

Volume 26, Number 1, January 2003

## **Current Section Officers**

### **From the Chair**

### **From the Editor**

*Legislative Studies Section Newsletter* is published at the Carl Albert Center, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, under the authority of the Legislative Studies Section of the American Political Science Association. The LSS and APSA are non-profit educational associations. The *Newsletter* is uploaded to this web site twice yearly: in January and in July.

<b>Editor:</b>	<a href="#"><u><b>Ronald M. Peters, Jr.</b></u></a>
<b>Editor, "Extension of Remarks":</b>	<a href="#"><u><b>Burdett A. Loomis</b></u></a> <i>University of Kansas</i>
<b>Co-Editors:</b>	<a href="#"><u><b>Gary W. Copeland</b></u></a> <a href="#"><u><b>Cindy Simon Rosenthal</b></u></a>
<b>Managing Editor:</b>	<a href="#"><u><b>LaDonna Sullivan</b></u></a>
<b>Editorial Assistant:</b>	<a href="#"><u><b>Laurie McReynolds</b></u></a>
<b>Web Master:</b>	<a href="#"><u><b>Robert Kelly Jr.</b></u></a>

Attribution, where appropriate, appears at the end of the salient articles, tables, and graphs. Several articles are reprinted with the permission of *Roll Call*, *State Legislatures*, and *Governing*, for which they retain all rights for reprint. Special thanks to these publications for their cooperation, advice, and kindness.

## **Current Section Officers**

**Chairperson**

Professor David R. Mayhew  
Department of Political Science  
Yale University  
124 Prospect St.  
P.O. Box 208301  
New Haven, CT 06520-8301  
(203) 432-5237  
Email: [david.mayhew@yale.edu](mailto:david.mayhew@yale.edu)

**Secretary/Treasurer**

Professor Frances E. Lee  
Department of Political Science  
10900 Euclid Avenue  
Case Western Reserve University  
Cleveland, OH 44106-7109  
(216) 368-5265  
Email: [fel@po.cwru.edu](mailto:fel@po.cwru.edu)

**Editor, *LSS Newsletter***

Professor Ronald M. Peters Jr.  
Carl Albert Center  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, OK 73019  
(405) 325-6372  
Email: [rpeters@ou.edu](mailto:rpeters@ou.edu)

**Editor, "Extension of Remarks"**

Professor Burdett A. Loomis  
Department of Political Science  
504 Blake Hall  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045-2157  
(913) 864-3523  
Email: [bloomis@ku.edu](mailto:bloomis@ku.edu)

**LSS Program Chair, 2002-2003**

Professor Nichol C. Rae  
Dept. of Political Science  
Florida International University  
University Park  
Miami, FL 33199  
(305) 348-2270  
Email: [raen@fiu.edu](mailto:raen@fiu.edu)

**Member-At-Large, 2001-2003**

Professor Alison Alter  
Department of Political Science  
University of Wisconsin -- Milwaukee  
P.O. Box 413  
Milwaukee, WI 53201  
(414) 229-2649  
Email: [alison\\_alter@post.harvard.edu](mailto:alison_alter@post.harvard.edu)  
Email: [aalter@uwm.edu](mailto:aalter@uwm.edu)

**Member-At-Large, 2001-2003**

Professor William Mishler  
Department of Political Science  
Social Sciences Building, Room 315C  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721-0027  
(520) 621-7600  
Email: [mishler@u.arizona.edu](mailto:mishler@u.arizona.edu)

**Member-At-Large, 2001-2003**

Professor Thomas F. Remington  
Department of Political Science  
Emory University  
Atlanta, GA 30322  
(404) 727-6566  
Email: [polstfr@emory.edu](mailto:polstfr@emory.edu)

**Preceding LSS Chair**

Professor John Hibbing  
Department of Political Science  
P.O. Box 880328  
University of Nebraska  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0328  
(402) 472-3220  
Email: [jhibbing@unlserve.unl.edu](mailto:jhibbing@unlserve.unl.edu)

---

From the Chair

---

[David R. Mayhew](#)  
Yale University

From my vantage point as LSS chair, many thanks to many people for making the 2002 APSA convention work out. To Gary Moncrief for organizing the LSS program, to Frances Lee for planning the LSS 25th anniversary reception, to Gerry Loewenberg and Dick Fenno for their remarks at that reception, to the even dozen people who served on the four LSS award committees, and to Karl Kurtz, who at the LSS business meeting introduced and won approval of a new annual award. That will be the Alan Rosenthal Prize for best book or article in legislative studies written by a junior scholar that has potential value to legislative practitioners.

Planning for the LSS side of the 2003 convention is well underway with Nicol Rae having agreed to serve as program chair.

At the 2003 LSS business meeting, we will need to elect new officers to the usual two-year terms—chair, secretary-treasurer, and three board members. For a nominating committee to recommend those new officers, I have appointed Michael Mezey (chair), Wendy Schiller, and D. Roderick Kiewiet.

For the LSS newsletter, an immediate need is a new editor of the “Extension of Remarks” section to carry on the excellent work of Burdett Loomis. Anyone interested please get in touch with me at [david.mayhew@yale.edu](mailto:david.mayhew@yale.edu) or Ron Peters at [rpeters@ou.edu](mailto:rpeters@ou.edu).

---

## From the Editor

---

[Ronald M. Peters, Jr.](#)

Carl Albert Center, University of Oklahoma

As members are by now aware, at last September’s business meeting those present voted to approve a plan to enroll all LSS members on the LSS listserve. This step was taken in order to “jump start” usage of the listserve, which since its inception last year had lagged in usage in comparison to those of other organized sections. It was specified that in enrolling all members we would make provision to unsubscribe members by request.

The first flurry of activity occurred over the semester break, in December 2002 and January 2003. It was satisfying to see members utilizing the listserve and some of the contributions and exchanges were of a substantive character, just the type of communication we hope to provide to our “virtual community” of legislative scholars.

However, some members did find it annoying to be bombarded by messages and a few observed that the kinds of interaction that the listserve was carrying were more appropriate for chat rooms or discussion boards than for a listserve devoted to posting inquiries, announcements, etc. About 103 members have unsubscribed to the listserve, so there are now 454 members remaining on the listserve.

During the flurry of messages over the semester break, members themselves posted helpful information, including how to unsubscribe oneself and how to create a daily digest that collects all listserve postings and delivers them once a day in a single message.

By February 2003, traffic on the listserve had been dramatically reduced. This may have been due to several factors: unsubscriptions, discouragement of the “dialogues” by the

several complaints that were posted, or perhaps most plausibly, everyone got busy with the beginning of the new semester.

As part of our ongoing effort to make cyberspace user friendly for LSS, we want to suggest the following steps and options.

First, we post separately on the LSS website the information on how to create a daily digest <<http://www.apsanet.org/~lss/listserv.html>>. This will be very helpful to those who find it aggravating to receive email messages intermittently. I have undertaken this myself and really like getting my digest at the end of the day.

Second, we remind members that there is an open, Online Forum for more extended dialogues. Information about how to access the Online Forum is posted on the Announcements <<http://www.apsanet.org/~lss/announce.html>> page of the LSS website. We encourage members to open a discussion on the Online Forum, then use the listserve to announce their topic and invite other members to go to the Online Forum to participate in extended dialogue.

Third, we again encourage use of the listserve for appropriate, professional announcements and inquiries. This is the listserve's best and most appropriate use and it is of great benefit to us as we seek to facilitate communication among and between members of the LSS.

Finally, we invite any further suggestions or comments about the Newsletter, ListServe, Online Forum, or any other matter that we can address to better serve the membership.

| [Back to Top of This Page](#) |

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---

- 
- [\*\*Campaign Finance Reform and the Future of the Democratic Party\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Capitol Offenders: How Private Interests Govern Our States\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*The Clinton Wars: The Constitution, Congress, and War Powers\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Financing the 2000 Election\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Governance for a New Century: Japanese Challenges, American Experience\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Government's Greatest Achievements: From Civil Rights to Homeland Security\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Inside the House: Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*The Making of an American Senate, Reconstitutive Change in Congress, 1787-1841\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*The Movers and the Shirkers: Representatives and Ideologues in the Senate\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*To Assure Pride and Confidence in the Electoral Process\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*U. S. Senate: Exceptionalism\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Warring Factions: Interest Groups, Money, and the New Politics of Senate Confirmation\*\*](#)
  - [\*\*Why Congressional Reforms Fail: Reelection and the House Committee System\*\*](#)
- 

**Campaign Finance Reform and the Future of the Democratic Party**, Jerrold E. Schneider, Routledge, 2002. ISBN 041593320X, \$19.00, paper, 219 pages.

Stubbornly occupying the political agenda of the most recent presidential election and the most recent congressional sessions, campaign finance reform has been a key issue in contemporary politics. Thus, Jerrold E. Schneider's book, *Campaign Finance Reform and the Future of the Democratic Party*, is a timely exposition interpreting the probable repercussions of an effective campaign finance reform law upon America and, most importantly, the Democratic Party.

Schneider's book is a valuable resource for students and scholars interested in either American political parties, campaign finance reform, or both. He makes three significant contributions with *Campaign Finance Reform and the Future of the Democratic Party*. First, his scholarship stands within the long-standing debate in political party literature between those whom he identifies as Pluralists (who believe that representation provided by the parties is weak, interest group influences are strong, and campaign finance reform results would be minimal), and Strong Party theorists (those who believe that a strong party is the only instrument for meaningful representation so changes in contributions would alter legislative behavior). Schneider places himself among the Strong Party theorists due to anomalies that he claims Pluralist theories are unable to explain. This theoretical juxtaposition is important for two reasons: one, it gives the reader a brief and coherent synopsis of the popular theories and their assumptions that dominate political party literature; twp, it provides the justification for why campaign finance reform is a meaningful issue, is worth discussing, and can affect the political landscape.

Second, Schneider contributes to campaign finance reform scholarship by defining "effective" campaign finance reform. He argues that members of Congress would more faithfully represent voter's preferences and create better policies if a reform package adopts, among other things, the following

measures: voluntary full public financing of campaigns; public matching financing in response to privately funded campaign communications; and expanding public broadcasting. Any reform leaving out these measures, he argues, will fall short of producing meaningful change. More importantly, these reforms are far more politically feasible than any current plan proposing to limit expenditures or spending. The McCain-Feingold bill (now since passed and entitled the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act of 2002) is absent from Schneider's discussion regarding reform, with the exception of scant attention in the appendix. In his very brief mention of McCain-Feingold, and other reforms, Schneider is quick to point out that these proposals fall short of being "effective" because they lack the aforementioned suggestions. Thus, he predicts that McCain-Feingold will not alter legislative behavior.

Finally, Schneider discusses the consequences of campaign finance reform on America and the Democratic Party which, he suggests, is being hurt more by special interests and the money chase. He argues that campaign finance reforms would allow Democratic lawmakers the opportunity to focus on legislative priorities for their voting base and not on contributors. If special interests did not have to be serviced by line after line of pork-barrel appropriations, then Democrat lawmakers could take the wasted money, he estimates at \$1 trillion, and put it into progressive economic policies aimed at increasing worker productivity and reducing economic inequality. These public sector investments in education, job training, and health care can reverse the decline of the Democratic Party's voting base. Most importantly, Schneider claims that a \$1 trillion re-allotment in these service programs could create \$10 trillion for the American economy.

Regardless of whether one agrees with his conclusions, his book would make an excellent supplementary text to any political science course discussing American political parties, campaign finance reform, or both as readers will find many topics and points to discuss and debate. In conclusion, Jerrold E. Schneider's book is meticulous yet succinct, making it a valuable resource for those fascinated with the dynamics of American politics.

Josh Stockley  
Ph. D. student of political science  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Capitol Offenders: How Private Interests Govern Our States***, Diane Renzulli and the Center for Public Integrity. Public Integrity Books, 2002. ISBN 1882583140, \$14.00, paper, 297 pages.

Whether at the grassroots, the treetops, or the Astroturf level, lobbying is alive and well in the United States. Consequently, any discussion of representation and politics in the United States is largely incomplete without some reference to interest groups and some discussion of the impact that this shadow government has upon the political process and perhaps more importantly, policy outcomes. Certainly more than a cursory glance at the interest group variable is necessary when lobbyists employ strategic tactics to gain influence, access, and ultimately, the votes of Congressmen. While the focus of much scholarly literature on the topic has been directed at the level of the U.S. Congress, Diane Renzulli and the Center for Public Integrity explore the impact of special interests at the state level.

In an era of devolution, the states have recaptured their past glory and solidified their status as the laboratories of American democracy. This vision of the states as policy innovators necessitates enhanced scholarly efforts at examining state legislatures and the pivotal role that they play in casting the direction of state policy. Renzulli invokes causal stories as well as some aggregate data to demonstrate the (supposed) insidious nature of politicking between state legislators and special interests. Indeed, she generally portrays the relationship between these two groups as symbiotic, if not parasitic.

While Renzulli uncovers ample anecdotal evidence at the state level to back her claims of corruption, what remains unclear is the *extent* of corruption. Renzulli concedes at almost every turn that the

majority of politicians are trustworthy, yet still feels compelled to argue that the entire system is in peril due to the few bad apples that she identifies. The fact that there exist six lobbyists for every individual state legislator is quite troublesome to Renzulli (as evidenced by the fact that she repeats this fact in virtually every chapter), yet she fails to offer statistics as to the percentage that might represent public interests (i.e. children, orphans, the mentally ill).

Although there is always room for another normative argument about the necessity of purging the system, Renzulli's effort seems somewhat misdirected. After criticizing interest groups of almost every ilk, she finally admits that a dearth of oversight and/or lax enforcement at the state level with regard to ethics violations is a contributing factor. Yet, the overarching tone of her work implicates special interests as bad, state legislators as captive, and the public as hoodwinked. Instead of highlighting how states might better hold themselves accountable, Renzulli falls prey to the straw man trap, skewering interest groups while giving lip service to the need for states to reform (or pass) their own ethics laws, campaign laws, and term limits provisions.

Larycia A. Hawkins  
Ph. D. student of political science  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Financing the 2000 Election***, edited by David B. Magleby, Brookings Institution Press, 2002, ISBN 0815706227, \$54.95, cloth, 260 pages.

The Citizens Research Foundation has been publishing accounts of campaign and election funding every four years since 1960. This book is the latest edition of such efforts. This is an eminently readable and complete analysis of campaign financing in the 2000 election cycle. It is a work which can be easily referenced as it breaks each topic down into separate chapters. There are also helpful charts and graphs throughout the text. The primary concern is with the role of money within politics, and this work does an excellent job of framing each specific element of campaign finance within the bigger picture of the legitimacy of our electoral system given the role that money plays.

There are separate treatments for several aspects of campaign finance. There is an introductory chapter from Magleby that addresses the nature and importance of the 2000 election. Candice J. Nelson provides a treatment of the aggregate spending in 2000 and compares 2000 trends to previous election cycles. John C. Green and Nathan S. Bigelow and Anthony Corrado handle the financing of the presidential election in two parts, one a chapter devoted to the nomination campaign and the other for the general election. Paul Herndon and Kelly D. Patterson summarize the financing of the congressional elections. A critical look at the role of political parties in the financing of campaigns is performed by Diana Dwyre and Robin Kolodny. Allan J. Cigler investigates the role of interest groups in this election cycle, while Anthony Gierzynski provides analysis of the financing of state level elections. This particular edition is the first to include a chapter devoted to the financing of judicial elections, authored by Roy A. Schotland.

Thomas E. Mann, in his conclusion, summarizes the trends of financing the elections of 2000, "The explosive growth of funding in targeted contests, the diminishing role of public financing in presidential elections, the increasing importance of unregulated spending by parties and groups, and the loss of transparency as disclosure requirements are circumvented by candidates-specific issue advocacy and by a dizzying pattern of financial transfers among party organizations together confirm how far campaign finance practice has departed from the intentions of the law's framers" (238).

Aleisha Karjala  
Ph. D. student of political science  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Governance for a New Century: Japanese Challenges, American Experience***, edited by Thomas

E. Mann and Sasaki Takeshi, The Brookings Institution Press, 2002. ISBN 4889070613, \$23.00, paper, 140 pages.

Written in comparative perspective *Governance for a New Century: Japanese Challenges, American Experience* is a brilliant collection of essays by some of the finest experts from Japan and America. The book is structured around the core premise that "Japan and the United States face many similar challenges of governance" in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Concurring with neo-institutionalism that "institutions clearly matter", the authors endorse a positive but caution approach to political reforms in Japan, notwithstanding Prime Minister Koizumi's stunning success in reigning the faction ridden LDP and parliamentary victory. Five leading Japanese scholars and practitioners discuss Japanese public opinion, elections, political finance, Japanese style political corruption, and an intransigent bureaucracy. For instance, Taniguchi Masaki's description of political funding reform reveals more success in "changing the law than in producing the desired effects".

In contrast, five leading American policy experts including Thomas Mann enrich the comparative perspective of the volume by offering insights from the American experience. The most interesting comparative insight comes from James Lindsay's exploration of reforms in decision-making process in American Congress. Lindsay succinctly argues that disillusioned by the Vietnam War, many Americans supported the efforts of reform in Congress in the 1970s that eventually led to a decentralization of power, relative independence of junior members, dispersal of power to subcommittees, or "the smaller gurus", collapse of the iron-triangle system, expansion of congressional staff, creation of new agencies to strengthen Congress's capacity for policy making. But herein lies the paradox, according to Lindsay. More democracy does not necessarily lead to better governance. The reforms of the 1970s made Congress more democratic, more accountable to the public. Yet Congress has increasingly come to be characterized by gridlock, more ad hoc policymaking arrangements, the smaller gurus becoming hostage of narrower interests in the 1980s and 1990s. This explains why reformers have sought some recentralization of power in recent years. Therefore, the decentralization of power is a double-edged sword, and this lesson is worth remembering in assessing similar reforms in Japanese Diet, Lindsay argues. This book is undeniably a must read to anyone interested in not just Japanese politics but also American Politics.

Ashwani Kumar  
Ph. D. student of political science  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Government's Greatest Achievements: From Civil Rights to Homeland Security***, Paul Charles Light. Brookings Institution Press, 2002. ISBN 0815706049, \$19.95, cloth, 241 pages.

David Mayhew has kept Paul Light busy. He (Light) has followed Mayhew down the path of assessing Congress's performance by tabulating and weighing the value of congressional enactments. In *Tides of Reform* Light tracks over 140 congressional enactments seeking to reform the federal bureaucracy and draws conclusions about their inspiration, derivation, path to enactment, and impact. His goal is empirical and theoretical: under what circumstances does Congress seek to reform the government and with what consequences?

Here, Light's goal is more explicitly normative. In *Divided We Govern* Mayhew had sought to show that the government works even when its powers are shared across party lines. To do that, he had to pick out important laws, and he found quite a few. In the present volume, Light wants to assess the most important of Congress's enactments since World War II, differentiating between the good and the great. His purpose is not simply normative, however; he also wants to consider the conditions under which great bills are likely to become law. In this sense, the book is a study in policy development, restricting its field of vision to the most significant bills the Congress has passed.



Necessarily, Light's selection criteria are subjective. He builds upon Mayhew's list, which lends a degree of intersubjective validity one supposes to the list. Of course, some bills are non-controversially important - the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - but others seem less likely to win quick endorsement. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings? Well, maybe. If it were merely a matter of fostering great bills as historians do great presidents, differences of opinion at the margins would not matter much - part of the fun of the game. But Light wants to draw conclusions about how great laws are made by offering narratives about the statutes on this list. He plunges fifty deep into the roster of great achievements, and then faces the challenge of generalizing from a rather disparate set of cases. Necessarily, this restricts generalization to the most obvious factors; government stumbles along, rarely getting things right on the first attempt (as Lindlbom told us long ago); great achievements require strong civic support; etc.

A concluding chapter looks to the future and draws on a survey of academics to establish the most important issues facing the country, the great achievements of the next century laying in wait. A 27% response rate from an arbitrarily designated group does not appear too firm a footing for making normative claims, which these are. Still, Light succeeds here just where he is strong elsewhere: he never loses sight of things that are really important. Or at least, he never stops pursuing them. So, agree with him or not, he forces the reader to think about the questions he raises.

Ron Peters  
Regents' Professor of Political Science  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Inside the House: Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works***, edited by Michal T. Hayes and Lou Frey, Jr., University Press of America, 2001. ISBN 0761819371, \$32.50, paper, 344 pages.

In their edited volume *Inside the House: Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works*, Lou Frey, Jr. and Michael T. Hayes bring together an impressive assortment of former members to explain the workings, not only of the House of Representatives, but also what goes on behind the scenes in the lives of its members. They succeed in both these endeavors, providing an introduction to the formal rules and institutions of the House while also providing a glimpse into not only the personal side of elective service, but also the sense of accomplishment that these members feel from their service.

The book itself is divided into eight parts, each of which is comprised of chapters written by different former House members who represent a full range of political ideologies and backgrounds. The book is at its best in parts one, two, three, and seven, which deal with the personal side of Congress. In these chapters, former members, a former member's spouse, and a former staff member all discuss their experiences in terms of what went into their decisions to run, their personal experiences moving to Washington, and the choices that they made in order to make a difference as only one of 435. These short anecdotes provide insight into what motivates Members that can only be provided by former members themselves.

Parts four, five, and six, all deal with the actual mechanics of the House, with members explaining the committee system, the actual rules of the House, as well as the role of parties and the media in the lives of Members. These sections are especially enlightening as a way to compare the traditional understanding of the legislative process with the behind-the-scenes view of former members.

Finally, part eight provides an opportunity for the former members to look at the House today and evaluate the changes that have occurred over time. The one change that most contributors agree has happened, and which they dislike, is an increase in partisanship that has broken the collegiality that they enjoyed during their service in the House. These insights are useful in evaluating the current situation relative to the experience of past members.

In his preface, Frey, Jr. describes the mission of the book as providing “an inside look at the Congress from a personal viewpoint” (xi). He and Hayes have succeeded, drawing former members, spouses, lobbyists, and staffers together to give students and scholars a look at the House from the inside, providing unique observations that explain the institutions and rules of the House as well as the importance of the individual personalities that comprise its membership. While there is no comprehensive argument presented, Frey, Jr. and Hayes provide a useful volume that encourages the student or scholar to develop an appreciation for both the institutions and personalities of the House.

Travis Chapman  
Carl Albert Undergraduate Fellow  
University of Oklahoma

---

***The Clinton Wars: The Constitution, Congress, and War Powers***, Ryan C. Hendrickson, Vanderbilt University Press, 2002, ISBN 0826514146, price?, paper, 224 pages.

As the United States embarks upon an era in history during which military actions may become frequently necessary, an examination of the constitutional powers granted to Congress and the president will become increasingly important. The two branches of the government have historically asserted their own power in struggles to control the use of the military and the international backdrop of the “war on terrorism” will likely imply more such battles. Ryan C. Hendrickson’s *The Clinton Wars: The Constitution, Congress, and War Powers* is an insightful analysis of how these struggles played out during the Clinton administration’s foreign military actions and the lessons they provide for future interactions.

Hendrickson uses case-studies of Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and terrorism to demonstrate how domestic and foreign political environments shaped the actions of the Clinton administration and Congress with regard to war powers. A president’s propensity to consult Congress, make a case to the public, gain United Nations approval, or simply obey the War Powers Resolution of 1973 are all considered and an overriding deference to the president is observed. Hendrickson concludes that the observed congressional deference in these cases was due to unique political and personal factors of the time and cannot be considered a norm of the institution.

*The Clinton Wars* makes a convincing case that war powers should not be in the hands of a single actor in an increasingly complex international environment. Ryan C. Hendrickson has provided a useful and important contribution to the study of American politics in the realm of international relations and this book will open students to the realities of presidential authority and the potential for their moderation.

Michael Avery  
Carl Albert Undergraduate Fellow  
University of Oklahoma

---

***The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress***, Michele L. Swers, The University of Chicago Press, 2002. ISBN 0226786498, \$16.00, paper, 200 pages.

By looking at bill sponsorship, cosponsorship, amendment, and roll call activity in *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*, Swers examines “whether congresswomen demonstrate a more intense commitment to the pursuit of women’s issue legislation and whether women bring a different point of view to the policy debate than do their male partisan colleagues” (7). But Swers does not stop there. She also examines how the political and positional context affects women’s ability to pursue legislative goals.

Swers first clarifies the concept of women’s issue legislation. She differentiates between feminist and

antifeminist bills. She then follows all bills dealing with women's issues in the 103<sup>rd</sup> and 104<sup>th</sup> Congresses through the entire legislative process from sponsorship to final vote. After tracking sponsorship, cosponsorship, amendment activity, and voting behavior, she employs regression analysis to measure differences in the involvement of male and female Members in women's issue legislation. She then combines the findings of this analysis with the qualitative findings of 28 interviews of representatives and congressional staff to develop a rich understanding of the influence of identity, specifically gender identity, on legislators' commitment to women's issue legislation.

In observing the 103<sup>rd</sup> and 104<sup>th</sup> Congresses, she finds that women do have a policy impact in Congress. Regardless of partisanship, they do "exhibit a profound commitment to the pursuit of policies for women, children, and families" (132). Swers qualifies this conclusion, however, with the following precaution. Simply increasing women's numbers in Congress will not lead to a greater representation of women's interests. It is also critical to look at the position of women within the institution, including: seniority, access to committee positions, and majority/minority party status.

Swers' work on the contemporary Congress is significant for a number of reasons. Rather than focusing on either anecdotal evidence or roll call data, Swers grounds her analysis on a rich data set combining both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Secondly, Swers provides a first look at the behavior of women within the formal institution of the House of Representatives. Finally, she offers one of the only examinations of women in the Congress since the partisan turnover in the House in 1994. Her comparison of the 103<sup>rd</sup> and 104<sup>th</sup> Congress is one of the few pieces of research available on the implications of party control for women's legislative behavior and institutional impact.

Jocelyn Jones  
Professor of Political Science  
University of Wisconsin at Green Bay

---

***The Making of an American Senate, Reconstitutive Change in Congress, 1787-1841***, Elaine K. Swift, University of Michigan Press, 2002. ISBN 0472088718, \$24.95, paper, 264 pages.

In a work that is intensely relevant to American politics, U.S. history, and political theory, Elaine Swift has provided us with new and provocative perspective from which to view the early history of the United States Senate, while simultaneously developing a model of political change that holds important lessons for anyone seeking to alter the organs of government. *The Making of an American Senate* chronicles the development of the early Senate from the Constitutional Convention in 1787 to the beginning of the 1840s with an eye towards the chamber's metamorphosis as an institution:

Originally the Framers had created a United States Senate grounded surprisingly not in Classical Republicanism or Liberal thought, but rather in the Tudor tradition of England's House of Lords. According to Swift, the Framers conceived a body playing a variety of roles not unlike those of Britain's upper chamber in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century. The Senate's lengthy terms, indirect election, and general form point to a body designed to represent a particular facet of society, an elite the Framer's saw as a necessary foil to the dangers of unfettered democracy.

For ten congresses the Senate retained this character, remaining relatively distant from the citizenry and collaborating little with the House of Representatives. By about 1809, however, the Senate was on the path to significant and lasting change. A small cadre of Senators became committed to a new vision of the Senate as an institution. During the next three decades the chamber underwent an evolution that saw it firmly engage the citizenry, the states, and the House of Representatives for the first time while also removing some of its superfluous ties with the Executive. These changes allowed the Senate to strengthen rather than weaken as the 1830s and 1840s approached, avoiding the fate of the body on which it was modeled, Britain's House of Lords, which has since become an obsolete and ceremonial entity rather than a functioning organ of government.

This story of the Senate's naissance and rebirth is not without an important theoretical framework. According to Swift, the Senate's realignment is representative of "Reconstitutive Change," defined as "a rapid, marked, and enduring shift in the fundamental dimensions of the institution." (Pg 5) This model of change is contrasted with short-term realignment that fails to become institutionalized and reverses itself quickly, as well as long-term evolution that, though lasting, has no defining moments of striking change. In this model of reform there are obvious lessons to be learned if one seeks to cause change in republican government. Critical to this lesson is the necessary confluence of both external factors such as changes in the political landscape and internal factors such as those within an institution who have vision and means to move forward with action. Whether the reader ultimately has designs to reform contemporary government or merely seeks a better academic understanding of our institutions, Swift's chronicle of the making of the American Senate nearly two centuries ago holds significant relevance in our time.

Brady Henderson  
Carl Albert Center Undergraduate Fellow  
University of Oklahoma

---

***The Movers and the Shirkers: Representatives and Ideologues in the Senate***, by Eric M. Uslaner, University of Michigan Press, 2002. ISBN 047208870X, \$22.95, paper, 248 pages.

***U. S. Senate: Exceptionalism***, edited by Bruce I. Oppenheimer. The Ohio State Press, 2002. ISBN 0814209157, \$65.00, cloth, 432 pages.

Many scholars have debated the extent to which the U.S. legislative system is *sui generis*, unlike any other law-making body in the world. *U.S. Senate Exceptionalism* examines whether or not, within that presumed uniqueness of Congress, the Senate specifically is remarkable among other legislating bodies. To really understand how our system of government stands alone, we must examine how "exceptional" the Senate as an institution is. Oppenheimer begins by observing, quite rightly, why the question of Senate exceptionalism has been overlooked in scholarly literature. First, most scholars are much more preoccupied with the House, owing both to the increased focus in legislative studies on the role of committees (which play a larger institutional role in the House) and to the larger number of observable cases in the House. Second, most of the research that focuses on the Senate finds its roots in research on the House, testing whether or not House findings hold true in the Senate but overlooking the possibility of fundamental institutional differences that might warrant a full investigation on Senate uniqueness.

The contributors to this volume constitute an impressive symposium of congressional scholars. Alan Abramowitz offers an explanation for increased party polarization in the Senate, owing primarily to an ideological realignment of the two parties alongside an increased electoral role of national issues and ideology. The extent to which conditional party government applies (or fails to apply) to the Senate, then, is at least as much a function of the greater electoral environment as it is of internal ideological cohesion and strong party leadership. Robert Erikson's piece places Senate volatility to national forces in theoretical perspective. While the Senate was designed to resist the ebbs and flows of popular opinion, he finds, it is actually much more receptive to public passion than is the House. This means that parties can control a large amount of their electoral fate by catering to public pressures and resisting the tendency to engage in "ideological indulgence". As Wendy Schiller finds, this need to respond to pressures from the electorate drive senators to seek different election constituencies, particularly when the two are of the same party. The two senators will focus on different regions and different concerns of the state, treating their constituency as a multi-member district. Building on her prior work about the effects of disproportionate representation in the Senate, Frances Lee studies the extent to which distributive policy making is affected by apportionment. More so than party or electoral incentives, there is an inverse relationship between state size and the proportion of federal funds that

are allocated to them. Small states are uniquely advantaged over larger states when it comes to the distribution of goods. The variable of apportionment, more than any other, explains why the U.S. Senate is truly exceptional among legislative institutions.

Other chapters in the volume provide strong insight into the unique characteristics of the Senate. David Rohde provides concluding remarks that direct scholars toward questions that logically follow this work, particularly the study of sequence in electoral and legislative contexts, conference committees as tools of the majority party leadership, and patterns of partisanship across issue areas. Lawrence Dodd offers a final commentary that sums up the scholarship in the other chapters: the one thing we know about the elusive Senate is that if it is truly exceptional then future research will require a “new form of theoretical analysis.”

Eric Uslaner’s work *The Movers and the Shirkers: Representatives and Ideologues in the Senate* builds upon the ideological-equilibrium model and the Downsian-delegate model of congressional behavior. Downs argued that candidates, being rational actors who seek reelection, will take positions on issues that are in line with the demands of their constituents. Downsian representatives are delegates in the truest sense of the word. The ideological-equilibrium model suggests that voters are concerned about issues but actually prefer candidates who take clear positions rather than catering to public whims. Voters expect their officeholders to be trustees rather than opportunists.

Uslaner’s very sophisticated research challenges whether or not these two models are mutually exclusive. Our prior understanding of Senate behavior errs in that it assumes that politicians are constantly choosing between their own ideological beliefs and the desires of their constituents. This perspective is short-sighted, he argues, because it fails to consider the number of “constituencies” and forces that guide member behavior, because it assumes a simple principle-agent model of representation, because it assumes that constituent desires and senator desires are necessarily at odds with one another, and because it assumes that reelection hinges upon a senator’s ability to present neutral and unexcitable policy alternatives to her constituency. By expanding what we mean when we talk about a “constituency”, Uslaner offers a hybrid model that shows senators as being both ideologically driven and largely in line with the issue-demands of those whom they represent. This model forces us to reevaluate how we think about shirking, a concept that really only makes sense in the Downsian delegate model. He finds that, most of the time, what we would call shirking under a traditional principle-agent model might be representation of a different constituency. Further, he points out that senators, in the beginning stage of their run for office, will most likely get a party’s nomination and achieve success in November if their ideology is at least somewhat in sync with the electorate anyway, causing us to question why scholars have pitted ideology versus constituent pressure in a dichotomy for so long.

Both of these books are enormously rich and offer much to enhance our understanding of the contemporary Senate.

Lynsey Morris  
Carl Albert Fellow  
University of Oklahoma

---

***To Assure Pride and Confidence in the Electoral Process***, Jimmy Carter, Gerald R. Ford, Lloyd N. Cutler, Robert H. Michael, Co-Chairs, Brookings Institution Press, 2002. ISBN 0815706316, \$22.95, paper, 358 pages.

Following the controversial 2000 presidential election, former presidents Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter collaborated with the University of Virginia’s Miller Center of Public Affairs and the Century Foundation to form the National Commission on Federal Election Reform. In *To Assure Pride and Confidence in the Electoral Process*, the Commission presents its policy recommendations for improving the election

process in the United States. According to the Commission, democracy is a “precious birthright” to Americans, and in order to live up to the promises of democracy the election system must be reformed.

While the presidential election focused primarily on political and legal struggles in Florida, the Commission is quick to point out that the problems with the electoral system range far beyond the Sunshine State. Therefore, many of their recommendations are more expansive than the problems in Florida would necessarily warrant. Their principal policy recommendations focus on three fundamental principles – uniformity, fairness, and participation – and encourage the federal government to provide the financial resources necessary to achieve the lofty goals of democracy. Their recommendations include standard systems of statewide voter registration; additional efforts to assure the voting rights of all citizens and to enforce the principle of one person, one vote; uniform benchmarks for voting system performance; uniform statewide standards for defining what will constitute a vote; efforts to discourage news organizations from projecting presidential election results; and increased federal spending on election administration. In general, the principal policy recommendations of the Commission are extremely fair and address all of the problematic issues that were uncovered during the 2000 presidential election.

Obviously, the intended target of the Commission’s work are the federal, state and local government officials who have the ability to make the necessary changes to the current electoral system. For those officials, the book will be extremely helpful in undertaking election reform legislation. However, *To Assure Pride and Confidence in the Electoral Process* could have a broader audience. In the portion of the book justifying their recommendations, the Commission focuses primarily on the fundamental principles of American democracy like equality and political participation. For this reason, the book can be enjoyable to those of us who are not legislators.

Carrie Palmer Sparling  
Ph.D. candidate in political science  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Warring Factions: Interest Groups, Money, and the New Politics of Senate Confirmation***, Lauren Cohen Bell, Ohio State University Press, 2002. ISBN 0814208616, \$60.00, cloth, 264 pages.

On the 2002 campaign trail, President George W. Bush frequently complained about the delays in the U.S. Senate that his nominees to the federal judiciary suffered at the hands of the majority Democrats. As Lauren Cohen Bell’s *Warring Factions* shows, the institutional clash over nominations is not unique to President Bush or the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, but rather she argues quite convincingly that the confirmation process represents a new battleground in which interest groups play an important role.

Analyzing 1,242 federal judicial appointments between 1979 and 1998 and information from 88 Senate hearings on cabinet-level nominees between 1977 and 1998, Bell shows that procedural delay, partisan intensity, uncertainty of outcome and less visibility increasingly characterize the process. The reasons for the changed landscape elude a quantitative analysis, and to explore the dynamics of interest group influence, Bell draws upon interviews with senators, former senators, staff, nominees and interest groups and from her first-hand experience working with the Committee on the Judiciary. Her qualitative evidence points to increasing frequency of “holds” – requests by senators to the majority leader to delay or deny floor debate on a nomination (45).

Bell argues that interest groups emerge as “robust, active players in the process”, albeit behind-the-scenes, (126) and strategically target their lobbying, with circuit court nominees being more likely to attract participation than lower court nominees. She also finds evidence that the degree of formal participation (e.g. testifying at hearings) depends upon the disposition of the chair of Senate Judiciary to group input.

In the end, Bell concludes that interest groups are now “nearly coequal actors with agency heads and the presidential personnel staff in the contemporary confirmation process” (148). This fact in itself does not present a problem except insofar as contributing to delay. Bell wisely warns, however, that the real danger lies not in their participation but in the secrecy and absence of public scrutiny that characterizes their informal input.

Cindy Simon Rosenthal  
Associate Professor of Political Science  
Associate Director of the Carl Albert Center  
University of Oklahoma

---

***Why Congressional Reforms Fail: Reelection and the House Committee System***, E. Scott Adler, The University of Chicago Press, 2002. ISBN 0226007561, \$19.00, paper, 263 pages.

In his study of efforts at reforming the committee structure in the House of Representatives, Adler posits that such attempts at reform (since the 1940s) have repeatedly failed because the current committee structure allows members to further their reelection goals. Widespread change is opposed from the start because it would create uncertainty in electoral strategies.

This study utilizes the model of rational legislators in order to explore institutional outcomes. In order to better understand the resiliency of the House committee structure, Adler looks at member preferences in conjunction with organization structures. Given that members set the rules, the explanation of the presence of the current committee structure should coincide with the explanation of that same structure's persistence.

Adler examines three well-known instances of reform efforts in order to explore his hypothesis. The Legislative Reform Act of 1946, the House Select Committee on Committees in 1973-74, and the Contract with America and the 104<sup>th</sup> Congress. Looking at the above list, one may contend that certain of these instances went beyond effort and resulted in actual reform. Adler challenges this, disputing the notion that modifications in committee jurisdiction resulted in real and lasting change in the actual policy responsibilities of House committees. If Adler's case holds, then another problem is presented – none of the cases run contrary to his proposition. In fact, if Adler's case holds, then it is doubtful that any contrary cases can be found in the last 50 or so years.

Despite these problems, the book does offer insight into the internal process of committee reform. When viewed as just one ingredient in the process of change (or failure to do so), as Adler states his proposition should be, it contributes to a better understanding of committee structure and operation in the House of Representatives.

Courtney Cullison  
Carl Albert Fellow  
University of Oklahoma

---

[BACK TO TOP](#)

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---

## Journal Articles

This section is meant to provide LSS members with the basic citation information about journal articles dealing with legislatures. Numerous journals were searched in compiling this list. The major source for this information is *CSA Political Science and Government*.

---

### ***American Journal of Political Science***

"Minimizing the Risks of Delegation: Multiple Referral in the German Bundescrat," Alter, Alison B. Alter, 46, 2 (April 2002): 299-315.

"Partisanship, Blame Avoidance, and the Distribution of Legislative Pork," Steven J. Balla, Eric D. Lawrence, Forrest Maltzman, and Lee Sigelman, 46, 3, (July 2002): 515-525.

"On Measuring Partisanship in Roll-Call Voting: The U.S. House of Representatives, 1877-1999," Gary W. Cox and Keith T. Poole, 46 3 (July 2002): 477-489.

"Parliamentary Behavior with Two Principals: Preferences, Parties, and Voting in the European Parliament," Simon Hix, 46, 3, (July 2002): 688-698.

"Amateur Legislators—Professional Politicians: The Consequences of Party-Centered Electoral Rules in a Federal System," Mark P. Jones, Sebastian Saiegh, Pablo T. Spiller, and Mariano Tommasi, 46, 3, (July 2002): 656-669.

"Plurality Rule, Proportional Representation, and the German Bundestag: How Incentives to Pork-Barrel Differ across Electoral Systems", Thomas Stratmann and Martin Baur, 46, 3, (July 2002): 506-514.

### ***AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW***

"Distributive and Partisan Issues in Agriculture Policy in the 104<sup>th</sup> House," Mark S. Hurwitz, Roger J. Moiles and David W. Rohde, 95, 4, (December 2001): 911-922.

"Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting," Brandice Canes-Wrone, David W. Brady and John F. Cogan, 96, 1, (March 2002): 127-140.

"The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures," Gerald C. Wright and Brian F. Schaffner, 96, 2, (June 2002): 367-379.

### ***AMERICAN POLITICS REVIEW***

"The Effect of Legislative Diversity on Agenda Setting: Evidence from Six State Legislatures," Kathleen A. Bratton, 30, 2, (March 2002): 115-142.



"Home is Where the Heart Is: Congressional Tenure, Retirement, and the Implications for Representation," David L. Leal, 30, 3, (May 2002): 265-284.

"Tracking the Filibuster, 1917 to 1996," Sarah A. Binder, Eric D. Lawrence, and Steven S. Smith, 30, 4, (July 2002): 406-422.

"Modeling Legislator Decision Making: A Historical Perspective," Lawrence S. Rothenberg and Mitchell S. Sanders, 30, 3, (May 2002): 235-264.

### ***ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLITICAL SCIENCE***

"Landmarks in the Study of Congress since 1945," Nelson W. Polsby and Eric Schickler, 5, (2002): 333-367.

### ***ARMED FORCES & SOCIETY***

"Discourses of War: The Landscape of Congressional Rhetoric," Glenn A. Phelps and Timothy S. Boyland, 28, 4, (summer 2002): 641-667.

### ***ASIAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE***

"Development and Working of Parliaments in South Asia," Nizam Ahmed, 9, 1, (June 2001): 18-49.

### ***BRITISH JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE***

"Constitutional Agenda-Setting through Discretion in Rule Interpretation: Why the European Parliament Won at Amsterdam," Simon Hix, 32, 2, (April 2002): 259-280.

### ***COMPARATIVE POLITICAL STUDIES***

"Moving beyond Procedures: An Empirical Analysis of European Parliament Legislative Influence," Amie Kreppel, 35, 7 (September 2002): 784-813.

### ***CONTEMPORARY SOUTH ASIA***

"Parliamentary Committees and Parliamentary Government in Bangladesh," Nizam Ahmed, 10, 1, (March 2001): 11-36.

### ***DADOS***

"Instituições e política no controle do executivo" (Institutions and Politics in Horizontal Accountability), Argelina Cheibub Figueiredo, 44, 4 (2001): 689-727. (POR) Translated from English by Paulo Garchet.

"O congresso brasileiro e a distribuição de benefícios sociais no período 1988-1994: uma análise distributivista," (The Brazilian Congress and the Distribution of Social Benefits during the Period 1988-1994: A Distributist Analysis) Leany Barreiro de S. Lemos, 44, 3 (2001): 561-605. (POR)

### ***DER STAAT***

"Reconsidered: 'Der Mensch ist nicht für den Staat, sondern der Staat für den Menschen da.' Der Parlamentarische Rat und die Entstehung des Grundgesetzes," (Reconsidered: "Man Is Not There for the State, but the State

for Man." The Parliamentary Council and the Emergence of the Basic Law), *Rolf-Ulrich Kunze*, 40, 3 (2001): 383-404. (GER)

## **DIE VERWALTUNG**

"Der Wissenschaftliche Dienst des Landtags Rheinland-Pfalz," (The Scientific Service of the Rhineland-Palatinate State Parliament), *Lars Brocker*, 35, 1, (2002): 131-137 (GER)

## **EUROPE-ASIA STUDIES**

"Legislative Voting Behaviour in the Russian Duma: Understanding the Effect of Mandate," *Frank C. Thames, Jr. Europe-Asia Studies*, 53, 6, (September 2001): 869-884.

## **EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL RESEARCH**

"The Size of Second Chambers and European Assemblies," *Rein Taagpera and Steven P. Recchia*, 41, 2, (March 2002): 165-185.

## **FORO INTERNATIONAL**

"Para comprender la disciplina de partido en la Cámara de Diputados de México: el modelo de partido centralizado" (Understanding Party Discipline in the Chamber of Deputies of Mexico: The Centralized Party Model), *Benito Nacif*, 42, 1, (January-March 2002): 5-38.

## **FORSCHUNGSJOURNAL NEUE SOZIALE BEWEGUNGEN**

"Die Mitte gewinnen–die Mehrheit nicht verlieren. Überlegungen zur Bundestagswahl 2002," (Winn the Middle–Do Not Lose the Majority. Deliberations about the Parliamentary Elections of 2002), *Klaus Lang*, 15, 2, (June 2002): 49-57. (GER)

## **GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION**

"From 'Organic' Legislators to 'Organicistic' Interpreters: Intellectuals in Yugoslavia and Post-Yugoslav States," *Siniša Malešević*, 37, 1, (winter 2002): 55-75.

"Selection, Voting and Adjudication: The Politics of Legislative Membership in the Federal Republic of Germany," *Geoffrey K. Roberts*, 37, 2, (Spring 2002): 231-249.

## **II POLITICO**

"The Evolution of Legislative Power in Federal Austria," *Carlos de Cueto Noguera*, 66, 1, (January-April 2001): 117-133.

## **IMMIGRANTS & MINORITIES**

"Congressional Passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882," *Patrick Fisher and Shane Fisher*, 20, 2, (July 2001): 58-74.

## **JOURNAL OF LEGISLATIVE STUDIES**

"The Transformation of Legislative Elites: The Cases of Britain and Germany since the 1860s," Heinrich Best, Valerie Cromwell, Christopher Hausmann and Michael Rush, 7, 3, (autumn 2001): 65-91.

"Financial Indiscipline in Zambia's Third Republic: The Role of Parliamentary Scrutiny," Peter Burnell, 7, 3, (autumn 2001): 34-64.

"Governing without Surviving? An Italian Paradox: Law-Making in Italy, 1987-2001," Giliberto Capano and Marco Giuliana, 7, 4, (winter 2001): 13-36.

"Party Discipline and Universalism: The Case of Budgeting in Berlin," Louise K. Davidson-Schmich, 7, 4, (winter 2001): 37-62.

"The Creation of a Devolved Parliament': An Overview of the Processes and Principles Involved in Establishing the Scottish Parliament," Paul Grice, 7, 3, (autumn 2001): 1-12.

"Explaining Partisanship on Special Rules in the Postreform House," William Hixon and Bryan W. Marshall, 7, 4, (winter 2001): 127-140.

"Do Ideological Preferences Explain Parliamentary Behaviour? Evidence from Great Britain and Canada," Christopher Kam, 7, 4, (winter 2001): 89-126.

"The Establishment of the National Assembly for Wales," John Lloyd, 7, 4, (winter 2001): 1-12.

"Inside Rationality: The Division of Labour in a Parliamentary Party Group," Juri Mykkänen, 7, 3, (autumn 2001): 92-121.

"Playing by the Rules: The Constraining Hand of Parliamentary Procedure," Philip Norton, 7, 3, (autumn 2001): 13-33.

"Party Control in a Committee-Based Legislature? The Case of the European Parliament," Richard Whitaker, 7, 4, (winter 2001): 63-88.

"Increasing Parliamentary Control of the Executive? New Instruments and Emerging Effects," Tom Christensen, Per Laegreid, and Paul G. Roness, 8, 1, (Spring 2002): 37-62.

"The Northern Ireland Assembly: A New Beginning," Niall Johnston, 8, 1, (Spring 2002): 1-9.

"Tories in the Killing Fields? The Fate of Private Members' Bills in the 1997-2001 Parliament," Holly Marsh and David Marsh, 8, 1, (Spring 2002): 91-112.

"Who Participates and Who Is Seen and Not Heard," Evidence from the Honduran Congress," Michelle M. Taylor-Robinson and David J. Sky, 8, 1, (Spring 2002): 10-36.

## ***JOURNAL OF POLITICS***

"Symbolic Speeches in the U.S. Senate and Their Representational Implications," Kim Quaile Hill and Patricia A. Hurley, 64, 1 (February 2002): 219-231.

"Setting the Legislative Agenda: The Dimensional Structure of Bill Cosponsoring

and Floor Voting," Jeffery C. Talbert and Matthew Potoski, 64, 3, (August 2002): 864-891.

### **LEGISLATIVE STUDIES QUARTERLY**

"Congressional Leadership 1965-96: A New Look at the Extremism versus Centrality Debate," Bernard Grofman, William Koetzle, and Anthony J. McGann, 27, 1, (February 2002): 87-105.

"Explaining the Role of Restrictive Rules in the Postreform House," Bryan W. Marshal, 27, 1, (February 2002): 61-85.

"Executive Decree Authority in Brazil: How Reactive Legislators Influence Policy," Gary Reich, 27, 1, (February 2002): 5-31.

"The Color of Their Skin or the Content of Their Behavior: Race and Perceptions of African American Legislators," Kerry L. Hayney, 2002, 27, 2, (May 2002): 295-314.

"How to Make Congress Popular," John R. Hibbing, 27, 2, (May 2002): 219-244.

"Ideological Distance from the Majority Party and Public Approval of Congress," David R. Jones, Monika L. McDermott 27, 2, (May 2002): 245-264.

"Minority Rights and Majority Power: Theoretical Consequences of the Motion to Recommit," Keith Krehbiel and Adam Meirowitz, 27, 2, (May 2002): 191-217.

"Midterm Elections and Economic Fluctuations: The Response of Voters over Time," G. Patrick Lynch, 27, 2, (May 2002): 265-294.

"Northern Democrats and Party Polarization in the U.S. House," Mark D. Brewer, Mack D. Mariani, Jeffrey M. Stonecash, 27, 3, (August 2002): 423-444.

"Whistle While You Work: Job Satisfaction and Retirement from the U.S. House," Samuel H. Fisher III, Rebekah Herrick, 27, 3, (August 2002): 445-457.

"Electoral Influences on Legislative Behavior in Mixed-Member Systems: Evidence from Ukraine's Verkhovna Rada," Erik S. Herron, 27, 3, (August 2002): 361-382.

"Explaining Seat Changes in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1950-98," Brian Newman and Charles Ostrom, Jr., 27, 3, (August 2002): 383-405.

"The Emergence of Career Politicians in Post-Communist Democracies: Poland and the Czech Republic," Goldie Shabad and Kazimierz M. Slomczynski, 27, 3, (August 2002): 333-359.

### **MIDDLE EAST POLICY**

"Weak Institutions and Democracy: The Case of the Yemeni Parliament, 1993-97," Abdu H. Sharif, 9, 1, (March 2002): 82-93.

### **PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS**

"Competing Interests: Democracy, Islamification and Women Politicians in Iran,"

Haleh Afshar, 55, 1 (January 2002): 109-118.

"Women and Constitutional Change in Scotland and Northern Ireland," Alice Brown, Donaghy, Barnett Tahya, and Elizabeth Meehan, 55, 1, (January 2002): 71-84.

"Maintaining a Balance: The Retention of Women as MPS in Scotland," 55, 1, (January 2002): 85-98.

"The 'Femocrat' Strategy: Expanding the Repertoire of Feminist Activists," Louise Chappel, 55, 1, (January 2002): 30-42.

"Hitting the Target: Are Labour Women MPS 'Acting for' Women?" Sarah Childs, 55, 1, (January 2002): 143-153.

"Women in the European Parliament," Jane Freedman, 55, 1, (January 2002): 179-188.

"Does Size Matter? Critical Mass and New Zealand's Women MPS," Sandra Grey, 55, 1, (January 2002): 19-29.

"Women's Place in 'Male' Space: Gender and Effect in Parliamentary Contexts," Karen Ross, 55, 1, (January 2002): 189-201.

"The Representation of Women in Australia: Meaning and Make-Believe," Marian Sawyer, 55, 1, (January 2002): 5-18.

"Mainstreaming in Westminster and Whitehall: From Labour's Ministry for Women to the Women and Equality Unit," Judith Squires and Mark Wickham-Jones, 55, 1, (January 2002): 57-70.

"Parliament: Mostly Continuity, but More Change Than You'd Think," Philip Cowley, Mark Stuart, 55, 2, (April 2002): 271-286.

"Parliament and Government: An Annotated Bibliography of Government," Michael Rush, 55, 2, (April 2002): 416-431.

### ***POLITICAL QUARTERLY***

"Devolution and Equality of Representation in the United Kingdom: A Constitutional Mess?" Ron Johnston, Charles Pattie, and David Rossiter, 73-2, (April-June 2002): 158-171.

### ***POLITICAL RESEARCH QUARTERLY***

"Predicting Legislative Output in the First One-Hundred Days, 1897-1995," John Frendreis, Raymond Tatalovich, and John Schaff, 54, 4, (December 2001): 853-870.

"A Bicameral Perspective on Legislative Retirement: The Case of the Senate," Jeffrey L. Bernstein and Jennifer Wolak, 55, 2, (June 2002): 375-390.

### ***POLITICAL STUDIES***

"Shifting the Balance? Parliament, the Executive and the British Constitution," Matthew Flinders, 50, 1, (March 2002): 23-42.

"American Indian Policy in Committee: Structure, Party, Ideology, and Salience," Charles C. Turner, 29-3 (September 2001): 400-448.

### ***PRESIDENTIAL STUDIES QUARTERLY***

"The Contemporary Presidency: Parties, Process, and Presidential Power: Learning from Confirmation Politics in the U.S. Senate," Gary J. Andres, 32, 1, (March 2002): 147-156.

"Coalition Building and Overcoming Legislative Gridlock in Foreign Policy, 1947-98," 32, 1, (March 2002): 67-83.

### ***PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW***

"Live Bureaucrats and Dead Public Servants: How People in Government Are Discussed on the Floor of the House," Thad E. Hall, 62, 2, (March-April 2002): 242-251.

### ***PUBLIC CHOICE***

"Congressional Dominance and the International Trade Commission," James M. DeVault, 110, 1-2, (January 2002): 1-22.

"Searching for Symptoms of Political Shirking: Congressional Foreign Travel," 110, 1-2, (January 2002): 173-191.

### ***POLITICS & POLICY***

"American Indian Policy in Committee: Structure, Party, Ideology, and Salience," Charles C. Turner, 29, 3, (September 2001): 400-448.

"Evaluating Changes in Florida's Legislative Process: Innovative Rules and Conservative Norms," Abrey Jewett, 30, 1, (May 2002): 40-68.

### ***POLITY***

"Self-Reported Legislator Ideology versus Interest Group Ratings," Grant Reeher, 34, 2, (winter 2001): 231-240.

### ***RECHT UND POLITIK***

"Verfassungspoker im Bundesrat. Zur umstrittenen Bundesratsabstimmung vom 22. März 2002," (Constitutional Poker in the Bundesrat. On the Disputed Bundesrat Vote on 22 March 2002), Hartmut Bauer, 38, 2, (June 2002): 70-82. (GER)

"Der Streit um das Zuwanderungsgesetz. Willensbildung und Entscheidungsfindung im Bundesrat," (The Controversy over the Immigration Law. Consensus Building and Decision Making in the Bundesrat), Jürgen Jakewitz, 38, 2, (June 2002): 83-92. (GER)

### ***REPRESENTATION***

"Putting a Human Face on Proportional Representation: Early Experiences in Scotland and Wales," Thomas Lundberg, 38, 4, (Spring 2002): 271-283.

## **RES PUBLICA**

"Vertegenwoordiging in vrouwelijk meervoud Bahartiging van vrouwenbelangen en 'vrouwelijke' vertegenwoordiging in het Vlaams Parlement, 1995-1999 (Representing Women and 'Female' Representation in the Flemish Parliament, 1995-1999), Karen Celis, 43, 4, (DUT 2001): 571-594.

"Do Quotas Matter? Positive Actions in the Belgian Parliament," Mercedes Diaz Mateo, 44, 1, (2002): 49-72.

## **SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY**

"Race and Environmental Voting in the U.S. Congress," Paul Mohai and David Kershner, 83, 1, (March 2002): 167-189.

## **STATE POLITICS & POLICY QUARTERLY**

"Single-Member Districts and the Representation of Women in American State Legislatures: The Effects of Electoral System Change," James D. King, 2, 2, (summer 2002): 161-175.

"State Legislative Campaign Finance Research: A Review Essay," Graham P. Ramsden, 2, 2, (Summer 2002): 176-198.

## **STATSVETENSKAPLIG TIDSKRIFT**

"Bør parlamentariske regjeringer ha ubegrenset oppløsningsrett? (Should the Dissolution Power of Parliamentary Governments Be Unrestricted?), Bjørn Erik Rasch, 104, 1, (Swe 2001): 29-52.

## **THE SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL**

"Weather and Legislation: The Effect of Drought and Flood on Water Laws," Charles R. Britton and Richard K. Ford, 38, 4, (October 2001): 503-514.

## **WOMEN & POLITICS**

"Gender, Power, and Peace: A Preliminary Look at Women in the Northern Ireland Assembly," Kimberly Cowell-Meyers, 23, 3, (2001): 55-88.

"Do Differences Matter? Women Members of Congress and the Hyde Amendment," Dena Levy, Charles Tien, and Rachelle Avad, 23, 1-2, (2001): 105-127.

"Research on Women in Legislatures: What Have We Learned, Where Are We Going?, Michele Swers, 23, 1-2, (2001): 167-185.

## **ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR PARLAMENTSFRAGEN**

Zwischen Gleichstellung und traditioneller Rollenorientierung. Ausschusspräferenz von Politikerinnen in Parlamenten Westeuropas," (Between Equality and Traditional Role Orientations: Committee Preferences of Female Politicians in West European Parliaments)), Sabine Lemke-Müller, 33, 1, (March 2002): 99-114. (GER)

"Der Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Technologie des Deutschen Bundestages-

Arbeitsweise und Bedeutung,” (The Committee for Economics and Technology of the German Federal Parliament-Function and Meaning), Annette Mann and Ekkehard Münzing, 33, 1, (March 2002): 80-99 (GER)

“Forbidden für eine Bundestratsreform? Lehren aus den Erfahrungen der Verfassungspraxis Zweiter Kammern,” (Models for Bundestrat Reform? Lessons from the Experience of Constitutional Practice by the Second Chamber), Roland Sturm, 33, 1, (March 2002): 166-179. (GER)

## **ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR POLITIK**

“Zur Legimation des Bonner Grundgesetzes-Das Selbstverständnis des Parlamentarischen Rates wider die Kritik” (On the Legitimation of Bonn’s Constitutional Law-Self-Conception of the Parliamentary Council against Criticism), Angela Bauer-Kirsch, 49, 2, (June 2002): 171-197 (GER)

“Informative Intelligenz, Informationsverantwortung und Recht auf Informationsentzug: Zur Diskussion um Parlamentsreform and Öffentlichkeit,” (Informative Intelligence, Information Responsibility and the Right to Information Withdrawal: The Discussion around Parliament Reform and the Public), Ulrich Metzger and Stefan Dehnert, 49, 1, (March 2002): 36-55. (GER)

---

[BACK TO TOP](#)

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---



--	--

--

Volume 26, Number 1, January 2003

--

---

## Links to recent articles on the *Governing* magazine web site:

["Why Are We Meeting Like This?"](#) by Alan Greenblatt

["Leaving It to the Court"](#) by Jonathan Walters

["Southern Discomfort"](#) by Rob Gurwitt

---

## Recent articles from NCSL's magazine, *State Legislatures*:

[Editor's Note: Copyright 2002 by National Conference of State Legislatures. All rights reserved. These articles are reprinted here with permission. To order copies or to subscribe, contact the marketing department at (303) 830-2200.]

["The Legislature Is Like..."](#)

["GOP #1: First Time in 50 Years"](#) by Tim Storey and Gene Rose

---

## Recent article from Spectrum: The Journal of State Government:

[Editor's Note: This article appeared in Spectrum, Fall 2002, pages 18-21. Copyright 2002, The Council of State Governments. All rights reserved. The article is reprinted here with permission. To order copies or to subscribe, contact the sales department at (800) 800-1910.]

["Partisan Dynamics of the Gender Gap among State Legislators" by Susan J. Carroll, Center for American Women and Politics, Rutgers University](#)

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---

## APSA Legislative Studies Section Newsletter

Volume 26, Number 1 January 2003

---

### Papers Presented

This section contains a listing of papers in the area of legislative studies that have been presented at professional conventions in recent months. Entries were taken either from preliminary or official convention programs. The following meetings are represented:

- \* [APSA](#): Papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Boston, Massachusetts, August 29 - September 1, 2002.
  - \* [NEPSA](#): Papers presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Political Science Association in Philadelphia, November 8-10, 2001.
  - \* [SPSA](#): Papers presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association in Providence, Rhode Island, November 7-9, 2002.
- 

#### **APSA Papers :**

"Beyond the Vote: Congressional Representation, Pork Project Allocation and Constituency Service," Christian R. Grose.

"A Bicameral Comparison of Congressional Parties," Gregory Koger.

"Bicameralism in Japan: Are Two Houses Really Different, Useful or Necessary?" Kentaro Fukumoto.

"Budget Procedures and Outcomes: The Impact of the Budget Enforcement Act," Bill A. Heniff, Jr. and James Saturno.

"Can Special Interests Buy Congressional Votes? Evidence from Financial Services Legislation," Thomas Stratmann.

"Catching the Runaway Bureaucracy in Brussels. MEPs in the Votes of Budgetary Discharge," Has-Won Jun.

"Coalition Building Under Uncertainty: Campaign Finance Reform and the A to Z Bill," William Hixon.

"Coalition of Extremes: Ideology and Partisanship in the United States Congress, 1947-1998," Wesley Hussey.

"Congress, the President, and Veto Bargaining," C. Lawrence Evans.

"Congressional Careers and the Biological Imperative," Daniel P. Franklin.

"Congressional Responses to Presidential Action: A Look at Rally Events," Michael Rocca.

"Connecting with Constituents: Congress and Presentation of Self on the WWW," Girish J. Gulati.

"Contributors and Women's PACs: Motivations and Characteristics," Christine L. Day and Charles D. Hadley.

"Defining the Terms of Debate: How Presidents, Party Leaders, and Committees Influence the Decisions of the House Rules Committee," Alan Rozzi.

"The Development of Legislative Institutions and Legislative Productivity in the U.S. Congress, 1789-1989," Gregory J. Wawro and Eric Schickler.

"Disease, Death, and Deliberation: Exploring the Congressional Response to the AIDS Epidemic," Stephen Kirk.

"Diversity and Representation in Four Latin American Legislatures," Leslie Schwindt.

"Dividing the Indivisible: Procedures for Allocating Parliamentary Ministries to Political Parties in a Parliamentary System," Steven J. Brams.

"The Dynamics of Cosponsorship Reconsidered," Lawrence S. Rothenberg and Mitchell S. Sanders.

"The Early Senate Reconsidered: Interpreting Bicameral Differences in Procedure and Legislative Activity," Daniel J. Wirls.

"Economic Inequality and Political Representation," Larry M. Bartels.

"The Effect of Member-to-Member Campaign Contributions on Parties in the House," Justin Buchier.

"Electoral and Institutional Consequences of Gridlock," Sarah A. Binder.

"Electoral Pressure and Policy Change: Conversion or Replacement?" Shawn A. Treler.

"Electoral Success and Institutional Failure: The Case of the Populists in the U.S. House of Representatives," Kenneth A. Gaalswyk.

"El Parlament de Catalunya: A Model for Regional Assertiveness in the EU?," William M. Downs.

"Emergence of the Modern Senate," Gerald H. Gamm and Steven S. Smith.

"The European Parliament and the Statutory Control of European Policies," Fabio Franchino.

"The Evolution of Procedural Gatekeeping in the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century House," Chris Den Hartog.

"Examining Presidential Influence in Congress: Testing A Theory of Anticipated Reactions in the Realm of Foreign and Domestic Policy, 1953-98," Bryan W. Marshall and Brandon Christopher Prins.

"Executive's Strategic Choices on Coalition-Based Presidential System: The Case of Brazilian Decision-Making Process on the Annual Budget," Carlos Pereira and Bernardo Mueller.

"Fear and Self-Loathing in Congress: Institutional Pathologies and Delegation of Power," Jasmine Farrier.

"Fighting Insecurity: Political Careers and Career Politics in Germany," Jens Borchert and Klaus Stolz.

"The Formation of Oversized Coalitions in Modern Parliamentary Democracies," Craig Volden and Cliff

Carrubba.

"Frontier for Freedom or Ripe for Regulation? U.S. Congressional Attempts at Internet Regulation, Kenneth S. Rogerson and Wendy Wu.

"Getting by with the Help of Their Friends: Lobbyists and Legislators," Richard L. Hall.

"Growing Eyes: Understanding the Growth of Congressional Oversight Activity," Keith W. Smith.

"'He Has to Go': Analysing Ministerial Resignations in the UK," Keith Dowding and Torun Dewan.

"House Committee Assignment Requests of Minority Members," Scott A. Frisch and Sean Q. Kelly.

"How Term Limits and Career Opportunities Increase Career Advancement to the House," John M. Phippen.

"How the Tail Wags the Dog: The Impact of Minor Party Entry on Incumbent Party Behavior," Shigeo Hirano.

"The Ideological Extremity of Senate Candidates Relative to Their Constituents and Relative to Their Peers," Joseph Gershtenson.

"If Policy Benefits are Measured as Year-to-Year Changes in Federal Programmatic Spending, Who Benefits and Why?" Barry S. Rundquist and Thomas M. Carsey.

"Institutional Change, Member Motivation and State Legislature Openness," Donald Ostlie and Margaret R. Ferguson.

"Is the Committee of the Whole the House? Implications of Michel v. Anderson for District of Columbia Representation," Richard S. Beth and Michael Kenneth Fauntroy.

"Leaders and Followers in the U.S. Senate: Rational Behavior or the Norm of Reciprocity? L. Marvin Overby and Lauren C. Bell.

"Legislators, Executives, and Patronage Distribution," Scott W. Desposato.

"The Limits of Term Limits: More Competition or More of the Same?" Erik J. Engstrom and Nathan W. Monroe.

"Looking Good...Feeling Good! How Dyadic and Collective Descriptive Representation Enhances Latino Efficacy," Stacy Burnett Gordon and Gary M. Segura.

"Media Friendly Congressional Websites: Who is Reaching Out to Journalists on the Web?" Daniel Lipinski and Gregory Glen Neddenriep.

"Members of Congress as Contributors, When Every Race Counts," Michael J. Malbin and Anne H. Bedlington.

"The Microfoundations of Political Trust," William T. Bianco.

"Minority Caucuses and Roll Call Voting in the State Legislatures," Gerald C. Wright, Jonathan Winburn, Tracy Osborn.

"Modes of Moderation in the U.S. House: Representational Styles of Ideological Moderates," Stanley P. Berard.

"MP Constituency Activity in Westminster-Style Parliaments," Valerie Heitshusen and Garry Young.

"National Parliamentary Scrutiny in the EU: A Party Perspective on Executive-Legislative Relations," Ronald L. Holzhaecker.

"The New Seniority System in the House and Senate," Russell D. Renka.

"Nineteenth Century Leadership in the U.S. Senate," Kimberly S. Maslin-Wicks.

"Partisan Competition for Media Coverage," Patrick J. Sellers.

"Partisan Polarization in Presidential Support: The Electoral Connection," Gary c. Jacobson.

"Party and Preferences in the American Political System," Matthew L. Gunning.

"Playing Both Sides: PAC Contributions and Representation," Jennifer A. Steen and Ian Shapiro.

"The President in the Legislative Process: Preferences, Strategies and Outcomes," Barbara Sinclair.

"Presidential Popularity and Congressional Control of the Bureaucracy: The Clinton Administration and the Contract with America," David M. Hedge, Renee J. Johnson, and Jeff M. Gill.

"Public Preferences and Policy Change in the UK (and the US)," Christopher Wlezien and Stuart N. Soroka.

"Quid Pro Quo: Loyalty, Dissent, and Career Advancement in British Parliamentary Parties," Christopher J. Kam.

"Reexamining Gridlock in the Legislative Process: A Transaction Cost Approach," Brad T. Gomez.

"Reform as Disruption: The Interaction of Political Pressure and Institutional Inertia on the 1974 Budget Act and its Implications," Fiona M. Wright.

"Reinterpreting the Relationship between Race and Representation in Congress," Ben Highton.

"Representation, Campaign Spending, and the Maine Clean Elections Law," Michael C. Herron.

"Representation, Parties and Elections: Building Party Coalitions in the U.S. House," Matthew Potoski, Jeff Talbert, and Robert C. Lowry.

"Representation in the Networked Society - The Americanization of European Representative Systems," Thomas Zittel.

"Representative Committees? The Assignment Process in the European Parliament," Gail McElroy.

"Rewarding Party Loyalty in the U.S. Congress: Party Leaders' Use of Legislative Incentives," Kathryn Pearson.

"The Role of Term Limits in State Legislative Policy Decisions," Priscilla L. Southwell.

"Roll Call Participation in Lame Duck Sessions of the House of Representatives, 1870-1932," Timothy P. Nokken.

"The Second Game: The Opposition in Parliamentary Democracies," Carolyn Forestiere.

"Senate Republican Committee Assignments: A Case Study of Self-Selection," R. Lawrence Butler.

"Signals of Conflict: Rules Requests in the House of Representatives," Linda L. Fowler.

"The Single Member Plurality Electoral System in Canada and Its Discontents," Donley T. Studlar.

"The Strategic Timing of Leadership PAC Formation in the Senate," Kristin L. Kanthak and A. J. Gibes.

"The Strategic Use of Self-Executing Rules by the House Majority Party Leadership, 1991-1998," Gregory R. Thorson.

"Strategy and Choice in 19<sup>th</sup> Century U.S. House Elections," Jamie L. Carson and Jason M. Roberts.

"Subconstituency Politics: A Theory of Representation," Benjamin Bishin.

"Suspended Partisanship in the House: How Most Laws Are Really Made," Don Wolfensberger.

"Televised Congress: Technological Change and Institutional Innovation, 1974-1994," Julian E. Zelizer.

"Term Limits and Electoral Competition," William M. Salka.

"Theories of Legislative Organization and Changes in State Legislative Rules of Procedure," Nancy Martorano.

"Understanding Lobbyists' Argument Styles: Medicare and Medicaid Hearings, 1991-2000," Kevin M. Esterling.

"Vetoes and Gridlock During Unified and Divided Government," David R. Jones.

"Where Do I stand? The Initial Positioning of Newly Elected Legislators in the Antebellum House of Representatives," Craig Goodman.

"Whither the Right to Change: Legislative Amendment," Jeff L. Lazarus and Michael Brewster Hawes.

"Why Are The House and Senate Floors So Different? Testing Competing Hypotheses Using Comparative Data," Andrew J. Taylor.

"You've Got That Look: The Role of Race and Gender on Local Congressional TV News," Brian F. Schaffner.

---

## NEPSA PAPERS

"Committee Leaders and the Redistribution of Campaign Funds," Eric Heberlig and Bruce Larson.

"Courts and Legislatures in the Diffusion of Policy Innovations: A Competing Risks Model," Thomas Schmeling.

"Defections, Defectors, and Individual Voting Decisions," Kevin J. Conway.

"Do You See What I See: Perceptions of Representation by African American U.S. Representatives," Danielle White.

"Federal Spending and Committee Assignments Revisited," Scott A. Frisch and Sean Q. Kelly.

"Gender Representation on Congressional Committees," Jeff Gulati.

"The House Rules Committee Under Republican Majorities: Continuity and Change," Donald Wolfensberger.

"Legislative Leadership and Legislative Language: Using Media to Shape the Conditions of Conditional Party Government," Douglas B. Harris.

"Legislative Politics in a Bicameral System: Strategic Conferee Appointments in the U.S. Congress," Jamie L. Carson and Ryan Vander Wielen.

"Making Post-Committee Adjustments: The Strategic Use of Self-Executing Rules," Layne Anderson, Cody Specketer, and Patricia Welte.

"Modeling Midterm Congressional Elections," Bruce Caswell.

"Old Democrats in New Clothing?: An Ideological Analysis of the House New Democrat Coalition," Stephen K. Medvic.

"Politics of Apportionment: Legitimacy, Race, and Single-Member District Legislation of 1842 and 1967," Bernard Tamas.

"Predicting Conference Committee Compromises on Appropriations Legislation, 1981-2000," Geoff D. Peterson and J. Mark Wrighton.

"Reconciling Macro Level and Committee Level Effects on Policy Change," Valerie Heitschusen and Garry Young.

"Rethinking the Party Cartel Model: An Analysis of the Bolling Committee Reforms," David H. Hogberg.

"The State of Committee-Centered Distributive Politics Research," Thomas Carsey and Barry Rundquist.

"Topical Matters: Constituency Concerns and Policy Areas as Predictors of House Roll-Call Behavior," Daniel Liam Singer.

"Up or Out: The Role of Committee Attractiveness in Defining the U.S. House Career," Garrison Nelson.

"Who are the Deficit Hawks? An Analysis of the Concord Coalition Congressional Vote Scores," Patrick Fisher.

---

## **SPSA Papers:**

"African-American State Legislators' Perceptions of Their Role as a Legislator," Michael Scicchitano and Charles Bullock.

"Assumed Impotence: Parliamentary Opposition in National Legislatures," Carolyn Forestiere.

"Citizen Discontent and Congress: Investigating Political Support," Stephen Farnsworth.

"Committee Jurisdictions, Specificity, and Policy Outcomes in the States," James Battista, J. Donald Smith, and Wenda Sheard.

"Committee Specialization in State Legislatures During the Twentieth Century: To What Extent Do Legislatures Tap the Talents of Their Members?" Keith Hamm, Ronald Hedlund, and Stephanie Post.

"Congressional Actions and Public Reactions: Exploring the Link Between Congressional Activity and Efficacy," Jason Gainous.



"Congressional Party Switchers: Why Do They Stay, Why do They Go?" Jennifer Barnhart.

"Congressional Responsiveness to District Court Caseload," Anthony Gabrielli.

"Congressional Staff and Theories of Legislative Organization: The Case of the House Appropriations Committee," Sarah Handy and Randall Strahan.

"Continuity v. Non-continuity: Differing Responsiveness Levels Among U.S. Representatives, 1975-1995," Jean-Phillipe Faletta and Mary Herring.

"Deterring or Defeating: Examining the Electoral Consequences of Legislative Behavior," Janna Deitz and Sarah Poggione.

"Do Stars Influence Washington? The Effect of Celebrity in Congressional Committee Hearings," Henry "Neil" Strine IV.

"An Examination of the Effects of Party Voting on Civil Rights Legislation in the U.S. House and Senate, 1957-1990," Bill Radunovich.

"The Growth of Partisan Incumbency Advantage in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1976-2000," Bruce Oppenheimer.

"How Individuals and Institutions Influence Dynamic Representation," Matthew Fellowes and David Kershaw.

"The Impact of Jurisdictional Dynamics on Interest Group Lobbying," Kathryn Shumaker.

"In Search of Killer Amendments in the House, 1953-2001," Jeffrey Jenkins and Charles Finocchiaro.

"Incorporating Political Institutions into Rent Seeking Games," Kenneth Godwin, Edward Lopez, Barry Seldon.

"Investigating an Old Assumption: Constituent Preferences for Legislative Behavior," Matthew Stelmack.

"Lawmaking in the Modern Congress," Sean Theriault.

"Maverick or Realist? James Jeffords and the Republican Party," Jacob Straus and Shannon Bow.

"Maximizing Minority Representation: Democratic Institutions and Descriptive Representation," Seth Jolly.

"A New Take on Gridlock: The 'Decline of Comity' and Legislative Output," Scot Schraufnagel.

"Old Assumptions in a New Environment: Campaign Finance Reform in the New Millennium," Pamela Fiber.

"One For All...Maybe Not: An Examination of Black Political Behavior Within the Congressional Committee System," Danielle White.

"'Orthodox' Preferences, Deliberation, and Trade Policy in the U.S. House of Representatives: Evidence from the New Democrat Coalition and Congressional Progressive Caucus," Celia Carroll.

"Parties and Roll Call Voting in the House," William Hixon and Bryan Marshall.

"Personal Relationships and the Importance of Information in State Lobbying," Adam Newmark.

"Presidential Success in Congress: Which Presidents Do Better or Worse Than Expected?" Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood.

"Race, Representation, and Constituency Service: The Effect of Black Representation on Service Strategies in Congress," Christian Grose, Maurice Mangum, and Christopher Martin.

"Sending Signals: Lobbyist Testimony and Legislative Impact," Tracy Mason.

"Shirking in the Contemporary Congress: A Reappraisal," Jeffrey Jenkins, Michael Crespín, and Ryan Vander Wielen.

"Stacking Committees in the Antebellum Congresses: Committee Composition from 1828-1861," Craig Goodman.

"Subsconstituency Politics: A Theory of Representation," Ben Bishin.

"To Give or Not To Give? Factors Influencing Leadership PAC Contribution Decisions," Marian Currinder

"Understanding Corporate Lobbying: A Game-Theoretic Approach," Kenneth Godwin, Edward Lopez, and Barry Seldon

"Variations in Party Voting in the House of Representatives, 1953-2000," David Rohde and Ryan Vander Wielen.

"Veto Bargaining Between the Congress and President," C. Lawrence Evans, John Gilmour, Christopher Connelly, and Megan McGrew.

"When Legislators Change Their Mind: Explaining Congressional Behavior on Fast-Track Trade Status," Glen Biglaiser, David Jackson, and Jeffrey Peake.

"The Work of Personal Staff in the 'Legislative Enterprises' of Four State Senates," Brian Russell.

[BACK TO TOP](#)

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---

## Research & Teaching

---

# Research and Teaching

- [Dirksen Congressional Center Research Awards](#)
  - [NCSL News](#)
  - [Policy Agendas Project](#)
  - [Visiting Scholars Program](#)
- 

## Dirksen Center Announces Grant Awards

The Dirksen Center will distribute \$35,862 in Congressional Research Awards to eleven projects in 2003. Since 1978, The Center has awarded over \$585,000 to more than 315 research projects.

According to Center staff member Frank Mackaman, political scientists will use the grants to study such topics as congressional intervention in defense budgeting, congressional oversight of the executive branch, and campaigns for the U.S. House. Historians will explore the culture of violence in Congress in the antebellum years and the influence of incumbents in selecting congressional candidates at the turn of the 20th century.

Recipients this year include PhD candidates and faculty from the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, North Carolina State University, Yale University, the University of Iowa, and Michigan State University, among others.

A complete list of this year's Congressional Research Award recipients is posted at <http://www.dirksencenter.org/grantcongresearchaward.htm>.

The Dirksen Congressional Center is a nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization in Pekin, Illinois, that seeks to improve civic engagement by promoting a better understanding of Congress and its leaders through archival, research, and educational programs.

---

## Representative Democracy in America ~ Voices of the People

The National Conference of State Legislatures, the Center for Civic Education, and The Center on Congress at Indiana University have formed an alliance to launch a new national project, **Representative Democracy in America Voices of the People**. The project is designed to reinvigorate and educate Americans on the critical relationship between government and the people it serves. The project introduces citizens, particularly young people, to the representatives, institutions, and processes that serve to realize the goal of a government of, by, and for the people. The project is funded by the U.S. Department of Education by act of Congress.

The goals of the project are to:

- \* **Encourage Americans** to understand better their representative democracy and play a responsible role in their government;
- \* **Strengthen classroom teaching** about representative democracy;
- \* **Develop mass media programs** to inform the public about representative institutions;
- \* **Provide legislators and staff** with resource materials to help improve public understanding of their institutions;
- \* **Support research** on public views about Congress and state legislatures.

Working over a five-year period the alliance expects to produce:

- \* **A video series** for teachers and their students in high schools and colleges —supported by printed materials;
- \* **A series of web-based, e-learning modules** designed to bring the work of legislatures alive for young citizens;
- \* **Classroom materials** that approach representative democracy from the point of view of elementary, middle and high school students that are designed to support America's Legislators Back to School Week;
- \* **Television documentaries** about representative democracy that describe how it works and the relationship between the people and their elected officials;
- \* **Television interview programs on C-SPAN** that feature members of Congress and state legislators discussing representative democracy with an audience of high school students;
- \* **A series of brief television, radio, and Internet messages** defining the roles of lawmakers and citizens in our representative democracy;
- \* **A resource kit** containing a variety of materials for lawmakers to help

them explain representative democracy to the public;

\* **Academic research** with practical application for improving public participation and support for representative democracy and its institutions.

For further information contact Karl Kurtz ([karl.kurtz@ncsl.org](mailto:karl.kurtz@ncsl.org)) at NCSL.

---

## Policy Agendas Project

Please take a look at a new website from the University of Washington's Center for American Politics and Public Policy:

<http://policyagendasproject.polisci.washington.edu/PAIndex.html>

The Policy Agendas Project, originally conceived by Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones, traces changes in attention to policy topics at the national level since 1946.

The new website is designed to make the data more accessible to instructors, students, or anyone interested in studying patterns in policymaking over the past 50 years.

In particular, Level II allows you to do instant queries of the data at the major topic or subtopic level, or by specific keywords. The chart that is automatically generated can be edited to suit your purposes. In addition, you can "drill down" into the accompanying table to compare, for example, how the content of foreign aid hearings in 1957 differed from those of 1993.

The plug-in for Chart FX will download automatically if you are using Internet Explorer, unless your computer is configured to prevent such automatic downloads. If you are using Mozilla or Netscape, you should be able to generate charts but you will not be able to edit them. This will be fixed in the near future.

This is the 'beta' version and feedback is welcome at [ampol@u.washington.edu](mailto:ampol@u.washington.edu)

---

## Report and Recommendations on Initiative and Referendum

Over the last six months a task force of the National Conference of State Legislatures has reviewed the growing use of initiatives and referendums around the country and examined their effect on representative democracy at the state level. The Initiative and Referendum Task Force found that opportunities for abuse of the process outweigh its advantages and does not recommend that states adopt the initiative process if they currently do not have one.

The task force also developed recommendations that would enable initiative states to make their processes more representative. For states that are intent upon adopting an initiative process, the task force offers a set of guidelines to enhance the process and to avoid many of the pitfalls currently experienced by the initiative states. The task force urges such states to consider giving preference to a process that encourages citizen participation without enacting specific constitutional or statutory language—specifically, the advisory initiative or the general policy initiative.

The 34 recommendations contained in this report acknowledge that the initiative process has outgrown the existing laws that govern it. After listening to expert testimony from a wide variety of witnesses and compiling data from all 50 states, the task force concluded that the initiative has evolved from its early days as a grassroots tool to enhance representative democracy into a tool that too often is exploited by special interests. The initiative lacks critical elements of the legislative process and can have both intended and unintended effects on the ability of the representative democratic process to comprehensively develop policies and priorities.

As a result, the task force suggests that initiative states reform drafting, certification, signature-gathering and financial disclosure statutes; adhere to single subject rules; and improve practices regarding voter education. It also recommends that initiatives be allowed only on general election ballots.

It is the task force's intent that the discussion and adoption of the reforms in this report lead to a more thoughtful lawmaking process, improve interaction between initiative proponents and legislatures, and ultimately produce better public policy and reinforce representative democracy.

The full report is available online at  
[www.ncsl.org/programs/legman/irtaskfc/IandR\\_report.pdf](http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legman/irtaskfc/IandR_report.pdf)

---

## **Visiting Scholars Program**

The Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center at the University of Oklahoma seeks applicants for its Visiting Scholars Program, which provides financial assistance to researchers working at the Center's archives. Awards of \$500 - \$1000 are normally granted as reimbursement for travel and lodging.

The Center's holdings include the papers of many former members of Congress, such as Robert S. Kerr, Fred Harris, and Speaker Carl Albert of Oklahoma; Helen Gahagan Douglas and Jeffery Cohelan of California; and Neil Gallagher of New Jersey. Besides the history of Congress, congressional

leadership, national and Oklahoma politics, and election campaigns, the collections also document government policy affecting agriculture, Native Americans, energy, foreign affairs, the environment, the economy, and other areas.

Topics that can be studied include the Great Depression, flood control, soil conservation, and tribal affairs. At least one collection provides insight on women in American politics. Most materials date from the 1920s to the 1970s, although there is one nineteenth century collection.

The Center's archives are described on their website at <http://www.ou.edu/special/albertctr/archives/> and in the publication titled *A Guide to the Carl Albert Center Congressional Archives* by Judy Day et.al. (Norman, Okla.: The Carl Albert Center, 1995), available at many U.S. academic libraries. Additional information can be obtained from the Center.

The Visiting Scholars Program is open to any applicant. Emphasis is given to those pursuing postdoctoral research in history, political science, and other fields. Graduate students involved in research for publication, thesis, or dissertation are encouraged to apply. Interested undergraduates and lay researchers are also invited to apply. The Center evaluates each research proposal based upon its merits, and funding for a variety of topics is expected.

No standardized form is needed for application. Instead, a series of documents should be sent to the Center, including:

- (1) a description of the research proposal in fewer than 1000 words;
- (2) a personal vita;
- (3) an explanation of how the Center's resources will assist the researcher;
- (4) a budget proposal; and
- (5) a letter of reference from an established scholar in the discipline attesting to the significance of the research.

Applications are accepted at any time.

For more information, please contact Archivist, Carl Albert Center, 630 Parrington Oval, Room 101, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019.

Telephone: (405) 325-5401.

FAX: (405) 325-6419.

Email: [kosmerick@ou.edu](mailto:kosmerick@ou.edu)

[BACK TO TOP](#)

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---



--	--

--

Burdett A. Loomis, Editor  
University of Kansas  
January 2003

## New Perspectives on Representation

---

As my reasonably lengthy and largely enjoyable tenure as editor of *Extension of Remarks* draws to a close, I thought that a reconsideration of democratic representation might make for a fitting finale. In more than a quarter century of thinking about legislatures, the idea of representation remains perhaps the core idea to which I continue to return, whether focusing on individual legislators, party leadership, campaigns and elections, or organized interests.

The seven articles included in this edition of *Extension of Remarks* employ various frameworks and methods to get at the idea of representation. Several bring in a comparative perspective, both across nations and the American states. The Internet comes into play, as does the growing strength of partisanship within the district activities of American House members. Institutional design reflects another recurring theme, whether in broad electoral reforms or term limits in the American states. And representation, we are reminded, can take place within the bureaucracy as well as in legislatures.

In the end, there is no "solution" to the "puzzle" of representation. Rather, we need to take the idea seriously and understand, as best we can, the implications of the choices we make in designing the institutions that serve us. Representation will continue to afford legislative scholars a cornucopia of opportunities to the nuanced and changing relationships between office-holders and citizens – the core of democratic practice.

---

### Contents of this issue:

[\*Parties in the District?\*](#)

Christian R. Grose, Lawrence University

*Representatives and Constituency Effort:  
Homestyle Goes Abroad*

Garry Young, George Washington University

*Political Representation and the Internet:  
Whither Responsible Party Government?*

Thomas Zittel, Center for European Studies, Harvard University;  
Mannheimer Zentrum fuer Europaeische Sozialforschung (MZES)

*Opposition, Representation and the "Second Game"*

Carolyn Forestiere, Emory

*Term Limits and the Representation of Women*

Krista Jenkins and Susan J. Carroll, Rutgers University

*Democracy, Herterogeneity and Representation:  
Explaining Representational Differences Across States*

Benjamin G. Bishin, University of Miami

*Common Ground: Links Between Bureaucratic  
and Legislative Representation*

Jill Nicholson-Crotty, Texas A&M University

---

Contributions to "Extension of Remarks" are encouraged. The total length of such contributions should be four pages, text typed, single spaced, with references following the style of Legislative Studies Quarterly. Works may be edited for content or for length. Please send proposed contributions to Burdett A. Loomis, Department of Political Science, 504 Blake Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045-2157.

---

Members may go to <http://pub37.ezboard.com/blegislativestudiessectionhuge69973> to post comments on the Bulletin Board for *Extension of Remarks*.

---

| [Front Page](#) | [Research & Teaching](#) | [Legislative News](#) |  
| [Papers Presented](#) | [Journal Articles](#) | [Book Notes](#) | [Extension of Remarks](#) |

---

| [Other Editions of the LSS Newsletter](#) | | [Announcements](#) |  
| [Legislative Studies Section Home Page](#) | [APSA Home Page](#) |

---

