

# 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

## MINOR PARTIES AND CANDIDATES IN SUB-PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

By Christian Collet, University of California, Irvine  
and Jerrold R. Hansen, University of California, Irvine

One of the hottest topics among students of political parties in recent years has been the breakdown of the two-party hegemony and the possible emergence of a 'third' party in the United States. Since the surprising performance by Ross Perot in 1992, a number of prominent political observers have argued for the development of a national third party and much of the discussion that has followed, at conferences and political roundtables, has focused on this possibility. As the presidential elections of 1996 emerge on the horizon, one only has to observe the news media's endless fascination with Ross Perot, Jesse Jackson and Colin Powell (as well as Bill Bradley), to get a sense of the salience and interest in this topic.

This wave of attention that 'third' parties and independent politics have received in the popular press and at panels of late, however, has overshadowed the fact that political science knows very little about parties other than Republicans and Democrats. While there have been scattered case studies of individual minor parties and independent candidate organizations, most research in the area has been either in the form of an historical survey of presidential elections or an analysis of mass voting behavior at the presidential level. In short, we may have some idea about why 'third' parties develop and why people vote for them, but we have very little comprehensive understanding about the individuals behind minor parties themselves, why they have become involved in alternative politics, and why they have chosen to challenge the two-party system. Furthermore, very little has been written about alternative party activity beyond that which takes place in presidential elections.

### Minor Party and Candidate Activity in the States

The recent activity of alternate parties and candidates below the presidential level, though suggests that scholars ought to be paying more attention to them. The election of a handful of indepen-

dent and minor party governors (e.g., Lowell Weicker, Walter Hickel, Angus King) as well as the first minor party member of the U.S. House of Representatives in 40 years (Bernard Sanders of Vermont), and the numerous victories of minor party candidates at the state and local level have underscored the increasing willingness of voters to support alternatives. The "extraordinary act" of voting for 'third' parties would indeed seem to be getting more common across the country in the 1990s.

Consider the aggregate-level indicators over time listed in Table 1. As one can see, voting for independent and minor party candidates erupted in 1990 (in spite of there being relatively few candidates), and the two successive election cycles saw a swell-

*(continued on page 2)*

### THEME: Minor Parties

From Headquarters .....	4
From The Field .....	6
Scholarly Precincts .....	8

Chair: L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College

Secretary-Treasurer: Diana Dwyre, University of Maryland

Program Chair: Jeffrey Berry, Tufts University

VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron

Executive Council: Everett Ladd, University of Connecticut; Jerome Mileur, University of Massachusetts; Maureen Moakley, University of Rhode Island; James Reichley, Georgetown University; Harold Bass, Quachita Baptist University; John Green, The University of Akron; Anthony Gierzynski, University of Vermont; Kay Schlozman, Boston College.



## Minor Parties *(continued from page 1)*

ing of minor party candidates for office, at all levels. Although the vote share dropped off considerably in 1992 in statewide and U.S. House races, in 1994 it registered an increase in the former, while declining slightly in the latter (perhaps due to the large shift to the Republicans). Voting for minor parties and independent candidates in state legislative races, however, seems to be at a twenty-five year high (between 7 and 8 percent) all regions of the country.

This recent surge in minor party and independent voting and candidacies is certainly noteworthy, but, as the table shows, is not unprecedented in the last quarter century (the steady growth in the West is a clear exception). But the measures in Table 1 do suggest something unique about the activity since 1990. Foremost is the proliferation of political parties, and the rise of candidates waging independent and minor party campaigns at the higher levels of office; an important consequence of this increase is the

growth in the number of races featuring multiple candidates. This is significant for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the implication of the *cumulative* power of minor parties. While an election with a third party taking 3% of the vote may not have much of an impact on the outcome of the race, an election with fourth, fifth and perhaps even a sixth party candidate taking that fraction of the vote may have an extraordinary impact. Thus, even if minor parties aren't taking a dramatically greater share of the vote, it doesn't necessarily mean that minor parties aren't *influencing elections* at a greater rate than in the past.

Because of recent trends and the lack of comprehensive research, we feel it has become necessary for a deeper consideration of the backgrounds and goals of those involved with minor parties. What kinds of people join alternative parties? Do they do so out of spite toward the major parties or have minor parties mobilized them and drawn them into politics? How strong is their partisanship? Ultimately, why have they rejected the two-party system?

### Social Characteristics and Backgrounds of Minor Party Members

To seek answers to these questions, we distributed questionnaires to every minor party member that ran as a candidate for statewide, congressional or state legislative office in 36 states in the 1994 elections. In total, the sample included members of 45 different parties, that were sorted into five basic categories: 'old' left (socialist), 'new' left (ecology or 'new age'), centrist, 'new' right (libertarian) and 'old' right (economic libertarian/social authoritarian).

Previous studies of individual minor parties have revealed high educational attainment, as well as overwhelming involvement by males. As indicated in Table 2, our sample was indeed very well-educated and male, as well as being considerably white. Most, however, were neither decidedly older or younger, richer or poorer; instead, they were middle aged (between 35-54) and middle class (between \$20,000 and \$60,000). In addition, we found two other social commonalities previously unmeasured by previous studies: residential stability and marriage. Regardless of party (but especially those in 'old' left, 'old' right and centrist parties), all individuals reported having lived for a long time in their state (mean = 29.3 years;  $p < .0001$ ), suggesting a strong connection to community and familiarity with local and state politics. Furthermore, most were married (83%), and reported that their spouses support the same party that they do (51%).

Are those that are involved in minor parties newcomers to politics, or are they former members of one (or perhaps both) of the major parties? Nearly eight in every 10 respondents were previously associated with one of the major parties; 14% were members of both. The centrist and 'old' right parties had the highest percentage proportion of individuals who were ex-Republicans or ex-Democrats; by contrast, the 'new' politics parties had the largest percentage of those new to party politics. As one might expect, most involved with left parties were once Democrats (58% in 'old' left parties; 53% in 'new' left); most involved with the Libertarians or 'old' right parties came from the Republicans (40% and 55%, respectively). The centrists were, in fact, nearly equally split, although slightly more came from the Democrats. Overall, only about a quarter of those involved in minor parties can be said to have had no contact with the

	1970	1974	1978	1982	1986	1990	1992	1994
<b># of parties</b> <sup>a,b</sup>	34	35	35	32	15	32	69	51
<b># of independent candidates</b>								
Statewide	10	20	36	20	18	13	22	34
U.S. House	16	53	47	42	45	33	122	60
State Legislative <sup>c</sup>	826	640	575	379	282	108 <sup>d</sup>	173 <sup>d</sup>	122 <sup>d</sup>
<b># of minor party candidates</b>								
Statewide	85	74	69	87	46	49	68	94
U.S. House	159	191	115	248	106	128	318	191
State Legislative	391	614	512	957	557	378 <sup>d</sup>	828 <sup>d</sup>	667 <sup>d</sup>
<b># of races with</b> <sup>b</sup>								
3 candidates	131	133	94	177	113	114	149	142
4 candidates	79	79	70	97	60	59	147	107
5+ candidates	48	113	93	104	29	37	223	120
<b>Mean vote (%)</b> <sup>c</sup>								
Statewide	2.3%	2.2%	1.5%	1.3%	2.1%	3.7%	2.3%	2.9%
Northeast	2.8	2.9	1.8	0.6	3.4	5.5	1.6	3.2
Midwest	0.6	1.2	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.8	1.5	1.6
South	8.6	2.3	1.9	0.5	1.6	2.6	2.2	2.3
West	1.4	2.7	1.8	3.7	2.2	4.4	3.7	3.9
U.S. House	3.0%	2.8%	2.8%	1.5%	2.1%	4.2%	3.0%	2.6%
Northeast	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.3	3.2	4.3	2.6	2.3
Midwest	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.3	1.1	3.0	2.5	1.7
South	4.7	3.2	4.0	1.2	2.0	3.7	2.7	2.2
West	1.6	3.2	2.8	2.3	2.0	4.7	3.9	3.8
State Legislative	5.3%	5.2%	5.9%	4.0%	4.6%	5.9%	7.6%	6.9%
Northeast	6.7	5.6	6.9	4.1	4.9	6.0	8.6	8.0
Midwest	2.9	3.9	5.9	3.0	5.0	4.8 <sup>c</sup>	6.0 <sup>c</sup>	5.1 <sup>c</sup>
South	2.6	3.0	2.3	2.5	3.1	4.7 <sup>c</sup>	8.8 <sup>c</sup>	7.1 <sup>c</sup>
West	2.6	7.3	5.4	5.6	3.6	6.2	6.6	5.8

a Defined as number of different parties appearing on ballots in a given year.

b State legislative races were not included in these measures.

c 1970-1986 figures may be inflated due to the inclusion of candidates coded as "unidentified—non major party".

d Data are incomplete due to missing election returns from Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia.

e Mean vote is controlled for seats uncontested by one of the major parties.

Sources: Statewide and U.S. House: *Congressional Quarterly Almanac*. State Legislative 1970-1986: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. 1992. *State Legislative Election Returns in the United States, 1968-1989 Computer File*. Fifth ed. Ann Arbor: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. State Legislative 1990-1994: Secretaries of State for the individual states.

Table 1: Indicators of Minor Party Activity in the United States: 1970-1994



major parties, suggesting that few of those involved in minor parties are perpetually “outside of the system”, as some have suggested. Individuals involved in minor parties, rather than being perpetual outsiders, are, in large part, individuals who have once been a part of the major party system and have rejected it.

### Partisanship, Independence and Reasons for Rejecting the Two Party System

Given this rejection, and their involvement with small, and oftentimes ideologically-based, groups one might expect minor party members to be fervently partisan. However, as Table 2 shows, this is hardly the case. On a number of partisanship measures—some derived from the 1980 NES, some constructed by us—the sample showed more of a dedication to political independence than their parties. While their responses compared favorably with “strong partisans” from the major parties on the statements dealing with the relevance of parties in the political system, the minor party sample differed greatly on the notion of being “better to be a firm party supporter than a political independent.” This belief was, in fact, manifested by the mere 56% that reported voting for their party’s presidential candidate. Sixty-two percent from the ‘old’ right parties supported Bush, while 65% of the ‘old’ left voted for Clinton and 53% of the centrists backed Perot. Only the Libertarians and ‘new’ left parties showed any consistent loyalty to their candidate for president.

Ultimately, why did these individuals abandon the two-party system? If the contemporary surge in minor party activity is similar to that in the past, then one might attribute involvement to the rise of a specific issue or event, which mobilized fervent constituencies and caused them to develop their own organization, independent of the major parties. However, as the data in Table 2 show, most of the respondents gave vague responses,

revolving around major party performance or ideology. The most common explanations for rejecting the major parties related to major party “corruption” or “hypocrisy”, or, in the case of ex-Democrats who largely went to left-wing minor parties, because “they no longer represented me”. Individuals migrating to the right focused instead on ideological explanations, saying that the major parties had become too statist, and had contributed too much to the growth of government. The exceptions were the ‘centrist’ parties who largely aligned around state party leaders (e.g., Lowell Weicker (A Connecticut Party), Frank Fasi (Best Party of Hawaii)) and some members of the ‘old’ right, who indeed left the major parties because of a divisive issue: abortion.

Taken as a whole, the predominance of vague and unspecific responses, revolving around general performance and inconsistency, or ideology, suggests that the contemporary movement towards alternative politics may be more the product of *long term* rather than a *short term* effects. The contemporary activity of minor parties would, *prima facie*, appear to be based on a more complex and deeply rooted sentiment than a temporary hostility over a divisive issue, that has historically been the cause of minor party emergence. Where major parties were once able to weaken minor parties by quickly coopting their issue positions, they may face a greater challenge today since dissatisfaction toward them goes beyond a single problem, and delves more deeply into the major parties’ performance, ideology and even philosophy toward government itself. Simply put, our data may suggest that the major parties may not be able to easily regain the support that they are losing to minor parties and independent movements. However, the good news for the Republicans and Democrats is that these individuals haven’t yet developed a strong allegiance to their current party either, and may still be prone to voting for the major parties in certain elections.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>1980 NES<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>Old Left</u>	<u>New Left/ New Age</u>	<u>Centrist</u>	<u>New Right/ Libertarian</u>	<u>Old Right</u>
I would vote for the Republicans and Democrats if they stood for more of my party's positions.	53%	—	43%	63%	58%	48%	64%
I always support all of the candidates on my party's ticket.	52	—	61	61	16	54	45
It is better to be a firm party supporter than it is to be a political independent	22	62	42	15	12	23	17
The truth is, we probably don't need political parties anymore.	21	21	10	20	35	20	26
It would be better if in all elections we put no party labels on the ballot.	30	34	15	23	52	29	38

<sup>a</sup> Cells report the percentage of “strong partisans” agreeing with the items in the 1980 CPS National Election Study. Source: Wattenberg (1994).

Table 2: Measures of Partisanship (cells report percentage strongly agreeing or agreeing with the statements)

---

---

## ***FROM HEADQUARTERS***

To the Members of POP:

When Hal Bass, as chair of the nominating committee, called to ask me to become POP chair, I was filled with both a sense of gratitude for the honor and trepidation at the thought of having to follow in the footsteps of Sandy Maisel, who had so effectively guided our organized section for the past two years. However, as Sandy advised me and I have already discovered, the task of heading POP is constantly eased and made pleasant by the cooperation of a membership willing to provide assistance and counsel.

### **The POP Electronic Journal Committee**

In the last newsletter, Sandy Maisel outlined the details of an about to be consummated arrangement for POP to assume sponsorship of the *American Review of Politics* (ARP) with Heldref as the publisher. To our surprise and shock, Heldref pulled out of the deal just prior to the annual APSA meeting in Chicago. As Sandy advised the membership at the business meeting, Heldref's totally unanticipated action threw the status of a POP journal back at square one after months of negotiations and planning by Sandy and ARP editors Gary Wekkin and Charles Hadley.

Fortunately, Cathy Rudder, The APSA's executive director, has taken an interest in our situation and in the possibility of POP being the first of the organized sections to consider publishing an electronic journal. With Cathy's active support, we have proceeded to appoint a joint APSA-POP Electronic Journal Committee to explore the feasibility of publishing an electronic journal. Sandy Maisel, who was intimately involved in the prior POP-APSA-ARP-Heldref negotiations, has graciously agreed to serve as chair of the committee. Other members include

Charles Hadley (editor of ARP), John Green (editor of VOX POP and Director of the Bliss Institute), Herbert Jacob (Northwestern Univ., a member of the APSA Publications committee), Anne Permaloff (Texas A&M), and Mike Brintnall (APSA staff). The committee is already at work—via e-mail—and would welcome your suggestions.

### **The 1996 Annual Meeting**

It is time to be planning for POP activities at the 1996 annual meeting in San Francisco.

### **1996 POP Workshop**

To maintain our tradition of informative workshops, the Executive Council needs your suggestions for the 1996 workshop. Please send me your recommendations and proposals as quickly as possible (c/o Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201; FAX: (414) 229-5021; e-mail: jfbibby@csd.uwm.edu).

### **1996 POP Program**

Following up on the highly successful program organized for 1995 by Jeff Berry, our POP program chair, Barbara Burrell is in the midst of planning for the POP portion of the 1996 annual meeting program and is anxious to receive proposals for panels, roundtables, etc. Please contact Barbara with your recommendations (c/o Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory, University of Wisconsin, 1930 Monroe St., Madison, WI 53711-2036; FAX: (608) 262-3366; e-mail: BURRELL@wslr.cee.uwex.edu).

I look forward to working with you during the next two years. Best wishes!

John Bibby

---

---

## **1995 POP AWARDS**

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

**James MacGregor Burns**, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for *The Deadlock of Democracy*. (Prentice Hall, 1963.)

**Gerald Pomper**, winner of the Jack Walker Award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for "From Confusion to Clarity: Issues and American Votes, 1956-1968." *"American Political Science Review."*

**Philip Klinkner**, winner of the Emerging Scholars Award.



**Political Organizations and Parties Section, American Political Science Association**

Chicago, September 1, 1995

This section meeting was called to order by L. Sandy Maisel, Chair, at 12:39 p.m. The following order of business transpired:

1. **A. Minutes:** Printed in VOX POP, Volume 13, Issue 2, pp 3-4.

**B. Treasurer's Report** (July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995):

Funds on Hand July 1, 1994		\$3,979.52	
Revenue Generated:			
APSA section dues	\$1,122.00		
Interest Income	72.91		
Other revenue: mailing labels	122.57		
1994 workshop	129.00		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,446.48</b>	<b>1,446.48</b>	
Expenditures*			
Bank service fees	(\$14.16)		
1994 award plaques	(237.12)		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$(251.28)</b>	<b>(251.28)</b>	
Funds on Hand June 30, 1995**		<u><u>\$5,147.72</u></u>	

\* Copying/printing, postage, telephone, travel and staff provided gratis by the University of Maryland Baltimore County, University of Akron, and Colby College.

\*\* Nations Bank funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking (\$2,347.06) and nonprofit savings (\$2,827.66) accounts.

Minutes and Treasurer's Report adopted unanimously.

2. **American Review of Politics:** Sandy noted that this was to be a celebratory meeting, but a week ago Heldref Publications informed him that Heldref had decided not to go forward with its agreement to act as publisher of the *American Review of Politics*. POP had been negotiating with Heldref, had ceased negotiations with two other publishers, and Sandy had traveled to Washington D.C. to meet with Heldref and work with APSA, whose lawyers had prepared a contract for the arrangement at great expense. Walter Beach of Heldref offered little explanation for Heldref's withdrawal from the project except to say that the APSA had taken too long to prepare the document and that the journal had not come out. At this point, there is an editor in place, an editorial board and a back-log of articles that have been referred and accepted. We have a list of people who will submit articles and/or serve as referees, so we had a lot of momentum.

Cathy Rudder, APSA Executive Director, has suggested that we explore electronic publishing, and that if we are interested the APSA would help POP with funds, staff, etc. A variety of concerns were raised: Sandy asked whether tenure committees would look at electronic publications in the same way as other publications and wondered if people would submit articles; Charles Hadley and Gerald Pomper also expressed concern about submission. Sandy noted that four out of five political science journals are already published electronically (e.g., Ken Janda noted that *Law and Politics Review* has been well received as an electronic journal).

Kenneth Janda, Co-Editor of Party Politics and founder of VOX POP, announced that Sage and Party Politics are open to an arrangement with POP. For example, POP could be responsible for one issue per year. Yet, he realizes it is important for POP to have its own identity.

Gary Wekkin noted that since the Heldref contract specified the journal to be free of debt when the transfer took place, ARP had paid all of its debt by using revenues from 1995 subscriptions. If these subscribers are not provided with journals, they will have to be reimbursed. Sandy recommended that authors of accepted articles be offered their articles back and that the new POP president appoint a committee to look at this matter as soon as possible.

3. **POP Awards Ceremony:** Awards reported on page 4.

4. **APSA POP Panels:** Sandy noted that Jeffrey Berry did a terrific job organizing the POP panels at this year's meeting and announced that Barbara Burrell, Wisconsin Research Laboratory, University of Wisconsin, Madison, has been appointed to serve as APSA Section Chair for 1996.

5. **1995 Workshop:** Jerome Mileur, University of Massachusetts, commented on the success of the 1995 POP workshop, "Political Parties and the Law." Special thanks are due to Jerry Mileur for organizing the workshop and to all who participated and attended.

Proposals for a 1996 Workshop should be submitted to incoming POP Chair John Bibby, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

6. **Nominating Committee Report:** The Chair on Hal Bass who noted the following were recommended for a two-year term on the Executive Council: Paul S. Herrnsen, University of Maryland College Park; Andrew S. McFarland, University of Illinois; John F. Bibby, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; and Nancy Zingale, was recommended for a two-year term as Chair. There being no nominations from the floor, the slate of nominees was adopted unanimously.

7. **New Business:** Sandy reported that at the APSA meeting of Heads of Organized Sections two issues were discussed: (1) many sections have had to cancel workshops; and (2) APSA asked the chairs to vote to add a surcharge to cover postage. The debate over the surcharge was acrimonious. APSA has decided to impose the surcharge. Sandy noted that about 20% of POP's membership would be affected.

The APSA has informed Sandy and other section chairs that many of the association prizes are underfunded and awards are quite low. POP has been asked to participate in the effort to increase the endowment for the Schattschneider award (which named no winner this year). A notice will be placed in Vox Pop and the APSA has agreed to pay for a mailing to solicit POP members.

Chair Sandy Maisel thanked the organization and his fellow officers for their service and support during his tenure as Chair. He announced that incoming Chair John Bibby has appointed him as chair of the committee to consider the future of POP and the *American Review of Politics*.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Dwyre, Secretary-Treasurer



## **FROM THE FIELD**

### **The Schattschneider Award For The Best Dissertation in the Field of American Politics**

APSA headquarters has advised me that the E.E. Schattschneider Award is in financial difficulty and lacks sufficient endowment to pay its recipients a prize commensurate with the Award's standing in the profession.

The Schattschneider Award, one of the APSA's most prestigious scholarly awards, is given in the American Politics field. The award memorializes a former APSA president who exercised a major influence over scholarship pertaining to political parties, interest groups, and American democracy. Schattschneider's best known books were *Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff* (1935), *Party Government* (1940), and *The Semisovereign People* (1960). The first of these pioneered "group approaches" to the study of politics. *Party Government* and its Committee on Political Parties of the APSA report, *Toward A More Responsible Two-Party System*, have had a profound effect on parties scholars ever since their publication. Clearly, E.E. Schattschneider was a leader in our field and it is fitting that a distinguished American politics award should be named in his honor.

The status of this award is of concern to POP because it has regularly recognized emerging scholars in POP's field of specialization. Regretfully, the endowment underscribing this major award in the American politics field pays only half the prize money (\$250) that is awarded to other dissertation and book award recipients. The APSA Endowed Programs Committee has therefore recommended that the Schattschneider Award be increased to \$500—an amount more in keeping with its stature.

To fully fund the Schattschneider Award at this new level, it will be necessary to raise \$5,500. POP members are urged to consider making individual contributions to the APSA Schattschneider Fund by sending checks to the APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington D.C. 20036.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Bibby

### **1996 POP AWARDS COMMITTEE**

The following awards committees have been appointed for 1996. Please forward your nominations for award recipients to members of the committees.

#### **Samuel Eldersveld Career Achievement Award Committee**

Gerry Pomper, Chair (Eagleton Institute,  
Rutgers University)  
Peggy Conway (University of Florida)  
Jeffrey Berry (Tufts University)

#### **Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award Committee and the Jack Walker Outstanding Paper/Article Award Committee**

Everett Ladd, Chair (Roper Center,  
University of Connecticut)  
William Keefe (University of Pittsburgh)  
Andrew McFarland (University of Illinois  
at Chicago)

#### **Emerging Scholar Award**

Maureen Moakley, Chair (University of  
Rhode Island)  
Philip Klinkner (Hamilton College)  
David Rohde (Michigan State University)

### **CALLS FOR PROPOSALS 1996 APSA - POP WORKSHOP**

Proposals are now being accepted for the 1996 APSA-POP Workshop to be held during the APSA annual meeting on Wednesday, August 28, 1996 in San Francisco. Proposals on any aspect of political organizations and/or parties are welcome. Please send a brief proposal as soon as possible to: John F. Bibby, Chair, Political Organizations and Parties Sections of APSA, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, P. O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201; (414) 229-4221; FAX: (414) 229-5021.



## **FROM THE FIELD**

### **Political Organizations and Parties Organized Section, American Political Science Association September 6, 1995**

#### **Executive Council**

##### **Chair:**

John F. Bibby (term expiring 8/97)  
Department of Political Science  
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee  
P. O. Box 413  
Milwaukee, WI 53201  
(o) 414-229-4221  
fax 414-229-5021

Jerome M. Mileur  
Department of Political Science  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
Amherst, MA 01003  
(o) 413-545-1354  
(h) 413-549-5912

Andrew S. McFarland  
Department of Political Science  
University of Illinois  
1007 W. Harrison Street  
Chicago, IL 60607  
(o) 312-413-3776  
fax: 312-413-0440

##### **Secretary-Treasurer (term expiring 8/96):**

Diana Dwyre  
Department of Political Science  
University of Maryland Baltimore County  
5401 Wilkens Avenue  
(o) 410-455-2845  
(h) 410-744-4811  
fax: 410-455-1021  
e-mail: dwyre@umbs7.umbc.edu

Maureen Moakley  
Department of Political Science  
University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, RI 02881  
(o) 401-792-4055

Walter Mebane  
Department of Government  
Cornell University  
125 McGraw Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853-4601  
(o) 607-225-3868  
fax: 607-255-4530  
e-mail: wrml@cornell.edu

A. James Reichley  
11912 Gregerscroft Rd.  
Potomac, MD 20854  
(o) 301-340-7649

Nancy Zingale  
Department of Political Science  
University of St. Thomas  
St. Paul, MN 55105  
(o) 612-962-5725  
e-mail: nhzingale@stthomas.edu

##### **Council Members:**

##### **Term Expiring 1996**

Everett C. Ladd, Jr.  
Roper Center for Public Opinion  
University of Connecticut  
P. O. Box 440  
Storrs, CT 06268  
(o) 203-486-4608

##### **Term Expiring 1997:**

Paul S. Herrnson  
Department of Government and Politics  
University of Maryland College Park  
College Park, MD 20742  
(o) 301-405-4156

### **Call for Papers 1996 APSA**

#### **Division 11. Political Organizations and Parties\*.**

Barbara C. Burrell, Wisconsin Survey Research Lab, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1930 Monroe Street, Madison, WI 53711; (608) 265-2029; (608) 262-3366 (fax); burrell@wsrl.cee.uwex.edu.

Questions of equality and inequality historically have been central to the formation and life of political organizations and parties. The theme of "Inequality and Politics" provides us with the prime opportunity to reflect upon and advance our knowledge in the extent to which political organizations and parties have worked to expand equality. I urge paper proposers to think about the ways in which their research is linked to notions of equality and inequality in political organizations and parties.

I would like papers and presentations to be historically grounded regarding how political organizations and parties have dealt with issues of equality and participation in the past, and how in the contemporary era, especially within the context of the information superhighway and expanding democratic politics globally, political organizations and parties are linking citizens to their government. Proposals that incorporate ideas concerning diversity within the overarching theme of inequality are especially encouraged. I hope that we will have a combination of traditional panels with formal papers being presented as well as roundtables and other discussion modes. Please feel free to propose whole panels or roundtables and also send me suggestions for discussants and panel chairs.



### Comments on Receiving The POP Awards

Gerald M. Pomper

(Editor's Note: the following comments were delivered by Gerald Pomper at the 1995 POP business meeting upon receiving awards from POP. Professor Pomper has graciously allowed his remarks to be represented in response to an overwhelming number of requests by members of POP.)

Receiving the Eldersveld and Walker awards first made me grateful, then made me think about our profession, and finally made me think gratefully.

I am deeply honored by these awards, by the confidence of the award committees, and by the excessively kind remarks of John Green and Sandy Maisel in their presentations. I am particularly pleased that I could join David Truman, my college mentor, in the list of Eldersveld recipients, and that Stanley Kelley, my model graduate mentor, could attend the ceremony.

Politically, my own early experiences were happy ones. Because of the generosity of America, my parents were saved from the Holocaust, and I could be born free of genocidal threat. As I grew up, I saw American politics essentially as good: effective, decent, and self-correcting. Politics was effective. In the New Deal, government began to promote a secure life for our citizenry. A united nation defeated evil in the second World War. Then, slowly but determinedly, the country began to achieve its promise of, at least, legal equality for all races.

Politics then was decent. The first time I voted—although I didn't admit it at the time—two exceptional and honorable candidates, Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson, competed fairly for the presidency. Politics was also self-correcting. The great domestic evil of my youth was Joe McCarthy, but his attack on freedom was turned back by the politicians. Later, as we learned about poverty, politicians did attempt solutions.

That kind of optimism certainly influenced the research honored by the POP awards. The evidence of the times convinced

me that politics could achieve morally desirable ends. Voters could be smart, they could be trusted to make reasonable decisions, if politicians promoted clarity, not confusion. The political parties could mobilize these trustworthy voters toward decent goals. We need not despair about democracy.

Contemporary politics, by contrast, makes me discontent rather than optimistic. Perhaps pessimism toward the present, and a nostalgic remembrance of the past, is a sign of aging, rather than of experienced perspective. Yet, in my subjective view, political problems today seem unsolvable through the political process—not because we lack the wit to find solutions, but because we lack the political will to employ solutions. Paraphrasing a famous description of another era, politics in the United States today seems *nasty and brutish*—as in negative campaigning; the perspectives of politicians seem *short*—extending rarely beyond the latest opinion poll; and our citizens seem *solitary and poor*—both in their spirit and in their economic means.

What to do about it? Even if this doleful description is right, I can find no alternative outside of the political process, no way but to still trust the voters, and to hope that the parties can be made or can bring themselves to deal with the nation's problems. Democratic commitment requires no less. But I view America with less optimism than I did before.

Beyond politics, this occasion led me to think about myself, and to recall Freud's simple formula for happiness: love and work. I have had the good fortune to receive more than my share of personal love, particularly from my family. The rewards of work, I have learned, are only occasionally love, but can be respect. These awards testify that I have won the respect of my peers. I gratefully thank POP for that recognition.



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

FIRST CLASS  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Akron, Ohio  
Permit Number 222