Herbert Weisberg is chair of the department. His research and teaching interests include voting behavior, legislative behavior, and research methods, with a focus on survey research methods and scaling techniques. His recent publications include The New Science of Survey Research: The Total Survey Error Approach (University of Chicago Press, 2005) and "The Structure and Effects of Moral Predispositions in Contemporary American Politics" (Journal of Politics, 2005).

Another presidential election year, with attention again focused on the state of Ohio, always makes for an exciting autumn quarter for the Department of Political Science at Ohio State. Presidential and vice presidential candidates come to speak on campus, and the news media besiege our faculty for election analysis. But it is the return of students to campus (and of the football Buckeyes to the field) that really energizes us at this time of year.

I am very pleased to report that our department was honored on campus this past year when the Graduate School did an evaluation of its doctoral programs and ranked us in its top category of "high quality" programs. With over a hundred doctoral programs on campus, this was a very special honor that affirms the high standards we have long prided ourselves on.

As most years, we have some new faculty members on board this year, this time ones who add to our teaching of comparative politics: Jeremy Wallace (China; PhD from Stanford) and Sara Watson (Southern Europe; PhD from Berkeley), plus Philipp Rehm (Western Europe; PhD from Duke) who will be joining us next year. At the same time, I want to call attention to a loss: the retirement of our department secretary Sandy Wood who was with us for 35 years and had become part of the departmental family.

Our faculty continue to receive important recognitions
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for their excellence. Tony Mughan received two campus honors: he was named a Joan Huber Faculty Fellow for his research in comparative politics, and he received the Harlan Hatcher Award for his overall contributions in research, teaching, and service. Ohio State President Gordon Gee made a surprise visit to one of Richard Herrmann's classes to give him the Faculty Award for Distinguished University Service.

As featured in this issue of PostScript, one of the most heartening new aspects of the department this year was the generous support of department alumni for our students who need to do research or training off campus. The new Susan Munthe Fund helped a graduate student go to Latin America this summer for research, and the new James Cotting Fund helped several undergraduates and graduates do study or research abroad. Additionally, we have a new Randall Ripley Fund to support graduate student research in American politics, including Canada as well as the United States. Our department very much appreciates the generosity of the kind donors who enable our students to have these exciting research opportunities.

More generally, this also gives me the opportunity to encourage our friends and alums to help support our endeavors. In the good old days, public universities were supported generously by their state governments, with 70% or 80% of their revenue coming from the state and student tuitions being low. Unfortunately, state budgets have become tighter across the United States, and now under 15% of the university's budget comes from the state. Private funds from alumni now help us with hiring distinguished faculty, supporting speaker series, and funding student research travel and study abroad. We are very appreciative of the alumni who have contributed to these efforts, and we are always available to work with alumni who would like to find a way to help support our efforts for training new generations of students.

This issue of PostScript features an article by a distinguished alumnus of ours, Richard Sisson, who went on to become a professor in our department as well as Ohio State's provost and interim president. Dick Sisson is one of the editors of the recently published "interpretative encyclopedia" about the American Midwest, and I thought it would be interesting to ask him to reflect for us about that encyclopedia and, more generally, about what being a Midwesterner means. I find his article particularly enjoyable because I'm a Midwesterner myself, from Minnesota originally, received my PhD from a once-top university "up north," and now have been in Ohio for over half my life—and I particularly resonate with his comments since I always feel like a Midwesterner when I visit other parts of the U.S. His essay reminds us of the greatness of the Midwest, of its many great universities and colleges, and of its unlimited potential. He ends by calling attention to the challenge before the Midwest to reinvent itself, and we Buckeyes hope and expect that The Ohio State University and our department will play major roles in positioning our state and the Midwest for the challenges of this new century.

As featured in this issue of PostScript, one of the most heartening new aspects of the department this year was the generous support of department alumni for our students who need to do research or training off campus.

I am very pleased to report that our department was honored on campus this past year when the Graduate School did an evaluation of its doctoral programs and ranked us in its top category of "high quality" programs.
The Supreme Court’s 
Heller Decision

by Charles Smith

Following 217 years of silence, on June 26, 2008, the United States Supreme Court declared that individuals have a constitutional “right to keep and bear arms.” The much-anticipated decision in District of Columbia et al. v. Heller set off shockwaves that will echo throughout the country for many years. While the facts of the case were relatively simple, the Court’s decision cracks the foundation of the gun control debate and opens the floodgates for litigating the Second Amendment.

In 1976, in an attempt to curb violent crime, the Washington, D.C., city council took a bold step—it banned the possession of handguns (although those owned prior to ’76 were grandfathered in). The law criminalized the possession of an unregistered firearm and prohibited the registration of handguns. The District’s ban on handguns, the first in the nation, was soon followed by similar bans in Chicago and three Chicago suburbs. (The D.C. law, though, cannot be considered a total ban; if a resident met the requirements for, and was issued a permit for a handgun, he could possess one within the city. However, as no permits have been issued since 1976, it is effectively a total ban.) Dick Anthony Heller, a special police officer employed by the Federal Justice Center and authorized to carry a handgun while on duty, applied for a permit so that he could legally possess his duty weapon while at home. His application was rejected. Rather than accept this rejection, as had countless D.C. residents, Heller joined in a suit to bar D.C. from enforcing the ban on handgun registration and “the licensing requirement insofar as it prohibits the carrying of a firearm in the home without a license” (District of Columbia et al. v. Heller at 2).

The D.C. federal district court issued a summary judgment for the District, but the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed, by a 2-1 vote, and overturned the District’s ban. The District appealed to the Supreme Court, which announced that it would take the case (grant certiorari) on November 20, 2007. The sole question presented to the Court was whether the District’s prohibition on the possession of usable handguns in the home violated the Second Amendment to the Constitution. The Court found that it did and, for the first time in its history, announced that the Second Amendment protects an individual’s right to own or possess a firearm.

One cannot comprehend the far-reaching implications of the Court’s issuing an individual rights interpretation of the Second Amendment without understanding the syntactic foundation for gun control in the United States.

distracting (even detracting) from the true intent of the Amendment, which was to preserve the right of individuals to possess firearms. “The Second Amendment protects an individual right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that arm for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home” (District of Columbia et al. v. Heller syllabus at 1, emphasis added). “The Amendment’s prefatory clause announces a purpose, but does not limit or expand the scope of the second part, the operative clause. The operative clause’s text and history demonstrate that it connotes an individual right to keep and bear arms” (District of Columbia et al. v. Heller syllabus at 1).

No longer able to base their calls for continued on page 4
tighter regulation on the collective rights interpretation, gun control proponents must look elsewhere for support. Almost presciently, over the last 10 years, some proponents have swapped arguments based on syntax for arguments based on statistics that spotlight our nation's epidemic of violent crime. Gun control is, once again, touted as a solution to violent crime. While the connection between gun control and violent crime is beyond the scope of this short piece, it is worth noting that, given 32 years of statistical evidence, the level of violent crime in D.C. has increased markedly since 1976.

What does all this mean for gun control/gun rights in the United States? The U.S. Supreme Court always limits its decision to the specific issues raised in the case before it. The decision in _Heller_ affects only the District of Columbia. The Court left undisturbed gun bans in other cities and it did not incorporate the Second Amendment against the States. _Heller_ was not an incorporation case. That is, the Court was not asked to apply protection afforded by the Second Amendment to the States. For now, the Second Amendment remains a protection only against Congress. States and municipalities (unless prohibited by state law) can still enact measures to restrict firearms possession.

In fact, Justice Scalia was adamant that any "right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited. ... [N]othing in [today's] opinion should be taken to cast doubt on longstanding prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill, or laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings, or laws imposing conditions and qualifications on the commercial sale of arms" (Heller at 54-55). Regulators can take solace that certain existing regulations _may_ be safe from judicial censure.

Although the Supreme Court did answer one important question—whether the Second Amendment protects an individual or a collective right—the fate of many city regulations will be determined by future litigation. This is similar to the after-effects of the Court’s decision in _Roe v. Wade_ (1973). While the Court in _Roe_ extended constitutional protection to abortion, parties are still litigating the contours of that right. _Heller_, like _Roe_, is merely the first step in extending Second Amendment protection.

Movement toward the next step began almost immediately after the Court handed down its decision in _Heller_. Within hours of the announcement that individuals have a Second Amendment right to possess firearms, multiple plaintiffs assisted by the National Rifle Association filed five separate lawsuits challenging local gun bans in San Francisco, Chicago, and three Chicago suburbs: Evanston, Morton Grove, and Oak Park. The Illinois suits seek to incorporate the Second Amendment against Illinois and, by extension, the other 49 states. Just as the blanket prohibition of handguns in the federal city could not stand up to Supreme Court scrutiny, it is likely that similar city ordinances will also fail. "[H]andguns are the most popular weapon chosen by Americans for self-defense in the home, and a complete prohibition of their use is invalid" (Heller at 57-58).

Ohio remains unaffected by the Supreme Court's ruling in _Heller_. Under Ohio law, municipalities are prohibited from enacting firearms regulations that are more restrictive than those passed by the state legislature. On January 8, 2004, Ohio Governor Bob Taft signed into law a bill allowing Ohioans to carry concealed handguns. This law became effective on April 8, 2004. To date, approximately 93,000 Ohioans have received a concealed-carry license. When HB12 went into effect, municipalities passed ordinances that not only added to the list of areas established as no-carry zones by HB 12 but also banned outright the carrying of concealed handguns.

The Cleveland, Ohio, city counsel enacted laws that prohibited minors from possessing firearms, banned weapons on school property, banned the possession and sale of assault weapons, and banned the carrying of concealed weapons within city limits in direct opposition to state law. The village council in Clyde, Ohio, enacted an ordinance that prohibited concealed weapons in the village park. In December 2007, the Ohio General Assembly passed over Governor Bob Taft's veto a bill revising Ohio's concealed-carry law. Among other things, the new state law prohibits cities and villages from enacting such measures. This type of prohibition, termed "preemption," nullifies local gun ordinances even when such ordinances do not conflict with state law. As of this writing, both Cleveland and Clyde are mounting legal challenges to the new state law by arguing that preemption violates the doctrine of "home rule" established by the Ohio Constitution.

In Illinois and California, litigation is under way to strike down city firearms bans as irreconcilable with the Court’s decision in _Heller_. In Ohio, municipalities are fighting legal battles to defend their ability to enact restrictions on firearms possession. As Justice Scalia noted in _Heller_, "Like most rights, the right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited" (Heller at 54). What those limits are, though, is yet to be determined.

Charles Smith (MA, Ohio State, 2001), internship coordinator and academic advisor, has research interests in civil liberties and the Second Amendment. He teaches the departments' "Gun Politics" and "Civil Liberties and the Courts" courses and has been awarded both departmental and university teaching awards. Since the _Heller_ decision, he has been increasingly sought out by media for clarification on the decision's meaning.
Reflections on Being a Midwesterner and The American Midwest: An Interpretative Encyclopedia

—by Richard Sisson

Herb Weisberg’s invitation to offer an essay on The American Midwest: An Interpretive Encyclopedia has spurred reflection. What is it? Why do it? When first invited to consider organizing a project on the American Midwest and publishing an encyclopedia of Midwestern history and culture, I demurred. There were many other things I wanted to do as I left the world of academic administration to return to my roots in the professoriate. My effort to answer Herb’s question has prompted more retrospection than I had anticipated as I reflect on considerations of nearly a decade ago now. The result is a personal story as well as a commentary on the development and
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Reflections on Being a Midwesterner (continued)

substance of The American Midwest, for, as you will see, my decision to pursue this project was driven by deep personal sentiment as well as by intellectual interest.

I am a Midwesterner, though I didn’t fully realize it until my graduate student days at Berkeley in the 1960s. My ties and sense of place and family origin were all powerful attractions in my coming home to Ohio to take on the provostship at Ohio State, one of the most challenging jobs in American higher education. Imagine walking onto campus at Berkeley, having just driven cross-country from Columbus, signs everywhere: “Trotskyites of the World Unite!”, “Revolution Now!”, “Join the Fair Play for Cuba Committee!”.

“Flyover country”; you can read about it in The American Midwest. And I talked different (not differently), though I did not realize this until I called home (since letters were the usual means of the day) some eight months after having left, my mother answering the phone—“has she always talked like that?” I wondered. I began increasingly aware of where I was from and clearly realized there was an expanded sense of place that had become relevant to me. Curiously, I was more cosmopolitan than they with respect to music and the arts. Perhaps this is why I find Kurt Vonnegut’s essay on “Indiana” in the encyclopedia so insightful and compelling.

Reflections going further back. I have always had a sense of place, most profoundly through our family farm in southern Ohio, not far from the Ohio River where my great-grandfather, born in 1795, settled in the second decade of the 19th century. I’ve lived in many cultures, and they have become a part of me, but I still feel a sense of rootedness and repose when I hit Route 35 in Chillicothe on my way south towards the river. But mine was also a broader world growing up. My family was absorbed by the issues of the day and full of stories about the past, persons, and events that could almost be touched. Family sentiments ran against the grain of local society and, in retrospect, we were marginal to it, engaged but apart. My grandmother was a single mom, raising three kids after the death of my grandfather at the turn of the 20th century. She was, as was he, devoted to learning and to reforming the world. He graduated from medical school in Louisville, she from normal school; he was an active abolitionist, she devoted to temperance and suffrage. She saw to it that her children were educated in the best places she could afford while running a farm—my father at Mount Herman, then Ohio Wesleyan, and both he (biochemistry) and my aunt (English and Latin) through graduate school at Ohio State. Chautauquas were an important part of their lives, as were summers at Ohio University for classics and the arts. My mother attended Ohio State, as did her three brothers, who graduated with degrees in agriculture. All on both sides went “back home” to farm and teach.

Social and international issues were matters for discussion in our family of rural “free-thinkers.” Dad, a lifelong registered Republican, cast his votes early in life for Norman Thomas, was attracted to the social gospel movement.

I was from southern Ohio, but at Ohio State I became a citizen of the world.

while an undergraduate, and worked at Hull House during a period of youthful exploration in Chicago. Intellectually, the world was not foreign to me, nor were Midwesterners Jane Addams and Eugene Debs, Carl Sandburg and Mark Twain, and, yes, James Whitcomb Riley, though then I didn’t see them in regional terms. I knew early on that I was going to become a living part of that world of family conversation, books, and the imagination, and I was encouraged to do so. This commitment was sealed during my undergraduate days at Ohio State where I majored in international studies and lived at the George Wells Knight Men’s International House, where many of my friends and fellow students were from areas of the world still under colonial rule, others but a decade free. Heady stuff, to be introduced to theories and themes of political transformation in the classroom, but to learn of such change in the everyday “seminars” with my friends about their social and political lives, “history from the bottom up.” I was from southern Ohio, but at Ohio State I became a citizen of the world.

When asked by John Gallman, then editor of Indiana University Press, to consider undertaking the organization and publication of an encyclopedia of the history and culture of the American Midwest, my wife and I were on our way to Santa Fe, which we had visited regularly for over two decades because of the extraordinary beauty and creativity of the place and our interest in Native American art. I reluctantly promised consideration. Many alternatives tugged, but I found myself thinking more and
more about growing up and coming of age in, becoming an immigrant from, and returning to Ohio. Upon returning to Columbus andwinning a myriad files in preparation for transitioning from the world of provosting to the world of professing again, I came across two I had forgotten about, both dating from my days in Berkeley—"Back Home, Porter, Ohio" read one; "Gallia County" read the other. The first included memorabilia from my family—letters, stories of my family's settlement in Ohio, the activities of various members during the turbulent and formative 19th century, and the remnants of beautifully pressed maple leaves my mother had sent me in Berkeley to remind me of the colors of home. It included articles from the local newspaper, one with the particularly instructive title "Dr. Sisson of Porter Publishes Book in West." A different and far-off land; a 20th-century guy from a 19th-century world. The second included information on the history of Gallia County and neighboring areas as well as memorabilia from undergraduate days at Ohio State, things forgotten but immediately remembered, including a copy of Wordsworth's poem "Michael," given to me by a professor of English from whom I learned much, Ruth Hughey, upon her learning something of my background and interests. I recall first reading that poem and committing myself to attaining a different conclusion were my own life to take a course like that of Luke. I would come home, and the shelter and what it represents would surely be built. I reflected on my own laboratory of political inquiry, South Asia, principally India. One of my first intellectual fascinations was the rise of regional political cultures, and how identities were shaped—Mahatma Gandhi became an Indian in Britain and South Africa, Jawaharlal Nehru from the north and Krishna Menon from the south, and a multitude of others "discovered" India while students in Britain. Menon I first met as an undergraduate at Ohio State, and later interviewed him about these matters in India. Others developed a strong regional identity while studying outside their area of origin, resulting in powerful political movements that tested the integrity of the new Indian state during its first two decades of independence. Their identities were shaped while pursuing their education "abroad," just like my own. I discovered the Midwest in California.

It is for these reasons and other sentiments yet un-mined that I decided to take on the project that resulted in the publication of The American Midwest: An Interpretative Encyclopedia. Mine was but one of many minds and hands involved, critical others being fellow general editors, Columbus Foundation, Wolfe Associates of Columbus, and various units within The Ohio State University, the project would have been short-lived. Ultimately, other critical support became available, including grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities as well as support from the Ohio General Assembly. We are indebted to our panel of distinguished senior consulting editors who assumed substantial responsibility for the 22 thematic sections and contributed integrative overview essays to each, and the nearly 1,100 experts who contributed the approximately 1,500 essays and entries that compose the nearly 1,900 pages of this double-columned-page book. The following selection from the preface provides the sense of our moorings, inspiration, and thinking about the region.

"In our time, African, Arab, Asian, and Hispanic Americans have established a significant presence in the region. No one particular group of people can lay claim to the Midwest."

Chris Zacher and Drew Cayton, both of whom had returned home to the Midwest after doctoral studies on either coast. So much to be done. The work needed to be conceived; a thematic framework created; a community of experts convened and consulted; outstanding senior consulting editors recruited; expert contributors identified and signed up; a timeline established; an efficient editorial tracking system developed; a versatile support staff recruited and responsibilities assigned; and substantial funding to be secured. This was all before the actual editing would begin.

The pace of progress was dependent upon securing funding, and we general editors had committed only five years of our professional lives, and only part-time, to the project where similar ones had taken well over a decade to complete. Without funding it would be difficult to develop a product; without an imminent product, it proved difficult to secure funds. Without initial support from the
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and the Dakota reservations of Louise Erdrich.

"The Midwest has always been in the middle, and not just geographically. It is, and was, a place of both industry and agriculture, large and small cities and small towns, massive corporations and powerful labor unions, artistic creativity and cultural repression. Politically, it has for two centuries been a place of close elections, iconoclastic leaders, and egalitarian movements. It is a complicated and unpredictable region, and contrary to its popular image, the Midwest has always been distinguished by the diversity of its residents. In ancient times the region was home to paleo-hunters, to the important Mound Builder civilizations commonly known as Adena and Hopewell, and to the various Mississippian cultures that found their apogee in the great city-state of Cahokia. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was home to a wide variety of Native Americans...No less diverse were the European immigrants who flooded the area in the 1800s, bringing with them countless languages, customs, and beliefs. In our time, African, Arab, Asian, and Hispanic Americans have established a significant presence in the region. No one particular group of people can lay claim to the Midwest.

"While we can argue about whether the Midwest has unique characteristics, we cannot deny that many of its daughters and sons think that the region is unique; think in some certain if inchoate fashion that they are Midwesterners. There is no more interesting expression of this vague regionalism than singer-songwriter Bob Dylan's ambivalence. He left his home state of Minnesota because 'it couldn't give me anything.' Almost in the same breath, however, Dylan concedes that Minnesota 'wouldn't be such a bad place to go back to and die in. There's no place I feel closer to now, or get the feeling that I'm a part of, except maybe New York; but I'm not a New Yorker. I'm North Dakota-Minnesota-Midwestern. I'm that color. I speak that way. I'm from someplace called the Iron Range. My brains and feelings have come from there.' ... However far from the region native Midwesterners may move, on some level they always live there. As Toni Morrison put it in a 1983 interview: 'I am from the Midwest so I have a special affection for it. My beginnings are always there. No matter what I write, I begin there.'

Populism and the Progressive Movements were born in the Midwest. While the Republican Party held sway through much of the century following the Civil War, the Midwest was principal home to Labor and Socialist parties as well as the Communist party.

The Midwest in our conception is a land bounded by pure water, the only region on earth so embraced and defined. It includes Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota east of the 100th Meridian, a waterfall line, a curtain of water east of which irrigation is unnecessary, west of which it is; east of which there are farms, west of which there are ranches, and in each of which settlement patterns tended to be distinctive. The north is bounded by the Great Lakes, the east and south by the watershed of the Ohio. We were also mindful of the origins of the geographical referent, Middle West or Midwest, as definitely set forth by James R. Shortridge, senior consulting editor of the section entitled "Images of the Midwest." Unlike the popular notion held by many, the term originated in the 1880s in popular literature and the popular imagination in the wake of population movements largely in horizontal manner from east to west after the Civil War. The Southwest, Texas, and Indian Territory were quite distinctive as were the Dakotas and Montana, the Northwest. Distinctive, too, were Kansas and Nebraska, the Middle West—between those regions north and south (not east and west), a place of independent farmers, small-town merchants, and amber waves of grain. By the turn of the century the term Midwest had moved north and eastward in popular usage to encompass the region of our attention.

What will readers find when they examine The American Midwest? A multitude of things, of course, and they may ponder the issue of whether America is the "Midwest writ large," or the Midwest is "America writ small." Regardless, several themes stand out. One is the cultural diversity of the region already noted. From mid-19th through the early 20th century, the Midwest was probably the most diverse region of the world, the populations of its major cities having been born elsewhere, principally abroad. Each successive generation of immigrants endeavored to emulate those before in their commitment to some form of labor or inventiveness and investment, education, and places for community engagement and worship. Linguistic diversity is likewise extensive, even in the form of dialects in English, as set forth in the section on "Language." Interestingly, the names of the 12 states of the Midwest have Native roots with only one exception—"Indiana."

The Midwest has been a region of social extremes, quite like its weather, rather than the sedate, bland, pastoral, conservative land of traditional values impervious to innovation and change as often depicted. The Midwest was the center of the Abolitionist Movement and the Underground Railroad, but also a principal home of the Copperheads before and during the Civil War. It became the center of the American labor movement with major unions being founded there. It was a place of strikes and labor unrest and industrial violence from the Haymarket Affair, through the Pullman Strike, through the strikes of the 20th century in the steel, auto, and meatpacking industries, and the labor tinged race riots that occurred subsequent to the
Great Migration of African Americans from the South to the industrial cities of the region. Most of the leaders of labor were home-grown; many of the titans of industry, though far from all, were immigrants from eastern states stirred by the entrepreneurial promise provided by the region's rich endowment of natural resources: vast stands of timber, iron and copper, and coal and petroleum that provided the raw materials and energy that the industrial revolution in America required.

Further examination would show that the region gave birth to extremes in political and social movements and advocacy. Populism and the Progressive Movements were born in the Midwest. While the Republican party held sway through much of the century following the Civil War, the Midwest was principal home to Labor and Socialist parties as well as the Communist party. The early part of the 20th century witnessed the election of numerous Socialist candidates in municipal elections throughout the region. Milwaukee had a Socialist mayor from 1910 to 1940, save for a four-year interruption. Dominant national figures on the left were Midwesterners, including Eugene V. Debs and Norman Thomas, from Terre Haute, Indiana, and Marion, Ohio, respectively. The spectrum right of center included the principled conservatism of Ohio's Senator Bob Taft. The Midwest produced Senator Joe McCarthy as well as Senator Gene McCarthy, Hubert Humphrey as well as Bob Dole. Between the two World Wars the Ku Klux Klan had its strongest presence in Indiana, where its candidates were elected to the governorship and senate, and had a strong presence in the states on either side. The region was at the time also home to the Progressive Movement led by "Fighting Bob" LaFollette of Wisconsin. And what about other movements and leaders against the cultural grain? Women's movements - the WCTU, Carrie Catt and others, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association, Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem, and the largest number of representatives of any region at the founding of NOW. Against this grain, of course, has been the influential advocacy of Phyllis Schlafly and others for family values. And what about the SDS and the Port Huron Statement? What about AIM and the Declaration of Indian Purpose? Midwestern, all.

What may become known as the American Century (plus a few years) was also the Century of the Midwest. From the Civil War through that in Vietnam the Midwest was both breadbasket and foundry for the nation, and a dominant region with respect to international trade, facilitated by a complex of great land-grant universities, the most consequential of any region of the country. It was also consequential in national political life—the Land of Presidents. Midwesterners served as president for 54 of those 120 years, 65 years had three not died in office, and served as vice president for 37 years during the presidencies of those from other regions. The trend has changed, however, with a decline in the Midwest's population, its wealth creation, and its electoral votes.

The equivalent of strong arms, educated minds, and indomitable spirit is very much present in those we educate, but they leave for places that in this century provide the environment that the Midwest provided in the past.

And what about literature and the arts? It is impossible to offer a course in American Literature of the late 19th and 20th centuries without an enormous presence of Midwestern novelists, essayists, poets and playwrights—Mark Twain, Theodore Dreiser, Willa Cather, Carl Sandburg; Sinclair Lewis, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, Richard Wright, Langston Hughes; Saul Bellow, Gwendolyn Brooks, Kurt Vonnegut; Toni Morrison, David Mamet, Rita Dove, Louise Erdrich, Sandra Cisneros. These are but a few. Five of America's nine Nobel Laureates in Literature have roots in the Midwest. Nobel Laureates in Economics? The proportion is higher. Ever heard the Cleveland and Chicago Symphony Orchestra in performance, and how they're judged by musicians and critics around the world? Incredible!

Midwesterners engage and reach out, a phenomenon that ranges from retail marketing and talk shows to political participation and philanthropy, all in the front rank. Montgomery Ward, Sears, Spiegel's, Federated and, of course, White Castle, McDonald's, Wendy's, Bob Evans, Dominos, Pizza Hut, plus many others. And what of the Today Show—Dave Garroway, Hugh Downs, Tom Brokaw, and Jane Pauley; the Tonight Show—Steve Allen, Jack Paar, and Johnny Carson; the Late Show with David Letterman; Phil Donahue and Oprah Winfrey? And we're not talking about much of the media, cinema, animation, theme parks, and such innovations as shopping centers.

And political participation and social capital. Essays in the "Politics" section report consistently higher voter turnout by Midwesterners than those in other regions, greater political involvement, higher levels of organizational involvement and social visiting, and a higher incidence of interpersonal trust than elsewhere. More people may be "Bowling Alone" in America, but this is much less true of the Midwest than elsewhere. Stunningly so, but not surprising. The region was, after all, the birthplace of community, social and service clubs including the Rotary, Kiwanis, Jaycees, and Lions Club among others. United Way was founded in Cleveland as was the first community foundation in America and community chest. The region continues to be at the forefront nationally in per capita charitable giving, while over one quarter of the nation's community foundations are found in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, and nearly one-third of the top 100 such foundations in asset size are located in the Midwest. In this regard continued on page 10
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Tocqueville would find Midwesterners quite recognizable as practitioners of “habits of the heart.”

Strains of evidence reported in The American Midwest, however, suggest a region in economic and political decline as economic production has become mobile and the world has become increasingly “flat.” The availability of rich land and natural resources attracted the first wave of immigrants to the region to create a productive and comfortable life. The discoveries and inventions of land-grant universities made for increasing agricultural productivity and efficiency and provided the knowledge and training in the engineering sciences essential for manufacturing and heavy industries. Such investment in the past made for demographic stability, recruitment, and growth. The spirit that gave rise to this extraordinary saga of human endeavor was captured quite early by Tocqueville in Democracy in America, prompted by his travel in the early 1830s to the eastern part of the Midwest:

“At the extreme borders of the confederated states, where organized society and the wilderness meet, there is a population of bold adventurers who to escape the poverty threatening them in their fathers homes have dared to plunge into the solitudes of America seeking a new homeland there. As soon as the pioneer reaches his place of refuge, he hastily fells a few trees and builds a log cabin in the forest. Nothing could look more wretched than these isolated dwellings. The traveler approaching one toward the evening sees the hearth fire flicker through the chinks in the walls, and at night, when the wind rises, he hears the roof of boughs shake to and fro in the midst of the great forest trees. Who would not suppose that this poor hut sheltered some rude and ignorant folk? But one should not assume any connection between the pioneer and the place that shelters him. All his surroundings are primitive and wild, but he is the product of eighteen centuries of labor and experience. He wears the clothes and talks the language of a town; he is aware of the past, curious about the future, and ready to argue about the present; he is a very civilized man prepared for a time to face life in the forest, plunging into the wilderness of the New World with his bible, his ax, and his newspapers.” And they succeeded, they and successive waves of immigrants—farmers, entrepreneurs, and laborers alike, from all lands, religions, and ethnicities.

Who will be the “bold adventurers” now and tomorrow? Who will create the equivalent of nature’s attraction and how will it be done? The equivalent of strong arms, educated minds, and indomitable spirit is very much present in those we educate, but they leave for places that in this century provide the environment that the Midwest provided in the last. This is the challenge before the Midwest. Without the invention and capturing of that equivalent, the history of the Midwest will of necessity change, and its place in the national consciousness and the character of its culture will fade. Visionary and strategic thought, public-private collaboration, orchestration of resources, and dramatic action required!

Richard Sisson (PhD, Berkeley, 1967), senior vice president, provost, and professor emeritus, has research and teaching interests in comparative politics with special emphasis on legislatures, parties, electoral politics, and democratization. He served as a general editor of The American Midwest: An Interpretative Encyclopedia, is co-editor of The Evolution of Political Knowledge: Theory and Inquiry in American Politics and a companion volume; and is co-editor of Ohio and the World: From Circa 1793 to Circa 2053.

Reflections on The American Voter Revisited and Its Implications for the 2008 Election

—by Herb Weisberg

Dick Sisson’s reflections on his interpretative encyclopedia of The American Midwest spurred me to reflect on my most recent writing project, The American Voter Revisited. What is it? Why did we write it? And what does it say for the study of contemporary American elections?

As many of you will remember from your political science classes, the modern study of voting behavior began in 1960 when four researchers at “that school up north” (as Woody Hays used to refer to it) wrote the book The American Voter about the elections of the 1950s. That book established the dominant paradigm for analyzing voting behavior. It is based on the first national surveys of the American electorate, one-hour face-to-face surveys taken in people's houses before the election, followed up by one-hour face-to-face surveys with the same people after the election. The book is so important that it has been challenged by hundreds, maybe thousands, of journal articles over the years. But a book on the 1950s elections is so old now that few people really remember the Eisenhower-Stevenson presidential elections.

So, four of us decided to redo the book, using 2000 and 2004 surveys, and
that led to *The American Voter Revisited* (by Michael Lewis-Beck, William Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and myself), which was published in early 2008 by the University of Michigan Press. We replicated the original book as closely as we could, using the National Election Studies surveys that still follow the same methodology and use many of the same questions as in the 1950s. Of course, we had to make some compromises. We dropped the *American Voter*’s chapter on the political behavior of farmers: there are too few farmers these days to get a reliable sample for statistical generalization. But in general, we found that the results of *The American Voter* still hold up pretty well today.

One of the best-known contributions of the old book is its originating the idea of party identification—that most people consider themselves Republicans, Democrats, or Independents. The chart at top-right shows how the proportion of the samples in each category changed over the years. Note first the growth in Independents since the 1950s, which occurred mainly during the period of the civil rights revolution, the Vietnam War, and the Watergate scandal, and has grown only a little since. Second, note that throughout this period more Republicans in this country thought of themselves as Democrats than Republicans, but that the Democratic lead has decreased. At the same time, it’s very important to realize that the social-demographic groups in the United States that are least likely to vote, such as poor people and those with low levels of education, happen to be the groups that are most Democratic, which cuts away the Democratic advantage in party identification. Thus, if we look at actual voters, we’d find that fairly equal numbers of Republican and Democratic identifiers voted in the 2004 election.

An important recent finding is that party identification has become more important in voting, at least through the 2004 presidential election. Defection from partisanship has become infrequent. More than a quarter of Democrats defected from their party and voted for Dwight Eisenhower in the 1950s, and 40% of Republicans defected from their party and voted for Lyndon Johnson in 1964, but only about 7% of partisans defected from their parties in the 2000 or 2004 presidential elections.

The *American Voter* found that party identification is fairly stable for most people. It often develops early in life, generally following the political party of one’s parents. It can change, of course, but usually doesn’t change a lot. *The American Voter Revisited* substantiated these earlier results. Since party identification is so stable, the large swings that we sometimes see in the outcomes of successive elections cannot be due to people changing their party identification.

Issues can be important in elections. But rarely does a single issue predominate in an election. When people are asked about a specific issue, many are not familiar with the issue, many do not have positions on the issue, and many do not see differences between the candidates on the issue. It is rare for as many as half of the public to pass these three “hurdles” on any one specific issue. Certainly there are people who care passionately about particular issues, like abortion, gay marriage, or gun control, but rarely would a single issue motivate a majority of the public, even though these issues can sometimes be used to help mobilize voters. The exception, of course, is the economy, and voters do understand when times are tough and then vote against the incumbent party.

Likewise ideology is not all that important in the United States. Elections are fought on the basis of left-right ideology in some countries. When we look at how Americans talk about politics, however, we find that only 20% of the electorate in this country thinks about politics in liberal and conservative terms. That is actually twice as high as *The American Voter* found for the 1950s, but it still means that, by and large, the American public is not ideological.

So, what explains the change in vote totals between elections if party identification is fairly stable and if issues and ideology are of limited importance? The answer is the candidate factor, which was very important in the elections that we looked at in our book. The surveys ask people what they like and dislike about the parties and the candidates, and their answers are classified along several dimensions. Statistical analysis then seeks to measure the impact of each factor on the vote. For example, we find that survey respondents, net, said more favorable things about George W. Bush than negative things about him in both 2000 and 2004.

The public was negative about the Iraq war in 2004, but Bush was seen as a strong leader after his response to 9/11, and that helped him get reelected. And the survey respondents said more negative things than favorable ones about John Kerry in 2004—the Republican ads made the public think about John Kerry as a flip-flopper. So, it was the candidate factor that made the difference in recent elections: Bush’s candidacy helped the Republicans, while Kerry actually hurt the Democrats.

The chart on page 12 shows some of the statistical analysis in our book. Survey respondents were asked what they like and dislike about the parties and candidates, and then we correlated their answers with their votes. The bars show how much a factor helped the Republican vote if it goes to the right, or helped the Democrats if it goes to the left. The social group factor helped the Democrats in 2004, as it always has, since most of the comments that people make about social groups are remarks like “the Democrats are good for the working class” and because the Democratic Party is a coalition of social groups. Foreign issues generally have helped the Republicans over the years, but in 2004 they helped the Democrats. Domestic issues generally have helped the Democrats over the years, but they didn’t have much effect in the last election.

But what helped the Republicans were the candidates: Bush’s favorable image

*continued on page 12*
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added 1% to the Republican vote, beyond what we'd expect on the basis of party identification, and Kerry's unfavorable image added nearly another 1% to the Republican vote totals.

Election administration poses an important limitation of this analysis. This analysis of voting cannot explain how George Bush won the Electoral College vote in 2000, since Al Gore actually won the popular vote that year by just over a half million votes. And some critics argue that the 2004 election was "stolen" in Ohio, or at least that the state constitutional amendment against gay marriage mobilized conservatives to vote for George Bush the election. But the real point is that the Democrats would have won the 2000 and 2004 elections if Gore and John Kerry had been more attractive candidates. The Republicans have been doing better in choosing presidential candidates that the public likes, or at least in selling their candidates to the public and raising doubts about the Democratic candidates, allowing the 2000 and 2004 elections to be so close that they were decided in the end by Florida and the Supreme Court in 2000 and by Ohio in 2004.

If you watch CNN or MSNBC or Fox News, you might think that Americans are preoccupied with politics, but it's only a few political junkies (and maybe political science graduates) who are obsessed by politics. Most people have more immediate problems to deal with. Back in the 1800s, national political campaigns were great entertainment for the public, but politics today must compete for attention with sports, movies, television, and the Internet. Political psychologists describe voters as "cognitive misers," giving the minimum amount of thought needed to decide which candidate they like most. Consider an analogy with buying a car. Some people carefully research every brand and model of car before making a purchase, but most people know whether or not they like their current car and therefore decide whether to buy another one or switch makes. Similarly some people carefully research every party and candidate before voting, but most people just perform some basic tests as to whether they did well under the current administration and how comfortable they feel with the two candidates.

So, how will this play through in the 2008 election? As I write this in October 2008, it is too early to know the election outcome. Party identification has shifted a little to the Democrats since 2004, which should help the Democrats. And, unfortunately, the U.S. economy has been weak, which should help the party out of power, the Democrats. But the candidates are the real wild card of the 2008 election. They are both improbable candidates. Most Americans were sure that they would never see in their lifetime an African American nominated for president by a major party, but Barack Obama won the Democratic nomination. And John McCain seemed out of presidential politics when he lost the Republican nomination to George Bush in 2000 and even more so when he was so low in the polls in 2007; but he came back to win the Republican nomination, and his choice of Sarah Palin as his running mate revitalized his candidacy.

In recent years, political scientists have developed some models for election forecasting. Their equations take into account two main factors. First, they examine how popular the incumbent president is, and George W. Bush is very unpopular, which would be predicted to hurt his party. These equations also take into account the state of the economy, which is very weak, and which is predicted to hurt the party controlling the White House. Those forecasting models for 2008 are very clear that the Democrats should be expected to win the presidency easily.

When the predictions of several of these models are averaged out, the average prediction is that the Democrat will win about 54% of the vote in 2008 and the Republican will win only 46%.

But, those forecasting models have been wrong before, as when they predicted an easy victory for Al Gore in 2000. That did not occur since Gore avoided running on Clinton's popularity, and did not even take credit for how strong the economy was in the Clinton years, because he did not want to be tarred by Bill Clinton's moral faults. Furthermore, these equations are based on the elections of the last half-century, so they cannot take into account the effects of race on the first election in U.S. history with an African American major-party nominee.

By the way, there's also a political stock market that takes bets on the election result, and in mid-September it showed an expectation of Obama winning 52% of the vote and McCain 48%, increasing to a 55%-45% Obama lead by mid-October. Myself, I've learned not to bet on how presidential races will turn out—and that's the fun of watching U.S. elections: there is always that element of unpredictability to them. What I am sure about, though, is that the 2008 election will be decided by the candidate factor.

Herbert Weisberg (PhD, Michigan, 1966), professor and department chair, has research interests in American voting behavior, Congress, survey research, and political methodology. He is a coauthor of The American Voter Revisited and was guest editor of an issue of Political Behavior on "The Iraq War and the 2004 Presidential Election." Other recent books include The Total Survey Error Approach: A Guide to the New Science of Survey Research and Models of Voting in Presidential Elections: The 2000 U.S. Election.
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Alum’s Lecture Elicits Thought-Provoking Questions

Beginning in 2000, the political science department has recognized its honors graduates with a special reception on the day before graduation. This recognition session also includes a distinguished alumnus speaker. The 2008 speaker was Rob Edmund, a 1995 BA from the department. Rob went on from Ohio State to Harvard Law School and subsequently returned to Columbus, where he became a partner at the law firm of Porter Wright specializing in labor and employment law. In January 2008, he became director of Policy and External Relations for the Ohio Business Roundtable, a nonpartisan organization of 80 chief executive officers of Ohio’s largest business enterprises. He works with them to advance the roundtable’s public policy agenda in such areas as education and health care. He also teaches as an adjunct professor of employment law at Capital University Law School. Rob is very active in the community, serving on the board for United Way of Central Ohio, as a former president of Columbus Early Learning Centers, and past chair of the Columbus Bar Association’s Labor and Employment Committee. He was the founding president of Ohio State’s College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Alumni Society.

Among several other honors, Rob received the William Oxley Thompson Award for early career distinction from The Ohio State University Alumni Association.

Rob’s talk at the reception was based on Ohio State’s motto: “Education for Citizenship.” Throughout his speech, Rob argued that the university’s political science grads are uniquely qualified to inspire citizenship in others. He challenged graduates to think about their citizenship obligations from several perspectives.

He first asked us to identify the communities we belong to. We belong to many communities at once, and these are broader than traditional communities. Those of us who live in central Ohio are citizens of the United States, of Ohio, of a region of the state, of a county, of a city or township, of a school district, and of a neighborhood, but nowadays many of us are also citizens in social networks on the Internet—an important modern expansion of the notion of community.

He next asked us to think about the borders of these communities—and, more particularly, whether the borders should be protected or changed. This question affects our organization of government, among other things, and Rob encouraged us to think about whether our local and other governmental borders are keeping up with the times. The question also has interesting implications for how and where we vote. We vote only in the community where we live, but Rob posed the fascinating question of what we would do if, instead of voting on 10 races on the ballot in our precinct, we could vote on any 10 races in Ohio. Keeping up with changes in our notion of borders also becomes more difficult as the pace of change in society accelerates. One way of measuring this change is by looking at the increment sociologists use to measure generations. Rob argued that sociologists used to measure generations in 20-year intervals (except, for example, during the transition between the agrarian and industrial societies when a generation passed in only 10 years). Now, however, sociologists are measuring generations in only 6- to 8-year intervals as we move to a knowledge-based information society. As we move into this new society, some borders are important to protect, such as the border between work and family, but he asked to consider whether some other borders should be torn down.

Finally, he challenged the future leaders at the reception to build partnerships appropriate for our time—partnerships that build bridges across the borders dividing our communities. On the international scene, the United Nations and NATO were the right partnerships for their time, though some would argue they are no longer the right partnerships for our time. Rob argued that we need a next generation of partnerships. Online networks provide one model for this. But they have limitations, and we need coalitions that protect democratic values and gain broad acceptance by citizens. We need to keep the masses involved in these new partnerships, continued on page 14.

Ohio used to try to attract businesses with the slogan “Ohio, the Heart of it All.” The new slogan is “Ohio, the State of Perfect Balance”...
Thought Provoking Questions (continued)

including those who do not keep up with the information society. He described public/private partnerships as one example of this, with the Ohio Business Roundtable as a prototype that builds these kinds of partnerships to address major public policy concerns across the state. These partnerships allow states to leverage resources and talent they might not otherwise be able to access. For example, some companies "loan" their executives—sometimes full-time—to a nonprofit partnership that helps governments solve public policy problems and leverage corporate charitable giving.

Talking to Rob after his speech, we gained further perspective on how business sees Ohio. Ohio has several successful industries, but many development leaders feel that Ohio has a competitive advantage in five areas: aerospace and aviation, bioscience and biomed, energy and alternative energy, logistics, and advanced materials including polymers and plastics. Ohio used to try to attract businesses with the slogan "Ohio, the Heart of it All." The new slogan is "Ohio, the State of Perfect Balance" because Ohio is seen by corporate venture capitalists and executives as providing an ideal "work-life balance" between work time and family time—especially compared with some competitor states where residents have to spend many hours a week commuting to work that Ohioans can spend with their families.

---

Oxford Pre-Law Program Courtesy of Cotting Grant

After hearing that I had been awarded a James C. Cotting Study/Research Abroad Grant in 2007, I was excited to know that funding for a plane ticket and meals was one less thing I had to worry about while attending the University of Oxford Pre-Law Program. The program significantly improved my understanding of the Anglo-American Common Law System, and it developed my appreciation of English culture and society. In addition, the program introduced me to law school teaching techniques, such as the Socratic Method, during class study of Supreme Court decisions.

Touring Blenheim Palace, viewing A Midsummer Night’s Dream at the Royal Shakespeare Company in Stratford-upon-Avon, dining at Middle Temple, and visiting the Houses of Parliament were only a few of the field trips we went on during the five weeks in England. My personal favorite was visiting Runnymede, where the Magna Carta was signed and hence the birthplace of modern democracy. Studying the monument that was built in its honor made me realize the struggle and extensive duration of time it took for modern democracy to be formed.

I decided to conduct my research on gun control following a lecture by an Oxfordshire police detective. My paper, Firearms Culture and Control in the United States and United Kingdom: A Comparative Study, examines the issue of gun control in the U.S. and U.K. from a cultural and historical standpoint, with emphasis on tradition and future gun control legislation in each country.

I was surprised by the level of education and experience of the tutors and lecturers. A Thames Valley Police detective inspector; several PhDs, JDS, and LLBs; as well as a member of Parliament lectured about topics ranging from University of Oxford history to Tony Blair’s domestic policy triumphs, among others. My favorite lecturer was Walter J. Leonard, former dean of both Harvard Law School and Howard Law School. Mr. Leonard captivated the classroom when he reminisced about his friendship with Martin Luther King Jr. and his active participation in the American civil rights movement.

The funding I received through the James C. Cotting Grant was valuable to help supplement my travels. If it were not for the grant, it would have been very difficult for me to afford a plane ticket and meals. I would like to thank the Department of Political Science for selecting me as a recipient of the grant. Furthermore, I thank James C. Cotting for providing the funding.

Kevin McDermott at Buckingham Palace with one of the Queen’s Guards
GRADUATE STUDENT NEWS

On September 28, 2008, at our annual graduate student reception, Anand Sokhey was awarded the Francis R. Aumann Award for the best graduate paper presented at a professional conference or convention.

Caleb Gallemore was presented the Jacobina Aman Award for best graduate student paper on public and international affairs.

And Dag Mossige won the Henry R. Spencer Award for Distinguished Teaching as the graduate student with the highest quality teaching record.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT NEWS

Ohio State's first Carnegie Junior Fellow is Kevin Slaton, who graduated in March 2008 with political science and sociology degrees. Slaton conducted research at Ohio State with Craig Jenkins in sociology and Alexander Thompson in political science. The Carnegie Junior Fellows program pairs recent graduates with researchers working on Carnegie Endowment projects such as Chinese affairs, democracy building, Eurasian affairs, international security, and non-proliferation. Kevin will work on China-related projects.

Ashley Hicks, an undergraduate student in the public policy minor program at Ohio State, joined forces last spring with Columbus mayor Michael Coleman, the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC), and the Solid Waste Authority of Central Ohio (SWACO) to explore ways to help increase business recycling in the central Ohio community. "Understanding the economic and political realities of environmental policymaking is the first step in developing workable policy choices," says Alan Wiseman, associate professor of political science and director of the public policy minor at Ohio State. Ashley stepped outside the classroom to learn firsthand the challenges involved in getting local businesses to do more recycling. Under Professor Wiseman's direction, she looked at other cities for possible legislative solutions. At the end of spring quarter, Ashley presented her suggestions to the City, SWACO, and MORPC for inclusion in a study that SWACO already had underway. The SWACO study is a much-broader analysis of recycling alternatives for central Ohio.

Graduate Students Receive Study/Research Travel Abroad Grants

We are pleased to announce that several of our graduate students have won grants to support their research travel abroad, including:

Shelly Fleming - Susan Munthe Latin America Research Abroad Grant, awarded by the department

Melanie Barr, Miryam Farrar, Shelly Fleming, Aisha Shafique, and Kadir Yildirim - James C. Cotting Study/Research Abroad Grants, awarded by the department

Quintin Beazer and Scott Powell - Southard Fellowships, awarded by the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

Jennifer Regan - Roth Fellowship, awarded by the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

Kadir Yildirim - International Travel Grant, awarded by the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

Christina Xydias - research travel grant, awarded by the Office of International Affairs

Scott Powell - Phyliss Krumm Memorial Scholarship, awarded by the Office of International Affairs

Quintin Beazer, Erik Heidemann, Kerry Hodak, Erin McAdams, Banks Miller, Scott Powell, Amanda Rosen, Byungwon Woo, Christina Xydias, and Kadir Yildirim - Alumni Grants for Graduate Research and Scholarship, awarded by the Graduate School

Melanie Barr, Austin Carson, Tongfi Kim, Yoon-Ah Oh, Jennifer Regan, and Amanda Rosen - research funds, awarded by the Mershon Center

Danielle Langfield was accepted for the Preparing Future Faculty program.

We are very fortunate to have generous donors who recognize the importance of study/research abroad grants!
Make a Gift to the Department of Political Science

University funds are always scarce, so the successes of the Department of Political Science—the support of important scholarship, the education of our undergraduate and graduate students, the presence of visiting speakers and distinguished scholars on campus—all these and more are supported in greater numbers by the generosity of our alumni.

We invite you to make a gift to the department through one of our existing funds, described on this page. Please use the check box on the return card (page 18) to indicate the fund to which you are donating.

And also please let us know about yourself so we can share with your colleagues in our next issue. You will find space for that on the reverse side of the return card.

Political Science funding opportunities

Jacobina Aman Award
Established January 12, 1959, with a bequest from Katherine A. Seibert in memory of her mother. Income provides a student award recognizing good will, understanding, and practical cooperation in international affairs and/or race relations among fellow students.

Francis R. Aumann Fund
Established February 4, 1983, by alumni, friends, and associates of Dr. Aumann, professor emeritus. Income rewards scholastic excellence of political science students and promotes academic goals of the Department of Political Science.

William Jennings Bryan Prize
Established July 20, 1898, by Mr. Bryan. Income supports a prize for the best essay on The Principles Which Underlie Our Form of Government. If no prize is awarded, income is reinvested to principal.

Lawrence J. R. Herson Fund
Established May 7, 1999, by alumni, friends, and associates of Professor Herson, in honor of his retirement and distinguished career in the Department of Political Science. Income enhances academic goals of the department and promotes scholarly excellence among political science majors.

Madison H. Scott Memorial Fund in Political Science
Established April 4, 1997, by family, alumni, friends, and associates of Mr. Scott, former vice president for human resources and former secretary of the Board of Trustees. Income provides research grants and scholarships for minorities in the Department of Political Science.

Walter J. Shepard Foundation
Established June 30, 1936, by friends of Dean Shepard. Income supports lectures by distinguished scholars in political science.

Henry Russell Spencer Fund in Political Science
Established July 11, 1949, by friends, colleagues, and former students of Professor Spencer. Income supports lectures or fellowships in political science.

Harvey Walker Sr. Memorial Fund in Political Science
Established September 8, 1972, by family, colleagues, and friends. Income funds fellowships for outstanding students in political science for purposes of advancing the study of political science.

Political Science Advancement Fund
At the discretion of the chair, the income from this fund is used to support student and faculty educational activities for the advancement of the department.

Political Science Development Fund
At the discretion of the chair, this fund’s income is used for teaching, research, faculty travel and recruitment, student aid, public service, publications, and other similar purposes.
Richard Herrmann, professor, political science, and director, Mershon Center for International Security Studies, received the 2008 Faculty Award for Distinguished Service in recognition of his contributions to the quality of the university and to the development and implementation of university policies and programs.

Anthony Mughan, professor, political science, has been named a Joan N. Huber Faculty Fellow for 2008. Huber Fellowships are awarded annually to full professors, in recognition of their first-rate scholarship. The fellowships are named in honor of Emeritus Professor Huber, who served as dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences from 1984 to 1992 and as senior vice president for academic affairs and provost until her retirement in 1993.

Professor Emeritus Bradley M. Richardson has been honored with the Order of the Rising Sun, the second most prestigious national decoration awarded by the Japanese government. He is one of 4,028 individuals selected from various fields, and one of 75 foreigners from 40 countries recognized with the autumn 2008 decorations. The Japanese government bestows these awards to those who have contributed greatly to the nation and the public in politics, business, culture, and the arts.

Professor Richardson has interests in comparative politics, comparative political behavior, and Japanese politics. His research is concerned with conflict vs. consensus in Japanese political processes, political culture in new democracies, and comparative mass behavior, including political communications.

continued on page 18
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“Bradley Richardson is the leading non-Japanese specialist on Japanese elections, including helping start some of the first academic surveys on voting in Japan,” says Herb Weisberg, department chair. “He helped develop our graduate program in comparative politics, teaching hundreds of graduate students in these courses, and helping start the careers of important young scholars of Japanese and East Asian politics.”

Beginning at Ohio State in 1965, Richardson served as the director of the East Asian Studies Center and was instrumental in creating and leading the Institute for Japanese Studies. He also founded the central Ohio chapter of the Japan-American Society and, until recently, he served as honorary consul-general of Japan in Columbus.

Richardson is currently engaged in research on political communications in old and new democracies; political culture change in Japan; and a cross-national comparison of political culture trends in Germany, Japan, and Spain. He received Ohio State’s University Distinguished Scholar Award in 1996.
Harry Basehart (PhD 1972) retired from Salisbury University (Maryland) in May 2008 after 37 years of service. The Maryland General Assembly awarded Basehart with a resolution thanking him for his career in which he helped expand civic engagement through research and discussion. The General Assembly especially thanked him for the interns: more than 300 interns came from Salisbury University to serve in Annapolis. Maryland House Appropriations Chair Norman Conway characterized Basehart’s contributions as influencing the next generation of leaders.

Robert E. Bennett (BA 1970) writes that he has completed the real estate program at Rhodes State College this year. He is in the process also of publishing American Titanic and Vietnam Words, both of which explore his experiences in Vietnam and the war’s relationship to today’s politics.

Dennis W. Cook (BA 2002) was elected to the Orland Park, Illinois, High School Board of Education in 2003 and became board president in 2005; he was re-elected to both positions in 2007. Orland Park is a district that includes 30 large high schools. Dennis is Illinois State Young Republican chair and works as government affairs manager for Illinois American Water. He has also started a political consulting company, Strive Strategies.

Joseph D. Karam (BA 1957) sends us his expressions of great memories and sincere gratitude.

Mark C. Miller (MA 1989, PhD 1990) received a Fulbright Distinguished Chair award for 2007-2008. The Fulbright Distinguished Chairs Program, sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, allows senior scholars with significant publication and teaching records to travel around the world to lecture and conduct research.

Linda Leah Reibel (BA 1984) is currently a lawyer in private practice doing general litigation. After attending law school in Washington, D.C., she worked as special counsel to the chair of the city council and as special assistant to the chief judge of the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Richard E. Spencer (BA 1988) is director of Business Development with AECOM International Development, Inc., in Washington, D.C. AECOM is a global consulting engineering firm with 34,000 employees.

Kevin Sweeney (PhD 2004) has been named Joint Warfare Analysis Center Junior Civilian of the Year by the United States Joint Forces Command.

Col. Frank A. Titus, USAF, Ret. (BA with distinction, 1970) was elected president of the United Nations Association – USA, Columbus chapter, on June 2, 2007, for a two-year term.

Jessica Weeks (BA 2001) completed her PhD at Stanford University and began a new position at Cornell University in July 2008.

Jason H. Wilson (BA 1992) is State Senator representing the 30th district of Ohio, including Columbiana, Jefferson, Belmont, Harrison, and part of Tuscarawas counties. He and wife Leah have two children, JJ (six) and Ava (five).