

Conclusion

The specific goal of this text was to present in several focused chapters a coherent body of information that would allow general readers and students in particular to understand and evaluate multiple dimensions of Connecticut government at the start of the twenty-first century. It is hoped that readers of this work have not only gained valuable and useful information concerning Connecticut's political system, but have also gained an appreciation for the many virtues associated with Connecticut government.

Power has most definitely devolved to state governments in recent years and the American people will increasingly expect state governors, state legislators, and state judges to resolve an array of difficult and challenging policy problems. It is imperative therefore that state governments possess the resources, energy, and skill required to meet the needs of the citizenry. The public will demand efficient state government in the years ahead.

With specific regard to Connecticut, there is every reason to believe that the framework of state government is prepared to meet new and challenging demands. The Connecticut Constitution is a very vibrant document, and from all indications will protect and expand the civil rights and liberties of Connecticut residents. Connecticut will remain a "pocket of liberty" in the years ahead.

The Connecticut General Assembly, in light of the legislature's technological resources, professional staffing, and

support services, appears to be well equipped to respond to new and pressing public demands. The professional upgrading of the state legislature over the course of the last fifteen years also suggests foresight on the part of state lawmakers regarding the growing need for efficient and responsive legislative services.

The broad powers of the Connecticut governor, and more generally the modernization of the governor's office, will provide future chief executives with the authority and resources required to confront the many policy challenges that lie ahead. Dynamic, efficient, and creative executive leadership will be expected from those individuals elected to the office of governor.

The state's judicial system is also prepared to meet the many legal challenges that will emerge during the next century. Recent judicial reforms point to a state judicial system that is willing and able to resolve a plethora of complicated and unprecedented legal disputes. Moreover, there is reason to expect a very high quality of justice for Connecticut residents.

For the twenty-first century, citizens who wish to participate in the political process will discover several mechanisms that allow for meaningful and constructive citizen involvement. Elections for a broad range of local, state, and federal office will continue to offer opportunities for direct citizen participation. Other than age, registration, and residency requirements, there are virtually no barriers to voting in the state of Connecticut. Any person who is eighteen years of age or older, a legal resident of Connecticut, and who has complied with state registration requirements can vote for an array of candidates competing for numerous public offices. For those who wish to participate in primary elections, registration with a political party will most likely still be required. It should be noted, however, that at the time of this writing there appears to be growing momentum in Connecticut for open primary elections.

Volunteer activity within a political party will still prove to be a useful means by which Connecticut residents can participate in the political process. Although the role of party organizations has declined in recent decades and candidate-centered organizations have in some instances supplanted the party organization as a means of mobilizing voter support, the Democratic and Republican

town committees will nevertheless continue to offer rich opportunities for persons who wish to become actively involved in the political process. Moreover, town party committees will continue to serve as the principal mechanisms for launching candidacies for public office. Until the convention-centered nominating process is reformed in Connecticut, town committees will for all intents and purposes continue to serve as the "gatekeepers" for most elective offices in the state of Connecticut.

In addition to the two major political parties, there will also be a variety of alternative political parties in Connecticut that will most certainly facilitate citizen participation in politics. Although alternative or "minor" political parties seldom win elections, they do provide participatory opportunities for those citizens who have become disillusioned with the platforms of the two major parties. The Green Party, the Reform Party, the Libertarian Party, and the Concerned Citizens Party are examples of such parties. Although such parties are on the fringes of Connecticut politics, they nevertheless will serve as participatory channels in the years ahead.

Special and public interest groups are on the rise in Connecticut politics and from all indications will continue to proliferate. Interest groups will provide yet another avenue for citizen participation. Like political parties, interest groups will be searching for energetic and dedicated volunteers. Residents who appreciate very focused and intense political activity will find interest groups a rewarding experience. Interest group involvement can directly connect citizens to the machinery of government and allow persons to keep abreast of issues that are of immediate concern to their lives. With political party organizations declining, it is possible that interest groups might become the most strategic form of citizen participation in the twenty-first century. Whether one prefers the simple but important act of voting, working for a political party committee, or engaging in the activity of an interest group, a variety of mechanisms are in place to ensure that residents of Connecticut can participate directly in the political process.

When the state constitution, the decision-making structures of state government, and the channels of citizen participation are examined collectively, it is difficult for one not to be proud of

Connecticut's political system. It appears as if Connecticut's political system has evolved with time and has, in multiple ways, effectively responded to the legal, economic, social, and political needs of the state's population. Such findings are encouraging, particularly when one considers those issues that require the most immediate attention.

For example, despite the state supreme court ruling of *Sheff v. O'Neill* (1996), as well as an increase in state aid to inner-city public schools, there is still great disparity with respect to resources and student performance between urban and suburban schools in the state of Connecticut. This is a problem that must be resolved. Connecticut's prisons are also overcrowded and in need of additional staffing and support services. At the time of this writing, the problem of overcrowded prisons has been addressed by sending prisoners to penal institutions in the state of Virginia. This is a temporary solution to what is obviously a long-term problem. Additional job retraining programs are needed to prepare Connecticut's workforce for occupations that require technological sophistication and expertise. Many nursing homes in Connecticut are currently understaffed, and elderly patients are in need of personalized and professional medical attention. Moreover, there will be a growing demand to provide services for substance abusers, the mentally impaired, teenage parents, and victims of the AIDs virus. To compound such problems, Connecticut, at some point in the not-too-distant future, will most surely slide into economic recession. Governors and state lawmakers will no longer have the luxury of resolving policy problems with a budget surplus. Indeed, a budget surplus can become a budget deficit almost overnight. However, despite the vexing policy challenges that await the state of Connecticut, there is reason to believe that the policy-making institutions of state government along with the political mechanisms that facilitate citizen participation will most surely meet the demands and needs of the state's citizenry. From all indications, Connecticut government is well prepared to face the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Notes

Preface

1. Quinnipiac College Poll, conducted August 3-12, 1999. 1,465 Connecticut residents surveyed. Poll results released October 26, 1999.

Chapter One

1. Richard E. Neustadt, *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan* (New York: Free Press, 1990), p. x.

2. An interesting and recent example regarding the power struggle between the national and state governments is *United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 779 (1995).

3. The development of the first political party system is concisely covered by Paul Goodman, "The First American Party System," in *The American Party System: Stages of Political Development*, ed. William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 56-89.

4. Quoted in Herman Von Holst, *John C. Calhoun* (New York: Chelsea House, 1980), p. 79.

5. Quoted in James MacGregor Burns, *The Lion and the Fox* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1956), p. 164.

6. Burns, *The Lion and the Fox* p. 183.

7. John L. Palmer and Isabell Sawhill, "Perspectives on the Reagan Experiment," in *The Reagan Experiment*, ed. Palmer and Sawhill (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1982), p. 3.

8. William Appleman Williams et al., eds., *America in Vietnam* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989), p. 290.

9. George E. Peterson, "Federalism and the States: An Experiment in Decentralization," in *The Reagan Record*, ed. John L. Palmer and Isabell Sawhill (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1984), p. 217.

10. Peter Benda and Charles H. LeVine, "Reagan and the Bureaucracy: The Bequest, the Promise and the Legacy," in *The Reagan Legacy: Promise and Performance*, ed. Charles O. Jones (New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, 1988), p. 121.

11. Peterson, "Federalism and the States," p. 229.

12. David Osborne, *Laboratories of Democracy* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1990), p. 1.

13. Osborne, *Laboratories of Democracy*, p. 1.

14. Larry Sabato, *Goodbye to Goodtime Charlie: The American Governorship Transformed*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1983), p. 179.

Chapter Two

1. Albert E. Van Dusen, *Puritans Against the Wilderness: Connecticut History to 1763* (Chester, Ct.: Pequot Press, 1975), pp. 28-29.

2. Quoted in *Connecticut Register and Manual* (Hartford: State of Connecticut, 2000), p. 55.

3. Ellsworth S. Grant, *The Miracle of Connecticut* (Hartford: Connecticut Historical Society, 1992), p. 20

4. Vincent Wilson, Jr., *The Book of Great American Documents* (Brookeville, Md.: American History Research Associates, 1993), pp. 5-10.

5. Wilson, *The Book of Great American Documents*, p. 5.

6. Van Dusen, *Puritans Against the Wilderness*, pp. 52-54.

7. Quoted in Grant, *The Miracle of Connecticut*, p. 26.

8. Richard J. Purcell, *Connecticut in Transition: 1775-1818*, new ed. (Middletown, Ct.: Wesleyan University Press, 1963), p. 113.

9. Van Dusen, *Puritans Against the Wilderness*, p. 54.

10. W. H. Gocher, *Wadsworth or the Charter Oak* (Hartford: W. H. Gocher, 1904), p. 216.

11. Gocher, *Wadsworth or the Charter Oak*, p. 281.

12. Gocher, *Wadsworth or the Charter Oak*, p. 307.

13. Gocher, *Wadsworth or the Charter Oak*, p. 333.

14. Van Dusen, *Puritans Against the Wilderness*, p. 71.

15. Edward R. Lambert, *History of the Colony of New Haven* (New Haven: Hitchcock and Stafford, 1838), p. 21.

16. Lambert, *History of the Colony of New Haven*, p. 32.
17. Lambert, *History of the Colony of New Haven*, pp. 31-32.
18. Lambert, *History of the Colony of New Haven*, p. 33.
19. Lambert, *History of the Colony of New Haven*, p. 38.
20. Jarvis Means Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut History: 1818-1850* (New York: Octagon Books, 1978), p. 3.
21. Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut History*, p. 5.
22. Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut History*, p. 4.
23. Quoted in Purcell, *Connecticut in Transition*, p. x.
24. David M. Roth and Freeman Meyer, *From Revolution to Constitution: Connecticut 1763 to 1818* (Chester, Ct.: Pequot Press, 1975), p. 89.
25. Roth and Meyer, *From Revolution to Constitution*, p. 20.
26. Roth and Meyer, *From Revolution to Constitution*, p. 92.
27. Wesley W. Horton, *The Connecticut State Constitution: A Reference Guide* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993), p. 11.
28. Roth and Meyer, *From Revolution to Constitution*, pp. 63-65.
29. Horton, *The Connecticut State Constitution*, p. 14.
30. Horton, *The Connecticut State Constitution*, pp. 14-15.
31. Horton, *The Connecticut State Constitution*, p. 15.
32. Horton, *The Connecticut State Constitution*, p. 16.
33. Horton, *The Connecticut State Constitution*, p. 16.
34. Robert B. McKay, *Reapportionment: The Law and Politics of Representation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965), pp. 46-47.
35. McKay, *Reapportionment*, pp. 55-56.
36. Louis Fisher, *Constitutional Rights: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1990), p. 1239.
37. *Colegrove v. Green*, 328 U.S. 549 (1946), at 555-56.
38. McKay, *Reapportionment*, p. 79.
39. McKay, *Reapportionment*, pp. 86-87.
40. *Butterworth v. Dempsey*, 229 F. Supp 754 D. Conn. (1964), at 790-91.
41. For a very thorough annotation of the Connecticut Constitution replete with case citations, see Horton.

Chapter Three

1. *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996), at 25-26.
2. *Sheff v. O'Neill*, at 33-34.
3. The "good faith" doctrine is among the several controversial rulings issued by the United States Supreme Court in recent years that allow for exceptions to the exclusionary rule. Other forms of searches in

which the exclusionary rule has been significantly relaxed include consent searches, searches incident to an arrest, searches involving the “hot pursuit” of a suspect, motor vehicle searches, searches in which evidence appears in “plain sight,” searches conducted during emergency situations, street searches in which there is an immediate need to “stop and frisk” a suspect, and searches conducted at the nation’s borders. Under today’s federal judicial code, a significant body of evidence can be admitted into trial that has been obtained without a search warrant, or, as the Leon case established, even when there is a defective warrant. A treatment of exceptions to the search warrant requirement appears in Craig R. Ducat, *Constitutional Interpretation*, 6th ed. (Minneapolis/St. Paul: West, 1996), pp. 745-87.

4. *State of Connecticut v. Marsala*, 216 Conn. 150 (1990), at 159-60.

5. *Horton v. Meskill*, 172 Conn. 615 (1977), cited in *State of Connecticut v. Marsala*, at 160.

6. *State of Connecticut v. Marsala*, at 171.

7. *State of Connecticut v. Stoddard*, 206 Conn. 157 (1988), at 166-67.

8. Doe’s medical problems are described in the body of the case: “Although her life was not endangered as a result of her pregnancy, Doe required an abortion for medical reasons. After she became pregnant, it was necessary to perform a conization (a cutting of the cervix) in order to determine whether she had cervical cancer because the endocervical curetage showed dysplasia (precancerous cells). If an abortion were not performed there would have been a risk that the conization would cause bleeding and hemorrhaging which could result in a miscarriage. Doe faced the possibility of further complications from the continuation of the pregnancy which included the following: She had been on methadone for the three preceding years. Her last two children had been born suffering from methadone withdrawal and they had to be hospitalized. If her pregnancy were to continue while she was on methadone, she also would have placed at risk of cardiac arrest, shock, respiratory depression, circulatory depression and gastrointestinal problems. Because of Doe’s age, her pregnancy could have caused further serious complications, including emotional and psychological distress.” Despite the severity of the medical complications, the court noted that “the evidence is conclusive that Doe’s medical condition did not require an abortion to preserve her life, but only to preserve her health.”

9. *Doe v. Maher*, 515 A2d 134 Conn. Super. (1986), at 143.

10. Christopher Collier, quoted in *Doe v. Maher*, at 143.

11. *Doe v. Maher*, at 156.

12. *Horton v. Meskill* and *Grace v. Meskill*, 172 Conn. 615 (1977), at 633.

13. *Horton v. Meskill*, at 649.

14. *Hartford Courant*, 28 October 1990, pp. A1, A10. This is an excellent journalistic summary of state constitutional law cases in Connecticut along with the perspective of several state Supreme Court judges.

Chapter Four

1. Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1965), pp. 12-13.

2. The *Civic Culture* was originally published in 1963 by Princeton University Press, and subsequently by Little, Brown and Co., in 1965. The seminal study was then updated in Almond and Verba, eds., *The Civic Culture Revisited* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980).

3. Almond and Verba, *The Civic Culture*, p. 3.

4. Daniel J. Elazar, *American Federalism: A View From the States*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1984).

5. Elazar, *American Federalism*, p. 116.

6. Elazar, *American Federalism*, p. 117.

7. Elazar, *American Federalism*, p. 127.

8. Elazar, *American Federalism*, p. 119.

9. Elazar, *American Federalism*, p. 130.

10. An informative graph that documents the declining trend in trust towards government from 1958-98 can be found in Stephen J. Wayne et al., *The Politics of American Government*, 3rd ed. (New York: Worth Publishers, 1999), p. 261. The graph is based on survey data from the American National Election Studies and the Pew Research Center.

11. *Hartford Courant*/Institute for Social Inquiry Connecticut Poll, May 23, 1991.

12. Connecticut Poll, June 19, 1997.

13. Connecticut Poll, April 25, 1995.

14. Connecticut Poll, September 18, 1996.

15. Connecticut Poll, April 2, 1996.

16. Connecticut Poll, September 21, 1993.

17. Almond and Verba, *The Civic Culture*, chapters 5-8.

18. Almond and Verba, *The Civic Culture*, p. 139.

19. Connecticut Poll, June 18, 1996.

20. Connecticut Poll, November 17, 1989.

21. Connecticut Poll, September 22, 1995.

22. Connecticut Poll, June 18, 1996.

23. Connecticut Poll, June 15, 1993.

24. Connecticut Poll, June 18, 1996.

25. Connecticut Poll, April 10, 1989.

26. Connecticut Poll, June 18, 1996.
27. Connecticut Poll, March 28, 1989.
28. Connecticut Poll, April 10, 1989.

Chapter Five

1. Duane Lockard, *New England State Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), chapters 9-10. See also Joseph I. Lieberman, *The Power Broker* (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1966).

2. Lockard, *New England State Politics*, p. 247

3. Joseph I. Lieberman, *The Legacy* (Hartford: Spoonwood Press, 1981), p. 213.

4. Connecticut Poll, April 10, 1989.

5. Connecticut Poll, July 31, 1990.

6. Connecticut Poll, July 31, 1990.

7. See Robert Agranoff, ed., *The New Style of Election Campaigns* (Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc., 1976); David S. Broder, *The Party's Over* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971); William Crotty, *American Parties in Decline*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1984); and Alan Ehrenhalt, *The United States of Ambition: Politicians, Power and the Pursuit of Office* (New York: Times Books, 1992). Such works are also excellent references with regard to describing and explaining political party decline in American politics.

8. Jack Dennis, "Trends in Public Support for the Two-Party System," *British Journal of Political Science* 5 (1975): 187-230.

9. Agranoff, *The New Style of Election Campaigns*, p. 6.

10. Gary L. Rose, *Connecticut Politics at the Crossroads* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1992), p. 35.

11. Rose, *Connecticut Politics at the Crossroads*, p. 39.

12. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., with Barry Sussman, *Maverick: A Life in Politics* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1995), p. 209.

13. Ehrenhalt, *The United States of Ambition*, pp. 162-63.

14. Paul Allen Beck and Frank J. Sorauf, *Party Politics in America*, 7th ed. (New York: Harper Collins, 1992), pp. 114-24.

15. E. E. Schattschneider, *Party Government* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1942), p. 1.

Chapter Six

1. A discussion of the relationship between political parties and interest groups can be found in Jeffrey M. Berry, *The Interest Group*

Society, 3rd ed. (New York: Longman, 1997), chapter 3. See also, John R. Wright, *Interest Groups and Congress: Lobbying, Contributions and Influence* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1996), pp. 14-15.

2. Connecticut Poll, February 21, 1991.
3. Connecticut Poll, June 9, 1992.
4. Connecticut Poll, April 2, 1996.
5. Connecticut Poll, April 2, 1996.
6. Bruce C. Wolpe and Bertram J. Levine, *Lobbying Congress: How the System Works*, 3rd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1996), pp. 20-47.
7. Wolpe and Levine, *Lobbying Congress*, pp. 20-47.
8. Quinnipiac College Poll, conducted October 5-11, 1999. 1,170 Connecticut residents surveyed. Poll results released October 14, 1999.
9. Quinnipiac College Poll, October 5-11, 1999.

Chapter Seven

1. Personnel data obtained from phone interview with Jim Tracy, Personnel Administrator for Joint Committee on Legislative Management, January 20, 2000.

2. Jane E. Zarem, ed., *The Connecticut Citizen Handbook*, 3rd ed. (Chester, Ct.: Globe Pequot Press, 1987), p. 35.

3. Wayne Swanson, *Lawmaking in Connecticut: The General Assembly* (New London, Ct.: Connecticut College, 1978), p. 42.

4. Swanson, *Lawmaking in Connecticut*, p. 42.

5. Randall B. Ripley, *Congress: Process and Policy*, 4th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1988), p. 64.

6. Alan Rosenthal et al., *A New Public Perspective on Representative Democracy*. Field Test Edition (Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Legislatures, 2000), p. 9.

7. Swanson, *Lawmaking in Connecticut*, p. 40.

8. Swanson, *Lawmaking in Connecticut*, p. 64.

9. A brief but excellent summary of legislative procedure and important facts pertaining to the state legislature can be found in "This is Your General Assembly," published by the Connecticut General Assembly, 1999-2000.

10. Connecticut Poll, October 4, 1994.

11. Connecticut Poll, November 3, 1990.

12. Connecticut Poll, October 4, 1994.

13. Connecticut Poll, November 17, 1989.

14. Connecticut Poll, November 17, 1989.

15. Connecticut Poll, February 2, 1994.

16. Connecticut Poll, October 4, 1994.

17. Internship papers submitted by political science students concerning the formulation and passage of the state's operating budget often suggest that the governor's version of the budget prevails. Such papers are a mandatory component of the state Capitol internship program coordinated through the Connecticut state legislature.

18. When evaluating a governor's formal powers, political scientists examine those powers afforded to the governor by the state constitution. An excellent review and discussion of formal powers is found in Ann O'M. Bowman and Richard C. Kearney, *State and Local Government*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), pp. 185-97.

19. Thad L. Beyle, in Harold A. Hovey and Kendra A. Hovey, *State Fact Finder 1997: Rankings Across America* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc. 1997), Table D-11. Cited in Bowman and Kearney, p. 196.

20. Louis W. Koenig, *The Chief Executive*, 5th ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986), p. 386.

21. An excellent treatment of Weicker the politician appears in Russell D. Murphy, "Connecticut: Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., A Maverick in the 'Land of Steady Habits,'" in Thad L. Beyle, ed., *Governors and Hard Times* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1992), pp. 61-75. Murphy notes that the last third-party governor was William T. Minor of the American Party, who was chosen by the state legislature to serve as the state's governor from 1855-57. Weicker was therefore not the first third-party governor. He was, however, the only third-party governor to have been popularly elected.

22. Larry Sabato, *Goodby to Goodtime Charlie: The American Governorship Transformed*, 3rd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1983), pp. 52-53.

23. "Biography of Governor John G. Rowland," State of Connecticut Website, <http://www.state.ct.us/governor/govbio.htm>.

24. *Hartford Courant*, 3 May 2000, p. 1.

25. *Searching for Justice: Connecticut's Courts* (Hartford: Connecticut Judicial Department, 1990), p. 12.

26. *Searching for Justice*, p. 23.

27. *Connecticut's Courts* (Hartford: State of Connecticut Judicial Branch), p. 14.

28. *Searching for Justice*, p. 25; *Connecticut's Courts*, p. 12; State of Connecticut Website, "Judicial Branch." <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/external/supapp/casecome.html>.

29. "Judicial Branch." <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/external/supapp/aro.htm>.

30. Henry R. Glick, *Courts, Politics, and Justice*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, Inc. 1993), p. 277.

31. The "Missouri Plan" works as follows: a nominating commission produces a short list of prospective judges to the state governor. Merit is the principal consideration in the development of the short list and the governor is required to appoint a judge from among the names recommended by the commission. After a minimum of one year, the electorate votes to either retain or remove the judge. The popular referendum coincides with a general election, and the issue of judicial retention appears on the election ballot. The Missouri Plan, also known as the Merit Plan, combines the work of a bipartisan nominating commission, gubernatorial appointment, and popular referendum. A review of different judicial selection procedures currently in place at the state level appears in Glick, pp. 116-26.

32. *Connecticut Law Tribune*, 15 December 1986.

33. Glick, *Courts, Politics, and Justice*, pp. 131-33.

34. "Judicial Branch." <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/external/supapp/lawclerkapp.html>

35. "Judicial Branch." <http://www.jud.state.ct.us/external/super/superiorclerk.htm>

36. "Judicial Branch." <http://www.jud.state.ct.us./ystday/adminop.html>

37. Full-time employees including judges is recorded at 2,874 in *The Biennial Report of the Connecticut Judicial Branch: 1996-1998* (Hartford: State of Connecticut Judicial Branch), p. 28.

Bibliography

Books and Journal Articles

- Agranoff, Robert, ed. *The New Style in Election Campaigns*. 2nd ed. Boston: Holbrook Press, 1976.
- Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1965.
- Beck, Paul Allen and Frank J. Sorauf. *Party Politics in America*. 7th ed. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
- Benda, Peter and Charles H. LeVine. "Reagan and the Bureaucracy: The Bequest, the Promise and the Legacy." In Charles O. Jones, ed., *The Reagan Record*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1984.
- Berdon, Robert I. "Connecticut Equal Protection Clause: Requirement of Strict Scrutiny When Classifications are Based Upon Sex or Physical or Mental Disability." *Connecticut History* 29 (November 1988): 130-51.
- Berry, Jeffrey M. *The Interest Group Society*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1997.
- Bowman, Ann O'M. and Richard C. Kearney. *State and Local Government*. 3rd ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.
- Brennan, William J., Jr. "State Constitutions and the Protection of Individual Rights." *Harvard Law Review* 90 (January 1977): 489-504.
- Broder, David S. *The Party's Over*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Burns, James MacGregor. *The Lion and the Fox*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1956.
- Collier, Christopher. "The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut and American Constitutionalism." *Connecticut Law Review* 21 (summer, 1989): 863-69.

- _____. "Why Connecticut is 'The Constitution State.'" *Connecticut Bar Journal* 61 (1987): 210-14
- Collins, Ronald K. L. and Peter J. Galie. "Models of Post-Incorporation Judicial Review: 1985 Survey of State Constitutional Individual Rights Decisions." *Publius* 16 (summer 1986): 111-39.
- Collins, Ronald K. L., Peter J. Galie and John Kincaid. "State High Courts, State Constitutions, and Individual Rights Litigation Since 1980: A Judicial Survey." *Publius* 16 (summer 1986): 141-61.
- Crotty, William, ed. *Political Parties in Local Areas*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1986.
- _____. *American Parties in Decline*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1984.
- Daniels, Bruce C. "Ratifying the Past: Historical Influences on Constitutional Development in Connecticut." *Connecticut History* 29 (November 1988): 1-15.
- Davis, Sue and Taunya Lovell Banks. "State Constitutions, Freedom of Expression, and Search and Seizure: Prospects for State Court Reincarnation." *Publius* 17 (winter 1987): 13-31.
- Dennis, Jack. "Trends in Public Support for the Two-Party System." *British Journal of Political Science* 5 (1975): 187-230.
- Ducat, Craig R. *Constitutional Interpretation*. 6th ed. Minneapolis/St. Paul: West, 1996.
- Elazar, Daniel J. *American Federalism: A View From the States*. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.
- Ehrenhalt, Alan. *The United States of Ambition: Power and the Pursuit of Office*. New York: Times Books, 1992.
- Fisher, Louis. *Constitutional Rights: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- Glick, Henry R. *Courts, Politics and Justice*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- Gocher, W. H. *Wadsworth or the Charter Oak*. Hartford: W. H. Gocher, 1904.
- Goodman, Paul. "The First American Party System." In William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham, eds. *The American Party System: Stages of Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Graham, Kenneth A. "Issues of Federalism in Connecticut in the Twentieth Century." *Connecticut History* 21 (November 1988): 116-29.
- Grant, Ellsworth S. *The Miracle of Connecticut*. Hartford: Connecticut Historical Society, 1992.
- Hollister, G.H. *The History of Connecticut*. Vol 1. Hartford: Case, Tiffany and Co., 1857.
- Horton, Wesley W. *The Connecticut State Constitution: A Reference Guide*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993.

- Koenig, Louis W. *The Chief Executive*. 5th ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986.
- Lambert, Edward R. *History of New Haven Colony*. New Haven: Hitchcock and Stafford, 1838.
- Lieberman, Joseph I. *The Power Broker*. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1966.
- _____. *The Legacy*. Hartford: Spoonwood Press, 1981.
- Lockard, Duane. *New England State Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.
- McKay, Robert B. *Reapportionment: The Law and Politics of Representation*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.
- Morse, Jarvis Means. *A Neglected Period of Connecticut History: 1818-1850*. New York: Octagon Books, 1978.
- Murphy, Russell D. "Connecticut: Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., A Maverick in the 'Land of Steady Habits.'" In Thad L. Beyle, ed. *Governors and Hard Times*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1992.
- Osborne, David. *Laboratories of Democracy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1990.
- Palmer, John L. and Isabell Sawhill. "Perspectives on the Reagan Experiment." In John L. Palmer and Isabell Sawhill, eds. *The Reagan Experiment*. Washington: D.C.: Urban Institute Press, 1982.
- Peterson, George E. "Federalism and the States: An Experiment in Decentralization." In John L. Palmer and Isabell Sawhill, eds. *The Reagan Record*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1984.
- Purcell, Richard J. *Connecticut in Transition: 1775-1818*. Middletown, Ct.: Wesleyan University Press, 1963.
- Rose, Gary L. *Connecticut Politics at the Crossroads*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1992.
- _____. "Local Party Organization Vitality in Connecticut: The Nominating Process and Organizational Maintenance." Paper delivered at the Annual Conference of the Northeast Political Science Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November, 1989.
- _____. "Evaluating the Role of Party Organization in the Nomination of State Legislative Candidates." *Connecticut Review* 11 (1988): 40-53.
- _____. "Party Organization Activity at the Grassroots: The Case of Connecticut." Paper delivered at the Annual Conference of the Northeast Political Science Association, Providence, Rhode Island, November 1988.
- Rosenthal, Alan, et al. *A New Public Perspective on Representative Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Legislatures, 2000.

- Roth, David M. and Freeman Meyer. *From Revolution to Constitution: Connecticut 1763 to 1818*. Chester, Ct.: Pequot Press, 1975.
- Sabato, Larry. *Goodbye to Goodtime Charlie: The American Governorship Transformed*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1983.
- Shea, Daniel M. *Transforming Democracy: Legislative Campaign Committees and Parties*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Schattschneider, E. E. *Party Government*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1942.
- Swanson, Wayne. *Lawmaking in Connecticut: The General Assembly*. New London, Ct.: Connecticut College, 1978.
- Van Dusen, Albert E. *Puritans Against the Wilderness: Connecticut History to 1763*. Chester, Ct.: Pequot Press, 1975.
- Von Holst, Herman. *John C. Calhoun*. New York: Chelsea House, 1980.
- Weicker, Lowell, P., Jr. *Maverick: A Life in Politics*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1995.
- White, John Kenneth. *The Fractured Electorate: Political Parties and Social Change in Southern New England*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1983.
- Wilson, Vincent, Jr. *The Book of Great American Documents*. Brookeville, Md.: American History Research Association, 1993.
- Wirt, Frederick M. " 'Soft' Concepts and 'Hard' Data: A Research Review of Elazar's Political Culture." *Publius* 21 (fall 1991): 1-13.
- Wolpe, Bruce C. and Bertram J. Levine. *Lobbying Congress: How the System Works*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1996.
- Wright, John R. *Interest Groups and Congress: Lobbying, Contributions and Influence*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1996.
- Zarem, Jane E., ed. *The Connecticut Citizen Handbook*. 3rd ed. Chester, Ct.: Globe Pequot Press, 1987.

Public Opinion Polls

- Hartford Courant*/Institute for Social Inquiry Connecticut Poll, 1980-1999.
- Quinnipiac College Poll. 1999.

State Publications

- Biennial Report of the Connecticut Judicial Branch, 1996-1998*. Hartford: State of Connecticut, 2000

- Connecticut Register and Manual*. Hartford: State of Connecticut, 2000.
Connecticut's Courts. Hartford: State of Connecticut Judicial Branch, 2000
Searching for Justice: Connecticut's Courts. Hartford: Connecticut Judicial Department, 1990.

Website

State of Connecticut Website, <http://www.state.ct.us>.