I am pleased to serve as the interim director of the Campbell Public Affairs Institute. Alan Campbell was a dynamic leader at the Maxwell School as well as in the public and private sectors.

Campbell faculty members continue to play academic leadership roles in the School and in their professions. Faculty are active in co-chairing a commission on fiscal sustainability for the National Academy of Sciences, running the State of Democracy lecture series, publishing major books and articles, securing and completing work on major research grants, and educating and serving the local, national and internal communities.

Regrettably, we have lost in the past year two former directors, Alastair Roberts and Mary Tschirhart, to other universities. Arthur Brooks, Louis A. Bantle Professor of Business and Government, has been tapped to lead the prestigious American Enterprise Institute think-tank. Arthur’s begins as President of AEI in January 2009. While we are sorry to lose Arthur, there will be opportunities for Campbell and Maxwell to partner with AEI on speakers and research.

During my year as interim director, I am working with Institute faculty and their respective department chairs and graduate students to develop three or more public affairs focus areas for Campbell. These should be important national or international issues that dovetail with faculty interests and long-term concentrations in our departments. As before, faculty hiring and graduate student admission occur through the departments. Campbell wants to be a center for the faculty and students who want to focus on the major public affairs areas, a place that enhances research opportunities, produces important faculty and graduate student research, and trains students to work on the frontiers of policymaking.

The newsletter offers more detail on what the research and activities of our faculty institute senior associates and of our graduate student associates.

I hope you enjoy reading the Campbell Connection.

Michael Wasylenko  
Interim Institute Director

---

State of Democracy Lecture Series

The Campbell Institute is pleased to announce that the State of Democracy series is once again bringing a provocative set of speakers to campus this semester. On November 14th sociologist Nancy Foner will answer the question “What’s New About Contemporary Immigration?” with responses drawn from her own research on recent immigration to the United States. Maxwell School assistant professor Jamie Winders will provide commentary from her vantage point as a Geographer also doing primary research with newly arrived immigrant communities.

Following Foner, on December 5th, Charles Murray will discuss his forthcoming book, Real Education, in which he discusses the consequences of democratizing higher education for the American society and economy.

All talks take place at 4:00 PM in Maxwell Auditorium and are followed by a reception in the foyer. Campbell faculty and graduate students are encouraged to attend and contribute ideas to the series.

The Series is sponsored by Betsy Levitt Cohn and Alan Cohn.

2008-2009 Series Events

Nancy Foner, November 14, 2008  
“What’s New About Contemporary Immigration”

Charles Murray, December 5, 2008  
“The Hard Truth: Too Many People Are Going to College Today”

Video Archive of Events at:  
http://www.campbellinstitute.org
Faculty News

The Campbell Institute is proud to announce our newest Associate, Walter Broadnax. Walter has been appointed distinguished professor of public administration at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University. He most recently served as president of Clark Atlanta University. Previously, he was dean of the school of public affairs at American University and professor of public policy and management at the University of Maryland.

Keith Bybee is working on three projects concerning the rule of law: a book-length examination of how the rule of law is compatible with public suspicions of judicial hypocrisy; a study of how the kind of reasoning used in courts is deployed in political disputes; and an assessment of how centralized legal authority is imposed on unruly localities. His research informs the work he does as Director of the Institute for the Study of the Judiciary, Politics, and the Media (IJP). IJPM is a collaborative effort between the College of Law, Maxwell, and Newhouse. In addition to staging conferences and dispensing research fellowships, IJPM has recently launched a new certificate program based at the College of Law and organized around an interdisciplinary team-taught course. The certificate program and associated course are supported by grants from the John Ben Snow Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. IJPM has also recently partnered with the Federal Judicial Center (FJC), the education and research agency for federal courts created by Congress in 1967. IJPM and the FJC are in the process of organizing a government-funded conference for federal judges to be held at SU next fall.

Elizabeth Cohen is finishing her book tentatively titled “Citizenship and Semi-Citizenship in Democratic Politics.” Elizabeth has also taken over responsibility for the State of Democracy Lectures.

Tom Keck has received the Houghton Mifflin Award from the Law and Courts Section of the American Political Science Association, in recognition of the best journal article on law and courts published by a political scientist in 2007. The article was “Party, Policy, or Duty: Why Does the Supreme Court Invalidate Federal Statutes?” published in the May 2007 issue of the American Political Science Review.

John L. Palmer and Rudolph G. Penner are co-chairs for the National Academy of Public Administration’s project on The Fiscal Future of the United States: Analysis and Policy Options. The project recognizes that a long-term fiscal imbalance threatens our future and that corrective policies must be adopted soon to reduce the risk of more serious economic damage and disruption, the MacArthur Foundation has asked the two Academies to undertake a two-year effort to produce a guiding framework and alternative federal budget projections under a range of policy assumptions. These projections will show different paths to fiscal stability that reflect a diversity of values, preferences, and expectations held by segments of the American public.” For more information, please visit the project web site at http://www.napawash.org/fiscal_future.html.

Grant Reecher, Tina Nabatchi and PARC, join with The Syracuse Post-Standard for CNYSpeaks. This joint effort will engage the community in a variety of forms of public dialogue about issues affecting the local area. The first issue, being examined in 2008 and 2009, concerns downtown Syracuse. The ultimate purpose is for these dialogues—refined and focused as they progress—to become a meaningful part of the policy decision-making process in the community, through the creation of a “citizens agenda.” The effort is modeled in part on the “Great Expectations” project of The Philadelphia Inquirer and The University of Pennsylvania.

Election 2008

David Medeiros

Fall 2008 carries with it a closely contested presidential election. Elevated interest in the public sector has Campbell associates in high demand, both in popular media and in the lecture halls of academia.

Chapple Family Professor of Citizenship and Democracy Robert McClure and Assistant Professor of political science Danny Hayes held a well-attended public conversation on the 2008 presidential election in the Maxwell auditorium September 19th. Standing before a mixed audience of current students and Alumni visiting for homecoming weekend, professors McClure and Hayes spoke to the historically exceptional nature of the race.

Associate Professor of political science Grant Reeher makes regular appearances as a political consultant on radio station WSYR and pens a regular opinion column for the Syracuse Post-Standard. Reeher has also contributed election commentary to Canadian news outlet Global National as well as National Public Radio affiliate Wisconsin Public Radio.

On September 26th, University Professor and Dean Emeritus John Palmer one of six national experts invited to the Cornell University campus to participate in the “Cornell Presidential Election Forum”, a panel discussion that examined candidates’ proposals for addressing major economic and social policy concerns prior to the first presidential debate. Before the event he made two presentations on the subject of “The Federal Fiscal Outlook and Entitlement Program Reform.”
Robert A. Rubinstein, Professor of Anthropology and International Relations and Campbell Institute Faculty Associate, published the paper “Culture and Interoperability in Integrated Missions,” in the journal International Peacekeeping, volume 15, number 4. The paper is co-authored by Maxwell Alumni, Diana M. Keller and Michael E. Scherger.

Jeremy Shiffman, was awarded two grants by the Rockefeller Foundation and a Gates Foundation-funded initiative for global health research. The grants, totaling more than $400,000, concern generating political priority for neglected health issues in poor countries, complementing research Shiffman is currently conducting on maternal survival in poor countries, with funding from the MacArthur Foundation. On the Rockefeller Foundation grant, Shiffman is collaborating with Tamara Hafner, a doctoral candidate in public administration, in studying how to advance an agenda for strengthening health systems in poor countries. On the Gates Foundation-funded initiative, Shiffman is collaborating with Stephanie Smith, also a doctoral candidate in public administration, in investigating the degree to which the survival of newborn babies receives political attention globally and in four countries with high newborn mortality: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Malawi and Nepal. Four million babies each year die in the first month of their life, far more than the number of people who die from HIV/AIDS, which gets much more political attention and donor resources.

David Van Slyke has been appointed to the editorial board of the Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. David has also received a grant from the Naval Postgraduate School, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and Department of the Navy, with Trevor Brown and Matthew Potoski. The grant, “Improving Government Procurement: Lessons from the Department of Homeland Security’s SBInet and Deepwater Programs.”

Faculty Spotlight

The Mass Media and the March to War in Iraq

Danny Hayes, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and Senior Research Associate, Campbell Institute

Matt Guardino, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science and Research Associate, Campbell Institute

For more than five years now, controversy has swirled around the performance of the American mass media in the run-up to the war in Iraq. Especially after it became clear in the months following the March 2003 invasion that coalition forces had failed to uncover credible evidence of weapons of mass destruction, or recent programs to develop them, critics and many news practitioners themselves began a period of intense scrutiny. According to the most common critique, news outlets before the invasion failed to air a wide-ranging and honest debate grounded in carefully vetted facts, and did not offer citizens analysis and commentary from diverse policy perspectives. In short, the mass media is charged with failing to fulfill one of its central democratic responsibilities: providing citizens with the information they need to form educated opinions on critical political issues.

Despite the near universal condemnation of media reporting, there has been little systematic and comprehensive research into the content of U.S. television news in the crucial period before the start of the war. The existing critiques have relied primarily on anecdotal or impressionistic evidence that may or may not accurately describe the actual content of pre-war Iraq news. If, as has been asserted, the media helped lead the country into war, then better empirical evidence that details the content of the news is required to verify that claim. Especially in light of the fact that network TV remains the dominant source for Americans’ news about politics and public policy, a careful account of pre-Iraq war coverage in this medium is essential for furthering our understanding of the run-up to the invasion, as well as the mass media’s role in foreign policy debates and the shaping of public opinion more generally.

Our systematic analysis of every ABC, CBS, and NBC news story in the eight months before the invasion of Iraq—from August 2002 through March 2003—shows that the public was offered a relatively one-sided account of the debate over the proposed war. Bush Administration officials comprised more than one-quarter of all the sources quoted in the news, the voices of anti-war groups and opposition Democrats were barely audible, and the overall thrust of coverage supported a pro-war perspective. The primary sources of dissent came not from domestic political actors, but...
But because those sources were rarely credible, domestic political actors, and because of the negative way in which opposition views were portrayed, the statements of those who opposed the war were surely accorded less weight by citizens than the pro-war pronouncements of the White House and its allies. In providing the public with a slanted account of the political debate, the mass media failed to live up to democratic ideals.

For more information on Danny’s research on the mass media and the march to the Iraq war, please go to http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/dwhayes/projects.htm.

**Campbell Dissertation Awards**

**Surfing for Problems: Policy Advocacy and Agenda Setting**  
*Jessica Boscarino, Ph.D. Candidate, Political Science*

In March 2008, I traveled to Stony Brook, NY to perform archival research in a newly-acquired collection on the Environmental Defense Fund. I spent a week in the SUNY-Stony Brook library accessing organizational documents, including congressional testimony, group newsletters, and internal memos. I was able to work with the archivist at Greenpeace U.S.A., to access documents and performed several interviews with organizational representatives from The Wilderness Society in June 2008. This contributed to my case study on sustainable forestry advocacy. I also performed phone interviews with representatives from the Sierra Club and additional Wilderness Society employees.

As a result of this research, the main arguments advanced in my dissertation have evolved and broadened. The project is still rooted in questions of agenda setting and policy advocacy by environmental organizations. I argue that advocacy groups attempt to sustain long-term interest in their policy proposals in three ways. First, policy advocates may link the problem(s) that they want to solve to other, more prominent problems as a way of attracting public and governmental attention. If they can successfully argue that solving issues that are already on the agenda requires addressing their cause, they may be more likely to achieve agenda access and positive policy change.

Second, policy advocates may promote their policy proposal (solution) as the answer to different problems over time, as old issues progress through the issue-attention cycle and no longer command as much attention as newer issues. By “surfing” for new problems within the problem stream described by John Kingdon, advocates may continually reinvent their policy solution over time, ensuring that it continues to appear relevant to policymakers. Finally, policy advocates may fight the creation of problem-problem and problem-solution linkages advanced by their competitors. In any given policy arena, there are likely to be many interests representing different perspectives and policy goals. In order to win support for one’s policy proposal, a group must convince policymakers that competing proposals are inadequate, inappropriate, or unfeasible. Together, these three activities represent an agenda setting strategy designed to overcome the challenges associated with promoting a policy proposal over long periods of time.
**Fighting for the Nazi New Order**  
*Martin Gutmann, Ph.D. Candidate, History Department*

In the most recent investigations into Nazi Germany, historians have focused on the generation born between 1903 and 1906. Too young to have served in the First World War, this generation came of age during the 1920’s. Unlike the traditional Nazi party members, who had forged a camaraderie and hatred in the trenches, this generation was less impressed by the bravado of street brawls and Nazi parades. Instead, many young men graduating from university in this period harbored intellectually sophisticated ideas about the primacy of race in history and international politics. Their anti-Semitism was equally emotionless, when compared to the average Nazi thug. Numerous scholars have documented the remarkable cohesion of ideas across the disparate regions and myriad of educational institutions in Germany. We do not know why such a high preponderance of Germans of this generation developed this world-view—but we know that they did.

My initial intention was to focus on the members of this generation who joined the German army, the Wehrmacht, and their role in aligning the military with the values of the Nazi government. I hypothesized that the military Hitler inherited in 1933 was neither saturated with enthusiastic Nazi’s nor controlled by the traditional Prussian officer corp. Instead, it’s most influential members were young officers who, while not committed Nazis, shared certain beliefs with Germany’s new masters: a cold, ‘racial’ interpretation of international politics and a strong desire to modernize German society and, in particular, the military. What I discovered when examining the personnel files of these officers was that there was a large contingent of non-German intellectuals of this generation who flocked to Germany to support the Nazi regime. This group of officers has been largely unexamined and now forms the core of my dissertation project. Why young, well-educated men from Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark and other Western European countries would leave their successful careers and families behind to fight for a murderous and foreign ideology is the main question my dissertation now seeks to answer. The files of the Berlin Document Center helped formulate this dissertation question and will provide a primary source in answering this question.

**Deliberating Conflict Democratically?**  
The Educative Impacts of Community Mediation  
*Heather Pincock, Ph.D., Department of Political Science*

Heather examines the educative effects of deliberation through community mediation, a process of facilitated negotiation of small scale citizen disputes. “Educative effects” refer to the potential of deliberative processes to change the skills, dispositions, and knowledge of participants in ways that make them better and more capable democratic citizens. Community mediation organizations offer mediation services to two or more citizens in disputes over neighbourhood and interpersonal matters. Interpersonal mediation has been largely overlooked by deliberative democracy research, which tends to focus on public policy disputes. Community mediation is uniquely situated to contribute to our understanding of deliberation’s ability to have educative effects because it has participatory aims, focuses on conflict, and places emphasis on the role of facilitators in producing these effects.

Drawing on the democratic theory literature and mediation theory, two mechanisms (autonomy reinforcement and interest clarification) are identified that may produce lasting effects for individual participants. The first mechanism suggests that through participatory deliberative processes citizens acquire a set of transferable skills and dispositions that increase their capacity to engage in democratic politics. The second mechanism suggests that through discursive exchange with other parties in the decision making process, participants acquire a better understanding of their own and others’ interests. This process of ‘interest clarification’ is thought to increase an individual’s capacity to engage in democratic politics in a lasting way. Through observation of training workshops, mediation sessions, and interviews with practitioners and mediation participants at two community mediation organizations in Toronto, Heather is looking for evidence of these mechanisms in the mediation process and exploring what if any lasting effect they have on individual participants.

**The Infamy of Self-Creation: the Democratic-Republican Societies and Political Communication in 1790s America**  
*Michele Orihel, Ph.D. Candidate, History Department*

My dissertation explores the political clubs known as Democratic-Republican Societies that formed in opposition to the foreign and domestic policies of the Washington administration during the 1790s. As extra-legal associations that operated outside of the constitutional framework of Congress and the Presidency, the democratic societies became the most innovative and controversial organizations that emerged during that pivotal decade of American political development. Inspired by the French and American Revolutions, the democratic societies advanced a radical conception of popular sovereignty that emphasized the role of political associations and newspaper publication in holding elected representatives accountable to the people. Moreover, these clubs imagined citizenship in democratic terms while maintaining an allegiance to the common good and to public virtue. While the democratic associations saw themselves as the heirs of such groups as the Sons of Liberty that had organized the resistance to British imperial authority, their opponents believed that the societies sought to usurp the legislative function of the new government, ultimately threatening to undermine the fragile political order of the nation.

With its comparative focus on three states: Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and South Carolina, my project aims to highlight the variations in democratic ideas and experiences that came to characterize the opposition movement. Traditionally, historians depict the nearly forty democratic societies that formed across the United States as a national and cohesive opposition, one that
was centered in Philadelphia and that foreshadowed the triumph of Jeffersonian-Republicanism in the election of 1800. Indeed, the similar rhetoric contained in the publications of those societies has led many historians to stress the unifying impact of the print culture of the national capital on the rest of the country. My dissertation re-examines these assumptions by searching for evidence of the communications and reception of the clubs that formed in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and South Carolina. In those three geographically-diverse states, democratic associations formed early in the movement and achieved a degree of strength. This comparative perspective highlights the diverse contexts of politics and print in which the clubs circulated their ideas, ultimately revealing the fragmented nature of the democratic network.

In July 2008, I presented some of the preliminary findings from my research trip at the Society for Historians of the Early American Republic (SHEAR).

A Tradition of Distinction
Kelley Coleman

The Campbell Institute acknowledges the recent departures of some of our distinguished faculty associates:
Alasdair Roberts, Jerome L. Rappaport Chair and Professor of Law and Public Policy at Suffolk University Law School (June 08)
Mary Tschirhart, director of the Institute for Nonprofits at North Carolina State University (June 08)
Arthur Brooks, President of the American Enterprise Institute (Dec 08)

The institute remains home to a truly diverse and dynamic faculty core. We look forward to the ongoing research and discoveries of our associates. Campbell news is always updated on our web site, www.campbellinstitute.org.