

# 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 – PARTISAN CHANGE

## THE EMERGENCE OF A COLD WAR PARTY SYSTEM

*John Kenneth White, Catholic University of America*

In 1992, New York City, schoolteacher John Driscoll said of the Cold War: "It seems surreal now. Every summer, when I [saw] heat lightning over the city and the sky would light up, I was convinced that it was all over. My whole childhood was built on the notion the Soviets were the real threat." Indeed, for fifty years the Cold War shaped the formative pasts of many present-day political leaders and created its own brand of party politics. Consider the former: A youthful H.R. Haldeman became fascinated with the Alger Hiss case and soon attached himself to Richard Nixon's political fortunes. Haldeman's entry into politics was presaged by the activities of his paternal grandfather and namesake, Harry Haldeman, who organized the Better America Foundation during the Red Scare of 1920. In Huntington, Indiana, young Dan Quayle was an ardent fan of Whittaker Chambers's *Witness*, arguing the merits of Chambers's prose in a college essay. In this, Quayle imitated his parents who subscribed to John Birch Society founder Robert Welch's thesis that Dwight Eisenhower was a clandestine communist. Hillary Rodham Clinton's initial foray into politics was as a "Goldwater Girl" in 1964. And on July 24, 1963, seventeen-year-old Bill Clinton had his picture taken with John F. Kennedy and heard Kennedy tell the American Legion-sponsored Boys Nation that the United States was standing guard in the battle with communism "all the way from Berlin to Saigon." Looking back Clinton was heard to say, "I am literally a child of the Cold War."

For a generation of Americans the Cold War was a political and cultural touchstone. It provided a convenient yardstick for separating countries into those "like us" (anti-communist) and those that were "one of them" (communist). It also resulted in the invention of the "Third World" and in competition for its domination. The Cold War also shaped the popular culture – inspiring the spy novel as a literary genre and prompting cinematographers to preach American values to worldwide audiences.

For example, in the 1963 anti-war film *Dr. Strangelove*, Slim Pickens waved his cowboy hat and yelled "Yahoo, Yahoo!" as he rode a hydrogen bomb toward its Russian target. Twenty-two years later Sylvester Stallone (a.k.a. Rocky) battled a menacing Soviet boxer who threatened him by saying, "I will break you." Moments later Rocky's battered and bruised opponent collapsed in the ring. In 1990 *Star Trek VI* depicted the Klingon chancellor searching for an end to decades of unremitting hostility between his empire and the Federation. Leonard Nimoy, the actor who became famous as Mr. Spock, admitted off-camera: "The Klingons have always been our stand-in for the Russians. What about a Berlin Wall coming down in space?"

For decades, Cold War victories and defeats defined our national moods – reinvigorating an "American Exceptionalism" during the 1950s and 1960s and spawning an "American Pessimism" in the 1970s. Given its extraordinary impact into American life, it should come as no surprise that the Cold War also redrew the electoral

*continued on page 2*

### THEME: PARTISAN CHANGE

From Headquarters.....	3
From the Field .....	6
Scholarly Precincts .....	7

**Chair:** Ruth Jones, Arizona State University

**Secretary-Treasurer:** Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico

**Program Chair:** Anthony Corrado, Colby College

VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron

**Executive Council:** John S. Jackson III, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale; Ruth Jones, Arizona State University; Candice J. Nelson, American University; Barbara Burrell, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Bruce Caswell, Rowan College of New Jersey; Debra Dodson, Rutgers University; Robin Kolodny, Temple University; John Shockley III, Western Illinois University

*continued from page 1*

maps. The Republican party was the primary beneficiary of this new ideological gerrymandering. This was quite a comeback for a party that had been decimated during the long twilight years of the New Deal. For example, after Franklin Roosevelt's landslide reelection in 1936, Democrats held 333 seats in the House and 75 in the Senate. The *Phoenix Republican* editorialized that Roosevelt's "present position is comparable only with that of Joseph Stalin." In that same campaign, Roosevelt deflected Republican charges that the New Deal was communist-inspired as "red herrings," characterizing the GOP as "desperate in mood, angry at failure, and cunning in purpose."

Yet less than two decades after Roosevelt's 1936 win, Republicans had persuaded a large segment of public opinion that the Democratic party was "soft on communism." When the Gallup Organization asked in 1950 which groups of Americans were more likely to be communists, the leading answers were labor union members (28 percent), poor people (21 percent), people in the government in Washington (18 percent), Negroes (14 percent), college students (13 percent), New Yorkers (12 percent), Jews (11 percent). Thus, less than five years after Franklin Roosevelt's death, his acclaimed New Deal coalition was already giving way to a xenophobic Republicanism whose leaders occupied the White House for much of the Cold War. In the ten presidential elections held from 1952 to 1988, Republicans won seven of them. Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Ronald Reagan, along with Barry Goldwater, are the founders of a modern Republicanism rooted in the Cold War. Anti-communism was the glue that bound all factions of the Republican party from Pat Robertson to Pat Buchanan.

The Republican party's successes during the Cold War era were grounded in two important yet contradictory aspects of American politics: (1) our fanatical preoccupation with communism and (2) a robust liberalism. As to the former, the Cold War years are replete with illustrations of American anti-communism. Table 1 shows that in surveys taken from 1937-1949, the American psyche recoiled from anything that smacked of communism.

Anti-communism was exacerbated once the Cold War intruded into the daily lives of most Americans. When asked in 1950 what should be done about members of the U.S. Communist Party, 22 percent wanted them put in interment camps, 18 percent recommended imprisonment, 15 percent said send them into foreign exile, 13 percent wanted them sent to Russia, 13 percent said shoot or hang them. A mere *one percent* thought they should be left alone since "everyone is entitled to freedom of thought." Even our everyday language reflected the nearly fifty-year struggle with communism. Terms such as *fellow-traveler*, *card-carrying*, *containment*, *hawk*, *dove*, *detente*, *red herring*, *Iron Curtain*, *Free World*, *Captive Nations*, *McCarthyism*, *gulag*, *counter-intelligence*, and *nuclear freeze* entered the popular lexicon. Cold War slogans also dominated our politics: "America: Love it or Leave It," "Give Peace a Change,"

"Peace Through Strength," "Godless Communism," "Soft on Communism," "Better Dead than Red," "Ban the Bomb," and "Live Free or Die" are but a few examples.

Fear is an animating emotion, especially in the United States. Louis Hartz once hypothesized that no other ideology, save classical liberalism, could thrive in the American polity. He argued that Americans were so ideologically straight-jacketed that a philosophy that did not espouse individualism, equality of opportunity, and freedom would be seen by many as alien. Certainly, Americans have exhibited little tolerance for any perceived ideological deviancy. Lewis Class, the 1848 Democratic nominee for president, told a Tammany Hall audience that he was "opposed to all the isms of the day. . . to communism and socialism, to Mormonism; to polygamy and concubinage, and to all the humbugs that are now rising among us." As the post-World War II decades passed with no end to the Cold War in sight, communism became the antithesis of the American creed. In a 1983 survey, 92 percent said that in a communist country "you only hear news the government wants you to hear"; 91 percent agreed that "if you speak your mind, you risk going to jail"; 84 percent rejected the notion that life for the average communist "is pretty much the same as in the United States"; 80 percent said "you can't move or relocate without permission from the government"; 75 percent agreed that "you can't pick your own job or change jobs"; 69 percent believed "there is no freedom of religion"; 60 percent rejected the idea that "men and women are treated equally." Thus, when Ronald Reagan dubbed the Soviet Union the "evil empire," most Americans agreed with him.

The rejection of communism reinforced American nationalism, and it made the Republicans into a patriotic party. Democrats, meanwhile, became mired in debates about Soviet intentions as the New Left (led by Henry Wallace and later George McGovern) struggled not only with their feelings toward communism but with hard-line anti-communists like John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Hubert H. Humphrey who represented the old politics of the New Deal. For much of the Cold War, presidential contests were fought over the corpse of the Democratic party – especially after McGovern's rise in 1972. Republicans never wavered in their belief that Democrats were naive when it came to Soviet intentions, and they repeatedly reminded voters of the Democrats' mushy thinking.

Despite the partisan sniping, most voters saw through the political smoke. A 1980 ABC News/Louis Harris poll found 50 percent agreed with this statement: "A candidate for president who says his opponent is 'soft on communism' is probably a hypocrite, because, if elected, he will soon be sitting down in Moscow and Peking to work out agreements with communist leaders." Even though Americans were cynical about the Republican party's frequent exploitation of the Cold War, when they retreated to the confines of the voting booth, they frequently chose tough-talking Republican warriors over their seemingly naive Democratic opponents. But once ensconced in the

*continued on page 4*



Dear POP Members:

The Boston meeting has a rich Parties and Organizations sponsored program. Kudos to Tony Corrado for putting together such a dynamic set of panels that nicely reflects the breadth of POP interests. And similar appreciation and recognition goes to Bruce Caswell and Diana Dwyre for creating a great workshop on The Politics of Campaign Finance Reform, a most timely topic for us all.

Our latest membership figures indicate 555 members, up 36 from November 1996. So, thanks to everyone who suggested POP membership to colleagues. We are particularly interested in including graduate students and I urge you to remind graduate students, when they enroll or renew APSA membership, that POP is an organization worth their consideration.

POP's volunteer committees have been working over the summer with wonderful results. (See list of award winners and proposed slate of officers.) Many thanks to the committee members and especially to the chairs (John Kessel, Mac Jewell, Robert Harmel and Sandy Maisel).

As you know, the number of panels POP will have next year at APSA is, in part, a function of our membership *and* the attendance at our panels in Boston. Please plan to attend as many POP panels as possible and take along a friend or two! The workshop has no registration fee to encourage participation by all our members as well as others who are interested in campaign finance reform but are not POP members. Please help spread the word so that all our colleagues are informed about the workshop.

I look forward to seeing you in Boston - at the various panels and the Business Meeting at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, August 4.

## 1997 POP AWARDS

**Nelson Polsby**, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.

Special Recognition: Louise Overacker

*Committee:* Debra Dodson, Michael Malbin and Malcolm Jewell, Chair

**Giovanni Sartori**, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for *Parties and Party Systems* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

*Committee:* John Coleman, Anne Costain, Steve Wolinetz and John Kessel, chair.

**Robert Salisbury**, winner fo the Jack Walker Award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for "Interest Representation: The Dominance of Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 78 (March 1984): 64-77.

*Committee:* John Coleman, Anne Costain, Steve Wolinetz, chair.

**Lonna Atkeson and Kenneth Kollman**, winners of the Emerging Scholars Award.

Honorable Mention: David Farrell and John Gerring

*Committee:* Richard Herrera, Ronald Rapoport and Robert Harmel, chair.

## NOMINATIONS

Report of the Nomination Committee:

The nominating committee offers the following recommendation for POP officers:

Secretary-Treasurer: Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico

Council Members

John Coleman, University of Wisconsin

David Farrell, University of Manchester

Robert Harmel, Texas A&M University

Anna Harvey, New York University

The nominating committee was composed of:

Barbara Burrell, University of Wisconsin

Ken Kollman, University of Michigan

Sandy Maisel, Chair, Colby College

Susan Scarrow, University of Houston



continued from page 2

White House, Republican presidents loved to don their commander-in-chief hats, and from that moment they placed themselves above politics. In effect, the national security state smothered “traditional” politics – and this suited Americans just fine, because so many of them cared little for politics and even less for political parties. Thus, although the Cold War allowed Republicans to bask in their sunshine patriotism, the party often was headed by a patriot who disdained it as an institution.

Still Republican succeeded in making liberalism a dirty word (shorthand: the “L-word”). By 1952, chastened Democrats were casting extensions of the New Deal not as antidotes to poverty but necessary for the nation’s defense. Democratic platform writers that year pledged: “Since several million mothers must now be away from their children during the day, because they are engaged in defense work, facilities for adequate daycare of these children should be provided and adequately financed.” Later, a Democratic Congress and a Republican president endorsed the National Defense Education Act and the Federal Aid Highway Act. One produced a generation of young mathematicians and scientists; the other modernized an antiquated transportation system. Both

were offered as examples of anti-communist resolve, and each constituted a major rewriting of the social compact by expanding the reach of the federal government into areas once considered the province of the states.

Despite such reformulations of the Roosevelt agenda, Cold War Democrats (fairly or not) often had to prove their loyalty to a skeptical electorate. Their frequent protestations of loyalty left many party faithful uncomfortable with the civic rituals that accompany political campaigns. For example, while meeting in San Francisco for the 1984 national convention, Democratic delegates waved hundreds of flags before television cameras while voters watched from their living rooms. Yet there was something surreal about the scene – it looked as though the delegates were playacting, that the demonstration was staged for political purposes. It was. Reacting to Ronald Reagan’s penchant for civic ritual, Democratic presidential candidate Gary Hart declared, “I don’t want to be president of a country that thinks like Ronald Reagan.” The Democrats, too, had become victims of the Cold War.

Excerpted from John Kenneth White, *Still Seeing Red: How the Cold War Shapes the New American Politics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997).

**Table 1.1 American Attitudes Toward Communism, Selected Gallup Surveys, 1937-1949**

<b>Text of Question</b>	<b>Public Response</b>
“If you had to choose between Fascism and Communism which would you choose?” (1937) <sup>1</sup>	
Percentage answering “Fascism”	61
Percentage answering “Communism”	39
“Which do you think is worse, Communism or Fascism?” (1938) <sup>2</sup>	
Percentage answering “Fascism”	42
Percentage answering “Communism”	58
“Do you believe in freedom of speech?” (1938) <sup>3</sup>	
Percentage answering “yes”	97
“Do you believe in it to the extent of allowing communists to hold meetings and express their views in this community?” (1938) <sup>4</sup>	
Percentage answering “yes”	38
“Would you be in favor of doing away with the Communist Party in this country?” (1940) <sup>5</sup>	
Percentage answering “YES!”	55
Percentage answering “yes”	25
Percentage answering “NO!”	8
Percentage answering “no”	12
“If it were up to you to decide, what would you do about the Communist Party in this country?” <sup>6</sup>	
Percentage answering “take repressive measures”	64
Percentage answering “put them in prison”	5
Percentage answering “do nothing”	8
“Should Americans who are members of the Communist Party be forbidden to hold civil service jobs or should they have the same rights as others to hold government jobs?” <sup>7</sup>	
Percentage answering “should be forbidden”	67
Percentage answering “should have same rights”	19
“Do you think a man can be a good Christian and at the same time be a member of the Communist Party?” <sup>8</sup>	
Percentage answering “yes”	11
Percentage answering “no”	77

1. Gallup poll, April 6, 1937. 2. Gallup poll, June 21, 1938. 3. Gallup poll, June 1938. 4. Gallup poll, June 1938. 5. Gallup poll, July 1940. 6. Gallup poll, April 10-15, 1941. 7. Gallup poll, March 28-April 2, 1947. 8. Gallup poll, July 22-28, 1949.



1998 POP Workshop  
THE POLITICS OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM  
Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association  
Wednesday, September 2

*\*There is no fee or registration required for this workshop.\**

**PANEL 1. 1:00-2:45 p.m., "The Issues"**

E. Joshua Rosenkranz, Executive Director of the Brennan Center for Justice at the New York University School of Law and author of "Buckley Stops Here."

Paul Taylor, Free TV for Straight Talk Coalition

Michael Malbin, SUNY at Albany, The Brookings Institute, and co-author of "The Day After Reform: Sobering Campaign Finance Lessons from the American States."

Bruce E. Caswell, Rowan University, Moderator

**PANEL 2. 3:15-5:00 p.m., "Insider Perspectives"**

Anthony J. Corrado, Jr., Colby College

Amy Rosenbaum, Aide to Rep. Martin T. (Marty) Meehan (D-MA) and Ph.D. candidate at Johns Hopkins University

Dr. Victoria A. Farrar-Myers, University of Texas, Arlington, 1998 APSA Congressional Fellow and Aide to Rep.

Christopher Shays (R-CN)

Ellen S. Miller, Executive Director of The Public Campaign

Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico, and 1998 APSA Congressional Fellow, Moderator

*\*Inquiries may be sent to [caswell@rowan.edu](mailto:caswell@rowan.edu)*

---

FROM THE FIELD

---

**Party Politics Announces Its Prize-Winner for 1998**

*Party Politics* is committed to publishing research of the highest quality, and is keen to provide a forum within which innovative work can be debated. It welcomes leading research papers from all scholars of party politics. To mark its commitment to promoting the work of young scholars, the journal awards an annual *Party Politics* Prize of \$250 for the best work submitted to the journal by a graduate student. The winning article is published in the report section of the journal.

The editors are pleased to announce that the 1998 winner of the *Party Politics* Prize is: Miki L. Cau., graduate student at the Department of Politics and Society, University of California, Irvine. Ms. Caul's paper, "Women's Representation in Parliament: the Role of Political Parties," will appear in the January 1999 issue of the journal, Volume 5, No. 1.

**Abstract**

"Parties vary substantially in the proportion of women they send to Parliament. This paper examines how party characteristics affect women's representation in the parliamentary parties of twelve advanced industrial democracies at three time points: 1975, 1985, and 1989. Four party-level factors have some explanatory power: 1) organizational structure; 2) ideology; 3) women party ac-

tivists; gender-related candidate rules. Leftist and New Left ideologies, high levels of women activists within the party and gender-related candidate rules all enable parties to increase the descriptive representation of women. I propose a temporal sequence in which the four factors and electoral rules work both directly and indirectly to affect women's representation. Women party activists and gender-related rules are the more direct mechanisms which affect women's legislative representation. Further, New Left values and high levels of women activists within the party both enhance the likelihood that gender-related candidate rules will be implemented."

The *Party Politics* editors are grateful to the judges of this year's prize: Professor Karen Beckwith, College of Wooster, Ohio; Professor Wolfgang Miller, University of Vienna; and Dr. Vicky Randall, University of Essex.

The closing date for next year's 1999 prize is November 1, 1998. Further details are available from the editors, and at the *Party Politics* web site on <<http://www.polisci.nwu.edu:8000/partypol.htm>>.

Queries and submissions to: Dr. David Farrell/Dr. Ian Holliday, *Party Politics* Prize, Department of Government, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom.



## Encyclopedia of American Third Parties

Dr. Ronald Hayduk, Dr. Immanuel Ness, Dr. James Ciment, Co-Editors

M.E. Sharpe Publishing

We are seeking authors interested in writing essays for a comprehensive and scholarly two-volume Encyclopedia of American Third Parties. The book covers all the major and minor parties and independent campaigns from the Federalists to date. Accordingly, the length of each essay will vary. A list of the parties and required essay lengths are detailed below.

Each essay need not be original research or analysis. What we are looking for is informed, clear and concise writing delivered in a timely manner. Because we are operating under a tight deadline, we are looking for submission of the essay or essay(s) no later than August 15, 1998.

The essay you write must include a discussion of the following (with the appropriate level of detail depending on length):

- A brief statement (few paragraphs) situating the party or campaign within the overall historical period and party system.
- Why and how the party or campaign arose when it did.
- Who were/are the major players within the party/campaign (including biographical material as detailed below), their organizational structure and activities.
- Party platforms/issues/policy proposals.
- The social, class, ideological, or regional constituencies that comprise their political base.
- Successes and shortcomings, including total number of votes received and as a percentage of total votes cast for each election, and factors contributing to its decline or its possible future (in the case of existing ones).
- What impacts it has had on the major parties and American political system.
- Bibliographic reference.

**Biographic Information.** You are required to produce biographical entries for each of the primary figures in the party of campaign (e.g. Eugene Debs for the Socialist Party). The number and length of these entries will vary from party to party, but should be at least 250-500 words for major parties and campaigns down to 50-100 words for minor party figures. Each biographical entry should include years of life, positions held in the party/campaign, and positions and activities beforehand or afterwards, major life events and influences, and the like.

**Glossary Terms.** You are also required to produce glossary entries for any terms or names of organizations not generally known (e.g. for the Populists, the "subtreasury plan"). Please provide as short definition, no more than 25 or so words, for each one.

**Bibliographies.** You are required to provide bibliographic information. The references should be limited to books and articles and include from two to ten items, depending on length of essay. You don't need to have read them, but please provide the latest you can find.

The length of each entry is given in manuscript pages (roughly 300 words a page, double-spaced). All material must be formatted in Microsoft Word for Windows 6.0 or above. You must submit one hard copy and one disk copy of the assignment.

If you are interested in this assignment, please contact Professor Hayduk as soon as possible. Please e-mail your resume and a writing sample (2-3 pages, preferably on political parties or electoral politics). Contact information for Ronald Hayduk: Phone: 212-477-6749, E-mail: rhayduk@igc.org, Address: 116 East 7th Street #9, New York, NY 10009.

The Third Parties and Independent Campaigns that will be covered in the book include:

### **Long Essays** (15-20 pages each)

1. Federalists
2. Whigs
3. Know Nothing (American) Party
4. People's (Populists) Party
5. Socialist Party(s) – Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas
6. Progressive Party – Robert LaFollette
7. American Independent Party – George Wallace
8. H. Ross Perot (Reform Party)

### **Medium Length Essays** (8-10 pages each)

1. Anti-Masonic
2. Liberty Party
3. Free Soil Party
4. Southern Democrat
5. Constitution Union Party
6. Union Party
7. Greenback Party
8. Prohibition Party
9. Bull Moose Party – Teddy Roosevelt
10. Communist Party
11. Nonpartisan League
12. American Labor Party
13. Liberal Party
14. Social Democratic Party
15. National Socialist White People's Party (Nazis)
16. Henry Wallace (Independent Progressive Party)
17. States Rights (Dixiecrats) – Strom Thurmond
18. Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party
19. Black Panther Party
20. Peace and Freedom Party
21. La Raza Unida
22. Conservative Party
23. John Anderson (National Unity Campaign)
24. Citizens Party
25. New Alliance Party
26. Libertarian Party
27. Green Party
28. Right to Life Party
29. New Party
30. Labor Party/Labor Party Advocates

*continued on page 8*



## Why Woman Suffrage Didn't "Fail"

Jo Freeman

Andersen, Kristi, *After Suffrage: Women in Partisan and Electoral Politics before the New Deal*, University of Chicago Press, 1996, paper, 191 pages.

When the 19th Amendment was added to the U.S. Constitution on August 26, 1920, expectations were high about what the doubling of the electorate would accomplish. Because these expectations were not met, before the decade ended women suffrage was pronounced a failure. This book demolishes that myth. Kristi Anderson carefully looks at what women did in the 1920s, and shows that 1) they did a lot, and 2) what they didn't do was a result of circumstances beyond anyone's control coupled with resistance from established institutions.

Anderson conceptualizes women's entry into the electorate as a negotiated shift in the gendered boundaries of political space, one that varied with time, place and circumstances, but which defined "what was expected or acceptable male and female activity in the public sphere" (p. 15). Politics, she asserts, was transformed by women voters, but it took longer and was more subtle than politicians expected or than scholars have understood. This shift occurred at a time that parties were declining in importance, largely due to the reforms of the Progressive era. The impact of women and that of Progressivism was synergistic, making it hard to isolate women's specific contribution.

Although Anderson's focus is on electoral politics, she does note that there were policy changes. Some federal laws were passed in the 1920s directly as a result of women's lobbying. More were passed in the states. There was among women's organizations "a general consensus on a political agenda which included protective legislation for women and children, women's rights, consumer protection, and industrial health and safety legislation" (pg. 9), and major gains were made in attaining these goals.

Three chapters are specifically concerned with women as voters, party workers, and candidates and office holders. But her overall theme is change, and her conclusion is not only did the boundaries between men and women change, but our understanding of politics itself. Women "helped solidify the movement from the partisan-structured politics of the nineteenth century to the politics of advertising, interest groups, and candidates that characterize the twentieth century" (p. 170).

In the 19th Century, voting was a male ritual involving drinking and rowdiness and some exchange of favors for votes. The presence of women transformed voting into the obligation of a good citizen. This happened regardless of how women voted, or which women voted. Thus attempts to determine "the woman's vote" after suffrage, then and more recently, miss the point.

Without polls, or separate counts (except for Illinois from 1914 through 1920), women's voting patterns can only be inferred from registration figures and statistical

analysis. These do not show clear trends, but they do give some outlines. Women's turnout was lower than men's, but not low enough to explain the general decline in voter turnout. Nor was women's turnout consistent. Sometimes it was higher than men's. Birth cohort, ethnicity, and region all effected turnout.

But just as important, Andersen argues, was organization. When women's organizations and/or political parties made a particular effort to bring women to the polls, their turnout increased. Initially, these factors helped the Republicans more than the Democrats. Republican women came from the socio-economic strata that were more likely to vote. But in the election of 1928, one marked by a significant increase in women voters, immigrant stock women began to enter the electorate in significant numbers, and to vote Democratic. This didn't help the Democratic Party win in 1928, but may have in 1932.

Andersen also believes that women voters did have an impact on "the shape of the political agenda" because legislators had to take them into account in their calculations of constituent interests. Because women were perceived to be a distinct group who behaved differently than men, it did not matter if there was no proof of that at the polls – in the days before random sample surveys no one knew exactly how women voted anyway.

The major political parties were a major arena for negotiating gender boundaries. On the one hand the parties admitted women on an equal basis to the National Committees, and to a lesser extent to the state and local party committees. On the other hand, this was not done without a struggle, and when women finally achieved their goal, they discovered the men excluded them from meetings or otherwise ignored them.

At the beginning of the decade suffragists and other important women were invited by the parties to work within them. But when these leaders proved too independent they were replaced by more compliant women. By the late 1920s, "women's political influence within the parties had declined", or at least women partisans believed it had declined. Women, and men, debated whether women's unique perspective required separate organization, or whether women should be assimilated and amalgamated into the regular party organizations. This question was never resolved, but throughout the 1920s, the "gendered boundaries within the parties and party politics" were redrawn, and would not "be subject to renegotiation until the 1970s" (p. 107).

To sum up, the expansion of the electorate in the 1920s accelerated several changes already in process. The scope of political concerns as well as the nature of the participants shifted, and was never the same again.



*continued from page 7*

**Short Essays** (3-5 pages each)

1. National Liberty Party
2. United Labor Party
3. Anti-Monopoly Party
4. National Woman's Party
5. Independence Party
6. Workingmen's Party
7. Liberal Republican Party
8. National Party
9. Jobless Party
10. Universal Party
11. Constitution Party
12. Independent Progressive Party
13. Equal Rights Party
14. National States' Rights Party
15. Afro-American Party
16. American Beat Party
17. Socialist Workers Party
18. Workers World Party
19. United Citizen's Party
20. U.S. Taxpayers Party
21. American Vegetarian Party
22. Liberty Union Party
23. Lowndes County Freedom Organization
24. People's Party (1971)
25. Lyndon LaRouche

**WANTED:**

**ABSTRACTS, RESEARCH REPORTS,  
BOOK REVIEWS, RANDOM  
THOUGHTS**

Just completed seminal research on parties or political organizations? Got a wild idea you would like to run by fellow scholars? Read any good (or bad) books lately? Need to get something off your chest? Feeling neglected?

**WRITE SOMETHING FOR VOX POP!**

*Send your material to:* John Green, Editor, VOX POP, Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1904 [FAX: (330) 972-5479, EMAIL: JGreen@uakron.edu or call (330) 375-5182.]



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

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