

VOX POP

Newsletter of

Political
Organizations/
Parties

Continuing Subfield of the American Political Science Association

CHAIR, 1981- Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University

SECRETARY, 1982- Andrew Nathan, Columbia University

Vol. 1, No. 3 Northwestern University; Evanston, Illinois 60201

Fall, 1982

1982 POP Business Meeting and Elections

The fourth annual business meeting of Political Organizations/Parties was held in Denver on September 4 in conjunction with the 1982 Convention of the American Political Science Association. It was attended by about 25 members and prospective members. The major substantive issue discussed at the meeting was the APSA's new policy on Official Sections and POP's interest in petitioning for Section status. This matter is treated separately in the next item of VOX POP. Other topics discussed included our name change from "Parties and Other Political Organizations" (POPO) to "Political Organizations/Parties" (POP), which was approved by consent, and the proposed journal, Political Organization, which is also treated separately below.

The business meeting also resulted in election of officers for 1982-83. Our founder and Secretary, Kay Lawson (San Francisco State), felt that someone else should now serve as Secretary, and Andrew Nathan (Columbia) was elected to succeed her. Kenneth Janda (Northwestern) was willing to continue for another year, and he was elected to succeed himself. Janda requested and received permission from POP members to create an Executive Committee to make major decisions between Business Meetings. POP now has the benefit of counsel from these distinguished students of political organizations who have agreed to serve as the POP Executive Committee for 1982-83:

WILLIAM CROTTY, Northwestern University
ROBERT HUCKSHORN, Florida Atlantic University
JOYCE GELB, City College of New York
KAY LAWSON, San Francisco State University
LAWRENCE LONGLEY, Lawrence University
DAVID MAYHEW, Yale University
GERALD POMPER, Rutgers University
FRANK SORAUF, University of Minnesota

Should POP Become a Section of the APSA?

The Council of the American Political Science Association, meeting at the 1982 Convention in Denver, made its long-awaited decision to recognize subfield interest groups, such as POP, as Official Sections of the APSA, providing they meet certain criteria and petition for section status. This action was the main topic of the POP business meeting later at the convention. Although the POP Business Meeting was well-attended, we decided to put the decision to the full membership through VOX POP. The matter is discussed below, and a questionnaire seeking your response is included at the end of the newsletter. Please study the issue and return the questionnaire promptly.

Proposed benefits of Section Status: The Association's staff would assume responsibility for maintenance of membership lists and would handle membership mailings. News of POP activities would be reported in a special section of PS, perhaps eliminating the need for a separate newsletter. Convention panels organized by Official Sections would be given preferential treatment in the convention program, rather than being relegated to an "unaffiliated groups" section. Indeed, there is no guarantee that the APSA will continue to publish a courtesy listing of unaffiliated groups. Similarly, Official Sections would be guaranteed meeting rooms at the convention, whereas these may not be given to unaffiliated groups. In the future, it is possible that relevant sections in the Convention Program would be "subcontracted" to the Official Sections, rather than handled by rotating Section Chairs as present. Finally, there is the possibility of APSA sponsorship of specialized journals reflecting special Section interests.

Costs of Section Status: The APSA would require all members of Sections to be members of the APSA, but there is a possibility of establishing a separate level of affiliation for foreign members and non-professional political scientists (e.g., journalists). APSA members would be charged at least \$3.00 extra for membership in each Official Section, with any amount in excess of \$3.00 going to the Section. Because the Association collects dues on a quarterly basis, changeover to an APSA-based membership would take at least one year. Finally, activities of Sections would be reviewable by a new committee on Sections of the APSA Council.

Procedures for Attaining Section Status: Any group contemplating Section status must have at least one elected officer to be financially responsible and an elected executive committee or governing council. The group must file a petition stating the group's purpose and the desire to affiliate with the APSA. This petition must be signed by 100 members who agree to belong to the group within the APSA. The APSA Council would consider the petition at its next meeting (scheduled for March or April).

Discussion of Section Status: Most of the sentiment expressed at the Business Meeting was in favor of affiliation with the APSA, but there were some questions. Who would control the setting of minimum dues to the APSA? Presumably, this would be the APSA Council, but it is expected that the Council would come to reflect the presence of Official Sections with interests in holding down the APSA share. How much dues over the APSA minimum would be accepted by POP members -- \$0, \$2, \$5? How many members of POP, if any, would we eventually lose by requiring that members belong to the APSA? We seek answers to these questions via the questionnaire at the end of this newsletter.

We will report these responses in the Winter issue of VOX POP, when we will hold a vote on the issue of seeking Section Status. It should be pointed out that official status within the APSA was an original objective of POP. It should also be mentioned that the Legislative Studies Group already decided to affiliate with the APSA. Despite the sentiment for affiliation at our Business Meeting, it was felt that this decision required broader participation by the membership. We would like to have your opinions expressed when you return the questionnaire.

POP Financial Report

POP is in relatively good financial shape. Not only has our membership increased to 231, but most of our members are dues-paying and in good standing for 1982. Here are the figures reported at the Business Meeting:

Revenue:

Balance on September, 1981	\$108.0	
Membership Dues in 1981-82	372.64	
Total Revenue		\$480.64

Expenses:

Long distance telephone calls	\$ 13.84	
Reproduction of Newsletters	164.20	
Postage and mailing	79.10	
Total Expenses		\$257.24
Balance as of August 13, 1982		\$223.40

Panels at the 1983 APSA Convention

Kay Lehman Schlozman (Boston College) will chair the section on "Political Parties and Interest Groups" at the 1983 Convention in Chicago on September 1-4. Building on the idea of "state of the field" papers included in the sections at the past convention, she has invited Jack Walker (Michigan) to prepare an evaluation of research on pressure groups. Professor Schlozman reports that there are still openings for papers and participants on her panels, and she invites inquiries from POP members. Here is Schlozman's statement concerning her plans for her section of panels on Political Parties and Interest Groups:

This section will be concerned with the various extra-governmental organizations which attempt to influence political outcomes in a democracy. Among such organizations are not only those that have traditionally served to represent collective citizen interests, political parties and interest groups, but also those that have emerged more recently--for example, candidate campaign and finance organizations, political action committees, and law, public relations and consulting firms that handle government relations for their clients. Papers may focus on a range of subjects: the origins and development of such organizations; internal problems of organizational maintenance and democracy; the multiple ways in which these organizations attempt to influence the electoral process and public policy making; the laws and norms that govern their activities; their impact on electoral and policy outcomes; their meaning for democratic governance.

Although the primary emphasis in this section will be on contemporary American politics, historical and comparative treatments of these topics are welcomed.

Among the panels presently contemplated are a panel on business organizations in politics; one on local party organizations; and one on interest groups representing political have-nots. In addition, a teaching panel or roundtable on the problems encountered when students work in campaigns as part of their work in American politics courses may be included in this section.

Prospective participants should direct inquiries to Professor Kay Lehman Schlozman; Department of Political Science; Boston College; Chestnut Hill, MA 02167.

Special POP Panel at the 1983 APSA Convention

As in recent years, POP will again sponsor its own panel at the APSA Convention to complement the offerings of the Official Program on political parties and interest groups. The panel in 1983 will be organized by Andrew Nathan, POP Secretary. It will concern "Political Organizations in Comparative Perspective." Nathan is soliciting papers dealing with cross-national or comparative studies of political organizations or case studies of political organizations, including parties, in countries other than the United States. Prospective participants are invited to write to Professor Andrew Nathan; Department of Political Science; Columbia University; New York, New York 10027. He can also be phoned to discuss papers or participation at (212) 280-3076.

The Status of POP's Proposed Journal

The Spring issue of VOX POP traced the history of POP's efforts to create a new journal, Political Organization, which reflected the interests of POP's members. Acting on a proposal by Kay Lawson and Jerome Mileur (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), MIT Press conducted a market analysis, which favorably evaluated the proposal, but MIT reluctantly declined to publish it due to existing commitments. At MIT's suggestion and with supporting materials, I wrote eight other publishers during the summer. Some were not at all interested, others indicated interest only if the publication were subsidized, and only the University of Wisconsin Press wrote to say it was still considering the proposal. Subsequently, I contacted Northwestern University, which has recently emerged from a deep sleep, and received some encouragement. NU Press is at present considering our proposal for a scholarly journal, and I will report developments in the next issue of VOX POP.

At the POP Business Meeting this September, Ralph Goldman (San Francisco State) proposed that we consider publishing a different kind of journal. I asked him to write up his ideas for VOX POP, and he kindly responded with the contribution below. I invite reactions to his proposal.

A "Slick" Periodical for POP?

by Ralph Goldman

Scholarly journals of the quarterly publication type continue to proliferate. Library and professional subscription budgets continue to shrink. New forms and media for publishing scientific and scholarly research, e.g., microfiche, computer files, etc., continue to develop. Perhaps this is an opportune time for POP to think of alternatives to the standard academic journal as its publishing vehicle. Perhaps POP should try to break out of the tiny professional readership and reach for additional audiences that may be ready to be informed about our fascinating subject-matter in a popular and readable periodical format. The model I have in mind is Psychology Today.

Let me reaffirm my support for Political Organization as proposed by Kay Lawson and Jerome Mileur, for all the reasons recognized by the referees who commented to MIT Press: a growing subfield of political science; a distinct area of scholarship; a need to encourage first-rate research in this field; etc. However, I have long pondered the larger need for bringing the educated public, journalists, academics outside the political science / sociology / history network, officials of political organizations and parties, and others closer to the exciting topics and research we do. After all, parties, interest groups, political movements, neighborhood organizations, etc. are among the most dynamic features of political life, and only two or three David Broders carry systematic knowledge about them beyond the halls of academe. What Psychology Today has done for that discipline should be the goal of a comparable Political Organization Today.

Admittedly, this is a whole other enterprise than what Kay and Jerry propose, requiring much more money, readership, market analysis, advertising budgets, and all the rest. We have the subject-matter and the knowledge. We probably have the reportorial and writing talent concealed behind those journal articles. What may be worth looking for is an enterprising and experienced publisher who can tell use more about the tribulations and triumphs of "slick" publications.

International Society of Political Psychology

Members of POP will be pleased to learn that James MacGregor Burns (Williams College), a POP member, has assumed office as President of the International Society of Political Psychology. The ISPP has a strong interest in political organizations, especially political parties, analyzed both from organizational and psychological perspectives. The Society next meets in annual convention in Oxford University, July 19-22, 1983. Some members of POP might want to attend and can receive information from Professor Betty Glad; Department of Political Science; 361 Lincoln Hall; University of Illinois; Urbana, Illinois 61801.

Call for Papers at the 1983 Midwest Convention

Robert Huckfeldt (Notre Dame) is organizing a section Parties, Voting, and Elections at the 1983 Midwest Political Science Convention, which will be held April 20-23 in Chicago. He writes:

In addition to topics traditionally covered within the section, I would especially welcome suggestions for papers and panels that are concerned with (1) the role of social influence in electoral politics, (2) the ties between individuals and groups in electoral politics, and (3) the dynamic structure of either long-term or short-term electoral change. Any and all suggestions are of course welcome, and a range of panels will be organized, both on the basis of theoretical issues and on the basis of topical concerns in electoral politics. Suggestions for papers and panels will be accepted until December 1.

The 1983 Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association

Members of POP will be interested in learning the papers scheduled for delivery on panels dealing with "Political Parties and Interest Groups" at the Southern Political Science Association, October 28-30.

Political Money: Party and PAC

JOHN C. GREEN, Furman

"Interest Group Campaign Contributions: Old Dogs, New Tricks, and New Dogs"

KEVIN L. MCKEOGH, Northern Illinois

"Business PACs and Rising Conservatism in Congress"

RUTH S. JONES, Arizona State

"Campaign Financing in the States, 1980"

WILLIAM A. BOYD and BRUCE HICKS, Emory

"Political Party and Interest Group Campaign Contributions in State Legislative Elections: The Case of Wisconsin and Georgia"

Political Parties in the 1980's

FREDERICK PAUL LEE, North Carolina--Chapel Hill

"The Strength of Party Identification among Party Activists: 1976-1980"

RODERICK A. MUNDY, JR., MacMurray College

"The Emergence of the Sixth Party System"

DANIEL M. RUSSELL, Mt. Holyoke

"Party Organizing Strategies for Low Income Participation"

Interest Group Politics in the Reagan Era

MICHAEL MUMPER, Maryland

"The Politization of Higher Education: Interest Groups and Policy Redefinition in the Reagan Era"

EHSAN H. FERAZ, Chicago

"A Group Theories Approach to the Process of Financial Accounting Standards Setting"

ROBERT D. HOLSWORTH, Virginia Commonwealth
"Christian Activism and the New Peace Movement"

Interest Groups in the States and Cities

GLENN ABNEY, Georgia State, and THOMAS P. LAUTH, Georgia
"Interest Group Influence in City Policymaking: The Views of
Administrators"

JACK E. BIZZEL, Morehead State
"The Legislator and the Legislative Agent"

PETER J. BERGERSON, Southeast Missouri State
"Toward and Understanding of a Change Agent's Role in the
Innovation-Diffusion Process: a Case Study of the Legal
Community's Role in the State Policy Process"

The American Political Foundation

If they don't already, members of POP should know about the American Political Foundation, a bipartisan tax-exempt organization formed in 1979 to promote communication and understanding between the American parties and democratic parties and groups elsewhere in the world. Its main officers are George Agree (President), co-author of Political Money; William E. Brock (Chairman), former Chairman of the Republican National Committee; Charles T. Mannat (Vice Chairman), Chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Cecil M. Cheves (Treasurer), former Counsel of the Democratic National Committee; and Ben Cotten (Secretary), former Chief Counsel of the Republican National Committee.

The Foundation is based in Washington, D.C. It describes its activities as

providing briefings, appointments, and other assistance to foreign parliamentary, political, and academic visitors to the United States. It has invited groups of foreign party representatives to a series of Washington seminars and interviews with party and governmental representatives. It responds to invitations to send Republican and Democratic observers to annual or other congresses of foreign political parties. In addition, it sponsors and conducts missions by American party representatives to meetings of international party organizations and groups of specialists to study aspects of foreign political systems (such as campaign finance regulation) which may stimulate fresh approaches to the solutions of problems within our own system.

The APF is currently studying the feasibility of programs for developing democratic forces abroad, focusing on the attendant problems as well as prospects. George Agree, APF President, has kindly contributed the following statement describing that project.

The APF Study of Democratic Assistance Abroad
by George E. Agree

The Chairmen of the Democratic and Republican parties and leaders of American business and labor have embarked on a study conducted under the auspices of the American Political Foundation to determine whether and how an American capability can be structured to deliver support to democratic forces abroad. The study was first announced by President Reagan in his June 8 Westminster speech proclaiming "a global campaign for democracy."

Mindful of the fact that the West German political party foundations over the past two decades have developed what is now a one hundred million dollar annual program of providing such support, the participants in the American study believe that similar capability can be developed in the private sector here, probably with government funding comparable to that received by the German foundations.

The German efforts were decisive in preventing a communist takeover of Portugal in the mid-1970s, and have been notably successful in easing the transition to democracy in Spain. Throughout the third world the foundations provide schools, training programs, public opinion sampling and organizational expertise, and a wide variety of other assistance to political parties, citizens' organizations, labor unions, business groups, and government development programs where local people are working to develop democracy.

The German parties are more ideological than ours. Each foundation tends to work abroad with partners who are ideologically compatible. Thus, they sometimes support competing forces in other countries. Germans welcome this as building the pluralism without which democracy has little meaning; and their assistance is accepted through most of the world because of its honest reflection of their political system.

Can the politically active sectors of American society -- our parties, businesses, labor unions, etc., -- devise means that are an honest reflection of our system?

Can we promote the attitudes, institutions, social infrastructure, and practical skills of democratic life in a way compatible with the relatively nonideological spirit of American politics?

Can we structure a set of effective programs which will command bipartisan support? Will we be able to act consistently with the basic democratic commitment of our country even though this may on occasion involve tensions with the immediate requirements of our government's foreign policy?

We are approaching the study with the conviction that the answer to all these questions and more will be affirmative. Much remains to be done. Achieving bipartisan cooperation is no small task. But everyone concerned -- in the parties, in Congress, and in the Administration -- wants this effort to succeed. All are working seriously toward the end of having answers to the many practical and policy problems by early next year, and reaching agreement on recommendations that will command wide support.

More on "Political Aid" Abroad

POP member Ralph Goldman has written a short paper that expands on the topic raised above by George Agree. In "Political Aid: Is the World Becoming Our Precinct?", Goldman sympathetically raises seven of many issues associated with foreign political aid program, which he says "is bound to be a large subject for political science." For copies, write to Professor Ralph M. Goldman; Department of Political Science; San Francisco State University; 1600 Holloway; San Francisco, CA 94132.

California Committee on Party Renewal

The California Committee on Party Renewal is an organization of scholars, political practitioners, and citizens interested in strengthening political parties. It has voted to act as litigant in a suit to eliminate excessive regulation of California's parties by the state legislature. Specifically, the group seeks to remove the following restrictions from the California Elections Code and other statutory law:

1. The ban on party organization endorsement and support for candidates for party nomination in primary elections and for candidates in nonpartisan elections.
2. Statutes prescribing the composition and selection of party slate central committees.
3. Requirements that party leadership be limited to non-consecutive two-year terms and rotate between Northern and Southern California every two years, and that the state central committee meeting in Sacramento at a specified time.

The group's rationale for this litigation is described in two short papers presenting their legal and practical arguments. If you are interested in this matter, you can write Professor Kay Lawson; California Committee for Party Renewal; Institute of Governmental Studies; 109 Moses Hall; University of California; Berkeley, CA 94720.

FEC October Summary Report for 1982 Elections

On the next page, VOX POP presents the Federal Election Commission's Financial Summary of campaign receipts and expenditures for 1981-1982 through June 30. The full tabulation is seldom published by the newspapers, and POP members should find the data illuminating. The final report of expenditures throughout the entire campaign will not be available until early 1983.

The FEC Press release that accompanied this report said:

- Eighteen-month spending figures of \$133.6 million for the 1982 Congressional races were \$30.6 million higher than Congressional election spending for the same time period in 1980.
- PAC contributions to all 1982 Congressional campaigns totalled \$34.6 million - 20% of all money raised by the candidates.

FEC PRESS OFFICE

1981-82 SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION FOR ALL CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS
(JANUARY 1, 1981 - JUNE 30, 1982)

OCTOBER 1982

CANDIDATE CATEGORY	I CONGS.	TOTAL RECEIPTS	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	LATEST CASH-ON-HAND (6/30/82)	MAJOR PARTY CONTRIB.	MAJOR PARTY EXPEND.	TOTAL PAC CONTRIB.	CORP. CONTRIB.	LABOR PAC CONTRIB.	NON-CONN. PAC CONTRIB.	W/MT PAC CONTRIB.	COOP. PAC CONTRIB.	C W/O S PAC CONTRIB.
TOTAL:		\$ 175,563,672	\$ 133,629,087	\$ 56,929,782	\$ 3,329,690	\$ 966,647	\$ 34,610,461	\$ 12,463,017	\$ 8,131,512	\$ 2,839,388	\$ 9,832,113	\$ 867,533	\$ 476,898
SENATE & HOUSE	2,020												
SENATE SUBTOTAL:	258	\$ 76,388,797	\$ 56,240,154	\$ 22,157,025	\$ 812,618	\$ 597,936	\$ 9,926,131	\$ 3,952,536	\$ 2,231,606	\$ 944,483	\$ 2,499,156	\$ 171,200	\$ 127,150
Democrat	116	\$ 39,552,877	\$ 23,769,399	\$ 16,364,884	\$ 476,400	\$ 104,850	\$ 5,369,091	\$ 1,477,766	\$ 2,078,331	\$ 464,705	\$ 1,161,314	\$ 122,650	\$ 64,325
Republican	98	\$ 37,725,220	\$ 32,412,900	\$ 5,743,304	\$ 336,218	\$ 493,086	\$ 4,557,040	\$ 2,474,770	\$ 153,275	\$ 479,778	\$ 1,337,842	\$ 48,550	\$ 62,825
Other	44	\$ 110,700	\$ 57,855	\$ 48,837	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
HOUSE SUBTOTAL:	1,762	\$ 99,174,875	\$ 77,388,933	\$ 34,772,757	\$ 2,517,072	\$ 368,711	\$ 24,684,330	\$ 8,510,481	\$ 5,899,906	\$ 1,894,905	\$ 7,332,957	\$ 696,333	\$ 349,748
Democrat	868	\$ 52,004,236	\$ 39,642,667	\$ 19,252,565	\$ 268,572	\$ 78,957	\$ 14,707,986	\$ 3,971,750	\$ 5,500,047	\$ 955,745	\$ 3,616,034	\$ 442,590	\$ 221,820
Republican	723	\$ 47,141,633	\$ 37,722,761	\$ 15,513,245	\$ 2,248,500	\$ 289,754	\$ 9,975,844	\$ 4,538,731	\$ 399,859	\$ 939,160	\$ 3,716,423	\$ 253,743	\$ 127,928
Other	171	\$ 29,006	\$ 23,505	\$ 6,947	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 500	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 500	\$ 0	\$ 0
BY PARTY AFFILIATION:													
Democrat	984	\$ 90,557,113	\$ 63,412,066	\$ 35,617,449	\$ 744,972	\$ 183,807	\$ 20,077,077	\$ 5,449,516	\$ 7,578,378	\$ 1,420,450	\$ 4,777,348	\$ 565,240	\$ 286,145
Republican	821	\$ 84,866,853	\$ 70,135,661	\$ 21,256,549	\$ 2,584,718	\$ 782,840	\$ 14,532,884	\$ 7,013,501	\$ 553,134	\$ 1,418,938	\$ 5,054,265	\$ 302,293	\$ 190,751
Other	215	\$ 139,706	\$ 81,360	\$ 55,784	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 500	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 500	\$ 0	\$ 0
BY CANDIDATE STATUS:													
Incumbent	430	\$ 91,552,267	\$ 58,099,440	\$ 48,099,351	\$ 1,850,018	\$ 220,716	\$ 27,463,391	\$ 10,474,886	\$ 5,831,931	\$ 1,569,490	\$ 8,358,749	\$ 808,890	\$ 419,445
Challenger	1,096	\$ 40,248,860	\$ 36,435,152	\$ 4,056,231	\$ 895,994	\$ 492,185	\$ 3,559,679	\$ 903,373	\$ 1,255,452	\$ 702,970	\$ 665,194	\$ 14,850	\$ 17,840
Open Seat	494	\$ 43,762,545	\$ 39,094,495	\$ 4,774,200	\$ 583,678	\$ 253,746	\$ 3,587,391	\$ 1,084,758	\$ 1,044,129	\$ 566,928	\$ 808,170	\$ 41,791	\$ 39,613

- 1/ Total Receipt and Disbursement figures are inflated because they double the amounts transferred between all committees within a campaign.
- 2/ Major Party Expenditures are monies spent by the National and State Party committees of the two national parties on behalf of candidates in the general election only. There are limits on what the parties may spend. These expenditures are in addition to direct contributions made by the parties.
- 3/ Open Seat Races are those in which the incumbent did not seek re-election.

Questionnaire concerning Section Status for POP in APSA

The Winter issue of VOX POP will contain a ballot for members to vote on affiliating with the APSA. As explained on page 2 of this issue, this questionnaire is intended to obtain information relevant to that decision. Findings from the questionnaire will be reported in the Winter issue to guide your voting decisions. The Editor encourages letters from readers on affiliation with the APSA for publication in conjunction with the questionnaire results.

Please check the categories below as appropriate.

____ 1. I am currently a member of APSA and would continue my membership in POP if dues were (check the highest applicable category)--

- () No more than the \$3 to be charged by APSA
- () No more than \$2 in addition to the basic APSA dues of \$3
- () No more than \$3 in addition to the basic APSA dues of \$3
- () I would pay anything to continue in beloved POP

____ 2. I am not currently a member of the APSA but would join in order to continue membership in POP (also check highest applicable category above)

____ 3. I am not currently a member of the APSA and would not join the Association to continue membership in POP.

PLEASE COMPLETE AND MAIL to Prof. Kenneth Janda; Dept. of Political Science; Northwestern University; Evanston, Illinois 60201.

(Cut at dotted line if you wish to remain anonymous.)

POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS/PARTIES

1982 Membership status ----->

Back dues for 1981-82 is \$3.00;
Make check payable to
"Northwestern University--POP"

If the mailing lable on the reverse side is incorrect, please check here () and revise on reverse side or give correct address below:

