REVIEW ESSAY — Bruce E. Altschuler, SUNY Oswego

DEMOCRATS RETURN TO POWER: POLITICS AND POLICY IN THE CLINTON ERA
By Theodore J. Lowi and Benjamin Ginsberg

When teaching undergraduates about American politics, I always require them to keep up with current events. Unfortunately, media accounts of politics are generally episodic with little historical context and even less attention to putting events into an explicit theoretical framework. That makes Lowi and Ginsberg’s “experiment in textbook publishing” an intriguing project. Designed to supplement a textbook, it seeks first to analyze the beginnings of the Clinton administration and then relate the president’s difficulties to the underlying problems of American government. The authors’ reputation for provocative ideas presents the possibility that even the professor could learn something. Because their conclusions center on American political parties, they are of interest to the readers of VOX POP.

Inherent in the project is an obvious pitfall. The time it takes to write, print, and publish even a small volume necessitates the risk that its conclusions will be overtaken by events. It appears that Lowi and Ginsberg completed their work after the passage of President Clinton’s economic program and the presentation of the first versions of his health care plan, but before the NAFTA vote. How well do their conclusions hold up? Do they still provide an adequate framework for understanding the problems facing the president at this moment?

The booklet consists of two parts. The first examines the 1992 election and the successes and failures of the new president. The second explains why any president today “is the victim of a political process that undermines the U.S. government’s capacity to govern,” concluding with recommendations about changes to address these systemic difficulties.

The material is presented in a clear and lively fashion that students will enjoy reading. The evidence is suggestive rather than definitive, allowing for considerable debate and possible further research by readers.

The first section is the weaker of the two, with some significant gaps in its analysis. The authors begin by analyzing the 1992 election from the perspective of the parties. Students will find the explanation of how each sought to patch together a winning coalition from a variety of conflicting constituencies useful in understanding the differences between parties as well as the practical problems of political strategy. A look at the appeals of the unsuccessful candidates for the nominations, especially (continued on page 3)
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FROM HEADQUARTERS

To the Members of POP:

Each time I have written one of these letters, I have started with a personal travelogue—first leaving on sabbatical, then planning to drive back to Maine, and now returning from my honeymoon. And each time I have had the chance to think about POP and our community of scholars not only as professional colleagues, but also as friends. So let me start by thanking so many of you for your hospitality this last year and for your good wishes as I begin my life together with (of all things) an economist.

Like the rest of you I am now looking forward to a productive summer of research and the upcoming APSA Convention. I want to thank Marjorie Hershey for her wonderful work on our portion of the convention program and for Bob Biersack for putting together a most exciting workshop (see announcement below). I assume all of the sessions will be well-attended and that we will benefit from sharing each other’s research. I also have had the pleasure of writing to our award winners to inform them that they have been selected as honorees by our section. A section head has no greater pleasure than to tell our esteemed colleagues just how highly we think of them. And, as you will read below, our committees, to whom I also extend heartfelt thanks, have done their tasks well and chosen wisely.

The awards will be presented at our business meeting which will be held on Friday, September 2, at 5:30 p.m. Please note this carefully. The time of the business meeting was inadvertently omitted from the Preliminary Program. We hope you will join us there. At that time, we will also be discussing the proposal to pursue internships at the two national committees. Please let me know if you have other business to present to the membership.

I wish you all a good summer and look forward to seeing you in New York.

With best wishes,

—Sandy Maisel

Nominations

The nominating committee submits the following slate of nominees:

For Executive Council (2-year term): James Reichley, Jerome Mileur, Everett Ladd, Maureen Moakley.

For Secretary-Treasurer (2-year term): Diana Dwyre.

Respectfully submitted,

—John White, Chair
Nominating Committee

Notice

The annual POP business meeting at the APSA in New York will be held on Friday, September 2, from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m.

POP Workshop Fall 1994

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

This half-day session will combine a true “workshop” on new data available on state and national party organizations with a discussion of strategies and problems in regulating party finance in a federal system. The first session will include an explanation of the new regulatory scheme under which parties raise and spend funds related to federal elections and the new data that come from these regulatory changes. Scholars currently working with the data will discuss their experiences, and participants will have the opportunity to receive data sets relevant to their research interests. The second session will involve regulators from the federal and state/local levels along with party officials in a discussion of the regulatory process in the environment where party priorities, state, and federal law are in conflict. Presenters will include: Robert Biersack, Federal Election Commission; Anthony Corrado, Colby College; Ruth Jones, Arizona State University; Frank Sorauf, University of Minnesota; as well as state and federal officials.

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

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

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

Former Members of Congress View the Role of Political Parties in the U.S. Congress

The report describes what the former Members think of the parties' role in the general management of the work of Congress, their experiences with and opinion of the parties as recruiters of legislators and leaders, and their assessments of policy development and presentation by the parties. The analysis summarizes former Members' attitudes regarding their party's role in congressional election campaigns, the funding of campaigns and party organization, and the probable consequences of term limits. There are a substantial number of surprises in the survey's findings. The report is bound to provide grist for the current debates on congressional reorganization, campaign finance, and party development.

Nearly 100 former Members of Congress responded to the Center's survey. Many added thoughtful comments. Four—Ken Hechler of West Virginia, John McCollister of Nebraska, Harold Sawyer of Michigan, and Burt Talcott of California—commented at great length, and their remarks are included in full in the 76-page report. The survey was directed by Professor Ralph M. Goldman, whose research in the field of political parties is widely recognized.

The Center for Party Development is associated with The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC 20064. The staff of the Center for Party Development invite you to partake of the newsworthy information in this report. The price per copy is nominal, covering only printing, handling, and postage costs. The price for a single copy is $10. Orders of five or more copies are $8 per copy. Please send checks to: Center for Party Development, P.O. Box 2057, Reston, VA 22090-2057. Checks should be made to the order of Center for Party Development.

(continued from page 1)

Jerry Brown, Paul Tsongas, Pat Buchanan, and David Duke would have added a great deal. More disappointing is the section on H. Ross Perot which simply describes his campaign, concluding that "despite its sound and fury, the Perot campaign ultimately had little effect upon the outcome of the election." Given Lowi's long time advocacy of a three-party system, there should have been a discussion of the possibility of a third party and an analysis of the 19 percent of the electorate who voted for Perot. There is also no discussion of Perot's continuing role in the political debate. Since the writing of the book, Perot led the opposition to NAFTA, much to the consternation of some of his nominal allies, allowing President Clinton to take on opponents of the agreement without confronting those members of his own party's congressional leadership who had deserted him.

The discussion of Clinton's policy problems starts with a neat image, that he was haunted by the legacies of James Madison and Ronald Reagan (although the latter is too alive to be a ghost quite yet). This theme of the fragmentation of power and the inability to develop governmental initiatives in light of the budget deficit is used to great effect in the second part of the booklet. The discussion of the trade-offs employed to appease the interest groups necessary for the passage of the Clinton economic package is instructive. On other issues, however, the authors are too easy on Clinton. His difficulty formulating a coherent foreign policy is completely omitted while the internal divisions that led to the virtual abandonment of his promise to eliminate the military's ban on gays are inadequately discussed. Lowi and Ginsberg suggest that "political reform, too, was a top priority" in the Clinton program when, except for the fairly easily adopted "Motor Voter" law, the president has done little to push even his own modest proposals. Candidate Clinton had stressed as one of his strong points that he had an economic plan ready to send to Congress immediately with a health care plan not far behind, but the delays in doing so contributed to his problems. Political scientists have pointed to the legislative successes of Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, and Ronald Reagan (in contrast to Jimmy Carter and George Bush) as examples of the necessity for a "move it or lose it" strategy at the beginning of an administration. Giving the president appropriate blame allows us to understand his current rebound better. As of this writing (January 1994), his popularity ratings have returned to near honeymoon levels, although they will probably drop between now and the publication of this review.

Whatever weaknesses the first part has are more than redeemed in the second, which seeks to demonstrate that "what Clinton's difficulties reveal about the process of American government is ultimately far more important than what they tell us about the president." The essence of this argument is that the popular will is being subverted as elections are effectively reversed through "politics by other means." The expansion of the roles of the judiciary and media has led to RIP, "revelation-investigation-prosecution." When government was divided, this allowed each party to strengthen its branch at the expense of the other. Even with the Democrats in control of both Congress and the presidency, RIP has continued with attacks (continued on page 7)
FROM THE FIELD

Call for Papers and Participation
New York State Political Science Association 49th Annual Conference
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
New York, NY
April 28-29, 1995

The New York State Political Science Association invites paper and panel submissions from scholars and public policy practitioners, as well as from governmental and nonprofit administrators. Anyone whose research or policy interests relate to the fields below should send a short abstract or prospectus to the Section Chair, with a copy to the Program Chair, by November 25, 1994. The Association encourages submissions from other disciplines, multidisciplinary panels, and presentations of works in progress, particularly from graduate students. Proposers uncertain of their paper’s placement may communicate directly with the Program Chair. Participants can expect a robust array of stimulating panels and a newly streamlined acceptance process that allows for early notice of participation. The conference’s mid-Manhattan location and Friday-Saturday format offers a highly accessible and culturally rich opportunity for professional development.

Registration fees are $15 in advance (or $20 at the door) and only $3 for students ($5 at the conference).

PROGRAM CHAIR
Patrick O'Hara, Department of Public Management
John Jay College of Criminal Justice-CUNY
445 West 59th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 237-8086 or (215) 879-6890; fax: (212) 237-8742
Email: Pohji@cunyvm.cuny.edu

JUDICIAL PROCESS AND LAW
Peter Galie, Department of Political Science
Canisius College, Buffalo, NY 14208
(716) 888-2699 or (716) 634-0409; fax: (716) 888-2525
Email: Galie@ccvmsa.canisius.edu

POLITICAL THEORY
Jodi Dean, Department of Political Science
Hobart and William Smith College
Geneva, NY 14456
(315) 781-3427 or (315) 789-9841; fax: (315) 781-3422
Email: Jdean@hws.edu

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT
Daniel C. Kramer, Department of Political Science
College of Staten Island-CUNY
2800 Victory Boulevard
Staten Island, NY 10314
(718) 982-2895 or (718) 720-6424; fax: (718) 982-2888

PUBLIC POLICY
David Cingranelli, Political Science Department
University Center at Binghamton
Binghamton, NY 13901
(607) 777-2946 or (607) 798-7418; fax: (607) 777-2675

STATE AND LOCAL
Jeffrey Kraus, Department of Political Science
Wagner College
631 Howard Avenue, Staten Island, NY 10301
(718) 390-3254 or (718) 266-4894; fax: (718) 390-3467

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
Cynthia Ward, Department of Public Administration
Russell Sage College
140 New Scotland Avenue, Albany, NY 12208
(518) 445-1724 or (518) 482-5101; fax: (518) 465-5414

CANADIAN POLITICS
Anne Griffin, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences
The Cooper Union
41 Cooper Square, New York, NY 10003
(212) 353-4276 or (212) 288-2507; fax: (212) 353-4398

TEACHING AND LEARNING
John F. Freie, Department of Political Science
LeMoyne College, Syracuse, NY 13224
(315) 445-4493 or (315) 445-9436; fax: (315) 445-4540

COMPARATIVE POLITICS
Azzedine Layachi, Department of Political Science
St. John's University, Staten Island, NY 10301
(718) 390-4545 or (718) 777-0599; fax: (718) 442-3612
Email: Layachi@acf2.nyu.edu

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Vicki Kraft, Department of Politics
Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 274-1577 or (607) 277-7783; fax: (607) 274-3474
SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

English Campaign Finance Reforms for America
Paul R. Schattman, Bethany College

Is it possible to prevent the invidious effects of faction without destroying the liberty which makes factions possible? This is what Jeffrey Berry has called "Madison's Dilemma." Madison's Dilemma is nowhere more clearly illustrated than in the current conflict over campaign finance. On the one hand is the fear of unhealthy, special interest influence over elected policymakers; influence driven by the ease and ability of organized interests to generate campaign contributions. On the other is the reluctance to comprehensively regulate campaign contributions and expenditures for fear of violating First Principles of free speech, free association and property which are not merely fundamental, but are indispensable to the formation and maintenance of a democratic capitalist state.

The model for solving the American campaign finance dilemma already exists, in Britain. British law regulates both political contribution and campaign spending, moreover it closely limits various forms of political advertising. The result of these restrictions is a very inexpensive election process. Special interest influence by financial clout is demoted to an indirect process, muffled in the party machinery. All this is managed without any loss of democratic values or democratic practice.

Effecting such reforms as would 'anglicize' campaign finance in America is most often criticized on grounds of the fundamental incompatibility of the U.S. and British systems. In particular, critics note that the British system is a responsible party system based on membership, while the American system is an irresponsible party system based on identification. This is not so. Far from being incompatible, American and British systems are structurally similar and functionally alike.

Reforming the U.S. election law to adapt and incorporate English methods of campaign finance is entirely appropriate to the American system. The case for 'anglicizing' campaign finance hinges on two concepts: nomination and membership.

First, after the nomination is secured there is a fundamental change in the character of those persons seeking election. Prior to winning nomination, office seekers are free agents. After the nomination is won, office seekers are the agents of the party whose label they bear. In these circumstances the campaign finance law may restrict contributions so that only parties, not candidates, may receive funds after the nomination.

This assertion will be criticized as being based upon a party membership norm consistent with the British system as opposed to the more familiar party identification norm of the American system. This objection raises the second point, misprison of the concept of membership.

Second, and contrary to generally accepted view, the American party system is a membership system, not an identification system. In the American system, membership is not established by paying dues and carrying cards. It is established by the methods used for selecting nominees to run in the general election and by active participation. Membership is established by primaries, caucuses and conventions. Participation in the caucus and convention is self-evidently and exclusively a function of membership. The same is true for participation in primaries.

Participating in a primary in order to select that party's nominee is to exercise a right exclusively associated with party membership. Some states, such as Pennsylvania and West Virginia, operate a closed primary. In a closed primary state the potential voter must, by law, pre-register affiliation in a particular party. Independents are ineligible to vote in primaries. The election law recognizes that selection of nominees is a right limited to party members only. In the primary election, the party affiliates claim their membership by coming out to vote.

In the semi-open primary states, eligible voters must have registered either as independents or as party affiliates. The independents may subsequently declare their membership by choosing to vote in the primary or a particular party. The party affiliates also claim their membership by coming out to vote. In these semi-open states the election law requires that in order to select from among candidates for nomination in another state, registered partisans must have officially registered a change of affiliation status prior to the date of the primary. This requirement is nothing less than legal recognition that only members of the party are allowed to choose the party's nominees.

In open primary states, party affiliation is not a condition of registration. Any eligible citizen may vote in any primary. Self-identifying partisans and self-identifying non-partisans are effectively claiming membership in a particular party by the act of voting in the party's primary.

In the British system, nominees for the general election are chosen by members of the party. Because they are chosen by the party membership, the nominees are the agents of the party. It is therefore appropriate that only the party and no other person or group lawfully be enabled to receive and disburse funds to promote the election of the nominee chosen by the members of the party.

If the above points related to primaries are accepted as valid, then nominees in the American system are chosen by members of the party, and as such the nominees are the agents of the party. The dilemma of balancing special interest penetration against First Freedoms disappears. Comprehensive regulation of both contribution and expenditure similar to that exercised in the British election code becomes constitutionally possible, politically defensible, and operationally feasible.
Publications

Special Issue from
American Review of Politics

Our next special issue for APSA POP, due out in
winter 1994, will feature new research on "State Political
Parties," under the capable guest editorship of Sarah
McCall Morehouse and Malcolm E. Jewell.

Unlike "Political Parties in a Changing Age," the
APSA POP special issue on "State Political Parties" is
not available free of charge. However, you can purchase
it at the special low price of $12 per copy—again, as per
our agreement with APSA POP.

Or—you could get more for your money by ordering
a subscription to the American Review of Politics for $15,
which would get you the APSA POP special issue edited
by Morehouse & Jewell, plus our three regular 1994 issues!
If you have not been getting the American Review of Politics
or its predecessor (the Midsouth Journal), then you probably
haven't seen...

• Thom Little & “Pat” Patterson's study of congressional
party organizations
• Denise Baer's review of theories of party organization
• Leon Epstein's thoughts about the post-reform presi-
dential nominating system
• George Edwards' postmortem on the Bush presidency
• Ole Holsti's latest research on foreign policy "consensus"
• Shepherd & Shepherd's survey of faculty attitudes
toward the Persian Gulf War
• Our special issues on segmented partisan identification,
democratization of one-party regimes, and Clinton and
the 1992 elections

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

Party Politics

Party Politics is a major new international journal that
will provide a forum for the analysis of political
parties, including their historical development, structure,
policy programmes, ideology, electoral and campaign
strategies, and their role within the various national and
international political systems of which they are a part.

Party Politics will be published four times a year com-
mencing 1995. The following subscription rates are avail-
able: Two-Year Charter Subscription Rate (8 issues) $71.95
(regular $96); One-Year Introductory Rate (4 issues) $37.95
(regular $48); Institution Rate—2-year $288; Institutional
Rate—1-year $144.

The charter membership entitles you to a discount of
10 percent off all future renewal invoices to the journal,
an acknowledgment of your support in an early issue of
the journal, and a full money-back guarantee if you are
dissatisfied with the first issue. To order contact: SAGE
Publications, P.O. Box 5096, Newbury Park, CA 91359,
USA or Sage Publications, 6 Bonhill Street, London
EC2A 4PU, UK. Phone +44 (0) 71 374 0645; fax +44
(0) 71 3740 8741.

The editors welcome contributions from both aca-
demicians and practitioners, and from individuals at all stages
of their careers. Articles (up to 8,000 words in length)
and shorter reports (profiles/developments in party poli-
tics, research notes and debates of up to 4,000 words in
length) will be accepted. Contributions must be typed (or
word-processed) double spaced and three copies submitted
to: David M. Farrell and Ian Holliday, Department of Gov-
ernment, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL,
UK. Phone +44 61 275 4885; fax +44 61 275 4925.

Submissions from North America should be sent to
Kenneth Janda, Department of Political Science, North-
western University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA. Phone
(708) 491-2634; fax (708) 491-8985.

Party Developments

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

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

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

Representing Interests and Interest Group Representation, edited by William Crotty and Mildred Schwartz is now available through the University Press of America, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706.

This volume includes essays by William Crotty, Robert Salisbury, Jeffrey Berry, Allan Cigler, John Tierney, Andrew McFarland, Virginia Gray and David Lowery, and Katy Schlozman, as well as comments from interest group leaders originally presented at the 1992 POP Workshop. These essays focus on the study of interest groups.

Machine Politics, Sound Bites and Nostalgia, edited by Michael Margolis, resulting from the 1991 POP Workshop, is also available from the same source. This volume includes essays by Leon Epstein, Paul Herrnson, Charles Hadley and Lewis Bowman, Michael Margolis and Kay Lawson, as well as comments by party leaders. These essays focus on the study of local political parties.

Also available from The University Press of America is Politics, Professionalism, and Power, which includes essays by John Bibby, John Kessel, Robert Huckshorn, Fredrick Wirtt, Paul Herrnson, Phillip Klinker, Jon Hale, David Menefee-Libby, Tim Hames and John Pitney on modern party development.

Forthcoming

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

Edited by Daniel M. Shea and John C. Green

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


(continued from page 3)

on Clinton's nominees. Such attacks often cut across party lines, as demonstrated by Ralph Nader and other liberals joining the opposition to Zoe Baird, who was defeated in the Senate by Republican Orrin Hatch. By concentrating on personality, interest groups are able to prevent the achievement of policies the voters supported in the election. "Political struggle is constant, leaving little room for the public good." The more recent charges of corruption and adultery against President Clinton for actions allegedly taken while he was governor of Arkansas strengthen his argument.

The best counter would be active parties mobilizing the electorate, but "neither side has much need for or interest in political tactics that might, in effect, stir up trouble from below." Because both parties represent largely upper-middle class bases, neither wishes to jeopardize its current office holders by changing the system. The authors cite the 11 House subcommittee chairs who voted against Clinton's economic package without penalty as evidence of the lack of party discipline. The more recent NAFTA vote shows even more clearly how fragmented the parties are. Walter Dean Burnham's argument that the party of non-voters is made up of those who would vote socialist in European democracies seems apropos.

Thus, it is surprising that the author's recommendations do not include the possibility of a third party. Instead they argue for strengthening the current parties to allow them to mobilize the voters more fully. Unfortunately, as they concede, conservatives fear losing the votes of poor and racial minorities while liberals are apprehensive about working-class whites. At best, we are likely to get only marginal changes such as the watered down "Motor Voter" law. Although Lowi and Ginsberg provide no specific ideas about how to reform the system, it is obvious that only by pressuring office holders will the electorate be able to achieve the kind of change that will make government more responsive to the public interest.

WANTED!

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

Send materials to:

John Green, Bliss Institute,
The University of Akron, Akron, OH
44325-1904.
**SPECIAL INTERESTS**

**Party Politics in the Year 2000**

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

The conference will have six main themes:

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

The conference is cosponsored by The University of Manchester, the UK Electoral Reform Society, the Ray C. Bliss Institute, the Goethe Institute, and the Party of European Socialists. Participants will include William Croatty, Gerald Pomper, Richard Katz, Robert Harmel, Kay Lawson, Peter Mair, Karen Beckwith, Alan Ware, Jean Charlot, Ferdinand Muller-Rommel, Wolfgang Muller, Pippa Norris, Diane Salisbury, Lars Savand, and Daniel Shea, among others.

For more information, please contact David M. Farrell and Ian Holliday, Department of Government, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK, or Kenneth Janda, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA.

---

**Erratum**

The editor mistakenly identified the affiliation of Grigorii V. Golosov in Volume 12, Issue 3. Grigorii V. Golosov is an Associate Professor at Novosibirsk State University in Russia.

---

**1994 POP Awards**

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

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


**SCOTT AINSWORTH**, winner of the Emerging Scholars Award.