

The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274
(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · <http://www.psqonline.org>

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 121 · Number 4 · Winter 2006-07

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of The Academy of Political Science.

Political Science Quarterly is published by The Academy of Political Science. Contact the Academy for further permission regarding the use of this work.

Political Science Quarterly
Copyright © 2006 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

Going Dirty: The Art of Negative Campaigning by David Mark. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006. 280 pp. \$24.95.

As we head into the midterm and presidential election seasons of 2006 and 2008, we will undoubtedly see many negative campaigns—especially in districts located in the pivotal battleground states. In *Going Dirty: The Art of Negative Campaigning*, David Mark examines negative advertising in campaigns and provides a historical context for what we may see over the next two election years.

Historically, Mark argues, campaigning has been a process of comparing and contrasting candidates. The modern system of *negative* campaigning, Mark explains, has its roots in the late nineteenth century, when “candidates became their own advocates [and] rules of decorum demanded at least a slightly higher level of rhetoric ... the theory that undergirds the twenty-first-century requirement that federal candidates stand by and endorse their own ads” (p. 24). This is not to say that campaigns did not contain negative components; Mark shows that negative comparisons were often articulated by proxies for the candidates, such as partisan newspapers. In the twentieth century, however, negative campaign messages were handled by the candidates themselves. Mark claims that the first “modern negative campaign” occurred in the 1934 California gubernatorial election, when Frank Merriam’s campaign not only branded novelist Upton Sinclair a Communist but also was the first campaign to employ direct mail. Negative campaigning via television was first employed by Lyndon Baines Johnson in his 1964 presidential run against Barry Goldwater, when his famous “Daisy Girl” ad made “Goldwater himself ... the focus of the election” (p. 40). Without naming his opponent, Johnson’s campaign implied that Goldwater’s apparent militancy would result in a nuclear apocalypse. Mark also explains how Jesse Helms’s campaigns in North Carolina exemplify the modern form of campaigning: “long, television-driven, negative, and with relatively few personal appearances” (pp. 104–105). Mark also discusses how new developments in negative advertising, such as the “Swift Boat Veterans for Truth,” allow a campaign to hurl invective while shielding the candidate from any negative association with such strategies. Finally, Mark examines how blogs and e-mail make it possible for negative messages to spread much farther than more traditional methods would allow.

Negative campaigning works, which is why candidates regularly employ it. As Mark explains, it is particularly effective when ads focus the electorate on a specific issue. Johnson’s Daisy Girl ad brought about a “long series of Cold War–era campaign commercials to focus on a candidate’s potential for launching a nuclear conflict” (p. 49). After the Cold War removed the Soviet threat, Mark explains, the 2002 Georgia Senate race put terrorism at the center of all modern campaigns. Mark also explains that negative campaigns are effective because they raise money; capitalizing on the flaws of

an opponent generates more donations than touting a candidate's virtues. Finally, he explains that negative ads are effective in "hammering opponents before most of the electorate even seem[] to be seriously paying attention to politics" (p. 113). In the 1996 presidential race, Bill Clinton and Al Gore connected potential Republican candidates to Newt Gingrich. When Senator Robert Dole was selected as the nominee, they yoked Gingrich to Dole—even though the two were not necessarily politically tied. In this way, negative advertising begins long before the campaign begins, forcing the opponent to go on the defensive before he or she can even begin to plan a positive message.

While scholars and pundits alike bemoan negative campaigning, Mark points out that American voters notice when negative comparison ads lapse into invective, and in those cases, he argues, those ads fail.

LEAH A. MURRAY
Weber State University

Disability Rights and the American Social Safety Net by Jennifer L. Erkulwater. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 2006. 252 pp. \$42.50.

How far do social constructionist-oriented policies that focus on individual rights and inclusiveness advance the social good of the disabled in the United States? Jennifer L. Erkulwater argues not nearly far enough in her important and very engaging new book on federal social welfare and disability policy. Since the 1960s, American disability policy has been characterized by a shift in orientation from a medical model focused on the welfare state providing adequate social services including education, job training, and income support to a more libertarian-oriented social model based on socially constructed individual rights for the disabled. This social model has included independence from public institutions, anti-discrimination regulations and laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, and inclusiveness in American society. The change in federal disability orientation was sped up by de-institutionalization caused by the Supplemental Security Income program and a shift of the disabled from public institutions to federally funded community care. Community care has been decentralized and fragmented among numerous federal, state, and local programs, and this has resulted in an unequal distribution of resources for the disabled. In line with this shift in disability policy orientation, disability advocates throughout the 1980s and 1990s also tended to "define civil rights laws and social welfare programs as incompatible approaches to the problems of disability ... " (p. 232).

Although this strategy of advocating individual rights in tandem with reducing the cost and size of the social welfare state appealed to neo-liberal market-oriented politicians in Congress during this period, Erkulwater argues that this advocacy approach has stalled positive social change in terms of