

---

# Notes

## CHAPTER 2

1. Raymond Moley, describing the 1946 congressional campaigns in "The Presidency," *Newsweek*, November 11, 1946, p. 116.
2. Richard M. Nixon, *Six Crises* (New York: Doubleday, 1962), p. 310.
3. Gerald H. Kramer, "Short-Term Fluctuations in U.S. Voting Behavior," *American Political Science Review* 65 (1971): 131-43.
4. Some of the best work has in fact been a direct response to some previously published papers: Stigler's replication of Kramer and Arcelus and Meltzer's response to Bloom and Price, See G. J. Stigler, "General Economic Conditions and National Elections," *American Economic Review* 63 (1973): 160-67; Francisco Arcelus and Allan H. Meltzer, "The Effect of Aggregate Economic Variables on Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review* 69 (1975): 1232-39; Howard S. Bloom and H. Douglas Price, "Voter Response to Short-Run Economic Conditions: The Asymmetric Effect of Prosperity and Recession," *American Political Science Review* 69 (1976): 1240-54.
5. Consider Stigler's equation (*ibid.*, p. 163, no. 11), where he alters Kramer's analysis by (1) changing the time series (1902-70), (2) using the change in the vote rather than the level of the vote and (3) using the change in the economic indices over a two-year period rather than Kramer's yearly scores:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vote} = & .49 + .028 (\text{White House Party}) - .0084 (\text{Unemployment}) \\ & \quad (t = 2.19) \quad \quad \quad (t = 1.93) \\ & - .109 (\text{Real Income}) - .326 (\text{Inflation}). \\ & \quad (t = .69) \quad \quad \quad (t = 3.50) \\ & R = .38 \quad D.W. = 1.65 \end{aligned}$$

6. Edward R. Tufte, "Determinants of the Outcomes of Midterm Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review* 69 (1975): 812-26; see also his *Political Control of the Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), chap. 5.
7. Tufte, "Midterm Congressional Elections," p. 826.
8. Anthony Downs, *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957).
9. Kramer, "U.S. Voting Behavior," p. 134.

10. M. Stephen Weatherford, "Social Class, Economic Condition, and Political Translation: The 1974 Recession and the Vote for Congress" [Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Portland, Ore., March 22–24, 1979], pp. 3–7.
11. Arcelus and Meltzer, "Congressional Elections," p. 1.234.
12. See M. Margaret Conway and Mike L. Wyckoff, "Vote Choice in the 1974 Congressional Elections: A Test of Competing Explanations" (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 21–23, 1977); Arthur H. Miller and Richard Glass, "Economic Dissatisfaction and Electoral Choice" (paper, Center for Political Studies, University of Michigan, 1977); Morris P. Fiorina, "Economic Retrospective Voting in American National Elections: A Micro-Analysis," *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (1978): 426–43; Donald R. Kinder and D. Roderick Kiewiet, "Economic Discontent and Political Behavior: The Role of Personal Grievances and Collective Economic Judgments in Congressional Voting," *American Journal of Political Science* 23 (1979): 495–527; M. Stephen Weatherford, "Economic Conditions and Electoral Outcomes: Class Differences in the Political Response to Recession," *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (1978): 917–38 and "The 1974 Recession and the Vote for Congress."
13. Morris P. Fiorina, "Short and Long-term Effects of Economic Conditions on Individual Voting Decisions," (Paper delivered during the Second International Workshop on the Politics of Inflation, Unemployment, and Growth, Bonn, West Germany, January 4–6, 1979), p. 27.
14. Samuel Kernell, "Presidential Popularity and Negative Voting: An Alternative Explanation of the Midterm Congressional Decline of the President's Party," *American Political Science Review* 71 (1977): 44–66. Other studies have also produced evidence that presidential evaluations affect congressional voters, although in most instances the effects are slight compared to those of other variables. See Robert B. Arseneau and Raymond E. Wolfinger, "Voting Behavior in Congressional Elections," (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, September 4–8, 1973); Robert B. Arseneau, "Motivational Conflict and Split Ticket Voting," (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, September 2–5, 1975); Candice J. Nelson, "The Effects of Incumbency on Voting in Congressional Elections, 1964–1974," (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September 2–5, 1976); Thomas E. Mann and Raymond E. Wolfinger, "Candidates and Parties in Congressional Elections," (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 31–September 3, 1979).
15. Miller and Glass, "Electoral Choice,"
16. M. Margaret Conway and Mike L. Wyckoff, "Vote Choice in the 1974 Senate Elections" (paper, College Park, Maryland, July 1979) and "Vote Choice in the 1974 Congressional Elections."
17. Miller and Glass, "Electoral Choice," p. 34.
18. Conway and Wyckoff, "Vote Choice in the 1974 Congressional Elections," p. 24 and "Vote Choice in the 1974 Senate Elections," tables 4 and 5.

19. Jack M. McLeod, Jane D. Brown, and Lee B. Becker, "Watergate and the 1974 Congressional Elections." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 41 (1977): 181–95.
20. Kinder and Kiewiet, "Economic Judgments in Congressional Voting," p. 499.
21. Kernell, "Negative Voting," p. 61.
22. Bruce E. Keith, David B. Magleby, Candice J. Nelson, Elizabeth Orr, Mark Westlye, and Raymond E. Wolfinger, "The Myth of the Independent Voter." (Paper delivered during the 1977 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.).
23. Richard Brody, "Stability and Change in Party Identification: Presidential to Off-Years," (Paper delivered during the 1977 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.).
24. Gerald H. Kramer, "Aggregate-Data Versus Survey-Research Findings on the Effects of Economic Conditions on Voting Behavior: Which Ones Would We Believe? Or, Is There Really Any Discrepancy?" (paper, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, 1980).
25. Fiorina, "Short and Long-term Effects."
26. Brody, "Stability and Change."
27. Important contributions to this literature include Robert S. Erikson, "Malapportionment, Gerrymandering, and Party Fortunes in Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review* 66 (1972): 1234–45; David R. Mayhew, "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing Marginals," *Polity* 6 (1974): 295–317; John A. Ferejohn, "On the Decline of Competition in Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review* 71 (1977): 166–76; Albert D. Cover and David R. Mayhew, "Congressional Dynamics and the Decline of Competitive Congressional Elections," in *Congress Reconsidered*, ed. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer (New York: Praeger, 1977); and Albert D. Cover, "One Good Term Deserves Another: The Advantage of Incumbency in Congressional Elections," *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (1977): 523–42.
28. Walter Dean Burnham, "American Politics in the 1970's: Beyond Party?" in *The American Party Systems: Stages of Political Development*, ed. William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975) and "Insulation and Responsiveness in Congressional Elections," *Political Science Quarterly* 90 (1975): 411–35.
29. Donald E. Stokes and Warren E. Miller, "Party Government and the Saliency of Congress," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 26 (1962): 331–46.
30. Arseneau and Wolfinger, "Congressional Elections."
31. Gary C. Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), p. 12.
32. Ferejohn, "Competition in Congressional Elections," p. 171.
33. Alan I. Abramowitz, "Name Familiarity, Reputation, and the Incumbency Effect in a Congressional Election," *Western Political Quarterly* 28 (1975): 673–63.
34. Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, p. 16.
35. Thomas E. Mann, *Unsafe At Any Margin: Interpreting Congressional Elections* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1978), pp. 30–34 and 55–75.

36. See Thomas E. Mann and Raymond E. Wolfinger, "Candidates and Parties in Congressional Elections," (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 31–September 3, 1979); Barbara Hinckley, "House Reelections and Senate Defeats: The Role of the Challenger," *British Journal of Political Science* (in press, 1980); Alan I. Abramowitz, "Electoral Accountability in 1978: A Comparison of Voting for U.S. Senator and Representative," (Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 31–September 3, 1979); Glenn R. Parker, "Incumbent Popularity and Congressional Elections," [Paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association Washington, DC., August 31–September 3, 1979]; Gary C. Jacobson: "Congressional Elections, 1978: The Case of the Vanishing Challengers," (Paper delivered during the Conference on Congressional Elections, Rice University and the University of Houston, Houston, Tex. January 10–12, 1980).

37. The variables in table 2.1 are constructed as follows:

Respondent's vote	1 if Democrat; 0 if Republican
Party Identification	1 if strong, weak, or independent Democrat, 0 if independent independent, – 1 if strong, weak, or independent Republican
Democrat is incumbent	1 if Democrat is incumbent; 0 otherwise
Republican is incumbent	1 if Republican is incumbent; 0 otherwise
Familiarity with Democrat	2 if respondent recalls candidate's name; 1 if name is recognized but not recalled; 0 if name is not recognized or recalled
Familiarity with Republican	2 if respondent recalls candidate's name; 1 if name is recognized but not recalled; 0 if name is not recognized or recalled
Likes something about Democrat	For each variable, 1 if respondent mentions anything liked (or disliked) about the candidate; 0 otherwise
Dislikes something about Democrat	
Likes something about Republican	
Dislikes something about Republican	

38. Note that the effect of incumbency per se is greatly diminished in the second equation. The regression coefficients for the incumbency variables are reduced by more than half, and they no longer differ significantly from zero. The impact of familiarity with the candidates is also substantially smaller. It is also worth noting that voters evaluate candidates primarily in terms of personal characteristics, job performance, and competence, with relatively few references to general policy positions and even fewer to specific policy stands; see Parker, "Incumbent Popularity and Congressional Elections,"

39. Jacobson, "Congressional Elections, 1978," p. 14.

40. Hinckley, "House Reelections and Senate Defeats"; Abramowitz, "Electoral Accountability in 1978"; Mann and Wolfinger, "Candidates and Parties in Congressional Elections": Jacobson, "Congressional Elections, 1978."

41. Some caution is advisable in using the 1978 NES/CPS Survey; the respondents seem inordinately fond of incumbents; for example, they overreport

- voting for the incumbent by more than 10 percent. See Jacobson, "Congressional Elections, 1978," pp. 16–18.
42. Kramer, "U.S. Voting Behavior," p. 135.
43. Arcelus and Meltzer, "Congressional Elections," pp. 1235–36.
44. Bloom and Price, "Voter Response to Short-Run Economic Conditions," p. 1243.

### CHAPTER 3

1. V.O. Key, Jr. (with the assistance of Milton Cummings), *The Responsible Electorate* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 7.
2. For a discussion of the evolution of the modern opportunity structure during the nineteenth century see Samuel Kernell, "Toward Understanding 19th Century Congressional Careers: Ambition, Competition, and Rotation," *American Journal of Political Science* 21(1977):689–93 and "Congressional Careerism and the Emergence of a Political Career Structure" (Paper delivered during the meeting of the Social Science History Association, Cambridge, Mass. 1979).
3. Joseph A. Schlesinger, *Ambition and Politics: Political Careers in the United States* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966), chap. 6.
4. Thomas Kazee arrives at a similar conclusion in a study of decisions to run for Congress. See his "The Decision to Run for the U.S. Congress; Challenger Attitudes in the 1970's," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 5 (1980): 79–100.
5. Gordon Black, "A Theory of Political Ambition: Career Choices and the Role of Structural Incentives," *American Political Science Review* 66 (1972): 144–59.
6. We argue in chapter 5 that the probability of attaining the collective goal of minimizing the loss of congressional seats affects the value some politicians place on the office and hence their strategic decision about running.
7. Kernell, "19th Century Congressional Careers"; William J. Keefe, *Parties, Politics, and Public Policy in America*, 2d ed. (Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press, 1976), p. 39.
8. "Who Advised Truman?" *New York Times*, 6 January 1946, pt. 4, p. 7.
9. Cabell Phillips, "Republican's Outlook Called Best in 13 Years," *New York Times*, 24 February 1946, pt. 1, p. 31.
10. John H. Crider, "Brownell Favors New Stassen Plan," *New York Times*, 31 March 1946, pt. 1, p. 31.
11. Arthur Krock, "Confident Democrats Canvass 1960 Outlook," *New York Times*, 22 February 1958, pt. 4, p. 3.
12. "The Big Issue," *Newsweek*, 3 February 1958, p. 18.
13. Russell Baker, "G.O.P. Faces Hard Task," *New York Times*, 11 February 1962, pt. 4, p. 5.
14. Tom Wicker, "Both Sides Wary on House Races," *New York Times*, 28 April 1962, pt. 1, p. 69.
15. R. W. Apple, Jr., "Election Problems of the G.O.P. Assayed," *New York Times*, 10 February 1974, pt. 4, p. 3.

16. **See**, for example, "Republicans: Running Hard in Watergate's Shadow," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 32 (16 February 1974): 352–58.
17. George H. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1935–1971* (New York: Random House, 1972), 2: 1161, 1210, 1221. The Gallup question was, "If elections for Congress were being held today, which party would you like to see win this state—the Republican Party or the Democratic Party?"
18. "Ike's Formula for '58 Elections: Help Business, Hold Peace Talks," U.S. News and World Report, 14 February 1958, p. 37. By May, 58 percent reported favoring the Democrats, prompting Gallup to observe that "not since 1936 had Democratic chances of taking overwhelming control of Congress seemed so good." See *Time*, 26 May 1958, p. 23.
19. Cabell Phillips, "G.O.P. Sure It Can Win in the House," *New York Times*, 16 June 1948, pt. 4, p. 7.
20. "Democratic Joy, Republican Gloom in Michigan's 5th," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 32 (23 February 1974): 493. Even a lost by-election may be taken as grounds for optimism. That of the Democrats in 1958 was "fortified by a hair-line Republican victory [in February, 1958] in a rural Minnesota congressional district that since 1893 has constantly elected Republicans by large margins" (Krock, "Confident Democrats," *New York Times*, 22 February 1958, pt. 4, p. 3).
21. "Running Hard in Watergate's Shadow," *C.Q. Weekly Report*, 32 (16 February 1974): 353.
22. "Southern Republicans: Little Hope This Year," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 32 (October 26, 1974): 2959.
23. This effect was not confined to congressional candidates. A Republican official in Tennessee lamented that his party was only contesting 65 seats in the state legislature. "Good, attractive candidates just said this was not the year to run." *Ibid.*, p. 2961.
24. Linda L. Fowler, "Candidate Perceptions of Electoral Coalitions: Limits and Possibilities" (Paper delivered during the Conference on Congressional Elections, Rice University and the University of Houston, Houston, Tex., January 10–12, 1980), p. 11.
25. Note that a difference remains when party is controlled, although it tends to be greater for Republicans than for Democrats.
26. State legislatures are the most frequent source of elective office experience for nonincumbent congressional candidates. National Republican leaders have recognized this explicitly and have contributed to state legislative campaigns with the acknowledged purpose of building up their pool of congressional talent.
27. Fowler, "Candidate Perceptions of Electoral Coalitions," p. 16.

## CHAPTER 4

1. A more elaborate and thoroughly documented presentation of these ideas can be found in Gary C. Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), chap. 3.
2. See, for example, William P. Welch, "The Economics of Campaign Funds,"

- Public Choice** 25 (1976); James E. Zinser and Paul A. Dawson, "The Rationality of Indigenous Campaign Contributions" (Paper delivered during the 1977 Annual Meeting of the Public Choice Society, New Orleans, March 11-13, 1977).
3. See Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, pp. 113-23, for the full evidence.
  4. W. P. Welch, "Patterns of Contributions: Economic Interest and Ideological Groups," in *Political Finance*, Sage Electoral Studies Yearbook, vol. 5, ed. Herbert E. Alexander, (Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications, 1979), pp. 199-220.
  5. "A Firm Organizes, Makes Political Voice Heard," *Los Angeles Times*, 12 May 1980.
  6. The evidence is in Gary C. Jacobson, "The Pattern of Campaign Contributions to Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives 1972-78," in *An Analysis of the Impact of the Federal Election Campaign Act, 1972-1978*, Report by the Campaign Finance Study Group to the Committee on House Administration of the U.S. House of Representatives (Cambridge, Mass.: Institute of Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, May, 1979), pp. 35-41.
  7. David R. Mayhew, "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing Marginals," *Polity* 6 (1974): 298-301.
  8. *C.Q. Weekly Report* 32 (16 February 1974): 352.
  9. *Ibid.*, p. 353.
  10. Expenditures rather than contributions are listed because differences in regulations and methods of data collection among these elections make them more comparable figures. The pattern of expenditures depends heavily on the pattern of contributions in any case. If contributions are disaggregated by source, the same pattern appears in each.
  11. The figures in table 4.1 also support, in summary fashion, several of the points made in the previous section. Incumbents obviously have an easier time raising money than do their challengers. And as we would expect, whether or not a nonincumbent candidate is facing an incumbent has an enormous effect on his ability to acquire campaign funds. Typically, the most expensive campaigns of all are for open seats.
  12. See Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, pp. 84-85; 127-28.
  13. Gary C. Jacobson, "The Effects of Campaign Spending in Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review* 72 (1978): 470-78, and *Money in Congressional Elections*, chaps. 2, 5.
  14. The challenger is estimated to gain approximately 1 percentage point for each \$10,000 (in 1972 dollars) spent on the campaign. Our discussion of contributor strategies raises the possibility that these estimates are subject to simultaneity bias: money not only generates votes, but the expectation of votes generates money. However, two-stage least-squares analysis of a simultaneous equation model of these relationships indicates that simultaneity bias is not a serious source of distortion. See Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, pp. 136-145.
  15. David R. Mayhew, *Congress: The Electoral Connection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

16. Direct evidence for this can be found in the connection between how much a candidate spends and how familiar he is to voters in the district. In all three elections for which requisite data are available (1972, 1974, and 1978), campaign spending by challengers and other *nonincumbents* is strongly related to how well they are known by voters. Only in 1974 is there any significant relationship between these two variables for incumbents, and even in that year *nonincumbent* spending had the greater effect. See Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, pp. 145-57 and “Congressional Elections 1978: The Case of the Vanishing Challengers,” (Paper delivered during the Conference on Congressional Elections, Rice University and the University of Houston, Houston, Tex., January 10–12, 1980), pp. 8-9.
- Campaign spending is important to both candidates in contests for open seats. It tends, however, to matter more to Republicans than to Democrats, which is not particularly surprising since fewer voters *identify* themselves as Republicans. Expenditures are evidently more important to candidates who suffer from electoral handicaps of any kind,
17. The challenger’s vote is measured as the percentage share of the two-party vote won by the challenger. The variables indicating whether or not the challenger is a Democrat or has held elective office are 1 if yes in either case, 0 if not. The strength of the challenger’s party is measured as the percentage of the vote won by the challenger’s party’s candidate in the last election for this seat. Expenditures are measured in thousands of dollars. The sources for the data in these equations are given in Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, pp. 38-39 and 115.
18. One further observation is in order. Experience in the elective office is, on the evidence of equation 4.2, worth about 1.9 percent of the vote. But this measures only its direct effect. Much of its effect is in fact indirect: experienced candidates raise and spend substantially more money and this is where the advantage of experience is most apparent.
19. Gerald C. Wright, Jr., “Constituency Response to Congressional Behavior: The Impact of the House Judiciary Committee Impeachment Votes,” *Western Political Quarterly* 30 (1977): 401–10.
20. David Johnston, “Leggett Likely to Win Despite Scandal,” *Los Angeles Times*, 19 October 1976.

## CHAPTER 5

1. Stephen Frantzich, “Opting Out: Retirement From the House of Representatives, 1966–1974,” *American Politics Quarterly* 6 (1978): 251–73.
2. R. W. Apple, Jr., “Election Problems of G.O.P. Assayed,” *New York Times*, 10 February 1974, pt. 4, p. 3.
3. That minority-party status may make the job less attractive can be found in the following twentieth-century retirement rates:

	Mean Percent Retiring	
	1896–1932	1934–1970
Democrats	11.9	3.5
Republicans	0.8	4.7



- In both party systems the minority party congressmen retired at a marginally higher rate. Frantzich similarly reports that during the 1970s Republican congressmen were more likely to have “progressive” career ambitions while Democrats most evinced “static” ambitions (“Opting Out,” pp112–14).
4. Nancy Skelton, “Wilson Will End Mystery Today on Congress Seat Held for 28 Years,” Los Angeles Times, 18 January 1980.
  5. More generally, as members near retirement the value of the office should be discounted with each election as the return on investment in the office becomes increasingly short-term.
  6. The Democratic and Republican retirement series was compiled from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research’s (ICPSR) “Biographical Characteristics of Members of the United States Congress, 1789–1977.” The data was originally collected by Carroll R. McKibbin. Neither he nor the consortium bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here. Unfortunately, these data do not identify the date and reason for a congressman’s last departure from Congress. To compile overall partisan retirement rates for each Congress required that all congressmen who had interrupted careers or who subsequently served in the Senate had to be examined individually using the *Biographical Directory of the American Congress*, 5th ed.
  7. Nelson Polsby, “The Institutionalization of the US House of Representatives,” *American Political Science Review* 68 (1969): 144-68 and Samuel Kernell, “Toward Understanding 19th Century Congressional Careers: Ambition, Competition, and Rotation,” *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (1977): 669-93.
  8. Kramer, “Short-Term Fluctuations in U.S. Voting Behavior”; Stigler, “General Economic Conditions and National Elections”; and Tufte, “Determinants of the Outcomes of Midterm Congressional Elections.”
  9. The exclusion of 1942 marginally improves most of the statistical relationships reported below.
  10. The relationships are more impressive when one recognizes that the retirement rates exclude the South while the national vote totals include the South. To the degree that the congressional vote in that region was stable during the period, its inclusion in the vote totals serves to weaken the correlations but should not affect their direction.
  11. Duff Spafford, “A Note on the ‘Equilibrium’ Division of the Vote,” *American Political Science Review* 65 (1971):180–83.
  12. For example, the Democrats’ hold on southern congressional seats has loosened much more slowly than might be expected from southern voting behavior in presidential elections or changes in party identification.
  13. Following Tufte’s and Converse’s example the average or normal vote has been calculated by averaging the national congressional vote for the preceding eight elections. The difference in incumbency is the number of Republican incumbents seeking reelection minus the number of Democrats. See Phillip E. Converse, “The Concept of the Normal Vote,” in Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes, *Elections and the Political Order* (New York: Wiley, 1966):9–39.
  14. This finding matches the greater importance of candidate-related variables

over party identification in explaining the individual vote choice reported in table 2.1.

## CHAPTER 6

1. In analyzing variations in on- and off-year elections Kramer concludes, “that around one-third of the votes gained (or lost) because of the specific candidates and campaign tactics of the presidential race carry over to the congressional candidates of the same party” (p. 140).
2. James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (Norwood, Mass.: Macmillan and Co., 1913), p. 128 (emphasis added).
3. V.O. Key, Jr., *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups* 5th ed., (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1964), p. 567.
4. Tufte, “Determinants of the Outcomes of Midterm Congressional Elections,” pp. 817–18. Tufte omitted the 1942 midterm election because of distorting wartime economic controls.
5. See Tufte’s caveat cited in chapter 2.
6. In testing our theory against Tufte’s we are, of course, limited to elections for which presidential popularity ratings are available.
7. Unfortunately, the National Bureau of Economic Research’s quarterly real income series begins in 1946 rather than 1945, the date needed to obtain change scores. This requires using the annual level for 1946 in both the spring and fall income series.
8. The revised estimates are also lower because adding 1974 and 1978 reduces the fit of the equation, even for Tufte’s original specification of the real income variable. In both instances the equation overpredicts the degree of change in the vote attributable to short-run forces. Perhaps this is but one additional manifestation of the increased incumbency effect on congressional elections.
9. At least they think it does. An alternative explanation for these results is that congressional elites are convinced that economic conditions are important to voters but they are not nearly so certain about presidential popularity. Presidents’ attempts to influence congressional elections directly have not been notably effective, regardless of their public standing. And the general effects of presidential popularity on election results have not always been obvious. A comment by a Republican politician interviewed in 1962 is instructive: “The Democrats are whistling in the dark if they think Kennedy’s popularity will affect Congressional races any more than Eisenhower’s did in 1958” [“Heating Up Mid-Term Campaigns,” *Business Week*, 26 May 1962, p. 467]. It would be ironic if elites were influenced more strongly by their readings of economic conditions—which have little direct influence on voters—than by the president’s popularity, which evidently does influence the voter.
10. Twenty percent by one estimate (Arseneau and Wolfinger, “Voting Behavior in Congressional Elections”).
11. Samuel Kernell, “Explaining Presidential Popularity,” *American Political Science Review* 72 (1978): 506–22; Samuel Kernell and Douglas A. Hibbs,

- Jr., "A Critical Threshold Model of Presidential Popularity," and Douglas A. Hibbs, Jr. and Nicholas Vasilatos, "Macroeconomic Performance and Mass Political Support in the United States and Great Britain," in *Contemporary Political Economy*, ed. Douglas A. Hibbs, Jr. and Heino Fassbender (New York: North Holland, 1981), pp. 49–72 and 31–48, respectively.
12. There are two alternative interpretations available for equation 6.3 which are less generous to economic voting theory. The first argues that the fall estimates may also reflect structural features of the electoral setting. During the fall campaign, for example, a favorable political climate may make it easier for the candidate to sustain campaign contributions and volunteer participation. Local activists respond much as voters respond to their evaluations of the president's job performance in contributing to campaigns. The second alternative explanation is unabashedly ad hoc. (Normally, this would make it less attractive, but as our degrees of freedom approach that of a case study we should keep in mind the academic aphorism that anecdote is the singular form of data.) The main problem of the spring popularity term is the 1974 election with President Nixon's popularity hovering around 26 percent for most of the spring. With the economy also in poor shape Nixon's popularity grossly overpredicts the decline of the Republican vote that year. This extreme case also means that the spring popularity variable tends to underpredict the vote for the remaining eight elections. The problem, we suspect, is that elite responses are less elastic at extremes of short-term conditions. Deleting the 1974 election and rerunning equation 6.3 produces a much improved estimate for spring popularity generally, at the expense of the fall estimates.

## CHAPTER 7

1. Christopher Buchanan, "Modest GOP Congressional Gains Expected," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (1 November 1980): 3242.
2. Christopher Buchanan, "Senators Face Tough Re-election Odds," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (5 April 1980): 905–09.
3. Gary Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980) p. 133.
4. See Mann and Wolfinger, "Candidates and Parties in Congressional Elections"; Hinckley, "House Reelections and Senate Defeats"; Abramowitz, "Electoral Accountability in 1978."
5. "The Outlook: Senate, House and Governors," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (11 October 1980): 2986–3086.
6. *Ibid.*
7. See Mann, *Unsafe at Any Margin*, pp. 82–87. The election returns are from nearly complete, unofficial returns in *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (8 November 1980): 3338–45.
8. The \$75,000 cutoff level is, of course, somewhat arbitrary: it could be raised or lowered substantially without affecting the point to be made.
9. The third winner in the lower right quadrant, Duncan Hunter, who upset veteran Democratic incumbent Lionel Van Deerlin, financed the early part

- of his campaign by loaning it \$114,000 of his own money. This does not appear in the preliminary FEC report, so he remains, for consistency's sake, in the "weak candidacy" category.
10. This reflects the successful Republican strategy, discussed below, of going after seats held by senior House Democrats.
  11. *Gallup* Opinion Index 177 (April-May 1980):23.
  12. *Ibid.*, p. 35; *Gallup* Opinion Index 175 (February 1980):13.
  13. The pool ratio figures for 1980 make the same point and, as usual, a much higher proportion of candidates for open seats have held elective office: 68 percent of the Democrats, 45 percent of the Republicans. Most Senate challengers of both parties were similarly experienced: 72 percent of the Democrats and 67 percent of the Republicans.
  14. "Congressional Retirements Down from Previous Years, Expected to Increase in 1982," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (2 August 1980):2172.
  15. Larry Light, "Democrats May Lose Edge in Contributions from PACs," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (2 November 1980):3409.
  16. *Ibid.* Five other PACs listed in the *Weekly Report* distributed their money more evenly among Democrats and Republicans; not surprisingly, most of this money went to incumbents.
  17. Christopher Buchanan, "Republicans Make Substantial House Gains," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 38 (8 November 1980):3317.
  18. The same idea has been expressed in informal, postelection discussions by Thomas Mann and David Mayhew.

## CHAPTER 8

1. For an example of vacancy-based mobility, see Harrison White, *Chains of Opportunity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).
2. The 1980 election witnessed two such cases when a neo-Nazi and a Klansman won a Republican and Democratic congressional primary, respectively. In the latter, nationally more prominent case, Tom Metzger, the California state head of the Ku Klux Klan won his nomination (Calif., 43rd) against two faint-hearted rivals who together spent under \$5000. Just their being on the ballot, however, was sufficient to so split the anti-Klan vote that Metzger won the primary with little more than one-third of the popular vote. In November he was soundly defeated, of course, by the incumbent Republican, Clare Burgener, but this did not detract from Metzger's resounding success in generating national publicity.
3. Whether or not elite strategies were as important in structuring the congressional vote in earlier decades as they are now is an intriguing question: we cannot answer it here, since our most comprehensive evidence is limited to the 1970s; one of us (Jacobson) is currently pursuing the question under National Science Foundation Grant No. SES80-07557.
4. Morris P. Fiorina, "Economic Retrospective Voting in American National Elections: A Micro-Analysis," *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (1978):440.

5. "The 1974 Elections: Integrity is the Universal Subject," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 32 (23 February 1974):391.
6. *C.Q. Weekly Report* 32(2 March 1974): 544.
7. *C.Q. Weekly Report* 36 (25 March 1978): 754.
8. See Gary C. Jacobson, "Congressional Elections, 1978: The Case of the Vanishing Challengers," (Paper delivered during the Conference on Congressional Elections, Rice University and the University of Houston, Houston, Tex., January 10-12, 1980).

## EPILOGUE

1. This equation is based on the data in Tufte, *Political Control of the Economy*, p.111, with data for 1978 added; we use it rather than the modified version of the referendum equation we developed in chapter 6 because Tufte's original equation is widely recognized as standard in the literature.
2. An alternative seats/votes equation offered by Douglas Hibbs would convert this vote into a Republican loss of 65 seats. See his "President Reagan's Mandate from 1980 Elections: A Shift to the Right?" *American Politics Quarterly* 10 (October 1982):411.
3. "The 1982 National Vote," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 41 (19 February, 1983):387.
4. For details, see Gary C. Jacobson, "Congressional Campaign Finance and the Revival of the Republican Party," in Dennis Hale, ed., *The United States Congress: Proceedings of the Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Symposium* (Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Boston College, 1982), pp. 313-30.
5. "GOP Earmarks \$63 Million for '82," *San Diego Union*, 17 January 1982, p. 18.
6. "More Voters to Back GOP Candidates, Survey Finds," *Los Angeles Times*, 24 May 1981, pt. 1, p.11.
7. Adam Clymer, "GOP Worried about Impact of Job Figures," *New York Times*, 15 January 1982, p. 9.
8. Adam Clymer, "Those Who Recruit Candidates Say the Parties Are Running about Even," *New York Times*, 8 March 1982, p. 4.
9. Lynda Du Val, RNCC, telephone interview, 9 January 1982.
10. Clymer, "Parties Are Running about Even," p. 4.
11. Adam Clymer, "GOP Recruiting in Missouri for House Contests," *New York Times*, 13 February 1982, p. 8.
12. From information in "Special Report: The 1982 Election," supplement to *C.Q. Weekly Report* 40 (9 October 1982):2477-2612.
13. See Gary C. Jacobson, "Strategic Politicians and Congressional Elections, 1946-1978" (paper delivered during the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, 3-6 September 1981).
14. Richard E. Cohen, "Congress: Control at Stake," *Notional Journal*, 9 January 1982, p. 66.
15. Richard E. Cohen, "Giving till It Hurts: 1982 Campaign Prompts New Look at Financing Races," *National Journal*, 18 December 1982, p. 2145.
16. Steven V. Roberts, "G.O.P. Challengers Get Low Priority," *New York Times*, 16 September 1982, pt. 2, p.10.
17. Dennis Farney, "Business PACs Decide to Go on the Defense," *Wall Street Journal*, 10 June 1982, p. 25.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
19. Albert R. Hunt, "An Inside Look at Politicians Hustling PACs," *Wall Street Journal*, 1 October 1982, p. 43.
20. Roberts, "G.O.P. Challengers," p. 10.
21. Cohen, "Congress," p. 66.
22. Clymer, "GOP Recruiting," p. 8.
23. Clymer, "Parties Are Running about Even," p. 4.
24. Adam Clymer, "Light Wallets Weigh Heavily on Democrats," *New York Times*, 17 October 1982, p. E4.
25. Roberts, "Congress," p. 66.
26. A formally identical clash of interests also limits the ability of parties to maximize their gains through a partisan gerrymander; see Bruce Cain, *The Reapportionment Puzzle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming).
27. See Gary C. Jacobson, "Money in the 1980 Congressional Elections" (paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Milwaukee, 28 April-1 May, 1982).
28. Cohen, "Giving till It Hurts," p. 2145.
29. Includes only data reported through 13 October 1982. See "1982 Congressional Races Set Record Spending," Federal Election Commission news release, 7 January 1983.
30. Dennis Farney and Brooks Jackson, "GOP Channels Money into Those Campaigns That Need It Most," *Wall Street Journal*, 19 October 1982, p. 1.
31. Adam Clymer, "Campaign Funds Called a Key to Outcome of House Races," *New York Times*, 5 November 1982, p. B10; Cohen, "Giving till It Hurts," p. 2146.
32. Jacobson, *Money in Congressional Elections*, p. 46.
33. Thomas E. Mann and Norman J. Ornstein, "Election '82: The Voters Send a Message," *Public Opinion* 5 (December/January 1983), p. 7.
34. Rob Gurwitt and Tom Watson, "Democrats Recoup State Legislative Losses," *C.Q. Weekly Report* 40 (13 November 1982), p. 2849.