

VOLUME 24
ISSUE 2

FALL
2005

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

Why Hillary Won't Run for President

by Joe Freeman, www.jofreeman.com

Even though the next Presidential election is still more than three years away already there is much talk about Senator Hillary Clinton as the most likely Democratic candidate. All this talk is coming from Republicans, not Democrats. Republicans want Hillary to run. Democrats—at least those in hi-level position — don't. Realistically, Hillary can't win. She and the Democrats know that. That's why she can't run.

On the surface Hillary has many of the characteristics necessary to run and win. She has very high name recognition. She's smart and articulate. She's a skilled politician and a sophisticated policy wonk. She has lots of experience under the microscope of public scrutiny. She's positioned herself on issues slightly to the right of the Democratic Party's center. She's a woman, which presumably brings in the left of center Democrats who might not like all her issue stands. With the help of her famous husband, she can raise a lot of money. But she can't win. There are three reasons Hillary can't win.

First, she has a characteristic unique among all the potential candidates. Hillary is a political wife. However qualified she might be, her rise in the Democratic Party and her name recognition came from her husband. Traditionally, political wives only ran for public office after their husbands died when they became political widows. Hillary may be the first political wife to run while her husband was still alive; if not, she's certainly the most prominent and the most ambitious.

As a political wife, Hillary Clinton carries all the baggage of Bill Clinton, good and bad. Political widows usually keep the name recognition and goodwill garnered by their husbands, while losing

the negatives. Political wives keep it all.

There is a vein of people in this country who truly hate Bill Clinton. They will do almost anything to keep him from ever stepping foot in the White House again, even as the first husband. The mere thought that Hillary might become President, and bring Bill back, causes apoplexy. The Republicans play to these strong emotions when they talk about Hillary being the Democratic candidate. They know that mere talk of another Clinton in the White House mobilizes the Republican base. It doesn't mobilize the Democratic base.

Second, Hillary is a Senator from New York. She chose to run from New York, a state with which she had no personal connection, because there was an opening and because she could win. New York is a very liberal state. In order to win in New York one must take positions on issues which make one unelectable in most of the rest of the country. If Republicans, George Pataki and Rudolph

(continued on page 2)

From Headquarters	2, 3, 4, 5
From The Field	6
Papers of Interest	7, 8

CHAIR: John Aldrich, Duke University

SECRETARY-TREASURER: John Bruce, University of Mississippi

VOX POP EDITOR: John Green, The University of Akron

PROGRAM CHAIR: Barry Burden, Harvard University

WEBSITE COORDINATOR: To Be Announced

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL: Barbara Norrander, University of Arizona; Byron Shafer, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Dan Tichenor, Rutgers University; Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame; Barry Burden, Harvard University; Marjorie Hershey, Indiana University; Ken Kollman, University of Michigan; and Beth Leech, Rutgers University.

(continued from page 1)

Giuliani haven't found this out yet, they will if they run in the Republican primaries. Other states - e.g. Massachusetts - whose officials lead from the left side of the Democratic Party also lose when they run for national office. While Hillary is positioning herself as more centrist than most New Yorkers, she still has to represent New York.

Third, while prejudice against women in public office has declined greatly in the last 40 years, it's not gone. Women running for major executive positions still have to prove themselves in ways that men do not. Men are assumed to be competent until they prove themselves incompetent. Women are assumed to be incompetent until they prove themselves competent. That's why the first woman to win a major party's nomination for President will most likely be a big state governor - the best available proof of competency. (An exception would be a sitting Vice-President succeeding a successful President).

For Hillary to successfully pursue the Democratic nomination for President, she first has to be elected Governor of New York; govern so conservatively that she probably couldn't be re-elected; and Bill has to die. What are the odds of all these things happening? Certainly not by 2008, and probably not at all.

Hillary knows this. The Democratic leadership knows this. That's why the only public people touting her candidacy are Republicans. But Hillary won't take a Sherman position on the Presidency because all this talk enhances her power in the Senate and her fund raising ability for fellow Democrats. And the Democrats won't publicly disown one of their best fund-raisers. So the talk will continue. The Republicans need the Clinton haters among the voters and the party workers to believe that Hillary will run in order to keep them working hard for Republicans and not get distracted by such issues as the enormous federal debt and the Iraq occupation. As for the Democrats, well they may not like the talk, but they do like the money.

Copyright © 2005 by Jo Freeman

Jo Freeman won the 2003 Leon Epstein Award for *A Room At A Time: How Women Entered Party Politics* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000). She is a regular columnist at www.seniorwomen.com.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR October, 2005

Dear POP Members:

First let me provide a very enthusiastic thank you to Frank Baumgartner, Distinguished Professor at Penn State University, from all of us for his terrific service as Chair of POP over the past two years. As Frank wrote about his predecessor, John Coleman, so it is true for Frank: under his leadership, the Section has prospered. Our membership remains over 600, many are sufficiently engaged with the Section as to attend the Business Meeting, the organization is financially sound, but above all, submissions for participation in panels vastly exceeds the space allocated to us. The last is so important because of its indication of intellectual engagement with political organizations and parties, to be sure. It also indicates potential for greater involvement in the Section.

You might ask why so many ask but so few are able to be chosen? The answer varies by organized section. The answer for POP is that the critical bottleneck arises from lower attendance at panels relative to willingness to participate on them, in comparison with other sections. That reflects, in part, the particularities of the APSA's formula for allocating panels. Let me note, first, that the APSA is reconsidering a number of its practices, to include this formula. As a result, let me suggest that you, especially those with good paper proposals (which is to say all of you, of course!) that were unable to be accommodated this past year consider what would be a meretricious formula for allocation of panels to sections and pass those ideas along. Increasing attendance at our panels is a good idea not only for its beneficial effect on the number of panels we can sponsor, but also for circulation of our work. So whether for consumption or instrumental rewards, increasing panel attendance is a good thing.

In that light, I want to thank Kevin Esterling for his fine service as Program Chair. In addition to having the unenviable task of choosing so few from so many proposals, he was quite creative in the use of discussants at the post sessions (complete with cheese and wine, as well) and of making special panels with larger than usual participation. Both were designed to encourage greater attendance - and for the right reasons, an intellectually richer event. I am pleased that Barry Burden has assumed that post for 2006 (in Philadelphia), to continue that good work.

Finally, I want to thank the retiring members of the Executive Council (although "retiring" does not describe their personalities very well), Larry Bartels, Holly Brasher, Tom Ferguson, and Mark Smith; and I would like to welcome the new members elected in Washington: Barry Burden, Marjorie Hershey, Ken Kollman, and Beth Leech. Award committees will be announced at the next opportunity, along with a new web master, and some plans for enhancing web communications and services. Please pass along any suggestions you may have about this or any other aspect of POP.

Best Wishes,

John Aldrich

Pfizer-Pratt University Professor, Duke University
aldrich@duke.edu

**MINUTES OF THE
POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PARTIES (POP) BUSINESS MEETING
APSA Annual Meeting
September 2, 2005**

Frank Baumgartner called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

I. MINUTES AND TREASURER'S REPORT

Minutes from the 2004 Meeting were unanimously approved. John Bruce presented the Secretary-Treasurer's report, including a discussion of section membership relative to other sections in APSA.

TREASURER'S REPORT (July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005)
FUNDS ON HAND - JULY 1, 2003 **\$10,732.83**

REVENUE FOR PERIOD

APSA section dues	\$1,304.00
Interest Income	\$ 14.03
Section List Rebate	<u>\$ 131.99</u>

TOTAL REVENUE: **\$1,450.02**

EXPENDITURES *

2003 Awards	\$(574.00)
Shipping of Awards	\$ (52.13)
Bank Fees	<u>\$ (24.00)</u>

TOTAL EXPENDITURES: **\$ (650.13)**

NET ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD **\$ 799.89**

FUNDS ON HAND - JUNE 30, 2004 ** **\$11,532.72**

* Copying, printing, postage, telephone, travel, and staff provided gratis by Penn State University, the Bliss Institute at the University of Akron, and the University of Mississippi.

** Bank of America funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking (\$8,423.09) and savings (\$3,116.39).

II. REPORT ON THE 2005 PANELS

Kevin Esterling reported on the process of assembling the panels for this year's meeting. Submissions remained high, while space remained limited. He received 178 paper proposals and 14 panel proposals, far exceeding space to fill. To enhance space, the section co-sponsored 4 panels with other sections. In an effort to increase attendance (to benefit next year's space allocation), Kevin tried several approaches. One roundtable was used as a draw, as were "blockbuster" panels, featuring an unusual format and more prominent scholars. The section also co-sponsored a wine and cheese reception during the POP poster session on Saturday. As in past years, the critical factor is the relatively low attendance at POP panels (especially relative to our size).

III. REPORT ON THE 2005 SHORT COURSE

Denise Baer reported on the short course, "Political Parties in Emerging Democracies: Tools for Democratic Political Development," co-sponsored by the National Democratic Institute. Reviews of the events were positive, and 77 people were in attendance

IV. PRESENTATION OF THE POP SECTION AWARDS

JACK L. WALKER, JR. OUTSTANDING ARTICLE AWARD

This award honors an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

"Abnormal Returns from the Common Stock Investments of the United States Senate," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, by Alan J. Ziobrowski, Pin Cheng, James W. Boyd, and Brigitte J. Ziobrowski.

LEON D. EPSTEIN OUTSTANDING BOOK AWARD

This award honors a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

Pradeep Chhibber and Ken Kollman,
The Formation of National Party Systems.

SAMUEL J. ELDERSVELD AWARD

This award is to honor a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field.

James Q. Wilson

EMERGING SCHOLAR AWARD

This honor is awarded to a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last seven (7) years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise.

Barry Burden Beth Leech

PARTY POLITICS AWARD

This award honors the best paper presented on a POP panel at the preceding APSA annual meeting. The award recipient is offered the opportunity to publish the paper in *Party Politics*.

Michael T. Heaney,
"Reputation and Leadership Inside Interest Group Coalitions."

V. RECOGNITION OF RETIRING AND NEW OFFICERS

Council members with terms expiring now include: Larry Bartels, Holly Brasher, Tom Ferguson, and Mark Smith. Kyle Saunders has completed his tour as Section Web Master, and Kevin Esterling assembled the panels for this year's meeting.

New Section Officers nominated include: John Aldrich as Chair, and Barry Burden, Marjorie Hershey, Ken Kollman, and Beth Leech on the Council.

The slate of new officers was elected unanimously.

Barry Burden will assemble Section's panels on the APSA program for 2006.

There was a motion to adjourn, and a second.

The meeting closed as 12:49 p.m.

AWARD CITATIONS

SAMUEL J. ELDELSVELD AWARD, a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field.

The Eldersveld Award for 2005, recognizing lifetime career achievement in the field of political organizations and parties, goes to **James Q. Wilson**, Ronald Reagan Professor of Public Policy at Pepperdine University. The Eldersveld Award asks for a distinguished, broad-based, cumulative body of scholarship: Jim Wilson might as well be the definition of that. There is the early work on city politics, on the public-regarding or private-regarding ethos as a way to understand politics more generally, on Negro politics, and on the difference between amateurs and professionals inside the parties. There is the capstone book, *Political Organizations*, which just may be the single best integration of the scholarly interests of the section on political organizations and parties. And there is the subsequent work, informed by all these predecessors, on matters as diverse as the operation of bureaucracies, regulation and deregulation, and crime and punishment, social institutions, and moral sensibilities. The committee is delighted to present the 2005 Eldersveld Award to **James Q. Wilson**.

JACK WALKER AWARD, honoring an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

The Selection Committee is delighted to honor "*Returns from the Common Stock Investments of the United States Senate*" as the best article published in the last two years in the general field of political organizations and parties and to present the Jack L. Walker Award to its authors: **Alan J. Ziobrowski, Ping Cheng, James W. Boyd, and Brigitte J. Ziobrowski**.

This article's importance is manifold. It is remarkable, simply as a research achievement. The U.S. Senate does not make it easy for researchers to access or use the personal financial disclosure forms its members file. While some watchdog organizations now help make these reports available, the authors required assistance from one U.S. Senator (since defeated for re-election) and much time and effort to get the data they needed.

The essay is also valuable for political scientists, however, because it provides a model example of how stock market data can be used to pin down propositions that have historically been highly disputed. Corporate insiders tend to out perform the market by something like 5 percent a year, while average investor returns are roughly flat or even slightly negative. The authors' discovery that U.S. Senators beat the market by approximately 12 percent a year is remarkable. It demonstrates that Senators regularly use inside information in their personal investments, no matter how many times they or political scientists studying Congress deny it. That authors' suggestions for future research on the stock portfolios of Congressmen and women, federal judges, and other officials deserve to be vigorously followed up in a discipline that values empirical research. This work, which appeared in the *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, and has been virtually ignored by the American media despite its striking findings, richly merits wider attention. The Selection Committee is pleased to have an opportunity to help in this.

LEON EPSTEIN AWARD, honoring a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

Pradeep Chhibber and Ken Kollman, *The Formation of National Party Systems: Federalism and Party Competition in Canada, Great Britain, India and the United States* (Princeton University Press, 2004).

The Formation of National Party Systems is a model for comparative political research in the field of parties and elections. With exceptional care and clarity, Chhibber and Kollman focus on the crucial yet understudied issue of how many parties are effective in a country and why a national or regional party system crystallizes. Their analysis transcends standard accounts of party aggregation that emphasize electoral rules or social divisions to explain the nationalization of fragmentation of party systems. Effective case selection is at the heart of this effort, as they control for variables such as electoral rules by investigating four countries with similar single member plurality systems for lower-house elections but varying traditions of centralization and devolution. Chhibber and Kollman make a powerful and original argument for federalism - that is, the relative authority exercised by different levels of government - as a critical force shaping how party systems are organized. They demonstrate that the success of national or regional parties hinges upon which level of government voters credit for initiating policies that influence their lives. Accordingly, national party systems emerge when the national government wields decisive political and economic authority while decentralized systems rely on the devolution of that authority to lower levels of government. This book's innovative theoretical insights are based on richly-textured data attuned to distinctive features of party system formation, state activism, and intergovernmental relations within each country over an extended period of time. By developing strong evidence linking party aggregation and government centralization in both comparative and historical context, *The Formation of National Party Systems* is a pioneering work that is sure to stimulate hearty debate and fresh research for years to come.

EMERGING SCHOLAR AWARD, honoring a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last seven years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise.

Committee members: Barbara Norrander, Chair; Scott Ainsworth (University of Georgia) and David Kimball (University of Missouri, St. Louis),

Barry Burden, Harvard University, Ph.D. 1998 Ohio State University

Barry Burden has been very active in research on political parties in the United States and is now branching out to study party politics in Japan. He has co-written an article and a book on split-ticket voting in U.S. National elections. In addition, he has written numerous articles on the impact of minor parties and independent candidates in American national elections, individual and contextual influences on American party identification, the role of partisanship in Congress, and party nominations and presidential primaries. Finally, Barry recently edited a book on the role of uncertainty in American politics. Thus, Barry is a very accomplished scholar of political parties and a deserving recipient of the Emerging Scholar Award.

Beth Leech, Rutgers University, Ph.D. 1998 Texas A&M

Beth Leech has been at the forefront of the interest groups subfield since her time as a graduate student at Texas A&M. She is the co-author with Frank Baumgartner of *Basic Interests*, an important analytical review of the subfield that has guided much subsequent research. Seldom does a young scholar possess such a comprehensive command of a field.

She is currently working with several folks on a multi-year NSF project on lobbying in Washington, which promises to keep her at the forefront of her field. Beth also knows a little something about life outside of academe as a former professional journalist. Beth is a very accomplished scholar of interest groups and a deserving recipient of the Emerging Scholar Award.

(continued on page 5)

FROM HEADQUARTERS

(continued from page 4)

POP / PARTY POLITICS AWARD, honoring the best paper presented at a POP sponsored panel at the previous APSA meeting.

Committee: Christina Wolbrecht (University of Notre Dame), Chair; Andrew McFarland (University of Illinois, Chicago); and Jennifer Victor (University of Pittsburgh).

The Committee is pleased to present the 2004 *Party Politics* award to Michael T. Heaney (University of Florida) for his paper, "Reputation and Leadership Inside Interest Group Coalitions." The few papers that were nominated this year were especially interesting and strong, and engendered a lively debate among committee members. In the end, however, the committee was unanimous in its decision to award the prize to Michael Heaney for his excellent piece of scholarship.

The Heaney paper examines the internal politics, particularly regarding leadership, of interest group coalitions. The work is well placed within several literatures and utilizes, among other things, a truly impressive set of interviews of actors in the health policy subsystem, including congressional staff members and interest group representatives. The data generated by these interviews allowed for careful and systematic statistical analysis of the relationships of interest. Indeed, the work is exemplary in combining substantive knowledge of a policy area, in-depth interviews, and careful statistical analysis. Heaney argues that groups are motivated primarily by concerns about their social, partisan, and policy reputation when pursuing and deciding on coalition leadership positions. He finds that positions of coalition leadership are determined by network position, partisanship (with bi-partisan and Republican groups being advantageous), and the groups core mission. His findings help us to further understand the way that reputation, power, and partisanship enter into the politics of policy making in Washington.

The practice of sharing resources and coordinating tactics through coalitions is an increasingly common and important, but understudied, aspect of interest group politics. As a mechanism for sharing costs and enhancing influence, the use of coalitions as an interest group strategy merits our careful attention. Heaney's work illuminates the way in which interest groups engage in strategic networking in their efforts to shape public policy, and in doing so, expands our understanding of interest group politics and policy making in the United States.

CALL FOR PAPERS POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PARTIES

Barry C. Burden, Harvard University
burden@fas.harvard.edu

This year's meeting asks participants to reconsider the concept of power. I encourage proposals that explore this theme in the context of political parties, interest groups, and other political organizations. What evidence is there that party leaders actually wield power over their members (whether activists, candidates, or incumbents)? To what degree do interest groups exert power in the policy making process? Precisely how do parties, interest groups, social movements, and the public influence one another? How has the relative power of parties and other political organizations changed over time? Authors are urged to examine the power of parties and other political organizations at every stage of the policy process from candidate recruitment to lobbying and persuasion to policy implementation.

In addition to theme-related papers, I welcome all high quality proposals concerned with political organizations. Party and interest group structure, financing, strength, and activities are all worthy topics. Papers focused on Washington politics are naturally encouraged, but so are state-based analyses and comparative research on parties and lobbying groups. Papers might develop new questions or revisit old debates. I expect a wide range of perspectives and methodologies to be represented, but preference will be given to papers that offer compelling questions and solid research designs to investigate them.

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION PROCESS:

- **Deadline:** November 15, 2005 — Midnight EST
- **Address / Method:** <http://www.apsanet.org/mtgs/>
- **Requirements:** E-mail address and Internet Access
- **Confirmation of Receipt:**
 1. Unique ID number assigned for each proposal.
 2. E-mail confirmation with ID number within 24 hours.
- **Notification of Acceptance:** E-mail in early March 2006

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW

The International Political Science Review, the official journal of the International Political Science Association edited by Kay Lawson and James Meadowcroft, would be pleased to receive quality submissions likely to be of interest to its international readership from the members of Political Organizations and Parties Section of the American Political Science Association.

The IPSR is committed to publishing material that makes a significant contribution to international political science. It seeks to meet the needs of political scientists throughout the world who are interested in studying political phenomena in the contemporary context of increasing international interdependence and global change.

IPSR reflects the aims and intellectual tradition of its parent body, the International Political Science Association: to foster the creation and dissemination of rigorous political inquiry free of subdisciplinary or other orthodoxy. We welcome work by scholars who are focusing on currently controversial themes, shaping innovative concepts of methodologies of political analysis, and striving to reach outside the scope of a single culture.

Authors interested in submitting their work should consult either a recent copy of the journal or <http://ipsr.sagepub.com> and follow submission guidelines, sending electronic copies to both klawson@sfsu.edu and jmeadowc@connect.carleton.ca. Preliminary queries are welcome.

NEW JOURNAL: SOCIETY AND BUSINESS REVIEW

Emerald (www.emeraldinsight.com) will be launching a new journal, *Society and Business Review*, in 2006. *Society and Business Review* aims to cultivate and share knowledge and ideas in order to assist businesses to enhance their commitment in societies. Being international in outlook and interdisciplinary in scope, the journal seeks to provide a platform for diverse academic and practitioner communities to debate a broad spectrum of social issues and disciplinary perspectives, globally. *Society and Business Review* seeks to promote an ethos of meaningful reflection, critical review and discussion informed by the results of relevant research. The journal particularly encourages readers to engage with and build upon research that highlight models and structures that advance the interests, dignity, and well being of all people and communities in societies, in a sustainable manner.

In this fast-growing, ever-changing, and always challenging field of study, *Society and Business Review* draws on theoretical, methodological and substantive debates to produce a rich vein of applied research that focuses on practical developments in the field of social issues of business activities worldwide. Business is IN society, where it is seen as a social activity among others. The journal particularly encourages attention to the impact of changes to the business/corporate social concerns and practices on people, the sustainability of different economic activities and how societal issues influence the scope of business activities, through contradicting social philosophies and business.

Society and Business Review is essential reading for both academics with research interests in society and business for practitioners seeking knowledge of practical developments in this field. The journal:

- Provide access to leading edge research findings theories and emerging trends relating to society and business.
- Contributes positively to the advancement of knowledge in this increasingly important field.
- International coverage allows you to share ideas and insights on a world-wide scale.

Society and Business Review is now inviting manuscripts on issues such as:

- Business and Politics
- Geo-Politics of Business
- Societal Change
- Business Ethics and Values

- International Dimensions of Business and Society Relationships
- Business Strategies and Ecological Prosperity
- Global Social Responsibility
- Corporate Governance
- Business and Government Relations
- Corporate Social Performance
- Environmental Impact

Articles submitted to *Society and Business Review* should be original contributions and should not be under consideration for any other publication at the same time. Authors submitting articles of publication warrant that the work is not an infringement of any existing copyright and will indemnify the publisher against any breach of such warranty. For ease of dissemination and to ensure proper policing of use, papers, and contributions become the legal copyright of the publisher unless otherwise agreed.

SUBMISSIONS SHOULD BE SENT BY E-MAIL ONLY TO:

The Editor, Society and Business Review
Professor Yvon Pesqueux
C.N.A.M.
Chair “Développement des Systèmes d’Organisation”
Case 251
292 rue Saint Martin
75 141 OARUS Cédex 93
France
E-mail: pesqueux@cnam.fr

All papers will first be considered by the Editor for general relevance and significance. If accepted for review, papers will then be subject to double blind peer review.

Articles should be 3,000 - 5,000 words in length with an appropriate title. Manuscripts should be set out using 12 font with double line spacing and 25mm margins. A brief autobiographical note should be supplied including full name, affiliation, e-mail address and full international contact details.

For full author guidelines, see:

www.emeraldinsight.com/info/journals/sbr/notes.htm

PAPERS OF INTEREST

2005

MIDWEST POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

- "Economic Inequality and the Vote for Distributive Parties." Guillermo Rosas, Washington University in St. Louis.
- "Political Support Across the World - Do Institutions Matter for Political Support?" Wonbin Cho, Michigan State University.
- "Duty, Empowerment and Patronage: Patterns of Political Participation in India." Amit Ahuja, University of Michigan, Pradeep Chhibber, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Is Democracy the Only Game in Town? Testing Linz's Notion of Democratic Consolidation in East Asia." Jason M. Wells, University of Missouri, Doh C. Shin, University of Missouri.
- "Intra-Party Selection Methods and Their Impact on Parliament Member's Behavior." Yael Shomer, Michigan State University.
- "The Regulation of Intra-Party Democracy: Issues to Examine in the Move Towards Electoral-System Reform in Canada and its Provinces." Brian M. Doody, University of Montreal.
- "The Strategic Placement of Women Candidates in French Legislative Elections." Dan Pemstein, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, William T. Bernhard, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- "What Motivates People to Become Politically Active?" Joanne M. Miller, University of Minnesota.
- "Legal Restrictions and Campaign Contribution Patterns in State Legislatures." David W. Prince, Bellarmine University.
- "State Parties Adjust to BICRA." Sarah Morehouse, University of Connecticut, Malcolm E. Jewell, University of Kentucky.
- "The Determinants of Transfers from National to State and Local Party Committees Before and After McCain-Feingold: Does Anything Matter Other Than Winning in the Short Run." Robert C. Lowry, Iowa State University.
- "State Legislatures and Electoral Reform." Stephanie C. McClean, University of Pittsburgh.
- "Party Candidates Versus Independents in Russia: What Difference Does Party Nomination Make?" Henry El Hale, Indiana University, Timothy J. Colton, Harvard University.
- "Red vs. Brown: Who Benefits from Poor Economic Conditions in Post- Communist Elections?" Joshua A. Tucker, Princeton University.
- "Mandate or Punishment?: Prospective and Retrospective Voting after Communism." Grigore Pop-Eleches, Princeton University.
- "Economic Voting Post-Communist Countries." Geoffrey Evans, Oxford University, Stephen Whitefield, Oxford University.
- "Big Dollars, But How Much Change? A Comparison of Soft Money Donors Pre- and Post - BCRA." Casey B.K. Dominguez, University of California, Berkeley, Kathryn L. Pearson, University of Minnesota.
- "The New Stealth PACs: Political Activities of 501(c) Non-Profit Groups." Craig B. Holman, Public Citizen.
- "The Role of the NRA in House Elections: Endorsements, Members, and Turmoil." Christopher Kenny, Louisiana State University, Michael McBurnett, RBC Centura, David Bordua, University of Illinois, Eric Jenner, Louisiana State University.
- "Electoral Turnout and the Influence of Interest Groups in the United States." Tim C. Wegenast, Pompeu Fabra University.
- "Across the Great Values' Divide: A National & State Level Analysis of Family Policy Focused Interest Groups." Brent D. Lollis, Lander University.
- "Evolving Strategies: Interest Groups and the Abortion Issue." Jessica C. Gerrity, Indiana University.
- "The Impact of BCRA in the 2004 New Mexico Presidential Election." Lonna Roe Atkeson, University of New Mexico, Nancy Carrillo, University of New Mexico. Mekace Walker, University of New Mexico.
- "The Impact of BCRA in the 2004 Ohio Presidential Election." Stephen Mockabee, University of Cincinnati, Michael Margolis, University of Cincinnati, Dan Bridson, University of Cincinnati.
- "The New Search for Campaign Effects: Candidates, Parties, and Effects on Voters." Brian A. Brox, The University of Texas at Austin.
- "The Mobilizing Effects of Soft Money in American Presidential Elections." Tom M. Holbrook, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Scott D. McClurg, Southern Illinois University.
- "Determinants of Party Systems: Comparing Established and New Democracies." Michael G. Huelshoff, University of New Orleans, Marc Rosenblum, University of New Orleans.
- "Electoral Coalitions in a Mixed-Member Electoral System: The Case of Post-Communist Hungary." Csaba Nikolenyi, Concordia University.
- "Portuguese Party Politics and Local Government Coalition Formation." Pedro J. Camoes, University of Minho-Portugal, Silvia M. Mendes, University of Minho-Portugal.
- "Changes in Party Structure: Origins and Implications." Matthew C. Falvey, Creighton University.
- "Strange Bedfellows or the Usual Suspects: Spatial Models of Ideology and Interest Group Coalitions." Richard Almeida, Southeast Missouri State University.
- "Agendas and Organizational Change in Interest Groups: The Break-up of the German Pharmaceutical Industry Association." Andreas Broscheid, University of North Carolina-Pembroke.
- "Partisanship and Collective Action Inside Interest Group Coalition." Michael T. Heaney, Yale University.
- "The Dynamics of the 'Invisible Primary' in Presidential Nominations, 1980 to 2004." Marty Cohen, University of California, Los Angeles, David Karol, University of California, Los Angeles, Hans Noel, University of California, Los Angeles, John Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "The Nationalization of Party Systems: Conceptual Issues and Alternative District-Focused Measures." Johannes Moenius, Kellogg School of Management, Yuko Kasuya, Keio University.
- "The Electoral Roots of Congressional Parties." Jeremy C. Pope, Brigham Young University.
- "Campaign Effects in the 2004 Presidential Election." Kelly Patterson, Brigham Young University.
- "Back to the Future: The 2004 Ground War in Ohio." Anne Hanson, The University of Akron.
- "Policy Entrepreneurs and Policy Change: Examining the Linkages between TANF, Domestic Violence and the FVO." Tera McCrown, Marshall University.
- "The Logic of Party Polarization." George Rabinowitz, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Stuart E. McDonald, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- "Multi-Dimensional Multi-Party Competition: A Stochastic Equilibrium Analysis." Thomas Plumper, University of Konstanz, Christian W. Martin, MPI Jena.
- "Parties' Policy Programs and the Dog that Didn't Bark: No Evidence that Proportional Systems Promote Dispersal Party Positioning." Lawrence J. Ezrow, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- "PR the Contagion Effect and Green Politics (Or How the European Center Came to Love the Environment)." Bedriye A. Koleman, University of Georgia, Christopher A. Allen, University of Georgia.
- "Party Polarization in the New EU Member States." Bojan M. Petrovic, University of California, Irvine.
- "European Integration and the Formation and Success of Regional Parties." Seth K. Jolly, Duke University.
- "EU Policy Constraints and the Volatility of European Party Systems." Eric H. Hines, University of Iowa.
- "Fickley Parties or the Changing Dimensions? Testing the Comparability of Party Manifesto Data Across Time." Ryan Bakker, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Erica Edwards, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Catherine Netjes.
- "The Party System and the Personal Vote: Revisiting Carey and Shugart." Martin Battle, Washington University.
- "Increasing Voter Turnout in the Hispanic Community: A Field Experiment on the Effects of Canvassing, Leafletting, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail." Gregg R. Murray, University of Texas, Brownsville, Richard E. Matland, University of Houston.
- "How Effective are Voter Registration Drives in Getting Young People to the Polls?" Tina Ebenger, Calumet College of Saint Joseph, Tracey McCabe, Calumet College of Saint Joseph.
- "Local Party Organization and GOTV Activities." Tin Hundsdorfer, University of Colorado.
- "The Length of Legislative Coalitions: Explaining Variation in Latin America." Marisa Kellam, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "An Institutional Explanation for Chile's Unique Political Stability in the Latin America." Patricio D. Navia, New York University, Cristobal Aninat, Universidad Adolfo Ibanez.

PAPERS OF INTEREST

(continued on page 8)

- "The Collapse of Party Systems in Comparative Perspective: The Case of Venezuela (1998-2000)." Eburne Zoco, University of Notre Dame.
- "Human Rights Policies in Latin America: Contrasting Divergent Outcomes." Rebecca Evans, Ursinus College.
- "The Puzzle of Soft Money: Replacement or Access Strategy?" Michael M. Franz, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- "The Effects of Electoral Context and the Legal Restrictions on Financial Contributions by Individuals to Candidates, Parties, and PAC's." Robert C. Lowry, Iowa State University.
- "Do 527's Add Up to a Party? Thinking About the 'Shadows' of Politics." Richard M. Skinner, Bowdoin College.
- "Ask and Then Ask Again: Party Finance Laws and the Rise of Fund-Raising in Canada and the United States." Claire M. Smith, University of Notre Dame.
- "Political Party Development: Issues and Challenges in Emerging Democracies." Denise L. Baer, George Washington University.
- "The German Greens and the Iron Law of Oligarchy: Implications of Organizational 'Normalization, 1980-2005.'" Gene Frankland, Ball State University, Robert Harmel, Texas A&M University.
- "Mobilizing the Choir: Party Activism in Advanced Industrial Democracies." Steven Weldon, University of California, Irvine.
- "Patterns of Interest Group Lobbying Across Venues: Administrative and Legislative Lobbying Expenditures." Frederick J. Boehmke, University of Iowa, Sean Gailmard, Northwestern University, John W. Patty, Carnegie Mellon University.
- "The Legislative Structuring of Interest Group Enfranchisement through Agency Design." Brian Gerber, Texas Tech University, Christopher M. Reenock, Florida State University.
- "Assessing the Power of Ethnic Lobbies." David M. Paul, Ohio State University, Newark, Rachel A. Paul, Ohio State University, Newark.
- "Why Ethnic Parties? Evidence from Sri Lanka, Bulgaria, and Malaysia on Mobilization Resources, Political Entrepreneurs and Selective Incentives." Nikolaos Bizziouras, Harvard University.

- "Individual Presidential Giving: Innovation and Choice." Alexandra Cooper, Duke University.
- "The Day After Reform: Presidential Contributors After BCRA." Michael Malbin, Campaign Finance Institute and SUNY Albany.
- "The Presidential Donor Pool: Significant Donors Over Time." Clyde Wilcox, Georgetown University.
- "Leaders and Advocates: Linking Outreach to Policy Deliberation." Christine A. DeGregorio, American University.
- "Competitive Lobbying in Policymaking: Does It Matter Who Wins?" Amy McKay, Duke University.
- "When Does Interest Group Policy Information Matter? A Dynamic Study of New Technology Interest Groups' Use of Information in Congressional Hearings." Bryan S. McQuide, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- "Counteractive Lobbying? Assessing the Policy Effects of Competitive Interest." Susan W. Yackee, University of Michigan.
- "It's A Family Affair: Party Systems in East-Central Europe." Adrian P. Hull, Jackson State University.
- "Rise of Populism in Post-Communist Poland in A Comparative Perspective." Jacek Lubecki, Millikin University.
- "The Battle Over Privileges and Pension Reform in Central and Eastern Europe-Evidence from Legislative Roll Call Analysis." Oana I. Armeanu, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- "The Evolution of the Former Dominant Parties in Marxist Leninist Regimes in Sub Saharan Africa." John Ishiyama, Truman State University.
- "Making and Breaking the Radical Right in Central and Eastern Europe." David C. Art, College of Holy Cross, Dana Brown, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- "Electoral Control with Political Parties." Michael M. Ting, Columbia University, James M. Snyder, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- "Primary Elections in Two-Party Systems: The Effects of Party Nominations on Policy Outcomes." Gilles Serra, Harvard University.
- "Political Parlization and Electoral Accountability." Cecilia Testa, Royal Holloway University of London.

- 8 -



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

Nonprofit Organization
BULK RATE
U.S. Postage Paid
Akron, Ohio
Permit Number 222