VOX POP Newsletter
of Political Organizations and Parties

"Conflict Extension" in American Party Politics

Thomas M. Carsey, Florida State University, tcarsey@fsu.edu
Geoffrey C. Layman, University of Maryland, glayman@gvpt.umd.edu

Contemporary descriptions of American politics regularly point to an increase in party polarization. The popular picture of a public sharply polarized and embroiled in a bitter "culture war" has attracted little support from academic research (e.g. Fiorina, Abrams, and Pope 2005). However, most political scientists and political observers agree that the ideological gulf between the Republican and Democratic parties, at both the elite and mass levels, is as wide as it has been in some time.

While party polarization may be a recent discovery by the popular press, the major American parties have been relatively far apart on some set of issues for most of our political history. The Federalists and the (Jeffersonian) Republicans were polarized over federal versus state power in the 1790s. The Democrats and Republicans were polarized on slavery in the 1850s, free silver in the 1890s, the New Deal in the 1930s, and civil rights in the 1960s. In fact, the conventional wisdom in the literature on partisan change is that party polarization is the normal equilibrium state of American Politics (e.g. Sundquist 1983; Miller and Schofield 2003).

That same conventional wisdom holds that party polarization typically takes shape along a single, dominant policy dimension, and is minimized on other, subsidiary issue agendas. Thus, periods of party change are characterized by "conflict displacement," in which the parties grow increasingly polarized on a new issue dimension that cuts across the lines of the previously dominant dimension, and converge on the old line of cleavage (Schattschneider 1960; Sundquist 1983).

However, the current period differs in that the parties are sharply divided on all of the major policy dimensions in American politics: economic and social welfare issues, racial and civil rights issues, cultural issues such as abortion and gay rights, and defense and foreign policy issues. More specifically, the increase in party polarization on newer, cross-cutting dimensions such as culture and race has not displaced party conflict on the social welfare issues that have been on the political agenda since the New Deal era. Instead, party conflict has extended from older policy agendas to newer ones.

We have highlighted this process of "conflict extension" in our work on both party identifiers in the mass electorate (Layman and Carsey 2002) and party activists (Layman, Carsey, Green and Herrera 2005). In both groups, domestic policy attitudes (we have not yet examined foreign policy issues) continue to fall into distinct social welfare, racial, and cultural dimensions. However, party polarization on all three of these agendas has either grown or remained stable at high levels. Table 1 demonstrates this by showing the difference in the mean social welfare, racial, and cultural positions of Democratic and Republican party identifiers from 1972 to 2004 and party activists from 1984 to 2000.

The key question for us is why has conflict extension, rather than conflict displacement, characterized recent party politics? We have explained conflict extension in the mass electorate as a response by party identifiers to the growing polarization of party elites (Layman and Carsey 2002). But why have the elites grown more polarized on multiple issue dimensions? Our explanation thus far has focused on party activists, who play a critical role in determining the nature and extent of party polarization. Most activists care mainly about policy issues, activists tend to hold more extreme issue positions than does the average citizen, and they provide critical resources to candidates in both nomination and general election campaigns. Thus, activists help to counter the Downsian pressure on parties to converge to the median voter. In what follows, we provide a brief overview of our accounts of conflict extension among party activists and the parties' coalitions in the mass electorate.

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR, 2005

POP officers and other committee members have been busy since our meeting last September selecting various award winners, and as you will see Kevin Esterling has been very active in putting together our panels and an unusual experiment with the poster sessions for the 2005 meeting in Washington, where we hope you will turn out in great numbers for our panels and the poster session.

Our business meeting will be on Friday, September 2 at noon. At that time we will be announcing new officers for 2005-06, as well as recognizing the winners of the following awards. Please plan to attend the meeting both to recognize these award winners as well as to discuss any issues relating the activities and functions of the Section.

Kevin Esterling, the Program Organizer for the 2005 meetings has worked hard to plan an excellent set of panels as usual at the annual meeting. In addition, he has paid special attention to our Poster Session, so please take special note of his innovations in this regard. I'll be there and look forward to seeing many of you there as well.

With best wishes,

Frank Baumgartner
Chair, POP

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION
Organized Section on
Political Organizations and Parties (POP)

LIST OF OFFICERS — 2005-2006

CHAIR: John Aldrich (Duke University)

PROGRAM ORGANIZER:
Barry Burden (Harvard University), 2006 Annual Meeting

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

SECRETARY / TREASURER:
John Bruce (University of Mississippi)

EDITOR, VOX POP:
John Green (The University of Akron)

WEBMASTER:
TBA

Outgoing members with terms ending with the 2005 meetings are:

CHAIR: Frank Baumgartner (Penn State University)
COUNCIL MEMBERS:
Larry Bartels (Princeton University)
Holly Brasher (George Washington University)
Thomas Ferguson (University of Massachusetts, Boston)
Mark Smith (University of Washington)
PROGRAM ORGANIZER:
Kevin Esterling (University of California, Riverside)
WEBMASTER:
Kyle Sanders

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION
Organized Section on
Political Organizations and Parties (POP)

LIST OF AWARDS FOR 2005

JACK L. WALKER, JR. OUTSTANDING ARTICLE AWARD
This award "honors an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties."

Thomas Fergus (Chair)	(University of Massachusetts, Boston)
Andrea Campbell-Frances	(University of Illinois)
Anne Costain	(University of Colorado)

WINNER(S): Abnormal Returns from the Common Stock Investments of the United States Senate, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, **by Alan J. Ziobrowski (Georgia State University, College of Business), Pin Cheng (Florida Atlantic University, College of Business), James W. Boyd (Kent State University, College of Business Administration), and Brigitte J. Ziobrowski (Augusta State University, School of Business Administration)**

LEON D. EPSTEIN OUTSTANDING BOOK AWARD
This award "honors a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties."

Dan Tichenor (Chair)	(Rutgers University)
Mark Smith	(University of Washington)
Robin Kolodny	(Temple University)

WINNER(S): Pradeep Chhibber (UC Berkeley) and Ken Kollman (University of Michigan), *The Formation of National Party Systems.*

SAMUEL J. ELDERSVELD AWARD
This award is to "honor a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field."

Byron Shafer (Chair)	(University of Wisconsin)
Susan Scarrow	(University of Houston)
Nicol C. Rae	(Florida International University)

WINNER(S): James Q. Wilson, UCLA

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

Barbara Norrander (Chair)	(University of Arizona)
David Kimball	(University of Missouri, St. Louis)
Scott Ainsworth	(University of Georgia)

WINNER(S): Barry Burden, Harvard (Ph.D. Ohio State, 1998), Beth Leech, Rutgers (Ph.D. Texas A & M, 1998)

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

Christina Wolbrecht (Chair)	(University of Notre Dame)
Andrew McFarland	(University of Illinois, Chicago)
Jennifer Victor	(University of Pittsburgh)

WINNER(S): Michael T. Heaney (University of Florida), "Reputation and Leadership Inside Interest Group Coalitions."

A SECOND NOTE FROM THE POP SECTION ORGANIZER:

The Poster Session Experiments

At the upcoming 2005 APSA meetings in DC, POP is trying a few experiments with our sessions in order to make the presentation of research in our section even livelier and more engaging than it has been in the past. A previous article in V*OX POP* described an experimental format for our panels, including two "blockbuster" panel experiments. This note describes POP's experiments with the poster session format. As I describe below, the experiment will rely on two innovations: discussants for the posters and holding a reception in the poster room.

This year getting onto the program in the POP section turned out to be extremely competitive. The POP section received 178 paper submissions and 14 full panel submissions, but POP was only allocated a total of seven panel slots to fill. Selection to panels was obviously competitive. For the final cut, much of my decision to accept papers for panel slots depended on their substantive fit with other submissions and the substantive panel themes that emerged endogenously from the selection process. Many excellent papers simply did not fit with any panel. For the posters, I decided to select from among the remaining papers the best work done by current graduate students or those who just this year received their degree, with the hope that the posters will show off some of the best emerging research in the field.

Given the highly competitive selection process, the posters represent very good research, overall on par with the quality of the research to be presented at panels. In the past, however, it seems that people feel getting assigned to a poster is something of a let down when compared to a panel presentation. This year POP will use two innovations to try to make the poster sessions a more rewarding experience for the presenters: we will assign a discussant to each poster presentation, and we will attempt to draw a crowd to the room with refreshments and a reception to help ensure the poster experience is rewarding for the presenters.

Each poster discussant is a researcher who is very visible in the field and will be listed in the program for the poster session; volunteers include Larry Bartels, Gary King, Barry Burden, Ken Kooman, Linda Fowler, Frank Baumgartner, Dick Niemi, and Yoi Herrera (although the final lineup is still subject to change). Each paper in the poster session has been assigned a separate discussant; this is, there will be as many discussants as there are poster presentations. Each discussant will give his/her comments in a one-on-one conversation with the presenter. The one-on-one discussion format is very likely to make the poster experience even more intellectually rewarding than a standard panel presentation; as Gary King commented to me when agreeing to participate as a discussant, the poster sessions are like panel presentations with a "fast forward and rewind button." That is, poster sessions offer better prospects for a rewarding discursive interaction for both presenter and discussant and arguably more so than a standard panel presentation.

This idea to experiment with discussants at the poster session did not emerge out of thin air, and I have some experience to suggest the experiment is likely to produce good results. Indeed, I admit to stealing the idea outright from Bert Kritzer of the University of Wisconsin. Years ago when I was a grad student I had two separate papers accepted to poster sessions at an MPSA conference, an interest group paper and a judicial politics paper. Inconveniently, the powers were assigned to the same time slot, but the posters happened to be in the same room, and so I decided to do both posters simultaneously, shuttling back and forth between the two aisles.

Bert was the section organizer for judicial politics that year and he assigned big name discussants to each poster (mine was Brad Cannon, but I remember Joel Grossman, Larry Bau, Kritzer, and others there too) and importantly, Bert listed the names of the discussants in the program. The result: the poster session in the judicial politics aisle quickly turned into a large gathering with a cocktail party atmosphere, since not only were the discussants in attendance, but having the discussants listed in the program signaled to the rest of the judicial politics crows that something interesting was happening in the poster session room. Meanwhile, the side of the room with the interest groups poster session had no discussants, and averaged about one or two visitors at a time. At one point, I remember noticing tumbleweed and a dusty dry wind blowing through. I can say empirically the experiences in these two poster sessions were very different, both substantively and statistically.

In an effort to re-create the cocktail party atmosphere of the very successful Kritzer-MPSA poster session, POP intends to provide wine and cheese refreshments at the poster session (assuming we can secure an afternoon slot for the posters. If it's a morning session, we will switch to coffee and bagels). We hope to make the poster session a great opportunity for people in the field to mill around and visit with each other, as well as to see some of the best new emerging research. We believe that having visible discussants along with refreshments will generate a crowd at the poster sessions.

APSA has strongly endorsed this experiment with the poster sessions, and they have agreed to several provisions that should make participation in the experiment more attractive for all involved. First, APSA has agreed to list the discussants in the official program under the POP poster session. Second, APSA has agreed to waive participation as a poster discussant toward the two participation limit. Finally, APSA is going to try to enhance the reception-style atmosphere by arranging the room to facilitate discussion and milling around.

On behalf of the POP section, POP president Frank Baumgartner and I, hope to see you at the poster session, or rather, our poster "reception" experiment.

Kevin M. Esterling
UC Riverside
APSA 2005 POP Section Organizer

POP
Executive Council Meeting
Thursday, September 1, 2005
12:00 p.m.

POP
Business Meeting
Friday, September 2, 2005
12:00 p.m.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

POP PANELS AND POSTERS FOR APSA, 2005
PANELS:

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

8:00 AM   35-5 POP BLOCKBUSTER I:
THE VARIETIES OF LOBBYING STRATEGIES
Chair: Beth L. Leech, leech@rci.rutgers.edu, Rutgers University
Author(s): "Funding the War of Ideas: Foundation Strategies for Informing Advocacy." Andrew Rich, arich@ccny.cuny.edu, City College of New York.
"Shifting Priorities: The NAACP's and National Urban League's Advocacy on Behalf of the Poor." Catherine Paden, c-paden@northwestern.edu, Northwestern University
"Elite Framing of the University of Michigan Affirmative Action Cases." Rosalee Clawson, clawson@polisci.purdue.edu, Purdue University
"Collective Action and Institutional Advocacy by Charter Schools in the States." Thomas T. Holyoke, tholyoke@hastings.edu, Hastings College and Jeffrey R. Henig, henig@tc.columbia.edu, Columbia University
"National Black and Latino Advocacy Groups: Re-Examining the Promise of Cooperation." Robert R. Preuhs, preuhs@colorado.edu, University of Colorado and Rodney E. Hero, rhero@nd.edu, University of Notre Dame
Discussants: Robert C. Lowry, Iowa State University
Lawrence S. Rothenburg, lawrence-rothenberg@kellogg.northwestern.edu, Northwestern University

10:15 AM   44-15 LEARNING TO LOSE: DEMOCRACY IN
ONE-PARTY DOMINENT SYSTEMS
Chair: Tun-jen Cheng, tjchen@wm.edu, College of William & Mary
Author(s): "Challenging One Party Dominance: Japan Gets Competitive." T.J. Pempel, pempell@berkeley, edu, University of California, Berkeley
"Learning to Lose: Indian Nationalism and the Institutionalization of a Procedural Culture." Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, srudolph@midway.uchicago.edu, University of Chicago
"Reformist Conservatism in South Korea: An Oxymoron?" Byung-Kook Kim, bkk@korea.ac.kr, Korea University
"Why Bother with Elections? The People's Action Party in Singapore." Garry Rodan, G.Rodan@murdoch.edu.au, Murdoch University
"Learning to Lose: The KMT and Democratic Consolidation in Taiwan." Joseph Wong, joe.wong@utoronto.ca, University of Toronto
Discussants: Edward Friedman, friedman@polisci.wisc.edu, University of Wisconsin, Madison

2:00 PM   35-8 CONDITIONS FOR PARTY COMPETITION
Chair: James Adams, adams@polisci.ucsb.edu, University of California, Santa Barbara
Author(s): "Building Parties and Capturing Constituencies in Democratizing Africa." Adrienne LeBas, aml75@columbia.edu, Columbia University
"Political Longevity: Consequences of Electoral Failure for Party Leaders." Josephine T. Andrews, jtandrews@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis and Robert W. Jackman, rwjackman@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis
"Competitiveness and Change in Party Systems: New Issues, Party Platforms, and Electoral Competition in Established Parliamentary Democracies." Jeannette Money, jnmoney@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis

"Party Subsidies and the Freezing of Party Competition: Do Cartels Work?" Susan Scarrow, sscarrow@uh.edu, University of Houston
"The Evolution of Competition: Elections, Intraparty Politics, and Nomination Rules in Mexico's PRI." Dwight D. Dyer, ddyer@berkeley.edu, University of California, Berkeley
Discussants: Scott Morganstern, smorgens@duke.edu, Duke University
James Adams, adams@polisci.ucsb.edu, University of California, Santa Barbara

2:00 PM   35-3 POLITICAL EXPRESSION:
INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE LINES
Chair: Dawn Brancati, Harvard University
Author(s): "Local Organizations and the Political Incorporation of Immigrants." Kristi Andersen, andersen@maxwell.syr.edu, Syracuse University and Brett S. Heindl, bsheindl@maxwell.syr.edu, Syracuse University
"Does Civic Participation Contribute to Political Engagement?: Using Fixed Effects Panel Analyses to Investigate Correlations and Causation." Mayling Birney, mayling.birney@yale.edu, Yale University
"Building Public Will and Community Mobilization for Children's Agenda." Doug Imig, dimig@memphis.edu, University of Memphis
"Instrumental Mass Action and the Vietnam Anti-War Movement." Stuart Hill, slhill@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis and Matthew Zafonte, mazafonte@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis
"Protesting the Republican National Convention: Political Organizations and the Expression of Policy-Specific Grievances." Michael T. Heaney, michael.t.heaney@yal.edu, Yale University and Fabio Rojas, fgrojas@harper.uchicago.edu, University of Chicago
Discussants: Christopher S. Parker, University of California, Santa Barbara
John C. Berg, jberg@suffolk.edu, Suffolk University

4:15 PM   31-3 HOW INSTITUTIONS SHAPE WOMEN'S ACTIVISM
Chair: Dorothy E. McBride, dmcbrid6@fau.edu, Florida Atlantic University
Author(s): "Grass-Roots Feminism: Raising Money for Abortion as Direction Action." Jessica Sowa, sowa@sc.edu, University of South Carolina and Laura R. Woliver, woliver@sc.edu, University of South Carolina
"Diminished Democracy? Comparing Opportunities for Participation in Women's Voluntary Associations." Maryann Barakso, barakso@american.edu, American University
"Changing Agendas: Women's Associations and the Retreat from Social Reform in Postwar America." Kristin Goss, kagoss@aol.com, Duke University and Theda Skocpol, tx@wjh.harvard.edu, Harvard University
"Inside and Outside the State: How Feminist Activists Inside the Federal Bureaucracy Changed Policy." Lee Ann Banaszak, lab14@psu.edu, Penn State University
Discussants: Ronnee Schrieber, rschreib@mail.sdsu.edu, San Diego State University

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 2

8:00 AM   35-6 MONEY IN LOBBYING POLITICS:
SOURCES AND CONSEQUENCES
Chair: Eric S. Heberlig, esheberl@uncc.edu, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Author(s): "An Insurance Model of Campaign Finance." Kenneth W. Kollman, kkollman@umich.edu, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor and Sang-Jung Han, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

- 4 -

FROM HEADQUARTERS

"The Effects of Electoral Context and Legal Restrictions on Financial Contributions by Individuals to Candidates, Parties, and PACs." Robert C. Lowry, Iowa State University

"The Outcomes of Business Political Activity: Export and Tax Benefits." Jeffrey Drope, jdrope@miami.edu, University of Miami, Wendy L. Hansen, wlhansen@unm.edu, University of New Mexico and Neil J. Mitchell, nmitchel@unm.edu, University of Aberdeen

"Interest Organization Behavior in Monopolistic and Competitive Industries." Holly Brasher, hbrasher@uab.edu, University of Alabama, Birmingham and David Lowery, dlowery@fsw.leidenuniv.nl, University of Leiden

"Groups and the Party Coalitions: A Network Analysis of Overlapping Donor Lists." Casey Byrne Dominguez, cbkdominguez@yahoo.com, University of California, Berkeley

Discussants: Eric S. Heberlig, esheberl@uncc.edu, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Mari Hojnacki, marieh@psu.edu, Pennsylvania State University

10:15 AM   35-7 ROUNDTABLE TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PENDLETON HERRING: GRANDFATHER OF MODERN SOCIAL SCIENCE

Chair: Martha Derthick, mad2d@Virginia.edu, University of Virginia
Participant(s):   Charles O. Jones, cjones@polisci.wisc.edu, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Fred I. Greenstein, Princeton University

Daniel J. Tichenor, tichenor@polisci.rutgers.edu, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

Matthew Holden, ITMProject@aol.com, Isaiah T. Montgomery, Studies Project, Inc.

2:00 PM   35-4 POP BLOCKBUSTER II: CONTEXT AND SOCIAL NETWORKS IN THE STUDY OF PARTIES

Chair: David Lazer, David.Lazer@harvard.edu, Harvard University
Author(s):   "We Appreciate Your Support." Gregory Koger, gregory.koger@umontana.edu, University of Montana and Seth E. Masket, smasket@du.edu, University of Denver

"Organized by Competition: Candidate-Consultant Networks in California Legislative Campaigns." Joseph W. Doherty, jdoherty@ucla.edu, University of California, Los Angeles

"Implications of State Funding for Party Organization." Lisa Young, Lisa.Young@ucalgary.ca, University of Calgary

"Social Cleavages and Party Constituencies in Diversity-Embracing Societies: The Case of Canada." John R. Petrocik, PetrocikJ@missouri.edu, University of Missouri, Columbia and Adrian Ang, auack5@mizzou.edu, University of Missouri, Columbia

"Mobilizing Socially Embedded Partisans: How Social Networks Affect the Political Choices of Boundedly Rational Persons." Alan S. Zuckerman, alan.zuckerman@brown.edu, Brown University

"National Parties" and "The Footrule of Local Prejudice": The Transformation of Intra-Party Relationships in the Late Nineteenth Century." Daniel Peter Klinghard, dklingha@holycross.edu, College of the Holy Cross

Discussant(s):   Daniel P. Carpenter, dcarpenter@latte.harvard.edu, Harvard University

Kevin M. Esterling, kevin.esterling@ucr.edu, University of California, Riverside

4:15 PM   22-8 DO PARTIES MATTER?

Chair: Brian R. Sala, brsala@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis
Author(s):   "The Powers and Limits of Parties in the U.S. Senate." Chris Den Hartog, cdenhart@ucsd.edu, University of California, San Diego

"Party Coalitions, Interest Groups, and the Limits of Unidimensionality in Congress." David Karol, dkarol@berkeley.edu, University of California, Berkeley

"Pivots, Parties, and Policy: Testing Pivotal Politics Models of Appropriations." Sarah Anderson, sarah.anderson@standford.edu, Stanford University

"Keeping Score: Parties, Interest Groups, and Roll-Call Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives." Jason M. Roberts, jmr@umn.edu, University of Minnesota and Lauren Cohen Bell, 1bell@rmc.edu, Randolph-Macon College

Discussant(s):   Jennifer Nicoll Victor, jnvictor@pitt.edu, University of Pittsburgh

Brian R. Sala, brsala@ucdavis.edu, University of California, Davis

POSTERS:

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

A THEORY OF PROACTIVE AND REACTIVE LOBBYING: OR WHAT SIR ISAAC NEWTON CAN TEACH US ABOUT FIREFIGHTING

Author(s):   Ms. Christine Mahoney   cxm548@psu.edu
Discussant(s):   Linda Fowler (Dartmouth College)

WHY INDEPENDENCE?

Author(s):   Dawn Brancati   dbrancati@hmdc.harvard.edu
Discussant(s):   Larry Bartels (Princeton University)

INTEREST GROUP IDEOLOGY AND LOBBYING PARTNER SELECTION: MODELS AND EVIDENCE FROM AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFS

Author(s):   Mr. Richard A. Almeida   ralmeida@semo.edu
Discussant(s):   Gary King (Harvard University)

THE COALITION MERCHANTS: HOW IDEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE SHAPED THE COALITIONS FORMED IN CONGRESS, 1930-1990

Author(s):   Hans Noel   hnoel@ucla.edu
Discussant(s):   Ken Kollman (University of Michigan)

HOW LEGISLATIVE STAFFERS PERCEIVE PARTY-LINE VOTING IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Author(s):   Mr. Zachary Cook   z-cook@northwestern.edu
Discussant(s):   Barry Burden (Harvard University)

CROSSING THE LINE: ELECTORAL CONSEQUENCES OF REDISTRICTING ACROSS COUNTY BOUNDARIES

Author(s):   Laura E. Miller   lemiller@stanford.edu
Discussant(s):   Richard Niemi (University of Rochester)

CITIZEN TRUST IN THE STATE: EXPLAINING ETHNIC PARTY SUCCESS IN INDIA

Author(s):   Amit Ahuja   aahuja@umich.edu
Discussant(s):   Yoshiko Herrera (Harvard University)

PARTNERING TO CHANGE THE WORLD: ALLIANCE BEHAVIOR IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Author(s):   Ms. Devashree Gupta   dg78@cornell.edu
Discussant(s):   Frank Baumgartner (Pennsylvania State University)

STATE PARTY RULES AND PARTY POLARIZATION

Author(s):   Daniel J. Coffey djc2r@virginia.edu
Discussant(s):   John Aldrich (Duke University)

TABLE 1: Party Polarization Among Presidential Campaign Activists and Mass Party Identifiers on Social Welfare, Racial, and Cultural Issues[1].

	SOCIAL WELFARE	RACIAL	CULTURAL
Activists[2]			
1984	.77	.72	.57
1988	.74	.68	.63
1992	.83	.79	.77
2000	.99	.73	.88
Identifiers[3]			
1972	.26	.12	.001
1976	.34	.15	.04
1980	.33	.24	.12
1984	.29	.29	.14
1988	.32	.28	.07
1992	.33	.28	.28
1996	.41	.31	.30
2000	.30	.30	.28
2004	.43	.44	.38

[1]Entries are estimated differences between Democrats and Republicans on latent issue variables (ranging from -1 for most liberal to 1 for most conservative) from confirmatory factor models. In all cases, a model with three factors fits the data significantly better than models with one or two factors.
[2]Data are from 1984, 1988, 1992, and 2000 Convention Delegate Studies (CDS), conducted by Warren Miller and M. Kent Jennings in 1984 and 1988, by Miller and Richard Herrera in 1992, and by Thomas Carsey, John Green, Richard Herrera, and Geoffrey Layman in 2000. There was no CDS survey conducted in 1996, and few issue questions were asked in CDS surveys prior to 1984.
[3]Data are from the American National Election Studies, 1972-2004.

PARTY ACTIVISTS

Much like two of the leading treatments of activist-level partisan change (Aldrich 1984; Miller and Schofield 2003), we think of the issue space as being multi-dimensional and populated by "clusters" of potential activists at various positions away from the median voter. Party leaders and candidates adopt policy positions designed to attract and mobilize these clusters. In their two-dimensional framework, Miller and Schofield (2003) describe partisan change as a series of "flanking" maneuvers by the two parties as they try to attract new activist clusters. The problem parties face is that every move toward some cluster of new activists is necessarily a move away from clusters of current activists. Thus, as parties move to capture activists polarized on one issue dimension, they necessarily begin to minimize conflict on the other. This process is essentially one of conflict displacement. Why then do we see evidence of conflict extension among party activists? We believe that several factors are important.

First, American political parties, particularly their nominating processes, have become increasingly open and participatory. Thus, clusters of potential activists need not wait passively for a party to move in their direction, but can actively decide to move into a party and attempt to shape its policy agenda. Similarly, different groups of strategic politicians within a party can try to attract different clusters of activists into the party. The end result may be that ideologically - extreme views on multiple policy dimensions are represented within a party's activist base.

Second, many activists care strongly about only a limited set of issues, behaving something like "issue publics." Thus, when a group motivated by a new set of issues moves into a party, it may not place much pressure on the party to soften its stand on older issues because it does not attach much importance to those issues. Meanwhile, losses among veteran activists from the party's more-extreme positions on the newer issues may be limited because these activists are motivated largely by the older issues. Thus, parties might be able to form coalitions of issue publics who care deeply about their respective sets of issues, but remain largely indifferent to their party's position on other issues.

However, such coalitions may be unstable in the long run if activists' attitudes on two (or more) issue agendas remain unrelated to each other. This sort of coalition

likely would be quite vulnerable to efforts by the other party to drive a wedge into it and/or to groups of activists threatening to abandon the party. Thus, our third point is that there must be some process that helps bring these issue dimensions closer together for at least a segment of the activist population. We focus on two possibilities: replacement and conversion.

There certainly are potential activists who hold ideologically-extreme views on multiple policy dimensions. As a party moves toward highly-liberal or highly-conservative positions on multiple sets of issues, these individuals should grow more likely to become involved in the party, and may replace those activists who are moderate or cross-pressured on different issue dimensions. This parallels the replacement process assumed by Aldrich (1983) and Miller and Schofield (2003). However, just as their models point to conflict displacement, we argue that replacement alone is unlikely to sustain conflict extension in the long run (Layman et al 2005).

We believe that attitudinal conversion plays a critical role in creating and sustaining conflict extension among party activists. Numerous scholars show that conversion contributes to activist-level partisan change, and there are several reasons why activists motivated by their ideologically-extreme views on one issue dimension may convert to extreme positions on issues that are less salient to them. First, interaction with fellow partisans who hold non-centrist views on other issues may begin to color activists' views on those issues. Second, the presence of groups of activists with extreme views on different sets of issues makes it more likely that a party will nominate candidates and draft platforms that adopt non-centrist stands on each set. This should send and re-enforce signals that being a Democrat or a Republican entails holding consistently-liberal or conservative views across multiple issue dimensions. Third, most activist have strong loyalties to their party that color their issue positions. In short, becoming active in a political party to pursue a particular issue agenda creates pressures and opportunities from some activists to bring their views on less-salient issues into line with the party's overall platform.

Using cross-sectional and panel data from the Convention Delegate Study surveys (see Table 1 for details), we find that both replacement and conversion have contributed to conflict extension among Democratic and Republican activists. In both parties, new activists have had less-centrist views on social welfare, racial, and cultural issues than the old activists whom they replaced, and continuing activists have converted over time toward more-extreme positions on these agendas (Layman et al 2005).

THE PARTIES IN THE ELECTORATE

At the mass level, the key to understanding why conflict extension rather than conflict displacement has occurred rests on the assumptions about individual-level partisan change that underlie each perspective. The partisan change literature tends to see party polarization on new issue agendas resulting from individuals changing their party ties—either switching parties or choosing a party affiliation for the first time—in response to the new issues, rather than adjusting their issue attitudes based on their party attachments. If individuals do not change their views on issues based on their party attachments, then citizens who were cross-pressured on the new and old issues will remain cross-pressured. Thus, as individuals increasingly choose party identifications based on the new issues, party polarization on the old issues should decline, and conflict displacement results.

However, drawing on work that views party identification as a deeply-held orientation that shapes policy attitudes (e.g. Campbell et al 1960; *(continued from page 6)* Zaller 1992), we contend that when party elites grow increasingly polarized on new issues, some individuals should change their views on the issues based on their party attachments rather than adjusting their party attachments rather than adjusting their party ties based on their issue positions. Using panel data from the National Election Studies, we find that increases in aggregate party polarization on important issues has resulted both from individuals reshaping their party identifications based on their issue attitudes and from individuals moving their issue positions based on their party loyalties. If some party identifiers change their views on various issue agendas to make them consistent with their party's stands, then

- 6 -

citizens' attitudes on previously cross-cutting policy dimensions should move closer together, allowing the parties' coalitions to grow more polarized on all of the agendas, resulting in conflict extension.

Of course, if all citizens demonstrate party-based issue conversion, then eventual outcome might be the convergence of policy attitudes to a single left-right policy dimension, much like in Congress (e.g. Poole and Rosenthal 1997). Such a development, however, seems unlikely because only some citizens respond to all to the signal sent by elite-level party polarization. These should be party identifiers who are aware of elite polarization on particular issue agendas. Furthermore, only some of these individuals who do respond to elite-level polarization will change their issue positions. Citizens who do not find the issues to be salient should be more likely than citizens who do to adjust their views based on their party identifications. The end result of only some individuals bringing their issue attitudes closer to the ideologically-extreme positions of their party's elites should be conflict extension: mass attitudes toward different issue dimensions remaining distinct, but the parties' coalitions growing more polarized on all of them.

CONCLUSION

Like most projects, our work on partisan conflict extension has occupied our time for several years, and is likely to do so for a few more. Some of our arguments and evidence already appear in journals. Some of it is in papers that either are currently under review or that we hope to submit for review relatively soon. We are now turning our attention to bringing this work, along with some new material, together into a book manuscript. So, we welcome any comments, criticisms, or suggestions anyone may have.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, John H. 1983. "A Spatial Model with Party Activists: Implications for Electoral Dynamics." *Public Choice* 41:63-100.

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, 1960. *The American Voter*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel J. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope, 2005. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America*. New York: Pearson Longman.

Layman, Geoffrey C. and Thomas M. Carsey, 2002. "Party Polarization and 'Conflict Extension' in the American Electorate." *American Journal of Political Science* 46:786-802.

Layman, Geoffrey, Thomas Carsey, John Green, and Richard Herrera, 2005. "Party Polarization and 'Conflict Extension" in the United States: The Case of Party Activists." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans.

Miller, Gary, and Norman Schofield, 2003. "Activists and Partisans Realignment in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 97:245-260.

Poole, Keith T., and Howard Rosenthal, 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Voting*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schattschneider, E. E., 1960. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Sundquist, James L., 1983. *Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

Zaller, John, 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

FROM THE FIELD

CONGRESS TO CAMPUS PROGRAM
The United State Former Members
of Congress in Partnership with
Center for Democracy and Citizenship and
Stennis Center for Public Service

The Congress to Campus Program was founded by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress Association in 1976. It reaches a wide audience of students, faculty, and college communities with its unique story about representative democracy and a special call to public service. Over the years, the Association has entered into strategic alliances with the Stennis Center for Public Service (1996) and the Center for Democracy & Citizenship (2002) to strengthen and expand the Program.

Much has been said and written lately concerning the sad state of civic literacy among America's young people. With the drop in participation in politics and voting even among college-educated young adults, not only is the breadth and depth of the electorate in decline, but the source of informed leaders for the future is in some jeopardy. That is a problem for democratic government in the United States, which depends on an educated citizenry and on a stock of well-informed leaders who are willing and able to fill the many elected and appointed positions at all levels of the government.

The Congress to Campus Program addresses several aspects of the civic learning and engagement deficit among the country's college-age young people, combining traditional educational content with a strong message about public service. The Program sends bipartisan pairs of former Members of Congress — one Democrat and one Republican — to visit college, university and community college campuses around the country. Over the course of two work days, the Members conduct classes, hold community forums, meeting informally with students and faculty, visit high schools and civic organizations, and do interviews and talk show appearances with local press and media.

The Program provides a distinctive and powerful means to educate the next generation about American government, politics, and public affairs. The sponsoring school is responsible for the schedule of events for each visit (with guidance from Program staff), for the visit's on-site costs, and for a contribution toward the administrative program costs of the program (based on the school's financial resources). The Members provide solid content, discussing how Congress and the government *really* work and relating their experiences as candidates and politicians, all combined with an appeal to public service and an important message about bipartisan cooperation.

Typically, the visiting Members will share their real life experiences of both achievement and occasional frustration - bringing to life for their young audiences the theory and the practice of democracy and explaining the often arcane ways of Congress and Washington. They present a living, bipartisan demonstration of what ought to typify our representative system: decent people with different points of view, who are able to discuss constructive ways to work through their differences to solve public problems. They give students and faculty an authentic and candid "insiders" look at the workings of American government and politics. This is a story of government and politics - positive but not unblemished - told in the compelling voices of those who have lived out the democracy's promise and met its challenges in the tough world of national politics.

In addition to these educational objectives, the former Members use the campus visits to inspire and encourage students to consider public service and government careers. With the imminent retirement of a large portion of the civil service at the federal level and in many of the states, the recruitment of talented young people is critical. Former Members receive briefing materials on current issues and public service career information for distribution to interested students.

The Program has enjoyed marked growth in the last three years, while also assuring that Members and the host schools enjoy a substantive, worthwhile experience. For each visit, the Center works with the host school to provide advice about the kinds of activities to schedule, to coordinate arrangements, and to review the schedule and program content. We systematically review the experience from each visit to distill lessons learned that can improve the planning and execution of subsequent visits.

Past campus visits have always received good evaluations from faculty sponsors. In 2002-03 and 2003-04 we also developed quantitative data to determine the impact of the Program, having the sponsoring faculty at each administer a simple questionnaire. By surveying a sample of students who participate in the Program's campus activities and a sample of comparable students who do not, we now have a better idea of the Program's effectiveness. The students exposed to the Program express more positive attitudes toward public officials and public service career options that are statistically significant compared to students with no exposure to the Program.

The U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is a nonprofit organization chartered by the Congress of the United States. It "seeks to promote the improved public understanding of the Congress as an institution and representative democracy as a system of government." The Stennis Center for Public Service is an organization established by law as an entity of the Congress and has been the Association's partner in managing the Program since 1996. In 2002, the Association engaged the Center for Democracy & Citizenship to manage the Program in partnership with Stennis; it is part of the Council for Excellence in Government, a qualified 501(c)(3) organization.

For additional information contact former Congressman David Skaggs, Executive Director, Center for Democracy & Citizenship, 1301 K Street NW, Suite 450 West, Washington, DC 20005; 202-728-0418, congresstocampus@excelgov.org or Brother Skaggs, Assistant Director for Programs, Stennis Center for Public Service, Box 6929, Mississippi, MS 39762; 662-325-8409; brother@stennis.gov.

- 8 -

American Political Science Association
101st Annual Meeting
September 1-4, 2005 • Washington, DC
Program Theme: Mobilizing Democracy

Theorists have posted that people who live in democracies are freer to express their preferences and that officeholders are more likely to respond to these preferences; that in democracy there is more room for meaningful debate and deliberation; and that under the proper conditions democratic decision-making will produce fair and just social outcomes.

For more information and registration, go to www.apsanet.org, before August 10, 2005.

SAVE THE DATE
The State of the Parties: 2004 & Beyond
October 5-7, 2005 • Akron, Ohio

The 2004 presidential election was extraordinary in many respects, including a massive increase in voter turnout, new records in campaign spending, and innovations in grassroots politics - all contributing to a nearly evenly divided nation on Election Day.

What role did political parties play in these events? How did the party organizations fare? What are the implications for the future? The fourth "State of the Parties" Conference on October 5-7, 2005; will seek to answer these questions.

Conference session will cover the activity of local, state, and national party organizations in the 2004 elections; party elites; major party nominating institutions; party finance; party coalitions; minor parties; party organizations; party activists; and party in government. Papers will be presented by leading political scientists, including James Reichley, John Jackson, David Magleby, John Petrocik, Ron Rapoport, Daniel Shea, Walter Stone, and James Thurber. For more information and conference registration, contact the Bliss Institute at 330-972-5182 or visit our website: www.WinningPolitics.com.

The University of Akron

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