Practices Across Western Democracies: Same Preliminary Findings." Clive S. Thomas, University of Alaska.

(continued on page 7)

## FROM THE FIELD

### POP MEMBERS SAVE 30% ON PARTY POLITICS

Members of POP are entitled to a 30% discount on an individual subscription to Party Politics. Party Politics is published six times a year (in January, March, May, July, September, and November).

In 2003 the special discounted rates are as follows:

- One year Subscription: US \$48 (Usual rate: US \$69)
- Two year Subscription: US \$96 (Usual rate: US \$138)

Please mention that you are a member of POP (APSA) when ordering by telephone or post. If renewing your subscription, please deduct 30% from the individual renewal rate printed on the order form and indicate that you are a POP (APSA) member.

Members in the USA, Canada, Latin America and Asia may contact: SAGE Publications, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, USA. Tel: +1-805-499-0721, Fax: +1-805-499-0871.

Members in the UK, Europe, Middle East, Africa, and Australia may contact: SAGE Publications, 6 Bonhill Street, London EC2A 4PU, UK. Tel: +44 (0)20-7330-1338, Fax: +44 (0)20-7330-1269.

More information is available at: [www.partypolitics.org](http://www.partypolitics.org).

### VOX POP NEWSLETTER ARCHIVE

<http://www3.uakron.edu/bliss/voxpop>

The on-line Vox Pop newsletter archive has undergone a few changes to make the collection more accessible. Previous editions of the newsletter are available in Adobe PDF files. In the past, the files were very large and difficult to download without a broadband Internet connection. Each file has been reformatted to reduce the size. Also, a text search can be made within each file.

Thanks to Internet search engine Google, a search can be made on the entire Vox Pop archive. Instructions are available on the Vox Pop web page. We are currently working on a more effective and integrated search feature. Watch for future improvements.

**TABLE 1**

### Democratic Candidates and the War Against Iraq (in percentages).

CANDIDATE PLATFORM	Iowa	New Hampshire	South Carolina	National Results
<b>Candidate A</b> says we have been too patient with Saddam Hussein and it is time for the U.S. to move militarily against him, regardless of whether or not the United Nations is ready for such action.	14	23	35	27
<b>Candidate B</b> says that the U.S. needs more hard evidence that Saddam has produced weapons of mass destruction; that we must wait for the U.N. inspection team to complete its work; and that we need to wait for strong global support before taking any military action.	84	72	60	69

Source: Zogby International, polls, January - March, 2003.

The economy remains a source of considerable grievance, and Democrats are strongly inclined to nominate someone who will draw a clear line, in contrast with George W. Bush on this issue. Democrats believe that Bush's tax policies favor the well-to-do, and they reject pleas from Democratic Leadership Council that the party should resist raising class-based arguments. Thus, when given a choice between a hypothetical **Candidate A**, "who opposes the President's tax cut plan and says that under Bush this country is facing a class struggle between the super rich and regular, hardworking Democrats," or **Candidate B**, "who also dislikes the President's tax cut but generally avoids talk about a class struggle," **Candidate A** decisively wins in all three states (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2**

### Democrats and Tax Policy, Early Contest States (in percentages).

CANDIDATE PLATFORM	Iowa	New Hampshire	South Carolina	National Results
<b>Candidate A</b> opposes the President's tax cut plan because it favors the rich and says that under Bush this country is facing a class struggle between the super rich who are favored by this administration and regular, hardworking Americans.	55	63	46	57
<b>Candidate B</b> also dislikes the President's tax cut and also would like to remove some of the provisions like elimination of taxes on stock dividends, but generally avoids talk about a class struggle.	38	28	43	35

Source: Zogby International, polls, January - March, 2003.

The Democratic party's single-minded focus on the economy is evident when voters are presented with several hypothetical candidates who are differing on this issue. Democrats prefer the candidate who emphasizes the economy (see Table 3). Bill Clinton's infamous 1992 slogan, "It's the economy, stupid!" applies with equal force to the current nominating contest. Democrats believe that economic revitalization should be the next president's number one job (see Table 3).

**TABLE 3**

**Hypothetical Candidate Preferences based on Issue Themes (in percentages).**

CANDIDATE PLATFORM	Iowa	New Hampshire	South Carolina	National Democrats
<b>Candidate A</b> says that fighting the war on terror is the most important problem the next president will face. This candidate believes that the war is not going well, and that even greater emphasis must be placed on destroying the al Qaeda network and Osama bin Laden. In this new war, sacrifice on the part of the American people will be necessary. This includes foregoing prospective tax cuts and instituting some form of mandatory public service on the part of young Americans, including the potential re-institution of a military draft.	6	10	10	11
<b>Candidate B</b> says that while winning the war on terror is important, the economy remains the most significant issue facing the country. Candidate B believes we need a president who will focus on the needs of ordinary citizens. This candidate believes the Bush administration's economic policies are skewed toward the wealthy and must be redesigned to help poor and middle-class working Americans.	64	54	48	56
<b>Candidate C</b> strongly supports President Bush's prospective war against Iraq. This candidate believes that terrorism must be stopped before it gains a foothold in countries like Iraq. At home, Candidate C strongly supported the creation of a Department of Homeland Security. In addition, this candidate believes that family values need to be strengthened. That includes fostering a new partnership between religious institutions and government to help serve those in need.	10	10	21	11
<b>Candidate D</b> believes that the problem facing the Democratic party today is that it has become too much like the Republican party. Candidate D believes that the Democratic party must return to its liberal roots, including using big government to help solve some of the country's most important problems.	6	5	3	4
<b>Candidate E</b> says it is time for new leadership within the Democratic party. New leaders can offer fresh perspectives, including establishing partnerships between the federal government and the private sector to help meet the economic needs of the middle class. A new, fresh face gives the Democrats the best opportunity for beating President Bush in 2004.	6	9	8	6
<b>Candidate F</b> says that experience counts. Having worked within the halls of Congress will give the next Democratic president an important boost in getting a legislative program adopted. Candidate F reminds Democrats that outsiders, especially President Jimmy Carter, are often ineffective in getting their legislative programs adopted. Experience counts.	3	3	2	2

Source: Zogby International, polls, January - March, 2003.

**FROM THE FIELD**

**THE AMERICAN  
ASSOCIATION  
OF  
POLITICAL  
CONSULTANTS  
AND  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF AKRON  
RAY C. BLISS INSTITUTE  
OF APPLIED POLITICS**

*present*

**THE 4<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL  
ACADEMIC OUTREACH  
CONFERENCE**

**"MAKING DEMOCRACY HAPPEN"**

**October 2-4, 2003  
Crowne Plaza Quaker  
Square  
Akron, Ohio**

The annual Academic Outreach Conference provides a forum for students, academics, and professionals to discuss professional political consulting and public affairs. Career trends, technical expertise, and ethical issues are explored throughout the conference.

A Mentoring Program will be established at the conference to connect students with professionals to provide career advice and guidance.

Registration information is available at [www.theaapc.org](http://www.theaapc.org).

Student scholarship and academic group rate packages are available on a first-come, first-serve basis at [www.winningpolitics.com/aapc](http://www.winningpolitics.com/aapc).

When the data are closely analyzed, Democrats seem to be on the verge of experiencing a “Goldwater Moment.” They want someone who will stand up for what he or she believes, regardless of the consequences. This Goldwater moment is fueled by the widespread belief that George W. Bush will be victorious no matter who the Democrats nominate. With less than two years remaining before the general election, 62 percent of Iowans and 60 percent of New Hampshireites and South Carolinians believe Bush will win. These figures should not be taken lightly, since Americans are often good prognosticators. Just prior to the 2000 balloting, for example, 49 percent expected George W. Bush to win; 33 percent said Al Gore would prevail.<sup>1</sup>

This sense of impending presidential loss is eerily similar to 1964, when many Republicans instinctively knew that Democrat Lyndon B. Johnson was not going to be defeated should he decide to seek the presidency in his own right. While Johnson has qualms that his Texas origins would prevent his election (no Southerner since Zachary Taylor back in 1850 had won the presidency), there was no way following the Kennedy assassination that the country would accept having three different presidents in fifteen months. This would remain true, even if the Republicans had selected a more palatable general election candidate such as New York governor Nelson A. Rockefeller or Pennsylvania governor William Scranton, instead of the pugnacious Arizona senator Barry Goldwater, who was widely disliked and feared. Given the current Democratic despair over recapturing the presidency, it seems that primary voters are intent on nominating someone who speaks to their issue concerns. And, in that regard, they want someone who is diametrically opposed to the foreign and domestic policies advocated by Bush. Many Democrats would welcome a candidate who adopted a variant of Goldwater’s 1964 slogan: “A Choice, Not an Echo.”

The results of the 2002 midterm elections strengthened the Democrats’ resolve. Last year, most strategists contended that a debilitated economy coupled with scandals on Wall Street would be enough to maintain Democratic control of the Senate; win additional House seats, and pick up lots of important governorships. None of that happened. Democrats forgot that the opposition party must do more than just criticize. In 1992, when the economy was foremost among voter concerns, Bill Clinton not only picked apart the elder Bush’s job performance; he outlined a comprehensive economic plan in a book entitled *Putting People First*. Clinton convinced just enough voters that he had a clear vision for curing the economic maladies of that time. Democrats did *not* do that in 2002, and they paid a heavy price at the polls.

This time, Democrats are looking for substance. They want someone who will focus on the economy “like a laser beam,” to use Clinton’s phrase. And they are not afraid to select a candidate who will make the case that Bush’s policies are skewed toward the rich. Democrats believe that the next president should be a communitarian, not a libertarian. In bumper sticker politics, the slogan is simple: “We, not me.” That may not be a winning line, but it is one designed to offer a choice, not an echo.

John Kenneth White is a Professor of Politics at the Catholic University of America and author of *The Values Divide: American Politics and Culture in Transition* which has just been published by Chatham House.

John Zogby is president of Zogby International and author of *Decision 2002: Why the Republicans Gained* which is available on the Zogby website: <http://www.zogby.com>.

<sup>1</sup>CBS News/*New York Times*, poll, November 1-4, 2000. Test of question: “Regardless of how you intend to vote, who do you expect to finally win the presidential election in November—Al Gore or George W. Bush?” Gore, 33 percent; Bush 39 percent; don’t know/no answer, 18 percent.

## SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

### THE AMERICAN CONGRESS

<http://congress.wustl.edu>

The new addition of this textbook is available on-line at no charge. That’s right, the on-line textbook is free. The new edition is co-authored with Jason Roberts and Ryan Vander Wielen. Six chapters are available now; all others will be on-line within a few weeks.

#### Features of the new on-line edition:

- All chapters are available separately in PDF format. Instructors and students just download and read.
- All chapters are up-to-date and will be kept up-to-date on-line.
- Links to congressional sources important for lectures and research projects are on-line.
- An excellent set of recent, readable essays and conference papers is always on-line in PDF format.
- A battery of test questions for each chapter will be on-line.

The on-line version of *The American Congress* is a project of the Weidenbaum Center on the Economy, Government, and Public Policy, Washington University in St. Louis.

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

(continued from page 3)

"Advocacy Communities in the United States and the European Union." Christine Mahoney, Pennsylvania State University.

"Having a Say" How Institutions Impact Labor Organization and Influence." Laura Stephenson, Duke University.

"From the Sidelines to the Headlines: How the Roma Gained a Voice in European Politics." Melanie H. Ram, Japan International Cooperation Agency and Thomas T. Holyoke, George Washington University.

**Discussant:** R. Daniel Kelemen, Rutgers University

### 4:15 p.m. 35-10 Party Adaptation and Partisanship

**Chair:** John A. Clark, Western Michigan University

**Authors:** "Is There a Role of Party Beyond Partisanship?" John M. Bruce, University of Mississippi.

"Partisan Voting in Presidential Primaries." William G. Mayar, Northeastern University.

"Changing the Calculus of Running: Party Adaptation and Congressional Primaries." Justin Taylor, Ohio State University.

"The Evolving Bases of Partisanship: Five Decades of Change." Marc D. Weiner, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

**Discussant:** Kevin S. Price, University of Washington

## SATURDAY, AUGUST 30:

### 8:00 a.m. 35-9 Parties, Party Elites, and Mass Beliefs about Parties

**Chair:** M. Margaret Conway, University of Florida

**Authors:** "The New Party Professionals: National Convention Delegates in 2000." Geoffrey Layman, Vanderbilt University, Thomas Carsey, University of Illinois-Chicago, John C. Green, University of Akron and Richard Herrera, Arizona State University.

"Political Party Behavior and Political Trust in Contemporary Democracies." Aida Paskeviciute, Binghamton University and Christopher J. Anderson, SUNY, Binghamton University.

"Purist Versus Pragmatist Orientations Among Political Party Activists: Grassroots Activists in the South, 1991-2001." Charles L. Prysby, University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

"Political Parties as Signaling Agents in the Postreform Era." Alan Rozzi, University of California, Los Angeles.

**Discussant:** Hans Noel, University of California, Los Angeles.

### 10:00 a.m. 35-5 Party Roles in Campaign Finance

**Chair:** Linda L. Fowler, Dartmouth College

**Authors:** "Building Intra-Party Coalitions with Leadership PACs." Justin Buchler, University of California, Berkeley.

"Leadership PACs in Congressional Campaigns: Long-Run Party Building versus Short-Run Ambition." Matthew Potoski and Robert C. Lowry, Iowa State University.

"The Redistribution of Campaign Funds and Institutional Advancement in the U.S. House." Bruce A. Larson, Fairleigh Dickinson University.

"Congressional Campaigns and Congressional Campaign Committees in the 2000 Elections." Chapman Rackaway, Fort Hays State University.

**Discussant:** Diana F. Dwyre, California State University, Chico.

### 2:15 p.m. 35-8 New Perspectives in Interest Group Mobilization

**Chair:** Scott H. Ainsworth, University of Georgia

**Authors:** "Governmental Agendas as Mobilizers of Interest Advocacy." Virginia H. Gray and David L. Lowery, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

"The Politics of Attrition: Interest Group Influence and Demobilization in National Politics, 1833-1960." Daniel J. Tichenor, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

"Hard Money, Soft Money or Direct Lobbying Expenditures? The Emergency and Growth of American Indian Lobbying." Frederick J. Boehmke, University of Iowa and Richard C. Witmer, Grinnel College.

"The Dynamics of a Disturbance." Matt Grossman, University of California, Berkeley.

**Discussant:** Timothy M. LaPira, Rutgers University.

### 4:15 p.m. 35-7 Strategies and Motivations for Advocacy

**Chair:** Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas

**Authors:** "Doing Good, Doing Well: The Professionalization of Advocacy." Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas.

"Closer to a Pluralist Heaven" Women's, Racial Minority, and Economic Justice Advocacy Groups and the Politics of Representation." Dara Z. Strolovitch, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

"To Lobby or Not to Lobby? And How? Washington Interest Group Representatives' Advocacy Decisions." Rogan Kersh, Syracuse University.

"Corporate Philanthropy and the Pursuit of Business Interests." Andrew Rich, Wake Forest University.

**Discussant:** Jeffrey M. Berry, Tufts University.

### 4:15 p.m. 35-12 Advocacy and the Internet: Political Parties and Political Movements

## SUNDAY, AUGUST 31:

### 8:00 a.m. 35-1 New Perspectives on Parties and Political Organizations in the American States

### 10:00 a.m. 35-11 Participation, Democracy and Organizations

**Chair:** Christine DeGregorio, American University

**Authors:** "Democratic Participation Among Poor Empowerment Groups." Heidi J. Swarts, Syracuse University.

"Examining Membership in Nonprofit Organizations." Elizabeth Reid, The Urban Institute.

"Testing the Transmission Belt: How Internal Associational Institutions Affect National Political Attitudes and Behaviors in the United States." Neil Carlson, Duke University.

"Opportunities for Influence in Interest Groups in the United States." Maryann Barakso, American University.

"Participatory Democracy: The Bridge from Civil Rights to Women's Rights." Julie Clements, American University.

**Discussant:** Anne N. Costain, University of Colorado, Boulder.

## FROM THE FIELD

### RECENT ARTICLES IN PARTY POLITICS

**Volume 9 Issue 2 - Publication Date: March 1, 2003**

#### ARTICLES:

**The Nationalization of Parties and Party Systems: An empirical Measure and an Application to the Americas**, Mark P. Jones (Michigan State University, USA) and Scott Mainwaring (University of Notre Dame, USA)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030835.html>

**Species of Political Parties: A New Typology**, Richard Gunther (Hoover Institution, USA) and Larry Diamond (Ohio State University, USA)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030836.html>

**Taming Labour's MEPs**, William B. Messmer (Drew University, Madison, USA)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab028139.html>

**Predestined Parties? Organizational Change in Norwegian Political Parties**, Knut Heidar (University of Oslo, Norway) and Jo Saglie (Institute for Social Research, Norway)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030838.html>

**The Rise of a Global Party? American Party Organizations Abroad**, Taylor Dark III (Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030837.html>

#### BOOK REVIEWS:


Larry, Desmond and Richard Gunther (eds), *Political Parties and Democracy*, reviewed by Kenneth Janda.

Nikiforos Diamandouros, P. and Richard Gunther, *Parties, Politics, and Democracy in the New Southern Europe*, reviewed by Caterina Paolucci.

**Volume 9 Issue 03 - Publication Date: May 1, 2003**

#### ARTICLES:

**Two-and-a-half-Party Systems and the Comparative Role of the 'Half'**, Alan Siaroff (University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032203.html>

**Constructing the Number of Parties**, Patrick Dunleavy and Francoise Boucek (London School of Economics, London, UK)   
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032204.html>

**Partisanship, Performance and Personality: Competing and Complementary Characterizations of the 2001 British General Election**, John Bartle (University of Essex, UK)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032205.html>

**The Impact of Electoral Rule Change on Party Campaign Strategy: Hong Kong as a Case Study**, Ngok Ma (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong) and Chi-keung Choy (City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032206.html>

**After the Divorce: Social Democrats and Trade Unions in Sweden**, Nicholas Aylott (Umea University, Sweden)  
<http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032207.html>

#### BOOK REVIEWS:

Seyd, Patrick and Paul Whiteley, *New Labour's Grass Roots: The Transformation of Labour Party Membership*, reviewed by Gordon Hands.

Forster, Anthony, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties Since 1945*, reviewed by Mark Aspinwall.

Gallagher, Michael and Michael Marsh, *Days of Blue Loyalty. The Politics of Membership of the Fine Gael Party*, reviewed by Anders Wildfeldt.

Rose, Richard and Neil Munro, *Elections Without Order: Russia's Challenge to Valdimar Putin*, reviewed by Matthew Wyman.

March, Luke, *The Communist Party in Post-Soviet Russia*, reviewed by Sean Hanley.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna, *Redeeming the Communist Past: The Regeneration of Communist Parties in East Central Europe*, reviewed by Sean Hanley.

The  
University  
of Akron

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

---

FIRST CLASS  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

---