The Democrats’ “Goldwater Moment”

John Kenneth White
John J. Zogby

From January to March 2003, Zogby International began polling likely caucus and primary participants in the three earliest Democratic presidential contests - Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina-as well as nationally. These surveys were designed to explore the mood of the Democratic electorate prior to next year's balloting. Voters in these states will assume greater importance than usual, since the 2004 nomination calendar is the most compressed ever devised. Thus, the outcomes of these early races will carry considerable weight in the dozens of primaries and caucuses that immediately follow, and these results should determine the Democratic nominee-a contest likely to be over by March 10, 2004.

Thus far, voters have not focused on the candidates. Indeed, for the vast majority of likely voters, the contenders remain unknowns. The results in South Carolina are typical; 85 percent say they never heard of Wesley Clark; Dennis Kucinich, 84 percent; Howard Dean, 81 percent; Carol Moseley-Braun, 60 percent; Bob Graham, 54 percent; John Kerry 53 percent; Richard Gephardt, 32 percent; Joe Lieberman, 26 percent. Indeed, in the early go-rounds, it is well-known candidates—Lieberman, Kerry, and Gephardt—who lead the pack.

While support for the candidates remains soft (three-quarters say they could change their minds by election day), the electorate’s mood is easy to detect. Democrats do not like how George W. Bush is handling his job as president, and they disagree profoundly with his prescriptions for the economy and dealing with the war on terror. In the latest Iowa poll (completed in late April), 71 percent say Bush is doing a fair or poor job; only 28 percent give him excellent or good marks. The results elsewhere are similar: 74 percent of likely New Hampshire rate Bush negatively; in South Carolina, 63 percent give him a fair or poor rating. It may be that the phrase “Bush Democrat” will become an oxymoron by Election Day.

One primary reason for the Democrats’ antipathy toward George W. Bush is the war against Iraq. Large majorities of Democrats—including South Carolina Democrats—strongly opposed the war. Rather than armed combat, Democrats overwhelmingly favored giving United Nations inspectors more time to find the supposed weapons of mass destruction (see Table 1). Unlike George H. W. Bush, who secured strong bipartisan support for the Persian Gulf War, Democrats did not see a compelling need for this war and were loath to support it. Interestingly, in a second round of Iowa polling conducted in late April after the war ended, 54 percent believe their party should select someone who did support the war—proving the wisdom of the old adage, “Nothing succeeds like success.”

(Continued on page 2)
FROM HEADQUARTERS

Dear Colleagues:

The response to POP's new Proposal Review Service has been very positive. I am sending out this message to remind you about the service and to encourage faculty to volunteer to participate.

The PRS gives graduate students who are registered POP members an opportunity to receive feedback on a dissertation proposal from a faculty member outside their department. This is, obviously, intended not to replace evaluations from within a student's department, but to give the student a mechanism to have another set of scholarly eyes read and comment on the proposal.

Interested grad students will send their proposal to POP. We will send the proposal to a faculty member who has agreed to be one of POP-PRS's reviewers. The faculty member will return the proposal to POP and it will then be returned to the student. This way, we will be able to monitor that proposals are in fact being evaluated in a timely manner. In addition, this process allows for complete anonymity if the two participants prefer that.

Instructions for grad students: Grad students who wish to have a proposal reviewed will mail a hardcopy of the proposal to Professor John M. Bruce, Department of Political Science, 302 Deupree Hall, P.O. Box 1848, University of Mississippi, University MS 38677-1848. If you wish to remain anonymous, do not put your name on the hardcopy (but, of course, supply your name and mailing address to John).

Instructions for faculty: Faculty, we need your help. If you would be willing to serve as a reviewer for PRS, please let John Bruce know at jbruce@olemiss.edu. Provide your mailing address and indicate the areas in which you would be willing to consider proposals. John will do his best to match up proposals with the interests you have listed. We will send you at most one proposal a year, so that this does not become overly burdensome. After you have reviewed the proposal, return your evaluation to John, who will send it to the grad student. As with the grad student, you may choose to remain anonymous or not: it is up to you.

We hope this service provides valuable assistance to grad students in the POP community.

Regards,
John Coleman, POP Chair

POP Award Winners

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: Jo Freeman, A Room at a Time: How Women Entered Party Politics (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).

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: Daniel Tichenor and Richard Harris, “Organized Interests and American Political Development.” Political Science Quarterly 117 (Winter 2002-03), 587-612.

Samuel Eldersveld Award, honoring a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field: Kay Lawson, San Francisco State University.

Emerging Scholar Award, honoring a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last five years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise: Daniel Tichenor, Rutgers University.

POP/Party Politics Award, honoring the best paper presented at a POP-sponsored panel at the previous APSA meeting: Byron Shafer and Richard Johnston, “Economic Development, Legal Desegregation, and Partisan Change in the Postwar South.”

POP Short Courses, APSA, 2003

I. TOOLS FOR COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON POLITICAL PARTIES - THE STUDY OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN WESTERN EUROPE.

Convener: Prof. Thomas Poguntke

CONTENT:

- Parties as an object of research: How to get information from political parties.
- Coping with language barriers: Standardized approaches (e.g. coding techniques, survey data, quantitative organizational data).
- Quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of political parties.
- Parties as campaign organizations.
- Methodological problems in comparative research on parties.

The course will address practical problems related to research on political parties in Western Europe and include the following presentations (each followed by time for questioning and discussion):

Prof. Thomas Poguntke, Keele University, UK: Parties as an object of research: How to get information from political parties.
Prof. David Farrell, Manchester University, UK: Parties as campaign organizations.
Prof. Robert Harmel, Texas A&M, USA: Standardized approaches: Coping with language barriers (e.g. coding, techniques, quantitative organizational data).
Dr. Karina Pedersen, University of Copenhagen, DK: Survey research on political parties: mail surveys.
Prof. Thomas Poguntke, Keele University, UK: Identify and Equivalence in comparative research on parties.

CONTACT DETAILS:

Prof. Dr. Thomas Poguntke, School of Politics, International Relations and the Environment (SPIRE), Keele University, Staffs, ST5 5BG, UK, phone: 0044-1782-583591, fax: 0044-1782-583592, Email: t.poguntke@keele.ac.uk, http://www.keele.ac.uk/depts/spire/

There is no charge for the course, but participants should pre-register with John Bruce at jbruce@olemiss.edu. Registration forms will also appear in the summer issue of PS.
II. A METHODOLOGY FOR STUDYING CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS.

Participants: Paul S. Herrnson, University of Maryland
David B. Magleby, Brigham Young University
L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College
Joseph Quin Monson, Brigham Young University
Darrell M. West, Brown University

CONTACT: Joseph Quin Monson, CSED, 112 KMB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; Email: csed@byu.edu or 801-422-3716.

REGISTRATION: No fee, but please register in advance with csed@byu.edu or 801-422-3716.

Recent years have seen an increase in the variety of methods used to study congressional elections from quantitative surveys of congressional campaigns to collaborative case study research. This short course will include presentations by the principle investigators of several prominent studies of congressional elections who will discuss their methods and techniques. The purpose of the course is to broaden the understanding of innovative techniques and help participants think more broadly about data collection and analysis strategies in their research, including the mixed methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative techniques and creative approaches to data collection and analysis that employs actors to answer the research question at hand. The course will equip attendees with a wide variety of tools for studying elections as well as tips for executing a large collaborative research project. In addition, the presenters will place emphasis on how the methods used in their projects can productively be applied in other settings such as interest group decision-making, state party operations, candidate recruitment, legislative redistricting, PAC decision-making, state policy making processes, and gubernatorial elections.

David Magleby and Quin Monson will discuss a systematic collaborative fieldwork methodology they used to study party soft money and interest group issue advocacy activities in presidential primaries and congressional elections.

Scholars from congressional districts around the country were recruited to follow a common methodology in collecting data for a case study. The methodology included elite interviews as well as data from media outlets on advertising buys and expenditures. A "reconnaissance network" was established to gather political data and track political telephone calls and personal contacts. Survey data were also collected in selected districts. Sandy Maisel and Darrell West will discuss their research coordinating a team of scholars looking at the content of the discourse in campaigns in a series of congressional and senatorial races. They developed a detailed protocol that permitted scholars across the nation to observe and analyze ads, mailings, news coverage, debates, and Websites through a similar lens. Paul Herrnson will discuss how to use surveys, interviews, and case studies to learn about candidate campaign organizations and strategies, and party and interest group assistance in issue and opposition research, campaign communications, fund-raising, and other aspects of congressional campaigning. These data allow an "insider's perspective" on the nature of congressional elections and comparisons among campaigns waged by incumbents, challengers, and candidates for open seats; campaigns in competitive and uncompetitive contests; and campaigns waged by Democrats and Republicans. In addition to the presenters, the format will also involve scholars who have participated in these studies at the state/district level in assessing these approaches.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 29:

10:00 a.m. 35-4 Interest Advocacy in Comparative Perspective
Chair: William A. Maloney, University of Aberdeen
Authors: "Lobbyists and Lobbying Practices Across Western Democracies: Same Preliminary Findings." Clive S. Thomas, University of Alaska.
### TABLE 1

**Democratic Candidates and the War Against Iraq (in percentages).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE PLATFORM</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>National Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zogby International polls, January - March 2003

The economy remains a source of considerable grievance, and Democrats are strongly inclined to nominate someone who will draw closer to the voters' sentiment with George W. Bush on this issue. Democrats believe that Bush has failed to keep the well-to-do and they reject plans from Republican hardliners to cut social programs. Thus, when given a choice between a hypothetical Candidate A, who opposes the President's tax cut and says that under Bush this country is facing a class struggle between the super-rich and the working classes, and Candidate B, who also dislikes the President's tax cut but generally avoids talk about a class struggle, Candidate A decisively wins in all three states (see Table 2).

### TABLE 2

**Democrats and Tax Policy, Early Contest States (in percentages).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE PLATFORM</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>National Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zogby International polls, January - March 2003

The Democratic party's single-minded focus on the economy and economic targets are presented in several hypothetical scenarios for deciding on the presidency. Democrats prefer the candidate who emphasizes the economy (see Table 1). Bill Clinton's famous 1992 slogan, "It's the economy, stupid," only gained traction in the voters' mind in the current competing contest. Democrats believe that economic revitalization should be the top priory. A two-pronged campaign was evident in Table 2.

---

**FROM THE FIELD**

**POP MEMBERS SAVE 30% ON PARTY POLITICS**

Members of POP are entitled to a 30% discount on an individual subscription to Party Politics. Party Politics is published six times a year (in January, March, May, July, September, and November).

In 2003 the special discounted rates are as follows:
- **One year Subscription:** US $48
  (Usual rate: US $69)
- **Two year Subscription:** US $89
  (Usual rate: US $138)

Please mention that you are a member of POP (APSA) when ordering by telephone or post. If renewing your subscription, please deduct 30% from the individual renewal rate printed on the order form and indicate that you are a POP (APSA) member.

Members in the USA, Canada, Latin America, and Asia may contact: SAGE Publications, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320, USA. Tel: +1-805-499-0721, Fax: +1-805-499-0871.

Members in the UK, Europe, Middle East, Africa, and Australia may contact: SAGE Publications, 6 Bonhill Street, London EC2A 4PU, UK. Tel: +44 (0)20-7330-1338, Fax: +44 (0)20-7330-1269.

More information is available at: www.partypolitics.org.

---

**VOX POP NEWSLETTER ARCHIVE**

http://www3.uakron.edu/bliss/voxpop

The on-line Vox Pop newsletter archive has undergone a few changes to make the collection more accessible. Previous editions of the newsletter are available in Adobe PDF files. In the past, the files were very large and difficult to download without a broadband Internet connection. Each file has been reformatted to reduce the size. Also, a text search can be made within each file.

Thanks to Internet search engine Google, a search can be made on the entire Vox Pop archive. Instructions are available on the Vox Pop web page. We are currently working on a more effective and integrated search feature. Watch for future improvements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE PLATFORM</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>National Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate A</strong> says that fighting the war on terror is the most important problem the next president will face. This candidate believes that the war is not going well, and that even greater emphasis must be placed on destroying the al Qaeda network and Osama bin Laden. In this new war, sacrifice on the part of the American people will be necessary. This includes foregoing prospective tax cuts and instituting some form of mandatory public service on the part of young Americans, including the potential re-institution of a military draft.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate B</strong> says that while winning the war on terror is important, the economy remains the most significant issue facing the country. Candidate B believes we need a president who will focus on the needs of ordinary citizens. This candidate believes the Bush administration’s economic policies are skewed toward the wealthy and must be redesigned to help poor and middle-class working Americans.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate C</strong> strongly supports President Bush’s prospective war against Iraq. This candidate believes that terrorism must be stopped before it gains a foothold in countries like Iraq. At home, Candidate C strongly supported the creation of a Department of Homeland Security. In addition, this candidate believes that family values need to be strengthened. That includes fostering a new partnership between religious institutions and government to help serve those in need.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate D</strong> believes that the problem facing the Democratic party today is that it has become too much like the Republican party. Candidate D believes that the Democratic party must return to its liberal roots, including using big government to help solve some of the country’s most important problems.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate E</strong> says it is time for new leadership within the Democratic party. New leaders can offer fresh perspectives, including establishing partnerships between the federal government and the private sector to help meet the economic needs of the middle class. A new, fresh face gives the Democrats the best opportunity for beating President Bush in 2004.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate F</strong> says that experience counts. Having worked within the halls of Congress will give the next Democratic president an important boost in getting a legislative program adopted. Candidate F reminds Democrats that outsiders, especially President Jimmy Carter, are often ineffective in getting their legislative programs adopted. Experience counts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FROM THE FIELD

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF POLITICAL CONSULTANTS AND THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
RAY C. BLISS INSTITUTE OF APPLIED POLITICS

present

THE 4TH ANNUAL ACADEMIC OUTREACH CONFERENCE
“MAKING DEMOCRACY HAPPEN”

October 2-4, 2003
Crowne Plaza Quaker Square
Akron, Ohio

The annual Academic Outreach Conference provides a forum for students, academics, and professionals to discuss professional political consulting and public affairs. Career trends, technical expertise, and ethical issues are explored throughout the conference.

A Mentoring Program will be established at the conference to connect students with professionals to provide career advice and guidance.

Registration information is available at www.theaaco.org.

Student scholarship and academic group rate packages are available on a first-come, first-serve basis at www.winningpolitics.com/aaco.
When the data are closely analyzed, Democrats seem to be on the verge of experiencing a "Goldwater Moment." They want someone who will stand up for what he or she believes, regardless of the consequences. This Goldwater moment is fueled by the widespread belief that George W. Bush will be victorious no matter who the Democrats nominate. With less than two years remaining before the general election, 62 percent of Iowans and 60 percent of New Hampshirites and South Carolinians believe Bush will win. These figures should not be taken lightly, since Americans are often good prognosticators. Just prior to the 2000 balloting, for example, 49 percent expected George W. Bush to win; 33 percent said Al Gore would prevail.¹

This sense of impending presidential loss is eerily similar to 1964, when many Republicans instinctively knew that Democrat Lyndon B. Johnson was not going to be defeated should he decide to seek the presidency in his own right. While Johnson has qualms that his Texas origins would prevent his election (no Southerner since Zachary Taylor back in 1850 had won the presidency), there was no way following the Kennedy assassination that the country would accept having three different presidents in fifteen months. This would remain true, even if the Republicans had selected a more palatable general election candidate such as New York governor Nelson A. Rockefeller or Pennsylvania governor William Scranton, instead of the pugnacious Arizona senator Barry Goldwater, who was widely disliked and feared. Given the current Democratic despair over recapturing the presidency, it seems that primary voters are intent on nominating someone who speaks to their issue concerns. And, in that regard, they want someone who is diametrically opposed to the foreign and domestic policies advocated by Bush. Many Democrats would welcome a candidate who adopted a variant of Goldwater's 1964 slogan: "A Choice, Not an Echo."

The results of the 2002 midterm elections strengthened the Democrats' resolve. Last year, most strategists contended that a debilitated economy coupled with scandals on Wall Street would be enough to maintain Democratic control of the Senate; win additional House seats, and pick up lots of important governorships. None of that happened. Democrats forgot that the opposition party must do more than just criticize. In 1992, when the economy was foremost among voter concerns, Bill Clinton not only picked apart the elder Bush's job performance; he outlined a comprehensive economic plan in a book entitled Putting People First. Clinton convinced just enough voters that he had a clear vision for curing the economic maladies of that time. Democrats did not do that in 2002, and they paid a heavy price at the polls.

This time, Democrats are looking for substance. They want someone who will focus on the economy "like a laser beam," to use Clinton's phrase. And they are not afraid to select a candidate who will make the case that Bush's policies are skewed toward the rich. Democrats believe that the next president should be a communitarian, not a libertarian. In bumper sticker politics, the slogan is simple: "We, not me." That may not be a winning line, but it is one designed to offer a choice, not an echo.

John Kenneth White is a Professor of Politics at the Catholic University of America and author of The Values Divide: American Politics and Culture in Transition which has just been published by Chatham House.


¹CBS News/New York Times, poll, November 1-4, 2000. Test of question: "Regardless of how you intend to vote, who do you expect to finally win the presidential election in November—Al Gore or George W. Bush?" Gore, 33 percent; Bush 39 percent; don't know/no answer, 18 percent.

---

**SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS**

**THE AMERICAN CONGRESS**
http://congress.wustl.edu

The new addition of this textbook is available on-line at no charge. That's right, the on-line textbook is free. The new edition is co-authored with Jason Roberts and Ryan Vander Wielen. Six chapters are available now; all others will be on-line within a few weeks.

Features of the new on-line edition:
- All chapters are available separately in PDF format.
- Instructors and students just download and read.
- All chapters are up-to-date and will be kept up-to-date on-line.
- Links to congressional sources important for lectures and research projects are on-line.
- An excellent set of recent, readable essays and conference papers is always on-line in PDF format.
- A battery of test questions for each chapter will be on-line.

The on-line version of *The American Congress* is a project of the Weidenbaum Center on the Economy, Government, and Public Policy, Washington University in St. Louis.
“Advocacy Communities in the United States and the European Union.” Christine Mahoney, Pennsylvania State University.


**Discussant:** R. Daniel Kelemen, Rutgers University

---

**4:15 p.m. 35-10 Party Adaptation and Partisanship**

**Chair:** John A. Clark, Western Michigan University

**Authors:**

- "Is There a Role of Party Beyond Partisanship?” John M. Bruce, University of Mississippi.
- "Changing the Calculus of Running: Party Adaptation and Congressional Primaries.” Justin Taylor, Ohio State University.

**Discussant:** Kevin S. Price, University of Washington

---

**SATURDAY, AUGUST 30:**

**8:00 a.m. 35-9 Parties, Party Elites, and Mass Beliefs about Parties**

**Chair:** M. Margaret Conway, University of Florida

**Authors:**

- "Political Party Behavior and Political Trust in Contemporary Democracies.” Aida Paskeviciute, Binghamton University and Christopher J. Anderson, SUNY, Binghamton University.
- "Political Parties as Signaling Agents in the Postreform Era.” Alan Rozzi, University of California, Los Angeles.

**Discussant:** Hans Noel, University of California, Los Angeles

---

**10:00 a.m. 35-5 Party Roles in Campaign Finance**

**Chair:** Linda L. Fowler, Dartmouth College

**Authors:**

- "Building Intra-Party Coalitions with Leadership PACs.” Justin Buchler, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Leadership PACs in Congressional Campaigns: Long-Run Party Building versus Short-Run Ambition.” Matthew Potoski and Robert C. Lowry, Iowa State University.

---

**2:15 p.m. 35-8 New Perspectives in Interest Group Mobilization**

**Chair:** Scott H. Ainsworth, University of Georgia

**Authors:**

- "Governmental Agendas as Mobilizers of Interest Advocacy.” Virginia H. Gray and David L. Lowery, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- "The Dynamics of a Disturbance.” Matt Grossman, University of California, Berkeley.

**Discussant:** Timothy M. LaPira, Rutgers University

---

**4:15 p.m. 35-7 Strategies and Motivations for Advocacy**

**Chair:** Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas

**Authors:**

- "Doing Good, Doing Well: The Professionalization of Advocacy.” Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas.
- "Closer to a Pluralist Heaven” Women’s, Racial Minority, and Economic Justice Advocacy Groups and the Politics of Representation.” Dara Z. Strovloitch, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- "To Lobby or Not to Lobby? And How? Washington Interest Group Representatives’ Advocacy Decisions.” Rogan Kersh, Syracuse University.

**Discussant:** Jeffrey M. Berry, Tufts University

---

**SUNDAY, AUGUST 31:**

**8:00 a.m. 35-1 New Perspectives on Parties and Political Organizations in the American States**

**10:00 a.m. 35-11 Participation, Democracy and Organizations**

**Chair:** Christine DeGregorio, American University

**Authors:**

- "Democratic Participation Among Poor Empowerment Groups.” Heidi J. Swarts, Syracuse University.
- "Examining Membership in Nonprofit Organizations.” Elizabeth Reid, The Urban Institute.
- "Opportunities for Influence in Interest Groups in the United States.” Maryann Barakso, American University.
- "Participatory Democracy: The Bridge from Civil Rights to Women's Rights.” Julie Clements, American University.

**Discussant:** Anne N. Costain, University of Colorado, Boulder
FROM THE FIELD
RECENT ARTICLES IN PARTY POLITICS
Volume 9 Issue 2 - Publication Date: March 1, 2003

ARTICLES:
The Nationalization of Parties and Party Systems: An empirical Measure and an Application to the Americas, Mark P. Jones (Michigan State University, USA) and Scott Mainwaring (University of Notre Dame, USA)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030835.html

Species of Political Parties: A New Typology, Richard Gunther (Hoover Institution, USA) and Larry Diamond (Ohio State University, USA)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030836.html

Taming Labour's MEPs, William B. Messmer (Drew University, Madison, USA)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab028136.html

Predestined Parties? Organizational Change in Norwegian Political Parties, Knut Heidar (University of Oslo, Norway) and Jo Saglie (Institute for Social Research, Norway)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030838.html

The Rise of a Global Party? American Party Organizations Abroad, Taylor Dark III (Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab030837.html

BOOK REVIEWS:
Larry, Desmond and Richard Gunther (eds), Political Parties and Democracy, reviewed by Kenneth Janda.

Nikiforos Diamandouros, P. and Richard Gunther, Parties, Politics, and Democracy in the New Southern Europe, reviewed by Caterina Paolucci.

Volume 9 Issue 03 - Publication Date: May 1, 2003

ARTICLES:
Two-and-a-half-Party Systems and the Comparative Role of the 'Half', Alan Staroff (University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032203.html

Constructing the Number of Parties, Patrick Dunleavy and Françoise Boucek (London School of Economics, London, UK)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032204.html

Partisanship, Performance and Personality: Competing and Complementary Characterizations of the 2001 British General Election, John Bartle (University of Essex, UK)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032205.html

The Impact of Electoral Rule Change on Party Campaign Strategy: Hong Kong as a Case Study, Ngok Ma (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong) and Chi-keung Choy (City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032206.html

After the Divorce: Social Democrats and Trade Unions in Sweden, Nicholas Aylott (Umea University, Sweden)
http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journals/details/issue/abstract/ab032207.html

BOOK REVIEWS:

Forster, Anthony, Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties Since 1945, reviewed by Mark Health.


Rose, Richard and Neil Munro, Elections Without Order: Russia's Challenge to Vladimir Putin, reviewed by Matthew Wyman.


Grzymala-Busse, Anna, Redeeming the Communist Past: The Regeneration of Communist Parties in East Central Europe, reviewed by Sean Hanley.