

# 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

## ISSUE THEME: LEGISLATIVE PARTIES

### FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON PARTIES' ROLE IN CONGRESS

*Ralph M. Goldman, President, Center for Party Development*

Political parties are the managers of legislative business in most of the parliaments and congresses of the world. When the 102nd Congress of the United States established an Ad Hoc Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, the Joint Committee was directed to study the organization and operation of the Congress and to recommend to the 103rd Congress improvements with a view toward strengthening the effectiveness of the Congress. The authorizing resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 192, mentioned political parties only in passing. This seemed to be one more reflection of the low esteem in which the political parties are held by many in the nation's leadership and citizenry.

Believing that former Members of Congress may have useful insights into the role of the parties in congressional management, the Center for Party Development embarked upon a survey of the nearly 550 members of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. In a last-minute, but unsuccessful effort, the views of those 90-plus incumbents retiring from the 102nd Congress in 1993 were also sought. As a group of oft-forgotten "experts" on the workings of Congress, former Members of Congress are in a special position to make assessments from experience and with detachment. Ninety-six former Members responded to a mail questionnaire, four of whom wrote extended and thoughtful comments.

The subjects covered in the four-page questionnaire included: parties in the general management of Congress; the parties as recruiters of legislators and leaders; policy development and presentation; party role in the conduct of congressional election campaigns; funding campaigns

for congressional office; the funding of the parties as organizations; and term limits.

Several broad conclusions may be drawn from the responses. On the matter of the general management of Congress by the parties, two-fifths of the former Members considered the parties' role adequate, but as many as a third believed the role to be insufficient. Four-fifths were satisfied with the way the parties selected their leaders, but only three-fifths were satisfied with the agenda-setting function performed by the parties. As for the issue of "divided government" so much lamented by pundits and political scientists, three-fifths of the former Members dismissed this as an issue.

*(continued on page 4)*

#### **THEME: Legislative Parties**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>From Headquarters</b> .....   | 2 |
| <b>From the Field</b> .....      | 3 |
| <b>Scholarly Precincts</b> ..... | 6 |
| <b>Special Interests</b> .....   | 8 |

**Chair:** L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College

**Secretary-Treasurer:** Charles Hadley, University of New Orleans

**Program Chair:** Marjorie Hershey, Indiana University

**VOX POP Editor:** John Green, The University of Akron

**Executive Council:** Gary Wekkin, University of Central Arkansas; Robert Biersack, Federal Election Commission; Jo Freeman, Brooklyn, NY; Marjorie Hershey, Indiana University; Harold Bass, Quachita Baptist University; John Green, The University of Akron; Anthony Gierzynski, University of Vermont; Kay Schlozman, Boston College.

---

---

## ***FROM HEADQUARTERS***

To the Members of POP:

I am writing this as I begin my return from the West Coast back to Maine. Traveling the country has given me the opportunity to attend a number of regional meetings and to learn of some of the interesting work being done on political organizations and parties. I hope that next year we can arrange to have POP panels on programs at many of the regional meetings as another way to bring our research community together.

I want to call your attention to the first POP Special Edition of the *American Review of Politics*, which should reach you shortly. Bill Crotty and his colleagues—and Gary Wekkin—have done a terrific job on this issue. I saw Mac and Sarah at the Western Meetings and understand that

the second edition is well under way. We are still looking for editors for the third POP volume, as you will read elsewhere in this newsletter.

Our part of the APSA program, coordinated by Marjorie Randon Hershey, and our annual workshop, designed by Bob Biersack, both look excellent. I'm sure we all join in thanking them for their efforts. I hope at the Business Meeting in New York to have updates about the possible POP e-mail network and from the committee exploring the feasibility of POP fellowships at the national committees.

Best wishes for a productive end to the school year.

—Sandy Maisel

---

Dear Colleagues:

At the 1993 APSA meeting, POP voted to endorse the creation of a National Party Fellow Program. In the interest of obtaining input from section members, the Executive Committee decided to publish the proposal and invite comments, which should be sent to chair of the Committee Anthony Gierzynski, Department of Political Science, The Old Mill, The University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405-0114 (bitnet: AGIERZNY@UVMVM).

—Anthony Gierzynski

### **Proposal for A National Party Fellow Program**

*Under the Auspices of the American Political Science Association and the Political Organizations and Parties Organized Section*

*A Working Draft Prepared by the POP Committee to Assess the Feasibility*

#### **Brief Description**

The program will be a year-long Fellowship designed for early and mid-career political scientists to enable them to observe the national parties. It is expected that individuals selected as Fellows will be associated with accredited universities and have some college level teaching and publication experience in the area of political parties and elections. Fellows would be placed in the National parties and perform professional level services. These Fellows will participate in the established orientation and ongoing seminar program of the American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow Program along with those fellows selected to work in congressional offices. The

Fellowship year would begin in September, and end approximately August 15th.

#### **Goals of the Program**

The Fellow Program is intended to be bipartisan, with an equal number of Fellows placed in the Democratic and Republican parties. The primary goal is educational. The Fellow Program is intended to be of primary educational benefit to the individuals selected to participate, and secondarily to the body of knowledge collectively produced by political party scholars.

#### **Rationale for a Party Fellow Program**

Public confidence in political institutions is alarmingly low. This is particularly true of political parties. While elected officials are organized by party, citizens have increasingly negative views about political parties and the role of conflict in defining the public agenda. While political scientists are by and large committed to the philosophical view that parties do contribute to democracy, they—and political and party leaders—have been unable to communicate this effectively as citizens increasingly view parties as part of the problem of gridlock rather than the solution. Revitalizing the political system requires strengthened parties. But this remains chimerical so long as citizens and their leaders do not understand how parties work.

Restoring confidence in American institutions will require fundamental adjustments in the understanding that opinion leader—elected officials, party leaders, the public, the news media, and organized interest groups—

*(continued on page 4)*

## 1996 POP Annual Volume

The Section on Political Organization and Parties will be selecting a topic and editor for the 1996 POP Annual at the 1994 business meeting.

Proposals are welcome exploring a single theme of theoretical significance in the field of political organizations and parties.

The designated editor of the volume will be responsible for developing the theoretical structure of the theme, soliciting and reviewing articles, and developing a coherent, innovative and well-written final manuscript. This published volume will comprise about 200 pages, or 8 to 10 articles.

Prospective editors should submit a short, two- to four-page proposal, stating the theme, its theoretical significance, list of possible topics and authors, and the editor's qualifications to complete the volume. Send proposals as soon as possible to Sandy Maisel, Department of Government, Colby College, Waterville, ME 04901.

### **Editorship, *American Review of Politics***

The *American Review of Politics*, formerly the *Midsouth Political Science Journal*, is proud to announce that Charles D. Hadley of the University of New Orleans has accepted an invitation to serve as editor. He has assumed primary responsibility for the journal's manuscript review process

as of February 1, 1994, and will be responsible for issue content beginning with the first issue of volume 16 (Spring, 1995).

The *American Review of Politics* also is accepting applications between now and August 1, 1994, for another editorship to begin on January 1, 1995. The individual(s) chosen will work closely with Hadley and with book review editor Conrad Waligorski (University of Arkansas), with shared responsibility for the manuscript review process and issue content. The current editors and board of the journal hope to discuss the editorial search at the American Political Science Association meeting in September. Interested parties should send resumes, a letter of interest, and a summary of support available from the administration of their universities to: Harold F. Bass, Jr., ARP Editorial Search Committee, Department of Political Science, Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, AR 71998-0001.

Although the *American Review of Politics* is a quarterly journal of general political science research and theory, it also fills a niche as a journal that serves those especially interested in party and group politics. It enjoys a contractual relationship with the American Political Science Association's Organized Section on Political Organizations & Parties (APSA POP), with whom it publishes an annual symposium issue devoted to some aspect of party or group politics. Submissions may be addressed to Charles D. Hadley, Editor, *American Review of Politics*, Department of Political Science, University of New Orleans, Lakefront New Orleans, LA 70148.

## **POP Workshop Fall 1994**

### ***Federalism and Party Finance: New Approaches to Regulation and New Data on State and National Party Finance***

This half-day session will combine a true "workshop" on new data available on state and national party organizations with a discussion of strategies and problems in regulating party finance in a federal system. The first session will include an explanation of the new regulatory scheme under which parties raise and spend funds related to federal elections and the new data that come from these regulatory changes. Scholars currently working with the data will discuss their experiences, and participants will have the opportunity to receive data sets relevant to their research interests. The second session will involve regulators from the federal and state/local levels along with party officials in a discussion of the regulatory process in the environment where party priorities, state, and federal

law are in conflict. Presenters will include: Robert Biersack, Federal Election Commission; Anthony Corrado, Colby College; Ruth Jones, Arizona State University; Frank Sorauf, University of Minnesota; as well as state and federal officials.

**Registration fee:** \$25 for non-members; \$15 for POP members; and \$2 for Graduate Students. Checks should be made payable to the APSA.

**Registrant should send fees to:** The American Political Science Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20036. Attention: Short Course.

**For information:** Contact Bob Biersack, Federal Election Commission, 999 E. Street NW, Washington, DC 20463, (202) 219-3730 or 1-800-424-9530.

---

## FROM HEADQUARTERS *(continued)*

have about the role of parties. Central to this new understanding is the work of political scientists who create the knowledge we have about parties. Unfortunately, in the past 30 years as the parties have undergone a revolution in their organization, political scientists have virtually ceased to study political parties firsthand.

Increasingly, those who teach new generations about American politics have less and less practical experience in campaigns, elections and the organization of political parties. This not only limits their effectiveness as teachers of new generations of citizens, but also inhibits dialogue between educators and political leaders who make concrete decisions about party programs and organization.

Re-inventing parties is also central to American democracy. The increasing public nature of parties raises compelling questions about the public contribution of what are legally still considered "private" organizations. Recent issues that arised in the 1992 elections ensure that important facets of parties will be increasingly regulated. In particular, whether or not publicly funded conventions and general election presidential campaigns have some or any public accountability has come to the fore. Many

commentators, for example, have raised the question whether conventions now supported by tax dollars perform any useful public function, and queried whether presidential candidates who wage their campaigns with public funds are *required* to debate. Currently, these issues are discussed by private foundations (e.g., the Bipartisan Presidential Debate Commission) without the advice offered by political scientists who specialize in parties or party organizations. For example, the Commission on National Political conventions was advised by Dan Nimmo and his associate in their study of television coverage—well-regarded scholars, but not ones with expertise in parties.

By contrast, considerations of reform in the U.S. Congress almost always involve congressional scholars of the top ranks. For example, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has received expert testimony from top scholars in the field who have also been Congressional Fellows—Thomas Mann, Stephen Smith, Norman Ornstein, and Barbara Sinclair (among others).

Practical experience not only informs the scholarship of the "best and the brightest" among young scholars,

*(continued on page 5)*

---

*(continued from page 1)*

With respect to the recruitment function of parties, more than half of the former Members thought the parties should play a greater role, although less than a fourth experienced important party involvement in their own candidacies. Nearly one-half of the respondents anticipated that *party influence in recruitment would increase* if term limits were adopted. As self-recruiters themselves, two-fifths strongly disagreed with the suggestion that petition requirements to get on the ballot be made more stringent. On the controversial issue of term limits, the principle expectations were that term limitation would make Members more representative, create difficulties in their acquiring expertise, increase the influence of congressional staff as well as increase the influence of the parties in the recruitment of candidates.

Who should enunciate their parties' program? The president, if their party holds that office, otherwise, a "titular leader" (an office of parliamentary systems). Very few picked the Speaker, Majority or Minority Leaders, or the caucuses for this job.

If nothing else, parties are presumed to be campaign organizations. Yet, nearly 51 percent of the former Members said that their party was very little involved—in some cases, obstructive—in their own campaigns. What they found valuable, however, was the legitimacy lent their candidacy by the party name and the occasional ability of their party to provide volunteers for the campaign.

Only about one-fourth thought that the party should provide financial support.

Differences appeared on questions dealing with finances. There was a 42-42 split on whether disclosure requirements are now adequate or should be more strict. Asked about the effectiveness of statutory limits on campaign contributions, a plurality believe that the present limits are effective in the case of individual contributors, less so for contributions from party committees, and hardly at all for interest groups. Asked if public funds should be used to maintain specific units of party organization, three-fourths said "Never (*sic*)."

However, Democrats were clearly more inclined to favor public funds in support of the campaigns of duly nominated candidates.

The views of former Members of Congress, many of which are summarized briefly here, are the views of men and women who have served and who continue to feel concern for their country and its political system. Their views are important data for those seeking to facilitate the work of Congress, rationalize the nation's policy process, make the political parties more responsible and accountable, and give the citizenry a greater influence upon those who manage its government.

These objectives are hardly attainable in a system that fragments the units of political power to a degree that far exceeds the separation of power concept of the Founding Fathers. From an institutional perspective, the U.S. party system and the legislative process in Congress create an

*(continued on page 7)*

(continued from page 4)

but it also introduces these scholars to political leaders and gives scholars the sights needed to effectively communicate with leaders concerned with practical problems. The public dialogue on parties would be much informed if top political party scholars were more well-known among public officials and party leaders.

### **Compensation and Overall Cost of the Program**

It is expected that Fellows would be compensated by the American Political Science Association a 501(3) (C) third-party sponsoring organization. The funds for this compensation would be raised from foundations and other sources by individuals directing the Party Fellow Program. The compensation will be tied to the stipend paid to American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow Program (currently \$28,000), plus a travel allowance. The fellowship stipend may be supplemented, at the fellow's initiative, with university support. The cost of funding Fellows is about 150 percent of the stipend received for Fellows. Costs will include: administration, travel and relocation expenses, and expenses of the selection committee. If two Fellows are funded each year, then the expected cost for one year would be about \$78,000. This, of course, would gradually increase each year as the stipend and other costs increase.

### **Qualifications and Applicants**

To meet these goals, a scholarly interest in political party organizations and their role in providing linkage between institutions of American national government and mass publics will be stressed in both the application and selection process. The program will require a Ph.D. completed within the last 15 years (or near completion) and encourage mid-career faculty members on sabbatical leave to apply.

### **Program Administration**

Overall Program Administration will be under the direction of a APSA/POP National Party Faculty Director and an Advisory Committee.

### **Faculty Director of the Program**

The Faculty Director will be appointed by the Executive Director of the American Political Science Association, the President of the American Political Science

Association, and the President of the Political Organizations and Parties organized section of the APSA. The Faculty Director will sit on the Advisory Committee and chair its meetings.

### **Advisory Committee**

The Advisory Committee answerable to the APSA Council and the POP Executive Board. The members of the first Advisory Committee will be appointed by the Executive Director of the American Political Science Association, the President of the Political Organizations and Parties organized Section of the APSA, and the President of the American Political Science Association. The Advisory Committee should include in its membership individuals who are at the top ranks of their field of specialization in political organizations and parties, and who have some personal familiarity with national party organizations. Members of the Advisory Committee should be appointed for staggered terms of three years, which may be extended by one term. The Advisory Committee will appoint a nomination committee of three to set procedures for nomination to the committee.

### **Selection Committee Structure**

The Faculty Director of the APSA/POP Party Fellow Program will nominate members for the Selection Committee, dependent on approval by the Advisory Committee. The Selection Committee will include among its members: the Chair of the Democratic National Committee (or his or her designee), and the Chair of the Republican National Committee (or his or her designee).

### **Application Procedures**

Applicants will be asked to submit a detailed curriculum vitae, a personal statement of about 500 words detailing how the National Party Fellow Program relates to his or her professional career goals, the names of three professional references who will provide letters of recommendation, the name of at least one elected official or political party leader who will provide a letter of recommendation, and a sample of the applicant's best professional writing (a published article or unpublished manuscript). Applicants will be asked to specify whether they are applying for a Democratic or a Republican Fellow position.

Applicants will be asked to apply by December 1. The Selection Committee will notify applicants by March 1 if they have been selected as a finalist based on their written materials. Finalists will be asked to travel to Washington, D.C. for a personal interview before the Selection Committee in March.

## The Formation and Deformation of the Multiparty System in Russia

Grigorii V. Golosov

The mushrooming of Russian political organizations, beginning in the late eighties, has attracted the attention of specialists on post-Soviet politics, and is not without considerable controversy. On the one hand, there were those who assumed that new political parties, even if some of them were not well formed yet, played an increasingly important role in channeling political developments in the country. Correspondingly, these parties were referred to as "protoparties," suggesting their almost inevitable evolution, into full-blown parties. On the other hand, there were analysts who argued that these formations were "pseudoparties," in all probability doomed to wither away during and after the next election campaign. This categorization, most coherently presented by R. Sakwa, has proved to be more adequate than the former one. Of those 13 parties, blocks, and coalitions which were registered to contest the December 1993 parliamentary elections, only three trace their origins to the previous phases of party formation in the country. Others count their history in months rather than in years; most remarkably, the foremost of the reformers' parties, Russia's Choice, has been created on the eve of the election campaign.

The following analysis attempts to explain this phenomenon by examining the political performance of new Russian political parties from August 1991 to the outbreak of the unrestricted and potentially violent struggle for dominance in March 1993. During this period, the dominant strategy pursued by major political actors was the search for an intra-elite compromise. I will argue that the weakness of the new political parties' resulted primarily from the fact that they were increasingly involved with providing communication links within the elite, thus being unable to serve as intermediaries between state and society. In order to locate the development of parties in a specific political and social context, this discussion will be focused on the party scene in Western Siberia and, more specifically, in the city of Novosibirsk. The parties considered here are the mainstream democratic parties (i.e., those formations which, in R. Frankin's words, targeted at replacing the Soviet totalitarian system with a democratic, representative, and accountable government). Only a few of these parties, however, unequivocally supported the Yeltsin-Gaidar's government. The largest and relatively more influential of these formations, the Peoples Party of Free Russia (PPFR) and the Democratic Party of Russia (DPR), were increasingly skeptical about the strategy of "shock therapy economic policy." Before examining these parties' functions, it is important to clear up which groups were most likely to rule in the region.

In August 1991 through September 1993 both the executive and legislative branches of power in Novosibirsk

were strongly dominated by the local Communist *nomenklatura*. The head of the provincial administration V. Mukha was the former first secretary of Novosibirsk city committee of the Communist Party. It is not surprising, then, that the staff of the provincial administration changed only slightly since 1991. The same may be concluded about the city administration. Most provincial, city, and district people's deputies were also former Communists. The minority consisted of those intellectuals who had joined democratic movement in 1988-90, and sometimes even earlier. They were only slightly represented in the executive structures of Novosibirsk, holding the position of President Yeltsin's representative in the province (A. Manokhin). The democratic groups both in the provincial and city *soviets* were strongly critical about V. Mukha's administration, but they were not numerous enough to force the executives to resign. On the other hand, the ex-Communist majority could not afford to ignore democrats. Although weak on the regional level, the democratic opposition had the advantage of direct connections to those democrats who were in power in Moscow. In fact, these connections were institutionalized because the presidential representative's job was to act as a liaison between the local administration and Yeltsin and to ensure that presidential decrees were implemented locally. Not surprisingly, the executives were by no means interested in direct confrontations with their apparently weak opponents, and the state of relations between the two factions of the elite could not be interpreted in terms of antagonistic struggle.

There is no doubt that such an elite needed some means of inner communication. First and foremost, this function may be connected with the formulation of ideologies. Indeed, members of any elite not only produce ideology but are also its largest distributors and consumers. In the former Soviet Union, Marxist-Leninist ideology was of crucial importance for maintaining the stable and consensual political order. This order, however, was destroyed by the reformers under Gorbachev and replaced by pluralistic elites lacking ideological consensus. The former Communists—not only bureaucrats but also industrial and agricultural managers—were especially aware of the lack of ideological means of expression vis-a-vis their democratic opponents. Some of the new political parties were quick in their attempts to satisfy this pressing need. The case of the Civic Union is especially symptomatic. This coalition was formed in 1992 to promote the interests of industrial managers during the privatization process. The main force behind the Civic Union was the All-Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs, a pressure group created by the former

high-level Communist official A. Volskii. For him and his associates, lobbying activity was definitely more important than the public party-building. But to become a really influential force, and especially to form the government, the Civic Union had to be active in the political arena. That is why Volskii's lobby was joined by two "mainstream democratic" parties which not only sought mass memberships but also had relatively strong regional networks—the PPF and the DPR.

On the one hand, the Civic Union was by no means a pro-Communist coalition. Even the PPF, whose origin could be traced to the Democratic Party of Russian Communists within the CPSU, had distanced itself completely from Marxist ideology as early as in September 1991. As for the DPR, it was once the most influential group within the Democratic Russia movement. For these parties, the Civic Union was an attempt to function as a non-Communist representative of those decision-makers who felt themselves burdened with their Communist backgrounds. On the other hand, the coalition's ideology was deliberately detached from radical reformism which threatened the well-being of the former Communists. It was not for nothing that the Civic Union helped local decision-makers to relate their political preferences to those of the competing factions of Moscow elite, thus structuring regional politics in a way more or less reminiscent of the processes which took place on the all-Russian level. For example, in early 1993 the provincial and city administrations in Novosibirsk identified themselves primarily with the Civic Union, while Yeltsin's representative in the province alongside the democratic minorities of people's deputies

*(continued from page 4)*

every-person-for-him-or-her-self world. The search for the Holy Grail is simpler than the search for consensus in such circumstances. The good news is that anyone aspiring to establish a dictatorship in this country would give up the game very quickly for all the reasons noted here. However, those Americans who wish merely to avoid gridlock, discourage greed, promote accountability, and maintain a rational and vigorous system of policy making can see in these findings the dimensions of their task.

The Center's 65-page report is entitled *Former Members of Congress View the Role of Political Parties in the U.S. Congress*. Copies may be obtained by addressing the Center for Party Development, Department of Politics, Catholic University, Washington, DC 20064. The cost per copy, which includes postage and handling, is \$10. The cost for five or more copies is \$8 per copy.

tended to support the Republican Party of Russian Federation.

At the same time, new political parties' capability of intermediating mass-elite political communication gradually declined. It would seem that this function was at least partly performed by the electronic media. The difference between the two forms of political communication is clear: parties enable the masses to speak to the elite, while the media makes the masses listen. In fact, no form of meaningful mass participation in politics has evolved in Russia since August 1991. The less interest in politics was displayed by the public, the more intensive was the political life of the elite. Initially, all the factions of the elite accepted the worth of new political order which they called democracy. This order was substantially undermined in March 1993, when Yeltsin went on to the political offensive targeted at defeating the parliament. As a result, the parties involved with providing the channels of intra-elite communication began to wither away. The Civic Union split into several factions, while the attempts of the new political center which took shape in Russia, intending to become an appeasing force in the power struggle, were remarkably fruitless. Both Yeltsin and the parliament had reverted to the populist option. But if Yeltsin could appeal for the support of the remnants of democratic movement which had brought him in office, the only force presumably capable of providing mass support for the parliament was the Communist opposition. It goes without saying that the Communists' goal was not to become a part of the new system but to destroy it.

New Russian democratic parties, preoccupied with providing intra-elite communication links, were not ready to meet this challenge. That being so, they helped to create a political vacuum that could well be filled by some kind of revived authoritarianism. The October 1993 events in Moscow produced a good piece of evidence that Russian "proto-democracy" is still fragile, not only because this confrontation threatened to put communists back in charge, but also, and primarily, because it revealed the authoritarian tendencies of the ruling elite. Although the electoral process is itself a major stimulus for the development of a viable party system, it is unclear whether such system has prospects for the future in Russia, or if the democratic parties of new generation which emerge in the country are doomed to follow in their predecessors' footsteps.

Grigori V. Golosov is a professor at The Central European University in Hungary.

**WANTED!** Notices, announcements, reports, and short articles for VOX POP.

Send materials to: John Green,  
Bliss Institute, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1904

**Call for Papers**  
***Party Politics in the Year 2000***

A conference organized around the theme **Party Politics in the Year 2000** will be held in Manchester, UK, on January 13-15, 1995. The conference will have six main themes:

- I. Contemporary party organization
- II. Parties and party systems in emergent democracies
- III. Parties in crisis
- IV. Corruption in political parties
- V. Parties outside the political mainstream
- VI. Parties and new challenges

There will also be a roundtable discussion—Modeling party systems: where next?

The conference will also launch a major new political science journal, *Party Politics*, which will appear quarterly from January 1995. The journal will be published by Sage Publications, London, and will be edited by David M. Farrell, Ian Holliday and Kenneth Janda. It will carry full-length articles, short reports and book reviews on all aspects of party politics.

Anyone interested in contributing a paper to the conference *Party Politics in the Year 2000* or an article for publication in the journal *Party Politics*, should contact Dr. David M. Farrell and Dr. Ian Holliday, Department of Government, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK, or Professor Kenneth Janda, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA.



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

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