

# 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 — NEW RESEARCH**

## ENGLISH CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORMS FOR AMERICA: A REJOINDER TO SCHATTMAN

*By Thomas P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

One must concur with Schattman (Volume 13, Issue 1 of VOX POP) that campaign finance is a major problem in this country, but he selects the wrong facet of British politics to apply.

There are numerous obstacles to incorporating British campaign finance practices to the United States and none is readily overcome. One is federalism. The British system is unitary and Westminster can legislate on any topic it chooses with confidence it will be enforced throughout the United Kingdom. (The revolt a few years ago against Margaret Thatcher's community charge or poll tax, notwithstanding.) Given the federal structure of the United States, most laws regulating campaigns and political parties are state laws. There are no comparable statutes in Britain, which has one set of laws to restrict candidates and parties. The United States has 50, or more since the two major parties fall under different legal criteria in some states. The most visible evidence of the impact of federalism on candidates and parties is in the nominating processes for the president, where different statutes in each state require conformance to dozens of state regulations.

A second obstacle which Schattman raises but promptly drops is the First Amendment provisions of the United States Constitution, specifically those of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. As Fleet Street would strongly affirm, the British press enjoys no such protection. On the contrary, the press in Britain under the Official Secrets Act is severely limited by law. This is one of the reasons that campaign finances can be so effectively controlled in Britain, where by law newspapers can be prohibited from publishing advertising promoting a candidate.

Another constitutional difference that facilitates

British regulation of campaign expenditures is the lack of a constitutional right of free speech, in the broadest sense. Americans may glorify speakers Corner in Hyde Park as the epitome of free expression, but under British law, no one can put up a sign promoting a candidate, not even the candidate herself, without approval of the candidate's election agent, who often must include the monetary value of that in the total campaign budget of the candidate. Clearly, given *Buckley v. Valeo*, the U.S. Supreme Court would not condone that practice.

To sum up, major factors in the effectiveness of British law in regulating campaign finance are the lack of federalism and the constitutional freedoms of the press and speech, hallmarks of the American constitutional system.

*(continued on page 2)*

### **THEME: New Research**

<b>From Headquarters</b> .....	3
<b>Scholarly Precincts</b> .....	5
<b>From the Field</b> .....	7
<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.

(continued from page 1)

Another difference in the politics of the two nations is that in Britain political parties are considered private organizations, essentially unregulated by statute. In contrast, American parties are largely creatures of state laws, severely constrained in what they can do. Thus, state statute dictates how nominations must be made and what the various party organizations can be and do.

In Britain, as private entities, each political party determines its own internal operations, such as how candidates for the House of Commons shall be selected, or nominated as we would say on this side of the Atlantic. The Labour Party has in the last dozen years twice changed its method of selecting its leader (the American equivalent of nominating a presidential candidate) without any input from government. That would be impossible in the United States since state legislatures, at least indirectly, would have to sanction any such changes. The significance of this is that Britain lacks the tangle of state laws that must be addressed in changing the status and operations of American political parties and candidates. The British campaign finance laws apply not to parties, but to candidates. That is a factor that Schattman overlooks.

Near the end of his essay, Schattman indicates a misunderstanding of the British system when he says that "It is therefore appropriate that only the party and no other person or group lawfully be enabled to receive and disburse funds to promote the election of the nominee..." Here, he has left out a key instrument in regulating election finance in Britain: the election agent (or the equivalent if a candidate lacks an agent). It is the agent, not the party, that is responsible for ascertaining that campaign spending limits are not exceeded.

Schattman seems to contend that the two nominating systems can be rendered equivalent by conceptualizing the notion of party membership as equivalent in the two nations. His explication of this is baffling. As textbooks on political parties clearly note: party membership has several meanings in the United States. Since there is no registration by party there, the British system lacks a key meaning: membership by registration. Similarly, there is no equivalent in the United States to the British status of party member: one that pays dues to the party. As registration with the party legally makes one a party member in most, if not all, states, American parties cannot require a fee for one to participate in party matters, even the most important party decisions, the nomination of candidates.

Voting in the party primary as an indicator of party membership is markedly different from having to pay dues to participate in party activities. In the United States, some states permit people to become a party member instantaneously as they ask from the primary election ballot of a party that may be different than the one that they "supported" in the previous primary. Schattman equates that with dues paying membership in Britain, where customarily even *most* of these members have not participated in the nomination of candidates. British political parties have ordinarily used a party committee, not the entire local membership, to select nominees for parliamentary and local office.

Other pertinent differences between the two political systems could be examined, such as the much smaller geographic areas encompassed by parliamentary constituencies as compared to those of congressional districts, the free mailing that each parliamentary candidate may send to each registered voter in the constituency, and the strictly limited but free television time that British parties receive during campaigns. But the weaknesses of Schattman's case is demonstrated without those explorations.

That his analysis is defective does not suggest that we cannot learn from and utilize the experience of Britain and other parliamentary systems. Unlike the printed media, both congressional practice and U.S. Court decisions deny the electronic media the press freedom of the First Amendment. Broadcasting has been regulated for decades. In contemporary campaigns for major office, such as Congress and the Presidency, the largest expenditure is for broadcasting, especially television. Therefore, for these two elective offices, we need a law *prohibiting* candidates from *purchasing* radio or television broadcast time. This should substantially reduce the need for campaign funds and thus limits on total expenditures would be more palatable and practicable.

This proposal is not without its complications, such as at what point does a candidate qualify for free time? Is it only the party nominee or any candidate to be the nominee? Would this be acceptable to the broadcast enterprises? There would no doubt be some grumbling from the electronic media, but this proposal would liberate them from many campaign regulations with which they must now comply, as well as from dead beat candidates that do not pay their bills. Free broadcast time for candidates is more feasible than Schattman's broad, imprecise recommendation, which is based on a faulty understanding of the British system.

## Wanted!

Notices, announcements, reports, and short articles for VOX POP.

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

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

To the Members of POP:

My reminder from John Green that it is time to write another letter to the membership for VOX POP is beginning to achieve ritual magnitude in my life. But this time, I am pleased to say that I have remained in one place and intend to do so. In fact, I am writing this brief letter from my office/porch overlooking Great Pond, one of Maine's beautiful Belgrade Lakes, currently ablaze with the hues of autumn as I have rarely seen. I think the fall campaigns might be as colorful as the panorama in front of me, but I doubt they will lead to the serenity that might come if I follow my instinct of watching sunrises and sunsets and avoiding television, overrun as it is with campaign ads and incessant (non-) analysis.

Enough—and on to the business of POP. Our annual cycle has become somewhat predictable, enjoy and learn from our workshops and program panels at one annual meeting and then prepare for the next. I hope you will all work with Jeff Berry, our Program Chair, as he puts together POP panels for the 1995 Convention. Look for

announcements soon about the 1995 POP Workshop and our third annual edition of the *American Review of Politics*.

The one major issue that faces the section this year deals with the *American Review of Politics*. We as an organized section have been asked to take over the sponsorship of this journal. For many reasons, this is a most significant undertaking for an organization like ours. Within a month or so I will be writing to all POP members, outlining a proposal in great detail, and seeking your advice. The Executive Council will be meeting at the Midwest meetings to make a determination as to how we are to proceed with regard to the ARP. I hope many of you will give us your thoughts before that time.

I hope you enjoy and benefit from this issue of VOX POP. As always, I want to thank John Green and his colleagues at the Bliss Institute for their work in producing our newsletter and all of you who have been helping on POP projects.

Sandy Maisel, Chair

## Minutes

Political Organizations and Parties Section, American Political Science Association  
New York City, September 2, 1994

The section meeting was called to order by L. Sandy Maisel, Chair, at 5:38 p.m. The following order of business transpired:

1. A. Minutes: Printed in VOX POP, Volume 12, Issue 2, pp. 2-3.

B. **Treasurer's Report** (July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1994):

<b>Funds on hand</b>		
July 1, 1993		\$3,202.31
<b>Revenue Generated:</b>		
APSA Section dues	\$1,020.00	
Interest income	118.09	
1993 workshop	113.00	
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$1,251.09</u>	<u>\$1,251.09</u>
<b>Expenditures:*</b>		
Bank service fees	(\$ 17.34)	
Award plaques	(292.05)	
1993 Workshop lunch	(187.00)	
<b>Total</b>	<u>(\$ 496.39)</u>	<u>(\$ 496.39)</u>
<b>Funds on hand</b>		
June 30, 1994†		<u>\$3,979.52</u>

\*Copying/printing, postage, telephone, travel, and staff provided gratis by the University of New Orleans, University of Akron, and Colby College.

†National Bank funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking (\$1,224.77) and nonprofit savings (\$2,754.75) accounts.

2. **Nominating Committee Report:** The Chair called on John K. White who noted that the following were recommended for a two-year term on the Executive Council: Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., University of Connecticut/Storrs; Jerome Mileur, University of Massachusetts/Amherst; Maureen Moakley, University of Rhode Island; and, A. James Reichley, Georgetown University. Moreover, Diana Dwyre, University of Maryland/Baltimore County was recommended for a two-year term as Secretary-Treasurer. There being no nominations from the floor for either position, the slate of nominees was adopted unanimously.

3. **Committee Appointments** were announced by the Chair: *Samuel J. Eldersveld Award Committee:* Everett Carll Ladd, Jr., University of Connecticut/Storrs, Chair; Jo Freeman, Brooklyn, New York; and Walter J. Stone, University of Colorado; *Leon D. Epstein and Jack L. Walker Awards Committee:* Professor Alan Gitelson, Loyola University/Chicago, Chair; John C. Green, The University of Akron; Jerome Mileur, University of Massachusetts/Amherst; *Emerging Scholar Award Committee:* Maureen Moakley, University of Rhode Island, Chair; A. James Reichley, Georgetown University; and Robert Salisbury, Washington University/St. Louis; *Nominating Committee:* Hal Bass, Ouachita

(continued on page 4)

---

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

(continued from page 3)

Baptist University, Chair; Anthony G. Gierzynski, University of Vermont; and Kay Lehman Schlozman, Boston College. The following appointments were made for APSA Section Chair: Jeffrey Berry, Tufts University, for 1995, and Lorn Foster, Pomona College, for 1996.

4. **National Party Committee Internships:** Anthony G. Gierzynski, Ad Hoc Committee Chair, thanked committee members Denise Baer, John Bibby, and Frank J. Sorauf, a special thanks to Sorauf for his many discussions held with members of the Federal Election Commission (FEC). The committee started with the knowledge of several barriers to the establishment of a national party committee fellowship program patterned after the APSA Congressional Fellowship Program. As ways were found to get around them, new barriers arose, including the possibility of the American Political Science Association losing its nonprofit tax-exempt status because of political activities. He went on to note the possibility of going directly to the national parties; however, because of the many difficulties, it does not seem possible to pursue such a program at this time.

Sandy, after commenting on endowment problems, thanked committee members for their work.

5. **1994 Workshop:** Robert Biersack, Federal Election Commission, commented on the overwhelming success of the 1994 POP Workshop, "Federalism and Party Finance: New Approaches to Regulation and New Data on State and National Party Finance," which was attended by more than 50 people. Special thanks are due to Nicole Gordon, New York City Campaign Finance Board, Gail Shea, Wisconsin State Board of Elections, and John Surina, Federal Election Commission, all of whom participated in the program at their own expense. Thanks also are due to Denise Baer, Tony Corrado, Ruth Jones, and Frank Sorauf for their participation. Proposals for a 1995 Workshop should be submitted either to Sandy or APSA Section Chair Jeffrey Berry.

6. **American Review of Politics:** Sandy noted the proposal from Gary Wekkin, Managing Editor, *American Review of Politics*, that the POP Section sponsor its publication. VOX POP would alternate with book reviews in the journal and the workshop would frame the annual special issue, its presented papers published in it. After an explanation of alternatives by Gary, Walter, E. Beach commented on the interest of Heldref Publications and what it was expected to do for the journal as its publisher; he also, invited members to stop by the Heldref booth to look over its published materials.

Sandy laid out a number of issues concerning a permanent relationship between POP and the *American Review of Politics*: (1) What would happen to POP

membership if the section dues were increased by \$10? Is it possible to separate membership and dues? (2) What should the journal content be—only political organizations and parties or other? (3) What is the role of POP in the selection of the journal editor? (4) What is the role of POP with respect to journal managerial control? (5) Should POP revisit the earlier debate about a separate POP sponsored annual volume dependent upon generated income for the publication of future volumes versus the dues increase and all members getting the journal as part of section membership?

In the course of the discussion that followed, Ralph Goldman, Kay Lawson, Gerry Pomper, Mac Jewell, Gary Wekkin, Paul Smith, and Bill Crotty voiced concerns and made suggestions. At its conclusion, Sandy Maisel announced that the POP Section Executive Council would put together a questionnaire and query the membership. Gary Wekkin and the *American Review of Politics* editors will be included in the process. It also was agreed that the management of the journal will survey journal subscribers.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charles D. Hadley, Secretary-Treasurer

## Announcement

At the POP Business meeting at APSA in New York it was decided that the POP Executive Council would poll the membership regarding the proposal for APSA POP to sponsor publication of the *American Review of Politics*. POP Chairperson Sandy Maisel is currently working on a letter and survey to be sent to POP members regarding this proposal. Please note that the Executive Council will meet at the Midwest Political Science Association conference in Chicago to settle this matter (April 6-8, 1995).

## 1995 APSA

Political Organizations and Parties

Jeffrey M. Berry, Department of Political Science, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155; (617) 627-3465; (617) 627-3660 (fax); jberry@pearl.tufts.edu (e-mail).

In the areas of political parties, interest groups, and social movements, I want to form panels that reflect the diverse research interests of this organized section. I welcome solid research papers regardless of approach.

That said, there are some areas where I hope there will be sufficient interest for panels. One such topic is the linkage between parties, groups, and movements. For example, what is the relationship between interest groups and political parties? How do social movements evolve over time into institutionalized lobbies?

A second area, relating to the theme of the conference, is liberalism and political organizations. papers on this subject might be broad think pieces that critically assess the role of parties and other political organizations in the modern liberal state. Papers might also be empirical studies aimed at analyzing patterns of behavior relating to some principle of liberal political thought.

A third area which is of particular relevance today is grassroots empowerment. To what degree are the voices of the rank-and-file heard within their organizations? How does grassroots participation affect the capacity of political organizations to influence public policy outcomes?

These are just a few ideas; I look forward to receiving proposals on a wide variety of topics. Paper abstracts should offer a clear explanation of the theoretical issues to be addressed, the methodological approach to be used, and the nature of the data to be analyzed.

## 1994 POP Awards

**James L. Sundquist**, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.

**Mancur Olson**, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for *The Logic of Collective Action* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

**Theodore J. Lowi**, winner of the Jack Walker award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for "Four Systems of Policy, Politics, and Choice." *Public Administration Review* 32:398-310, 1972.

**Scott Ainsworth**, winner of the Emerging Scholars Award.

## SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

### Recent Papers of Interest

Presented at the 1994 APSA Meeting

"Seniors Organizations and Group Maintenance: Patronage Reconsidered." Henry J. Pratt, Wayne State University

"Social Welfare Interest Group's Advocacy Efforts on the Executive Branch." Richard Hofer, Northern Illinois University

"The Political Context of Interest Group Activities." Kenneth W. Kollman, University of Michigan

"Assessing Interest Group Impact and Power: A Critique of Existing Approaches and an Alternative Approach." Clive S. Thomas, University of Alaska, Juneau and Ronald J. Hrebenar, University of Utah

"Interest Group Power and Impact in the American States." Virginia H. Gray, University of Minnesota, David L. Lowery, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

"Interest Group Power in Cooperative Societies." Philippe C. Schmitter, Stanford University

"Interest Group Power in East and West: Why the Transition to Communism to Market Democracy is so Difficult." Mancur Olson, University of Maryland

"The Politics of Gay Rights in American Communities." Barbara Rienzo, James Button and Kenneth Wald, University of Florida

"Compromise: The Thinking Behind Colorado's Amendment #2 Strategy." Hubert Morken, Regent University

"Parties and Culture Wars: The Politicization of Cultural Conflict in the United States." Geoffrey C. Layman, Indiana University

"Parties, Budgets, and Production: Guns v. Butter in Postwar France, 1960-90." David Wilsford, Georgia Inst. of Technology and Rawi E. Abdelal, Cornell University

"European Unification, German Unification: A Tale of Two Europes?" Jeffrey Gedmin, Enterprise for Public Policy Research

"The Dynamic Qualities of Issue Networks." Jeffrey M. Bery, Tufts University

"Advocacy by Proxy: The Children's Lobby in American Politics." Douglas R. Imig, Harvard University

(continued on page 6)

## SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

"Bedfellows and Policy Preferences: Interest Group Coalitions in National Politics." Kevin W. Hula, Harvard University

"Milk Strikes: Agrarian Protest and the Reassessment of Grievances." Thomas J. Kriger, St. Lawrence University

"From Allies to Antagonists: The Transformation of Interests in Health Care." Mark A. Peterson, University of Pittsburgh

"The Decline of Spain's Socialist Party." Patricia Craig, Ohio State University

"The Decline of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party." Dennis P. Patterson, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

"The Emergence of Political Cleavages and the Decline of a Predominant Party," Pradeep Chhibber, University of Michigan and Mariano Torcal, Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

"Change in Party Organization and Identity: Evidence for System-Level Explanations." Robert Harmel, Texas A&M University and Kenneth Frank Janda, Northwestern University

"Organizational and Ideological Adaptability of Social Democratic Parties in Interwar France and Germany." Marcus Kreuzer, Columbia University

"Why Do Political Parties Split?" Randolph Stevenson, University of Rochester

"A Research Agenda for the Study of Political Parties in Developing Nations." William Crotty, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

"Third Party Voting in Presidential Elections: A Study of Perot, Anderson, and Wallace." Howard J. Gold, Smith College

"The Problem of Third Party & Indep Candidacies in American Political System: Wallace, Anderson and Perot in Comparative Perspective." Paul R. Abramson, Michigan State University, John H. Aldrich, Duke University, Philip Paolino, Georgetown University, David Rohde, Michigan State University

"Breaking the Rules: Ross Perot's 1992 Presidential Campaign." Daron R. Shaw, University of California, Los Angeles

"Local and National Party Responses to Third and Non-Party Organizational Strategies." Paul A. Smith, SUNY, Binghamton

"Commitment and the Campaign Contribution Contract." Nolan M. McCarty, University of Southern California and Lawrence S. Rothenberg, University of Rochester

"When Emily Wishes Upon a Star, Do Her Dreams Come True? Assessing the Impact of Women's Electoral Groups on 1992 Election Outcomes and Congressional Agenda Setting." Terri Susan Fine, University of Central Florida

"Social Movements and Political Parties: A Comparison of the American and Canadian Women's Movements." Lisa Young, University of Toronto

"Determinants of the Effectiveness of Campaign Organizations." Sally A. Healy, Ohio State University

"Political Careers and Their Consequences for Political Parties: The French Legislative Elections of 1993." Joseph A. Schlesinger, Michigan State University and Mildred Schlesinger, Michigan State University

"Career Paths and Party Behavior in the European Parliament." Susan E. Scarrow, University of Houston

"Party Competition and the Recruitment of Women." Rebecca H. Davis, Emory University

"Pluralism, Conflict, and Legislative Elites in the United Germany." Robert Rohrschneier, Indiana University

"Candidate Attributes, Campaign Strategies, and Campaign Communications in Congressional Elections: Winners and Losers in Congressional Elections." Paul S. Herrnsen, University of Maryland

"Should the Parties Play a Larger Role in the Financing of Congressional Candidates?" Diana F. Dwyre, University of Maryland

"Financing U.S. House Elections 1978-1992: Parties and PACs." Tim Hames, Oxford University

"Dividing the Spoils: Industry Political Strategies in Competitive Policy Settings." Lee Burke, George Washington University and Scott Brickner, Brickner Research

### Special Issue from *American Review of Politics*

Our next special issue for *APSA POP*, due out in winter 1994, will feature new research on "State Political Parties," under the capable quest editorship of Sarah McCally Morehouse and Malcolm E. Jewell. A table of contents for that special issue can be seen at the rear of this issue.

Unlike "Political Parties in a Changing Age," the *APSA POP* special issue on "State Political Parties" is

not available free of charge. However, you can purchase it at the special low price of \$12 per copy—again, as per our agreement with *APSA POP*.

Write to American Review of Politics Department of Political Science, P.O. Box 4995, University of Central Arkansas, Conway, AR 72035.

### Replication Datasets to be Listed in the Newsletter

An increasing number of political science journals, book presses, and granting organizations are requiring authors to add a footnote to publications indicating in which public archive they will deposit the information necessary to replicate their numerical results, and the date when such information will be submitted (or an explanation if the data could not be archived). In order to encourage these contributions to the scholarly community, this newsletter has agreed to provide authors writing in this field some additional visibility by listing a brief citation to their "replication dataset," and the corresponding publication for which it was created, in our next available issue.

Two of the archives willing to accept replication datasets include the Social Science Research Archive collection of the Public Affairs Video Archive (PAVA) at Purdue University and the "Class V collection" at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan. Both archives will forever keep and distribute replication datasets and make them known to others. In order to submit the data, put it on a disk or tape and mail it to PAVA (Director; Public Affairs Video Archive; Purdue University; 1000 Liberal Arts Building, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907-1000) and/or the ICPSR (Director, User Support; ICPSR; P.O. Box 1248; Ann Arbor, MI 48106). An easier approach is to put your data in a self-extracting archive file (with a utility such as PKZIP for the DOS operating system, TAR for Unix, or Stuffit for the Macintosh) and submit it via anonymous FTP; you should also announce the file name, and article, book, or dissertation citation in an accompanying electronic mail message.

To send to PAVA, FTP to [pava.purdue.edu](ftp://pava.purdue.edu) in directory `pub/incoming` and send electronic mail to [info@pava.purdue.edu](mailto:info@pava.purdue.edu). To submit to the ICPSR, FTP to [ftp.icpsr.umich.edu](ftp://ftp.icpsr.umich.edu) in directory `pub/incoming` and send electronic mail to [jan@tdis.icpsr.umich.edu](mailto:jan@tdis.icpsr.umich.edu).

### ***The State of the Parties: The Changing Role of Contemporary American Parties***

Edited by Daniel M. Shea and John C. Green

This volume provides students of political parties with up-to-date information on both the state of American party organizations and controversies over how they are studied. The collection focuses on a new direction in party scholarship—including debates over the vitality and relevance of the two party system, the analytical usefulness of the traditional model of American parties, and the import of organizational studies.

Copies of the book can be ordered through Rowman & Littlefield. To order call 1-800-462-6420 or mail to Rowman & Littlefield, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706.

### ***Party Developments***

The Center for Party Development (Washington, D.C.) and the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics (Akron, Ohio) have joined forces to fill a need in the field of party politics. The newsletter *Party Developments* is our effort to help fill a void in news reportage, the dissemination of knowledge, and the advancement of professionalism. We invite you to help by subscribing to *Party Developments*.

*Party Developments* focuses attention on the organizational and institutional aspects of party affairs and developments. This includes reports on the United States party system, party systems around the world, and the transnational parties. With respect to the U.S. party system, reports will provide news about party developments in Congress, the courts, the Federal Election Commission, the state party systems, and party organizations at all levels. We will bring to your attention work going on at conferences, in books, and in academic journals. News from around the world deals with national and regional party developments. There is special coverage of the activities of the transnational parties.

*Party Developments* will be published at 10-week intervals, five issues a year for \$25 (add \$15 for overseas delivery). Make subscriptions payable to Center for Party Development Fund in U.S. dollars and mail to Ray C. Bliss Institute, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1904 USA.

### **Conference**

*"How to Defeat an Incumbent"*

A conference on the strategies, tactics and resources for a candidate's most difficult race.

This conference, cosponsored by the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics and *Campaigns and Elections*, is dedicated to understanding the forces underlying incumbent defeat. How exactly, do you throw out a bum? What tools, strategies, and resources do challengers need in order to win? A distinguished cast of candidates and campaign consultants has been put together. Thrown into the mix will be media commentators, party activists, and the most prestigious scholars in the field.

The conference will be held in Akron, Ohio, on March 9-10, 1995. The registration fee will be \$50. For further information contact the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1904, phone (216) 972-5182.

***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

The conference is cosponsored by The University of Manchester, the UK Electoral Reform Society, the Ray C.

Bliss Institute, the Goethe Institute, and the Party of European Socialists. Participants will include William Crotty, Gerald Pomper, Richard Katz, Robert Harmel, Kay Lawson, Peter Mair, Karen Beckwith, Alan Ware, Jean Charlot, Ferdinand Muller-Rommel, Wolfgang Muller, Pippa Norris, Diane Salisbury, Lars Savand, and Daniel Shea, among others.

For more information, please contact David M. Farrell and Ian Holliday, Department of Government, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK, or 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