

Project SEED, Continued

shared his research accomplishment on protein-protein interaction studies using gold nanoparticles conducted with Prof. Marie-Christine Daniel, UMBC. Ms. Sindy Rosales from High Point HS explained her research on hydrogels that are having potential applications in the medical field as drug delivery vehicles. Ms. Rosales did her 2015 and 2014 summer Research at UMD-College Park with Prof. Jeffrey Davis. Ms. Ariane Chandler from McKinley Tech HS, did summer research at Prof. Laronde-Leblanc's lab at UMD, College Park and discussed her summer research on the Investigation of the effects of knocked down and over expression of RioK1 on cancer related processes. Final speaker of this session, Ms. Jeniffer Song from Thomas Jefferson HS summarized her SEED research on the design of Rickettsial outer membrane Protein B peptides for co crystallization with lysine methyltransferases from Rickettsia bacteria. After the research talks all the SEED fellows presented and explained their SEED research as a poster presentation. "A good balance of oral presentations" indicated one of the attendees. "The most successful part of this event was the presentations and seeing the SEED Fellows Projects" noted another participant.



Dr. Anderson also awarded a certificate of accomplishment to each SEED fellow. The best presentation award was held; the CSW-SEED committee would like to congratulate to Mr. John Arcibal (John Randolph Tucker HS) and Ms. Jasmine James (Wheaton HS) who won the first and second prize for their presentation, respectively. The symposium was well attended by SEED mentors, graduate students, students' parents, High school chemistry teachers, and CSW members. The closing remarks and vote of thanks was presented by Dr. Walter Benson (FDA, rtd).

Photo credit: Ajay Mallia

Now Accepting Nominations for the Charles L. Gordon Memorial Award

Contributed by Kim Morehouse

Named after Charles Gordon for his years of service as managing editor of the *Capital Chemist*, the Charles L. Gordon Memorial Award is given in recognition of exemplary service by a CSW member to the profession of chemistry, to the science of chemistry, and/or to the Chemical Society of Washington. Nominations are invited for this award, consisting of a plaque that will be presented at the February CSW dinner meeting. A written nomination should include a description of the accomplishments on which the nomination is based. Additional documentation that includes seconding letters and the nominee's CV are welcome.

Completed nominations for the Charles L. Gordon Award are due on or before **November 15, 2015**. The nomination should be submitted electronically to csw@acs.org. Please contact the Chair of the Awards Committee, Kim M. Morehouse at kim.morehouse@fda.hhs.gov, if you have any questions.

Now Accepting Nominations for the CSW Schubert Award

Contributed by Katrice Lippa

The Chemical Society of Washington (CSW) is pleased to announce the call for nominations for the Leo Schubert Memorial Award to recognize an outstanding teacher of high school chemistry in the Washington, D.C. area. The award was established in 1979 to honor Dr. Leo Schubert, a chemistry professor at American University who devoted much of his career to developing programs for high school teachers and students. The Schubert award consists of a \$500 honorarium and a certificate, which will be presented at the January 2016 CSW dinner meeting.

Nominations for the award must be comprehensive in describing the nominee's accomplishments in areas such as innovation in teaching, writing curricula, outside teaching, papers published, involvement in science fairs, and postgraduate study. The application may also include supporting letters, as well as any supporting documents that concisely illuminate the nominee's accomplishments.

To be eligible for the CSW Schubert award, the nominee must currently teach chemistry at a secondary school in the geographic region of the Chemical Society of Washington, which includes metropolitan Washington, D.C. and the neighboring counties in Maryland and Virginia – Arlington, Fairfax and Loudoun Counties in Virginia, and Montgomery, Prince George's, Charles, Calvert and St. Mary's Counties in Maryland. The region of CSW also includes six counties on the Eastern Shore of Maryland – Caroline, Talbot, Dorchester, Wicomico, Worcester and Somerset.

A CSW Schubert Award nomination form is available directly via The Capital Chemist website (<http://www.capitalchemist.org/the-chemical-society-of-washingtons-leo-schubert-memorial-award-2015-nomination-form/>). Alternatively, a pdf version of the nomination form can be obtained by an e-mail request to csw@acs.org. Completed pdf nomination forms can be sent directly to csw@acs.org. All nominations must be submitted by **November 15, 2015**. Please contact Katrice Lippa at katrice.lippa@nist.gov if you have any questions.

Last Chance: Hillebrand Prize Nominations Due 11/2

Nominations are invited for the 2015 Hillebrand Prize, awarded annually for original contributions to the science of chemistry by a member or members of the CSW.

The Hillebrand Prize is the most prestigious honor given each year by CSW and is recognized nationally as a mark of significant accomplishment in chemistry. The Hillebrand Prize originated in 1924 and is named for Dr. William F. Hillebrand (1853- 1925), an internationally recognized pioneer in analytical chemistry and one of Washington's most distinguished early chemists. The prize carries an honorarium of \$2000. Many previous Hillebrand Prize recipients have won numerous other national and international awards, including three who have received the Nobel Prize.

How to nominate:

Nomination packets must include:

- A nomination letter
- The nomination letter must be limited to 1000 words.
- Seconding letters.
- Two seconding letters may be sent, limited to a maximum of 500 words.
- A Curriculum Vitae
- List of publications
- A proposed citation (not more than 25 words)

Continued on next page

Hillebrand, Continued

The nomination package should be submitted by email, preferably as PDF files(s), to csw@acs.org. Nominations will be active for three years.

In accordance with the CSW Standing Rules, both the nominee and the nominator must be current members of CSW, but this restriction does not apply to writers of seconding letters. If you would like to verify the eligibility of an individual as a nominee or nominator, please contact the CSW Administrator at csw@acs.org.

All materials must be received by November 2, 2015. The awardee will be announced before the end of the year, and the Prize will be presented at the CSW dinner meeting in March 2016.

A Reason for Optimism: Proof That Your Vote Counts

By Rebecca Flores, Guest Contributor

More laws that regulate what you eat, drive, and breathe are passed at the state level than the federal level.

Do you know your state legislators? If you are anything like most people, you may know your federal representatives but not your state officials. I decided to research how people vote in state-level elections to see if voters based their choices in these elections on national issues and representatives.

My research, "Divided Federalism and Gubernatorial Elections," looks at the most popular aspects of state politics – the governor and the two major political parties – in order to further study if our federalist system is working. If state elections are simply informed by federal officials and national conditions, then our federalist system would be broken, implying that our state legislators are constantly churning out laws without being held accountable.

Divided federalism is when a state elects a president and a governor of different parties. Many scholars argue that divided federalism is a result of midterm-year elections and negative referendum voting. Negative referendum voting results in people voting for a different party for governor than they did for president two years earlier because they now disapprove of the president. Divided federalism is caused by people becoming disheartened by the president and punishing governors of the president's party. As a political optimist, I disagree: I think that people not only take into account the president when voting for their governor, they also consider gubernatorial candidates and their policy positions.

Framing the Questions

I decided to find out if I was wrong. In order to test whether voters base their gubernatorial election decisions on more than federal officials and national issues, my study looks at presidential-year elections – which scholars have failed to examine. Specifically, I conducted two-part study created using data from the 2008 and 2012 gubernatorial and presidential elections, as well as 2010 and 2012 Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) public opinion data.

The first part is an aggregate-level analysis, which uses the gubernatorial and presidential election results. This analysis looks at the ideology of the state and national parties. The intent is to understand if state parties that diverge ideologically from their national party enjoy more success than their national counterparts within a state. This is important because if states are diverging from the national parties, it shows that people take into account differences between state and federal politics. The implication is that state parties are responding to the ideology of voters, which we want in a functioning democracy.

The second part looks more closely at the governor and how people approve of governors compared to the president. This individual-level analysis sheds light on if people vote for governor based on their perceptions of the president or if people form their own separate opinions of governors.

Continued on next page

A Reason for Optimism, Continued

Where We're Right... And Where We're Wrong

The aggregate-level tests show that divided federalism is not simply – as most scholars argue – based on voters' perceptions of the president. State parties whose issue positions and rhetoric diverged from the national parties, experienced higher levels of electoral success within their states. Therefore, when state parties diverge and distance themselves from their national counterparts they can actually do better in gubernatorial elections than the national party does in the presidential election.

For example, in the graph below, the upward trend shows that in more conservative states, Democratic governors can perform well if they belong to a state party that diverges in a conservative manner. Ideologically conservative states can still elect Democratic gubernatorial candidates, and indeed they do: in states with a conservative ideology, Democratic state party divergence in a conservative direction resulted in a Democratic gubernatorial candidate outperforming presidential candidate Barack Obama by 4.47 points in 2008.

The conclusion is that politicians and state-level parties do not just mirror their national counterparts but also try to align with their state's ideology. These results demonstrate that state party divergence can result in vote difference as voters reward state parties for diverging. This is a significant finding. It runs counter to the common notion that people vote at the state level based on their perceptions of national issues, federal political leaders, and the two major national parties with little regard for state-level politics.

It is clear here that voters base their approval of governors and the president more specifically on the official's ideology and not just on party label. These aggregate findings were also substantiated at the individual level. I found that Democratic governors that diverged in a conservative manner experienced higher levels of approval by the median conservative respondent compared to the president. There was a strong difference between governors who diverged ideologically from the President and those who didn't. Clearly, voters think of a President differently than they think of a governor, and that is reflected in their voting patterns.

Some might argue that approval difference is not caused by ideological divergence between governors and the president but by substantive differences in relevant issues at the national and state levels (e.g. – national vs. state economies, national defense, etc.). As a test case, I did an analysis controlling for state vs. national economies. I found that ideological divergence was the main driver of approval difference as it had a stronger effect on approval difference than the economy. This is a particularly meaningful finding as most **scholars** argue that people **vote based on the economy** above all.

What Does It All Mean?

It is clear here that voters take into account officials' ideologies and not just party label when voting, which is exactly what is needed to maintain a healthy, functioning democracy with a federalist structure.

Neither referendum voting – in which voters base their state election decisions on their views of the president, nor straight-ticket voting – in which people vote based on party label alone, can explain divided federalism. It also seems that the methodology of leading scholarship may be flawed: we can't fully understand how people vote when we just consider off-year elections and specific national issues.

Importantly, it is very clear here that democratic state elections remain important and intact. Voters are rewarding the responsiveness of state parties that align more closely with their state's ideology. This is particularly important because while America has a two party system, state parties and their officials can enjoy electoral success when they move away from the national parties.

The biggest takeaway from all of this is that every individual's vote matters.

State parties and their officials are very clearly influenced and responsive to voters. With any luck, that knowledge could encourage more citizens to take part in the political process. With so much of the **news focusing on intractable gridlock at the federal level**, it could be energizing to demonstrate responsiveness of state governments. The data show that it's possible, if we as citizens will engage.

So go vote. It turns out that it actually can matter... if you make it.

BUSINESS DIRECTORY

SERVICES



Eastern Scientific

www.easternsci.com

781-826-3456

Vacuum Pump Problems?

Eastern Scientific specializes in the repair and precision rebuilding of all makes of mechanical vacuum pumps.

Free pick-up & delivery
Restrictions apply



It's easy to become a CSW
volunteer!

Email csw@acs.org about
upcoming opportunities
today!



SEARCHING FOR THAT SPECIAL JOB?

There are many companies and organizations searching for chemical and biochemical personnel to fill important jobs in their organizations.

- Companies for laboratory and management positions
- Universities & Colleges for teaching positions and laboratory personnel
- Hospitals for technical and research personnel

There are several web sites that may help you search for these open positions.

- www.mboservices.net
- <http://membership.acs.org/W/WashDC/career.html>

NMR Service 500MHz

*Mass

*Elemental Analysis

NuMega Resonance Labs

numegalabs.com P- 858-793-6057

ACS Webinars™

CLICK * WATCH * LEARN * DISCUSS

Learn more and register at
www.acswebinars.org



Micron Analytical Services

COMPLETE MATERIALS CHARACTERIZATION
MORPHOLOGY CHEMISTRY STRUCTURE

SEM/EDXA • EPA/WDXA • XRD XRF • ESCA • AUGER • FTIR • DSC/TGA

Registered with FDA • DEA GMP/GLP Compliant

3815 Lancaster Pike Wilmington DE. 19805 Voice 302-998-1184, Fax 302-998-1836

E-Mail micronanalytical@compuserve.com Web Page: www.micronanalytical.com

The Capital Chemist

A Publication of the Chemical Society of Washington Section of the American Chemical Society

Capital Chemist Staff

Voice: 202-659-2650
Email: thecapitalchemist@gmail.com
Twitter: @CapitalChemist

Editor-in-Chief

Christopher W. Avery, Chair
CSW Publications Committee

Editor, Business Manager

Jessica L. Rasmussen

Publisher

Chemical Society of Washington

Advertising Manager

MBO Services
PO Box 1150, Marshfield, MA 02050
Vince Gale, Advertising Manager
vincegale@mboservices.net
781-837-0424 voice

CSW Correspondence

CSW, 1155 16th Street, NW, 0-218
Washington, DC 20036
202-659-2650 voice
email: csw@acs.org
<http://csw.sites.acs.org>

Claims for missing issues should be sent to CSW at the above address. **Member change of address** should be sent to ACS, PO Box 3337, Columbus, OH 43210; phone 800-333-9511; e-mail: service@acs.org; or edit member profile online at www.acs.org.

GENERAL: The Capital Chemist (ISSN 0411-0080) is published monthly from January to December (except June, July, and August) by the Chemical Society of Washington, 1155 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Subscription price for an electronic subscription is included in all membership fees; mailed paper subscriptions are \$10.00 per year. ISSN 0411-0080

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to The Capital Chemist, 1155 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

CSW assumes no responsibility for the statements and opinions advanced by the editor or contributors to its publication or the products and services advertised herein.

Copyright ©2015, CSW.

The **Chemical Society of Washington (CSW)** is the local ACS Chapter for the Washington, DC area and serves approximately 4,000 members.

2015 Officers

President

Alan Anderson, Bowie State University

President-elect

Dennis Chamot, National Research Council (Retired)

Secretary

Jennifer Young Tanir, ILSI Health and Environmental Sciences Institute

Treasurer

Stefanie Wittenberg, United States Patent and Trademark Office

Connect with us on Facebook at
www.facebook.com/ACSCSW.

CSW Calendar of Events

November

11/2: Deadline for Hillebrand Prize Nominations

11/6: Deadline for NCW Illustrated Poem Contest

11/14: CSW 50- and 60-Year Member Luncheon

11/15: Voting Ends for CSW Election

11/15: Deadline for Gordon and Schubert Award Nominations

11/23: CSW Board of Managers Meeting