VOLUME 14
UE 3

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

COUNTING THE CASH: NEW RESEARCH ON MONEY AND POLITICS

The 1996 presidential campaigns has revived interest in the role of money in politics, and three new books help put the current situation in perspective.

The first of these is part of a long running tradition, *Financing the 1992 Election* by Herbert E. Alexander and Anthony Corrado (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1995). This volume is the ninth quadrennial book documenting the receipts and expenditures in American presidential election years produced by Alexander under the aegis of the Citizens' Research Foundation at the University of Southern California. It is safe to say that Alexander is the "scholar of record" on American campaign finance. His co-author, Anthony Corrado, is a well-known student of campaign finance and a professor at Colby College. This book is a worthy addition to the series.

As with previous of Alexander's books, this one is rich in data and covers a number of standard topics: the total amounts of money raised and spent; financing the presidential nomination contest, including detailed information on each of the major candidates among Democrats and Republicans; financing the national party conventions; the general election campaign; soft money; financing congressional campaigns; and campaign finance reform. Most of the data in the book come from the Federal Elections Commission, but as with past Alexander books, there is a wealth of additional information, often from the campaigns themselves, which adds to the depth and richness of the text. One bonus in this volume is a separate chapter on communicating with voters, the obstensible purpose for which campaign funds are raised and expended.

This book is chocked full of fascinating information. Consider for instance, the sheer magnitude of campaign financing. According to Alexander and Corrado, total campaign spending in the 1991-92 election cycle, including all manner of campaigns at the federal, state, and local levels, was $3.2 billion. The authors note that the total sum represents a 19 percent increase over the 1987-1988 elections cycle, only a fraction higher than the rise in the consumer price index.

The breakdown of this huge sum is instructive: 17 percent went for the presidential campaign, 21 percent for congressional races, some 16 percent for state campaigns and slightly more on local and ballot efforts. Another 17 percent were spent by the major parties and 12 percent by non-party committees, in addition to the money given to or spent on behalf of candidates.

And a breakdown on the presidential spending is equally interesting. Some 21 percent of the presidential total was spent by the major party nominees, which when combines with other expenditures, leaves the prenomination cmpaign at 28 percent of the total. The national party conventions cost another 11 percent, and the general election some 61 percent of the total. Looked at another way, the 1992 presidential campaign cost roughly one dollar per vote cast, and by the same logic, the total cost of

(continued on page 2)

THEME: Money and Politics

From Headquarters 3
Special Interests 4
From The Field 5
Scholarly Precincts 6

all campaigns and related expenses was about $32 per vote cast. Costs per eligible voter would be about half this amount. Although the magnitude of political expenditures is routinely decried, one cannot help but wonder if American elections are not something of a bargain.

One of the more fascinating chapters in the book is on soft money. Soft money attracted considerable attention in the 1992 campaign partly because the amounts were quite larger ($80 million), but also because the Federal Election Commission promulgated new regulations that required fuller disclosure of these transactions. Alexander and Corrado begin with a cogent description of the origins of the soft money in the 1979 Amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act and the development of the practice. They then document the sources and uses of these funds. On the one hand, they show how soft money is an aid to the major political parties, giving them additional resources, albeit largely in connection with the presidential campaign. But on the other hand, they demonstrate how soft money has allowed the return of very large contributions to campaign finance, potentially undermining the limitations in the law.

The large sums of money involved in the 1992 campaign as well as the creative ways that these funds were raised was bound to increase demands for reform. Alexander and Corrado chronicle the impasse on campaign finance reform prior to the election of Bill Clinton and describe in detail the President's initial push for a comprehensive reform package. Despite the fact that the Democrats controlled both houses of Congress—or perhaps because they did—Clinton's proposals died quickly, and the President eventually absented himself from the debate. In addition to the self-interest of politicians, reform groups and journalists are also blamed for the lack of progress. Their "all or nothing" approach to reform may have contributed to the continued statemate. The authors conclude that reform will not be possible without consensus developing on several fronts at once: between the major parties, the House and the Senate, the Congress and the White House, politicians, and reform groups.

This kind of evidence inevitably raises the question of how American campaign finance compares to other countries. An edited book by Herbert Alexander and Rei Shiratori (Tokai University), *Comparative Political Finance Amon Democracies* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1994), provides a basis for comparison. The book is based on papers given at conference held in Tokyo in September 1989 under the auspices of the Citizens' Research Foundation and the Research Committee on Political Finance and Political Corruption of the International Political Science Association. The collection has fourteen substantive chapters covering the United Kingdom, Australia, Brazil, France, Spain, Sweden, the Netherlands, Germany, Canada, India, South, Korea, and Japan as well as two chapters on the United States, one on presidential and one on state-level campaign finance.

These essays were written in a period when a series of major campaign finance scandals errupted in the democratic countries around the world. Contemporaneous with the "Keating Five" scandal and the controversy over soft money in the United States, Italy, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, South Korea, Spain and West Germany all experienced scandals that were of greater political consequence and probably more serious. Indeed, the Italian electorate was so provoked by the magnitude and ongoing nature of corruption in their government that they voted overwhelmingly in 1993 to end public financing of political parties—one of the reform routinely proposed in American to end corruption.

The Tokyo Conference produced a declaration on elections and election administration that contained the following points.

- The financing of political activities should be separated from the financing of the private lives of officeholders.
- Financial reporting by parties, candidates, and public officeholders should be made on a regular basis, and subject to public inspection and audit.
- Small contributions by individual citizens are desirable, and "Political contributing should be considered a positive act of political participation."
- The names of large scale donors should be open to public inspection.
- Free air time for political advertizing should be made available for candidates and parties.

From one perspective, these are rather modest principles that would be acceptable to most people in most of the countries studied in the volume. However, the fact that such a list was seriously proposed reveals how difficult it is to, in the words of the editors, "minimize economic inequalities by restricting the use of resources for political purposes and to maximize political equalities by expanding resources to increase electoral competition."

Much of the concern about campaign finance in the United States and abroad revolves around the relationship between the politicians who solicite financial donations and the donors who respond with funds. A third book deals directly with this subject: *Serious Money: Fundraising and Contributing in Presidential Nominating Campaigns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) by Clifford Brown (Union College), Lynda Powell (University of Rochester), and Clyde Wilcox (Georgetown University). Using surveys of presidential campaign contributors in 1988 and 1992, the authors explore in detail what might be called the "cultures of contributing" in American politics. The result is an invaluable book on a crucial subject about which little is known and a great deal supposed.

The authors begin with the premise that fundraising revolves around the interaction of two sets of decisions, each with their own imperatives: the strategic decision of campaigns aimed at soliciting funds, and the personal decisions of the individuals solicited. While these decisions are clearly related to one another, the authors argue cogently that the process begins with the campaigns, who in turn, face two important constraints: the regulatory environment and the pool of available donors.

The authors offer a very useful review of presidential campaign finance laws, less focused on the reform agenda and more directed toward the effects of these rules on campaign strategy. This chapter alone should be requires reading for would be reformers. But the next chapter on the pool of donors is every bit as good, and includes a good description of the demography, political activities, and motives of donors. By comparing current data with surveys conducted of donors twenty years ago, they conclude that the pool of donors has changed very little—a fact that may surprise some readers, given the great changes that havetaken place in presidential politics and campaign finance since Watergate.

continued on page 3

FROM HEADQUARTERS

To the Members of POP:

At our September 1995 business meeting during the APSA annual meeting, it was announced that Heldred Publications had withdrawn as publisher of a POP journal. This unanticipated development resulted in the creation of a special committee chaired by Sandy Maisel to explore the feasibility of POP becoming the first subfield within APSA to publish an electronic journal. The results of the Electronic Journal Committee's deliberations are reported in this issue of VOX POX.

On behalf of the POP membership, I want to express our appreciation to Sandy and his committee for taking on this important assignment.

Please review the Electronic Journal Committee report carefully. The members of the Executive Council will be meeting on April 19 in Chicago at the Midwest Political Science Association meeting to discuss the report. Members of the Council need to know the sentiments of the membership concerning the Committee's report and whether or not POP should commit itself to publishing an electronic journal. Needless to say, an electronic journal would have major implications for the future of the subfield. Therefore, please give members of the Council and me the benefit of your counsel and advice.

POP Program chair, Barbara Burrell, has completed the preliminary program for the 1996 APSA meeting and has developed a series of panels that I am confident will carry on the standards of quality set by our 1995 Program Chair, Jeff Berry.

John Bibby

Announcement

Burdett Loomis, University of Kansas, has agreed to be the POP program chair for the 1997 APSA meeting. His formal nomination was sent to the cochairs of the 1997 APSA program committee on March 6, 1996.

WANTED!

Notices, announcements, reports, and short articles for *VOXPOP*.

Send materials to: John Green
The Bliss Institute
The University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325-1905

Money and Politics *(continued from page 2)*

Given the legal environment and the pool of available donors, the campaigns must then decide how to solicite funds. Although there are many fundraising methods, the authors conclude that they boil down to two basic approaches: direct mail and personal networking. Each of these methods is associated with a strikingly different culture of contributing, and these cultures are not so much grounded in technical differences, as in the motivations of the donors. Those solicited via the relatively impersonal method of direct mail tended to be characterized by purposive motivations, while those approached via networking tended to be characterized by material and solidary motivations.

The authors identify three important kinds of resources campaigns can use to actually solicite donors in these cultures of contributing. The first of these is the ability of mobilize political networks in the candidates' home states, and the second is access to national networks based on party ties, congressional leadership, or group identify. A third resource is ideology, which allows candidates to tap like-minded donors. There is an interesting relationship between these resources and the methods of solicitation: candidates that are more extreme ideologically relie most of direct mail and the purposed motivations of donors, while less extreme candidates relie most on networking.

Armed with this conceptual apparatus and related empirical findings, Brown, Powell and Wilcox examine the presidential campaigns in 1988 and show how candidates successfully raised funds. Because their 1988 survey data does not include individuals who were solicited but did not contribute, they conducted a unique panel study of 1988 donors in 1992. These data produce what is arguably the most interesting part of the book: predictions of who is solicited and their likelihood of responding. An interesting sidelight is the investigation of individuals who act as fundraisers—the key figures in networking.

The authors draw some important implications for politics and government from their study. Both direct mail and networking have potential costs for candidates: the former drive candidates to be more extreme, on the campaign trail as well as in government, while the latter generates demands for material rewards and creates a new class of "fat cats" in the form of fundraisers. When put in the context of the other two books, these findings further highlight the complexities of campaign finance reform.

SPECIAL INTERESTS

Report of Electronic Journal Committee

To the Members of POP:

At last year's Annual Meeting of POP, I reported on the ultimate failure of our negotiations with Heldref Publications regarding POP's taking over the American Review of Politics and publishing it as a POP journal. You appointed me and my fellow committee members to explore the possibility of POP publishing its own journal electronically. Cathy Rudder, on behalf of the APSA, supported and worked with us on the effort; Mike Brintnall of the APSA staff served on our committee as did Herb Jacobs, representing the APSA Publications Committee and Bill Ball, who has worked with APSA on matters related to electronic comunication. As seems entirely appropriate, all of our committee work was done electronically. In fact, I am ashamed to say I would not recognize at least two of our committee members were we in the same room. I define that as something of a problem; I am certain others would define it as more!

Our initial efforts involved identifying the issues that POP would have to confront should we undertake electronic publication. We looked at alternative means through which the journal could be published, at alternative means of distribution, and at acceptability by libraries. While none of these issues is simple, in short order we were convinced that they were all soluble. We also were convinced that a future editor should be involved in solving them and that our sole responsibility was assuring that they were not so large as to make us think a project like this should not go forth.

While we were pursuing this course, the current editors of the ARP were examining other possible publishers who might take over the journal under POP auspices. While I appreciate the fact that Charles and Gary have kept me (and other committee members) informed of their progress, we as a committee felt that those efforts were beyond our mandate. That is, our mandate was to determine whether or not it was feasible for POP to publish iws own journal electronically. Once that determination had been made, the POP Executive Committee and ultimately the membership had to determine whether POP wanted to do so.

The final item on our agenda dealt with whether or not an electronic journal would be accepted by the profession. This acceptance had a number of different facets. On one side the question was whether or not such a journal could attract a sufficient number of articles to publish a high quality product. Related to this question was the other side of the acceptance coin, whether departmental and college and university personnel committees would look upon articles published in this journal positively when considering candidates for tenure and promotion. To get a handle on these questions, we polled those members of POP who had expressed interest in participating in a POP-sponsored journal in response to an earlier mailing and a sample of political scientists who are also administrators, seeking their opinions on how a journal such as the one we were considering would be accepted. We received 41 written responses to our questionnaires regarding acceptance of an electronic journal. Twenty-seven of those have been positive responses, five qualified responses, and nine negative responses. We broke the responses down in a number of ways. First, if one looks at responses from either Ph.D. granting institutions or from scholars who publish regularly in the field while teaching at other institutions (perhaps a little defensiveness show in drawing this category!) 15 responded positively, five had some qualification, and only three responded negatively; if one looked at the responses from chairs, administrators, or faculty teaching at other institutions, 12 responded positively and six negatively. As one would expect, there was also a disparity in the response rates for those who responded electronically 3.5:1 in favor as opposed to those who responded by traditional mail (7:3).

Many of those who responded positively went on at some length about the project. While we can share these responses with others who might pursue this project, summarizing them is quite easy. For the journal to succeed, the editors will have to establish a rigorous review process and be certain that that process is advertised well. The quality of the initial editorial board and of the articles in the initial volumes of the journal will be critical to its success (as will the reputation of the authors). Hard copies for authors and tenure and promotion committees were seen as a positive step. Those who have followed developments in this area most closely and most of those who consulted with their librarians see electronic publishing as a coming development and one on which we should be in front.

The negative responses focused on a couple of repeated points: fear that departmental and university committees would not view the articles as comparable to those published in traditional ways; fear that the articles would not be read by the wider community; concern that we as a discipline already publish or at least review for publication too many poor quality articles and that movement in this direction would only encourage more.

Qualifications included concern that we were promising faster turn around when this would not be the case if the peer review process were rigorous and lack of certainty that the saving we envision would eventuate.

A number of our colleagues wrote perceptive and thoughtful responses; we have the complete set of answers and think that anyone following through on our work would benefit from many of them.

With these responses in hand, we have accomplished what we set out to do. First, we know that electronic publishing is possible in a field like ours. We have looked at various options as to how this could best be done; we don't think it our role to decide among these options, though Herb Jacobs's report makes clear what direction seems most promising. We have some ideas on how best to distribute the journal, and again know that options exist. Once again, we think it would be inappropriate for us to choose among these options, but rather note to the POP Executive Committee that there are a number of ways in which future editors could decide to go.

We know that libraries are accepting electronic journals—in fact are anxious to have them, especially if they come at a reduced cost (for they save shelf space in any case). We know that electronic journals in other fields are indexed and abstracted in a number of different ways. We know that most of the POP members who expressed interest in working on a POP journal would be willing to do so if the journal were distributed electronically, just as they were if it were distributed in a traditional way. We know that a large majority of the chairs and administrators who responded to our questionnaire feel that personnel committees in their institutions would respond to a journal published electronically as they would to a journal published in hard copy, with quality of the journal and rigor of the peer review process standing as the most important considerations.

Based on these findings, we are ready to conclude our deliberations. Our charge was to access whether POP could publish a journal electronically that would be successful within the discipline. Our conclusion is that it is possible to do so, with hard-working, forward-thinking editorial leadership. Done the right way, an electronic journal from POP would be a leader in our field. Our charge is not to decide whether or not POP should pursue this option. That is a decision that the Executive Committee and the membership would have to reach after considering other options.

However, our recommendation would be that the POP Executive Committee should proceed with an electronic journal, if appropriate editorial leadership is available and if the APSA is willing to help underwrite the start-up costs. We feel strongly that such a journal can succeed and would be beneficial to many POP members.

L. Sandy Maisel

FROM THE FIELD

Political Organizations and Parties Workshop "The Role of Third Parties in American Politics"

Below is a preliminary program for the Political Organizations and Parties Workshop on the Role of Third Parties in American Politics. I have drafted a prominent group of academics and practitioners to discuss this timely and important subject.

The workshop is tentatively scheduled for August 28, 1996 and will be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in San Francisco. I will provide more information on the schedule in the future.

Below is a tentative list of participants, the topics they will be discussing, their addresses, and telephone numbers.

Morning Session

Ruth Jones, Panel Chair, Department of Political Science, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287, 602-965-6551

Paul Herrnson, "Why the U.S. Does Not Have a Multi-Party System," Dept. Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, 301-405-4123

Kay Lawson, "The Case for a Multi-Party System," San Francisco State University, (at the Sorbonne, 17, Rue de la Sorbonne, 75231 Paris, France through May 1996)

Samuel C. Patterson, "In Defense of the Two-Party System," Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210-1373, 614-292-3653, 614-442-0450

Christian Collet, "Minor Party Candidates in Subpresidential Elections: Backgrounds, Beliefs, and Political Activities," Department of Politics and Society, University of California, Irvine, 92717, 714-509-7019

Bob Harmel, "Lessons about New Parties from Multi-Party Systems Abroad," Department of Political Science, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, 512-845-5124

John Bibby, Discussant, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Bolton Hall, PO Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201, 414-229-6560

Afternoon Session

Diana Dwyre, Panel Chair, University of Maryland-Baltimore County, 5401 Wilkens Ave., Catonsville, MD 21228, 410-455-2845

Richard Winger, "Institutional Obstacles to Third Parties," Ballot Access News, P.O. Box 470296, San Francisco, CA 94147, 415-922-9779

Terry Savage, "The Goals and Strategies of The Libertarian Party," Executive Director, California Libertarian Party (Kim: call Diana Dwyer 410-455-2845 for his address and number)

Justin Roberts, "The Goals and Strategies of the Reform Party," Board of Directors, Reform Party of California, 1078 Carol Lane, Suite 203, Lafayette, CA Party, 94549, 510-283-6850

Greg Jan, "The Goals and Strategies the Green Party," P.O. Box 3727, Oakland, CA 94609, 510-652-7122

John Green, Discussant, Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325, 216-972-5182

Note: We intend to follow the tradition of publishing the proceedings of the workshop in an edited book. It would be helpful if the academic participants prepared papers to go with their remarks. The practitioners also have the option of submitting written remarks, however, we will tape their remarks and include an edited transcript of them in the book.

The Washington Center Announces Campaign '96 Seminar Series

College students can be in the know during the 1996 presidential campaign by participation in The Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars' **Campaign '96** series! These four academic seminars tracing the presidential campaigns from their early days through the national political conventions and culminating with the Presidential Inauguration include:

- **The Republican National Convention, San Diego, CA Aug. 4-16, 1996**
- **The Democratic National Convention, Chicago, IL, Aug. 18-30, 1996**
- **The Inauguration, Washington, D.C., Jan. 13-20, 1997**

The tradition continues!!! The Washington Center has offered campaign programs since the 1984 election. Each academic seminar features lectures, briefings and panel discussions by nationally recognized leaders who have included Bob Schieffer, CBS; Rich Bond, Former Chair, RNC; Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI), and Brian Lamb, Chairman and CEO, C-SPAN. Students also work in small groups led by Faculty Leaders and discuss the hot issues concerning the presidential campaigns.

Additionally, at the Convention seminars, students will have the opportunity to do fieldwork such as assisting the media, party officials, convention organizers, and other groups with convention responsibilities. In 1992, students' fieldwork placements included ABC, CBS, C-SPAN, the Democratic and Republican National Committees, and Larry King Live.

For more information, or to request an application for The Washington Center's **Campaign '96** programs, please contact The Washington Center at 1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005-5601. The toll-free phone number is (800) 486-8921, the fax is (202) 336-7609, and information may be requested via the Internet at seminars@twc.edu.

The Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars is the largest independent organization providing internships and academic seminars for college students in Washington. Since its inception in 1975, The Washington Center has served over 21,000 alumni from 750 colleges and universities.

The State of the Parties Revised Edition

Daniel Shea and John Green, eds.

Two realities structure the "state of the parties." First, the rumors of the death of parties are greatly exaggerated; they are alive, well, and all around us. Second the parties of the 1990s are distant cousins of their predecessors form only a decade or two ago. The 1992 election brought much of this transformation to light, but it was even further underscored in 1994. This revised edition of *The State of the Parties* covers this mix of continuity and change with 15 new and updated chapters. **New** coverage includes:

- the "Contract with America"
- local, state and national party activities in the 1994 election
- new research on minor parties, including what has happened to the Perot activists gone?
- new chapters on party elites
- three new case studies of party organizations

What is the state of the parties? This book has answers!

Available from Rowman and Littlefield for fall 1996.

State of the Parties Revised Edition Contents

Preface

1. Paths and Crossroads: The State of the Parties and Party Scholarship, *Daniel M. Shea and John C. Green*

PART ONE
The Party System Under Stress

2. The Future of the American Two-Party System, *A. James Reichley*
3. Who Speaks for the Political Parties Or, Martin Van Buren, Where Are You When We Need You?, *Ralph M. Goldman*
4. Toward a Responsible Three-Party System, *Theodore J. Lowi*

PART TWO
Party Activities

Party Activities at the National Level

5. The Politics of Cohesion: The Role of the National Party Committees in the 1992 election, *Anthony Corrado*
6. Party Strategy and Campaign Activities in the 1992 Congressional Elections, *Paul S. Herrnson*
7. The Nationalization of Party Finance, *Robert Biersack*

Party Activities at the State and Local Levels

8. How are We Doing?: Party Leaders Evaluate Performance of the 1994 Elections, *Andrew M. Appleton and Daniel S. Ward*
9. The Anatomy of Victory: Republican Organizations in 1994, *John C. Green*
10. Local Political Parties and Legislative Races in 1992 and 1994, *John Frendreis, Alan R. Gitelson, Gregory Flemming and Anne Layzell*

Case Studies in Party Organizations

11. Where's the Party? A Second Look at Party Structure in New York State, *Daniel M. Shea and Anne Hildreth*
12. Responsible Political Parties and the Decentering of American Metropolitan Areas, *Michael Margolis and David Resnick*
13. Change Comes to Youngstown: Local Parties as Instruments of Power, *William Binning, Melanie Blumberg, and John C. Green*

Independent Candidates and Minor Parties

14. Sources and Consequences of Activism in the Perot Campaign: 1992-1994, *Randall W. Partin, Lori M. Weber, Ronald B. Rapoport, and Walter J. Stone*
15. Minor Parties and Candidates in Sub-Presidential Elections, *Christian Collet and Jerrold Hansen*
16. The American Multi-Party System: An Activist Perspective, *John C. Green and James L. Guth*

PART THREE
Party Policy and Values

Party Policy Making

17. A Tale of Two Parties: National Committee Policy, *Laura Berkowitz and Steve Lilienthal*
18. The Platform-Writing Process: Candidate-Centered Platforms in 1992, *L. Sandy Maisel*
19. The *Contract with America* in the 104th Congress, *Robin Kolodny*

Party Values

20. A Longitudinal Study of Political Party Leaders and Identifiers and the Mass Public Over Four Presidential Elections, *John Jackson and Nancy Clayton*
21. The Democratic Leadership Council: Institutionalizing Party Faction, *John F. Hale*
22. Women's Political Leadership and the State of the Parties, *Barbara C. Burrell*

Reconceptualizing Parties

23. Resurgent of Jusy Busy? Party Organizations in Contemporary America, *John J. Coleman*
24. Voters, Government Officials, and Party Organizations: Connections and Distinctions, *John Frendreis*

Papers of Interest 1996 Midwest Convention

"Campaigning on the Internet: Parties, Interest Groups and the 1996 Presidential Race." Michael Margolis, David Resnick, Chin-chang Tu, University of Cincinnati.

"Business Political Strategy: Organizing the Firm for Political Activity." Emerson H. Tiller, University of Texas, Austin, John de Figueiredo, University of California at Berkeley.

"Tackling the 'Great Issues': Agenda-Setting and Internal Tensions in Professional Associations." Katherine Hinckley, Bette Hill, University of Akron.

"Claiming Credit: Linking Interest Group Maintenance to Policy Benefits." LaVonna J. Blair, Rice University.

"The Rise of Radical Right Wing Parties in Western Europe." John M. Cotter, University of Kentucky.

continued on page 7

Papers of Interest
1996 Midwest Convention

"Beyond Lobbying: Social Movements Making German Global Environmental Policy." Dale Gardner, Northwestern University.

Tractability and Triviality in Interest-Group Studies." Frank R. Baumgartner, Beth L. Leech, Texas A&M University.

"Logic, Exchange, and Beyond." Paul Johnson, University of Kansas.

"Understanding Interest Groups from the Inside." William Browne, Central Michigan University.

"The Rise of Interest Group Litigation in the Supreme Court: Non-Judicial Factors." Andrew J. Koshner, Washington University-St. Louis.

"Interest Groups, Legal Activity and Selection Bias." Rorie L. Spill, Ohio State University.

"The U.S. Supreme Court and Abortion Politics: An Examination of the Amicus Briefs Filed in the Abortion Cases." Suzanne Samuels, Seton Hall University.

"The Participation of Organized Interests in Federal Judicial Nominations." Gregory Calderia, Ohio State University, Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University, John R. Wright, George Washington University.

"Party Factionalism and Cabinet Durability." James Druckman, University of California, San Diego.

"Italian Politics in Transition: Electoral Reform and the Promise of Stability." Salvatore Lombardo, Siena College.

"Party Cohesion and Third Parties in the House of Commons." Steven E. Galatas, Kelly Shaw, University of Missouri, Columbia.

"The Size of the Institutional Agenda: Two party Systems Versus Multi-party Systems." Michella Kukoleca, State University of New York, Binghamton.

"Lobbying Till We Get It Right," Burdett Loomis, University of Kansas

"The Political Geography of Lobbying: How Industries Maximize Their Influence in Congress." Fiona McGillivray, Washington University, Wendy J. Schiller, Brown University.

"Decision Strategies of Interest Groups in a Pluralist Democracy." Michael Nickelsburg, Mark Lubell, State University of New York, Stony Brook.

"Intra-Party Realignment and Amateur Politicians." Joseph W. Doherty, University of California, Los Angeles.

"Why has Party Conflict among Elites Increased if the Electorate is Dealigning?" Jon Bond, Texas A&M University, Richard Fleisher, Fordham University.

"The Growing Revolt Against the Two Party System." David B. Reynolds, Eastern Michigan University.

"A Signaling Model of Outside Lobbying." Ken Hollman, University of Michigan.

"Activists as Certification Intermediaries." Tim Feddersen, Northwestern University, Tom Gilligan, University of Southern California.

"Higher Education Lobbying in Washington: Strategies and Tactics." Constance E. Cook, University of Michigan.

"Unions, Coalition Politics, and Public Policy: A Case Study of the Citizen Labor Energy Coalition." Andrew Battista, East Tennessee State University.

"State Lobbyists and Organizations: Some New Data." Anthony J. Nownes and Pat Freeland, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

"Interest Group Endorsement Approaches in State Legislative Races." Terri Susan Fine, University of Central Florida.

"Business Political Strategy: Organizing the Firm for Political Activity." Emerson H. Tiller, University of Texas, Austin, John de Figueiredo, University of California at Berkeley.

"U.S. Religious Interest Groups and U.S. Central American Policy." Anthony Perry, Wayne State University.

"Congressional Careers and Campaign Financing in the U.S. House of Representatives." Rodney A. Anderson, Arizona State University.

"The Cycle of Senate Spending and Fundraising." Darren Davis, Michigan State University.

"Money and the 1994 Congressional Elections: World Campaign Finance Reform Have Altered the Income?" Donald A. Gross, University of Kentucky, Todd G. Shields, University of Arkansas, Robert K. Goidel, Indiana State University.

"Money, Elections and Candidate Quality." Stephen Ansolabehere, James Snyder, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"Campaign Contributions as Bribes: Law and Practice." Daniel Lowenstein, University of California, Los Angeles.

"Democrats, Republicans, and Campaign Warchests in U.S. Senate Campaigns: Who Gets the Bigger Bang for their Bucks?" Glenn W. Richardson Jr., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Ross E. Burkhart, University of Iowa.

"House Partisan Loyalty: Is Anyone Paying Attention?" Francine Sanders, Middle Tennessee State University, David W. Romero, University of California, Riverside.

"Party Government Strength and Weakness in Clinton's 1993 Budget Vote: The Case of Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky." Andrea Chronister and Michael J. Cripps, Rutgers University.

"Clash of Constituencies on the House Resources Committee: National 'Interests' versus Local 'Interests'." Richard Waddel, Duke University.

"Killing With Kindness: Legislative Ambiguity, Judicial Policy making, and Labor's First Against Injunctions." George Lovell, University of Michigan.

"Third-Candidate Legacies: The Impact of Candidate Withdrawal on Issue Salience." Diane Lowenthal, Carnegie Mellon University.

"Common Sense for Uncommon Circumstances: Ross Perot and the Framing of Economic Solutions for Middle Class Hardships." Solon J. Simmons, University of Wisconsin, Madison, James R. Simmons, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh.

"Perot Supporters Before and After the 1992 Elections." Jeffrey W. Koch, State University of New York, Geneseo.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

The American Review of Politics

The American Review of Politics thanks the Offices of Research and Academic Affairs, University of New Orleans, the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron, and the University of Central Arkansas for filling the void left by the withdrawal of Heldred Publications from the Political Parties & Organizations Section, American Political Science Association, agreement to publish the journal for its section. As those of you who subscribe know, The American Review of Politics continues with the same number of pages, but in a double issue (Spring/Summer, Fall/Winter) format to save postage costs.

Look for the all/Winter 1995 issue which contains the APSA-POP Party Law Workshop papers and a guide of useful information for the 1996 presidential selection process by Thomas R. Marshall in the Winter section.

The Spring/Summer 1996 issue, to be mailed this summer, will contain a set of papers in its Summer section selected by the conference organizers from The Citadel Southern Politics Symposium recently held in Charleston, the issue receiving generous support from The Citadel Foundation.

Subscription renewals for the 1996 issues remain at $15.00 and will be sent as soon as the Fall/Winter 1995 issue now in production is mailed. Back issues for 1995 are available from Managing Editor Gary D. Wekkin, The American Review of Politics, P.O. Box 4995, University of Central Arkansas, 201 South Donaghey Avenue, Conway, Arkansas 72035-0001, at $10.00 each, complete subscriptions at $15.00. Your continued support is appreciated.

Volume 16 **Spring, 1995**

CONTENTS

Effects of Districting Systems on Republican Representation in Southern State Legislatures
Malcolm E. Jewell and David A. Breaux 1
Southern Republican Subnational Advancement: The Restricting Explanation
Joseph A. Aistrup 15
Comment: The Gift That Keeps on Giving? Consequences of Affirmative Action Gerrymandering
Charles S. Bullock III 33
Comment: Conceptualization, Measurement, and the Analysis of Representation in Electoral Systems Undergoing Structural and Social Change
Michael A. Krassa and Bryan Combs 41
Rejoinder
Joseph A. Airstrup 49
Rejoinder
Malcolm E. Jewell and David A. Breaux 59
Policitcal Action Committees in State Elections
James D. King and Helenan S. Robin 61
Economic Interests and the Framing of the 1988 and 1992 Democratic and Republican Party Platforms
Terri Susan Fine 79
Book Reviews 95

The University of Akron

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

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