Political Parties – Part I

AP Government
“Let me . . . warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally. This spirit...exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their (the governments) worst enemy.”

What is the government’s worst enemy according to George Washington?
In *Democracy in America*, Alexis de Tocqueville distinguished between “great” and “small” political parties.

**Great parties** are “those which cling to principles rather than to their consequences; to general and not to special cases; to ideas and not to men.”

**Small parties** are “generally deficient in political good faith” and lacking in general principle.
Writing in the 1830s, Tocqueville lamented that “America has had great parties, but has them no longer.”

Though Tocqueville lamented the decline of parties from the time of Jefferson and Hamilton to that of Jacksonian America, contemporary scholars view the 1830s and much of the 19th century as the “golden age” of American parties that preceded the significant “decline” of party strength in the 20th century.
Political Party

• An organized group of people who pursue common interests and goals by gaining and exercising power through winning elections
Why Do Political Parties Form?

Political parties seek to control the government by electing their members to office and thus by controlling the personnel of government.

Parties:

- facilitate collective action in the electoral process
- help resolve collective choice in the policy-making process
- regulate career advancement of politicians and thus deal with the potential threat of individual political ambitions
Electoral Politics

• In recent years, more focus on candidates.
• Main problem in modern American politics – political parties have been weakened.
• Political parties today are mainly composed of office seekers.
Political scientists worry about the party decline:

Voters make decisions about *candidates* rather than *parties*

Party control of government becomes *divided* rather than *unified*

Electorate has few opportunities to hold the government accountable and foster modern democracy.
Aspects of Political Parties
Political Parties

According to political scientist V.O. Key, there are three key aspects of political parties:

• party-in-the-electorate
• party-as-organization
• party-in-government
Party-in-the-electorate refers to voters’ attachments to and identifications with political parties.

Preference for a party

- **Party image**
  - A voter’s perception of what Republicans or Democrats stand for
The Party in the Electorate

- **Party identification**
  - A citizen’s self-proclaimed preference for and loyalty to one party or the other
    - Democrat, Republican, or “independent” (neither party) (no membership card needed)
  - High degrees of party identification strongest indicator of how a person will vote
    - Party identification based on the question, “Generally speaking, do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or what?”

Party identification has changed significantly over time and varies by demographic groups.
Party identifications (Democrat, Independent, Republican) serve as the “standing decisions” for voters that are not easily changed.

• Voter attachments to parties has declined in the second half of the 20th century as the number of Independents has increased.
• Party identifiers are less likely to vote a straight party ticket than in the past
• They are more likely to reconsider their “standing decision.”
ANALYZING THE EVIDENCE

In 1952, Democrats outnumbered Republicans nearly two to one. Today, the two parties appear to have nearly equal numbers of loyalists. What factors might account for this partisan transformation?


*Includes independents who report “leaning” toward one of the parties.

FIGURE 11.2 Americans’ Party Identification
FIGURE 11.3 Party Identification by Social Groups (top)
**FIGURE 11.3** Party Identification by Social Groups (bottom)

**EDUCATION**

- Not a high school graduate: 20% Republican, 39% Independent, 41% Democrat
- High school graduate: 28% Republican, 38% Independent, 34% Democrat
- Some college: 32% Republican, 37% Independent, 31% Democrat
- College graduate or postgraduate: 33% Republican, 35% Independent, 32% Democrat

**INCOME**

- Less than $20,000: 18% Republican, 39% Independent, 43% Democrat
- $20,000–29,999: 24% Republican, 39% Independent, 37% Democrat
- $30,000–49,999: 30% Republican, 36% Independent, 34% Democrat
- $50,000–75,000: 35% Republican, 36% Independent, 29% Democrat
- More than $75,000: 39% Republican, 33% Independent, 28% Democrat

**IDEOLOGY**

- Conservative: 51% Republican, 27% Independent, 22% Democrat
- Moderate: 22% Republican, 42% Independent, 36% Democrat
- Liberal: 9% Republican, 41% Independent, 50% Democrat

The Electorate - Trends

• Cuban Americans - Republicans.
• Growing percentage of Hispanic and young voters.
• Differences between men and women - “gender gap”
• Catholics, once staunch Democrats have shifted to Republicans due to the issue of abortion.
• Relatively affluent individuals who work in the public sector or such related institutions as foundations and universities tend to affiliate themselves with Democrats.
Party-as-organization refers to the formal party organizations and processes.

Aspects of political parties that assist and direct candidates seeking to win office in elections.
The Party as an Organization

• Party as an organization
  o has a national office, full time staff, rules, bylaws and a budget
• Maintains a state and local headquarters.
• Includes precinct leaders, state delegates to the national committee, and officials in the Washington office
• Keep the party going between elections and make its rules.
20th century - party-as-organization declined.

• Early in the 20th century, parties lost control over the nomination of candidates as the “direct primary” turned control of nominations over to voters.

• Throughout the century, parties became less active and effective in running campaigns and mobilizing voters as individual candidates’ campaigns became primarily responsible for these activities.
Party-in-government refers to the ability of parties to structure and control the government.
The Party in Government

- Party members actually elected to government
- Which party controls government has policy consequences.
- Coalition: a group of individuals with a common interest upon which every political party depends
- Parties and politicians generally act on their campaign promises.
In America, party-in-government tends to be weak compared to that of other similar democracies.

• Unlike parliamentary systems, in America control of the government can be divided between the two parties, one controlling the Congress and the other the executive.

• In the legislative branch, American parties lack the control over the votes of their members that most parties have in parliamentary systems.
Party Resurgence

In the last decades of the 20th century, there was a resurgence of partisanship in the United States, both in terms of party-as-organization and party-in-government.

Resurgence of Party-as-Organization

• Party organizations have stepped up the campaign and fundraising services they offer their candidates.
• Party organizations provide their candidates with a party image or “brand name” on which they can run.
Resurgence of Party-in-Government

• Partisanship in Congress has been on the rise since the 1980s.
• Party politicians are more likely to view themselves as part of a party “team” than they have in the past.
Party Competition

The notion that parties are “teams” that “market” their brand names to consumers in the electorate leads us to consider how Democrats and Republicans compete to control the government.
CBS Evening News – “Fractured Senate”
November 22, 2011
at 7:15 into broadcast

http://www.cbsnews.com/video/watch/?id=7389301n&tag=contentMain;contentBody
Is Partisanship in Decline?

Since 1948, researchers at the University of Michigan have collected survey data during election years as part of the American National Election Studies (ANES). The purpose of these surveys is to offer systematic explanations of election outcomes through individual-level surveys of ordinary citizens who participate in these elections. Because these data have been collected over an extended period, they have contributed to a much better understanding of changes in voting behavior over time.

Among the survey questions is a measure of how strongly voters and non-voters identify with a particular political party. Rather than using just three broad categories (Democrat, Republican, independent), the ANES uses a seven-point scale to assess partisanship. By separating out "strong" and "weak" partisan identifiers from independent "leaners" and "pure" independents, we gain a more nuanced understanding of trends in partisanship.

![Voter Partisanship (ANES data)](image)

Interestingly, in the ANES data we observe a sizeable decline in the number of strong partisan identifiers beginning in the 1960s and continuing into the 1970s and 1980s. This trend has been documented elsewhere by scholars, who suggest that large segments of the American public have steadily been drifting away from the major parties since the 1950s.¹

But is partisanship really in decline? By 1996, the proportion of citizens strongly identifying with the two major parties was almost as high as it was during the 1950s. When we factor in the proportion of weak identifiers and independent leaners over this entire period, we observe that the aggregate number of Americans identifying with the parties has remained fairly constant since the 1950s, even if the intensity of citizen preferences for the parties has clearly changed over time.


There has not been a marked increase in the number of "pure" independents over this period, suggesting that parties may be as relevant today as they were 50 years ago. The lesson here is how one thinks about the seven-point scale of partisanship affects the types of conclusions one draws about American political behavior.
An Economic Theory of Democracy

- Anthony Downs –
  - Theory of Party competition:
- Most voters tend to be moderates
- Parties move to the center to attract the “median voter.”
- Sometimes parties blur the ideological line between themselves and the opposition.
- Some argue this strategy makes little real difference between Democrats and Republicans.
Institutional factors do encourage parties to *sharpen* rather than *blur* their differences.

- Ideological appeals are more effective than moderation when it comes to fundraising and attracting campaign labor.
- Competing in primary elections means that candidates must appeal not just to the median voter but also to the party base in order to win.
Many political scientists have a strong attachment to political parties.

In the 1940s, E. E. Schattschneider wrote, “Political parties created democracy, and ... democracy is unthinkable save in terms of parties.”

In the 1980s, Morris Fiorina wrote, “The only way collective responsibility has ever existed, and can exist given our institutions, is through the agency of the political party.”
Responsible Party Theory requires:

• The two parties must offer the public a meaningful choice.
• The public must make an informed choice in an election.
• The winning party must implement its program in government.
• The voters decide in the succeeding election whether to reward or punish the party based on its performance.
The Big Tent

• Both major parties are "big tents"
  o Different coalitions exist within party and compete for attention/influence
  o Broad variety of different ideological viewpoints included
  o Designed to attract independent-minded voters
A Guide to the Democratic Herd

The voters of the Republican Party have been fraccionist, with natural leadership vacuums surrounded by arid and unyielding blocs for the patronage, its statesmen. But the G.O.P., in a portrait of unity composed of the Democratic leadership, has been called a collection of different groups. Rather than the dozen real or imagined blocs, it is possible to detect the growing recognition of the importance of the Democratic Party.

How to read this chart:

**Four Broad Coalitions within the Democratic Party**: The blocs are grouped by color.

**Blocks within Coalitions**: Their relative dominance is represented by the size of each individual bloc.

**Major Common Interests**: Blocks are listed where there are blocs to overlap (darker shades). There are only some of the leading areas of agreement; many other common interests are not shown.

**Opinion on War**: A galvanizing issue for the G.O.P., the question is whether the Reagan Democrats tend to support it.

**Fairness Bloc**: Want to see wealth and power spread beyond America.

**Liberal Elite Bloc**: Includes academicians, entrepreneurs, Hollywood stars, magazine moguls, George Soros.

**New Left Coalition**: Smallest coalition, but biggest growth. Helped Nader win the Senate in Connecticut. Young, ideological, and liberal.

**Blue Dog Bloc**: This group includes working class voters who are not living well economically (excluding renegade Reagan Democrats). Pro-labor, union, but not anti-military.

**Yellow Dog Bloc**: Extremely loyal, not fractious. They have kept Nixoms's popularity high and have remained the core of their support.

**Old Line Coalition**: Strongest bloc, dominated by statesmen who have remained loyal and solidly opposed to the New Left or the G.O.P. They support liberal social causes and the green agenda.

**Central Coalition**: Includes ex-Reagan Democrats and a few professional politicians.

**Reagan Democrats**: Bloc more conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Democratic Issues**: Includes economic, social, and cultural issues.

**Left-Wing Bloc**: More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Social Justice Coalition**: Major portion of the Democratic voters, ideological and issue-driven, economic, famous, environmental activists and social tolerance. Often younger, more cosmopolitan and more liberal than those in the Old Line Coalition, except for some minority groups.

---

**Centrist Coalition**

“Blue Dog” moderates note that this bloc's presence predates 1990s' famous red-state political coalition. This bloc, shown here in red, is not closely aligned with the G.O.P. They are largely independent in their belief that the Iraq war was a mistake.

**Competitiveness Bloc**: Also “New Democrats.” Support free trade and market-based growth, opposition to poverty, inequality, corporatism, America is G.K. Socially progressive; small-town, small business, traditional values.

**Blue Dog Bloc**: More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**New Left Bloc**: More liberal on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Left-Wing Bloc**: More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Social Justice Coalition**: A major portion of the Democratic voters, ideological and issue-driven, economic, famous, environmental activists and social tolerance. Often younger, more cosmopolitan and more liberal than those in the Old Line Coalition, except for some minority groups.

---

**Social Justice Coalition**

Major portion of the Democratic voters, ideological and issue-driven, economic, famous, environmental activists and social tolerance. Often younger, more cosmopolitan and more liberal than those in the Old Line Coalition, except for some minority groups.

---

More partisan

Less partisan

Less partisan

More partisan

Generally, the closer a group is to the outer edges of this chart, the more or less loyal it is to the Democratic Party.

---

**Left-Wing Bloc**

More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Democratic Issues**

Includes economic, social, and cultural issues.

**Left-Wing Bloc**: More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Social Justice Coalition**: A major portion of the Democratic voters, ideological and issue-driven, economic, famous, environmental activists and social tolerance. Often younger, more cosmopolitan and more liberal than those in the Old Line Coalition, except for some minority groups.

---

More partisan

Less partisan

Less partisan

More partisan

Generally, the closer a group is to the outer edges of this chart, the more or less loyal it is to the Democratic Party.

---

**Left-Wing Bloc**

More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Democratic Issues**

Includes economic, social, and cultural issues.

**Left-Wing Bloc**: More conservative on cultural issues, working class and populists on economic issues, voters in the South and Midwest.

**Social Justice Coalition**: A major portion of the Democratic voters, ideological and issue-driven, economic, famous, environmental activists and social tolerance. Often younger, more cosmopolitan and more liberal than those in the Old Line Coalition, except for some minority groups.
A Guide to the Republican Herd

HERE is an attempt to portray various philosophical and political factions under the Republicans’ big tent, taking account of the many overlapping concerns that unite them. This is based on the views of various Republican sources, notably Frank Luntz, the Republican pollster, who himself is controversial within his party. Different analysts prefer their own classifications, so there will be a lot here to provoke discussion. BILL MARSH

Cultural Coalition
Politics of domestic cultural issues, spurred by religion or concerns about morals and American decline.

Leave-Us-Alone Coalition
Opponents of big government: some are concerned about privacy, others with spending, and all with taxes.

TRADITIONAL VALUES
This group overlaps with high culture conservatives. Primarily interested in the general decline of morals in society and the breakup of the family rather than abortion and gay marriage. Education is their top issue.
VOTING BLOC: Working and middle classes, suburban and exurban
LEADING SPOKESMAN: William F. Bennett

EDUCATION, ABDON, GAY MARRIAGE

BIBLICAL
Religion drives politics. Allegiance is to causes, not to party unity. For this group, President Bush did not do enough to save Terri Schiavo.
VOTING BLOC: Conservative Christians
LEADING SPOKESMAN: James C. Dobson

SECURITY COALITION
The neoconservatives support military intervention to promote democracy abroad. Paul Wolfowitz has been a leading exponent. The Sept. 11 attacks created another bloc: Rudolph Giuliani is a prominent representative of those who support antiterrorism laws that some Republicans think are too strong.

LES S PARTISAN

LESS PARTISAN

ANTI-WASHINGTON
The largest group. Dislikes regulation, government waste and pork-barrel politics, would move power to the states.
VOTING BLOC: Red-state voters who hate blue-state voters

MAVERICKS
The deficit hawks with independent views. They are not social conservatives. Their hero is John McCain.

OPPOSITION TO DEFICITS, SPENDING

OPPOSITION TO ALL TAXES

OPPOSITION TO ESTATE TAXES, CAPITAL GAINS TAXES AND “MARRIAGE PENALTY”

DECLINE OF AMERICAN VALUES

SCHOOL CHOICE, OPPOSITION TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, GUN CONTROL

LEADING SPOKESMAN: Pat Buchanan
MAGAZINE: American Conservative

TAX CUTTING
Among the most vocal G.O.P. constituencies. Heroes are President Bush and Ronald Reagan.
VOTING BLOC: Wall Street, small and big business, upper middle class
FAVORITE RESEARCH GROUP: Cato Institute

MORE PARTISAN

POLITICAL SECURITY

LIBERAL
SPREADING DEMOCRACY

NEOCONSERVATIVE

PERSONAL SECURITY

PATRICIAN

OLD GUARD COALITION
Republicans like Senator Lincoln Chafee of Rhode Island who inherited their politics. A small, shrinking bloc that is pro-abortion, pro-environment and often at war with tax cutters.
Political Party Functions
Shape of Party Organizations

• For every district where an election is held, there should be some kind of party unit.
• Each organization tends to be unique to the region as to their politics and stances on issues.
• Political parties today are permanent coalitions of individuals with shared interests who support one another.
Party Activists

Drawn from the ranks of the strong identifiers, the voters who contribute time, energy, effort to party affairs by ringing doorbells, stuffing envelopes, attending meetings, and contributing money to the party cause are party activists.
One of the most important functions

Political parties perform multiple functions to accomplish these aims.

Parties:
- recruit candidates
- nominate candidates
- work to get out the vote
- facilitate mass electoral choice
- influence and coordinate the activities of the national government
Ideal Candidates

• Unblemished record.
• Ability to raise enough money for a serious run for office.
• Senate seat – several million dollars.
• House seat – several hundred thousand dollars.
The Party Organizations: From the Grass Roots to Washington

• **The 50 State Party Systems**
  o Closed primaries: Only people who have registered with the party can vote for that party’s candidates.
  o Open primaries: Voters decide on Election Day whether they want to vote in the Democrat or Republican primary.
  o Blanket: voters have a list of candidates (from both parties) and can pick some from either party.
Nominating Candidates

• Nomination – Process by which a party selects a candidate.
  – Nomination by Convention
  – Nomination by Primary Election
    • Dominate method
    • Closed Primary – previously declared party affiliation
    • Open Primary – party affiliation declared day of primary
Results are reported to county board of elections and secretary of state. Ballots are printed and election is administered at government expense.

**Traditional Route**
- Convention or caucus: Delegates vote for candidates or party.

**Primary Route**
- Primary election: Enrolled voters choose by secret ballot among two or more designated candidates.

**Independent Route**
- Petition is filed, with a minimum number of signatures, as provided by law.
- Declaration for party’s support: Informal designation is the result of a following among committee members and delegates.
- Formal designation: Petition is filed, with a minimum number of signatures, as provided by law.
- Self-declaration or support by small “independent” party.

**FIGURE 11.1 Types of Nominating Processes**
Electoral Process

• First step – voter registration
• Civic groups such as League of Women Voters, unions, and chambers of commerce.
• Political parties still do some but have clearly declined in importance in this way.
Party Appeal

• Democrats
  – Organized labor
  – The poor
  – Members of racial minorities
  – Liberal upper-middle class professionals

• Republicans
  – Business
  – Upper middle and upper class groups of the private sector
  – Social conservatives
Voting Rights Act of 1965

• African American voting grew in the South for the next two decades.
• Republicans began offering southern whites alternatives to the Democrats.
• Began to see an end to conservative Democrats and moderate Republicans.
• Today, area of greatest Republican party strength is the South.
Political Parties - Part II

AP Government
History of Political Parties

AP Government
The formation of political parties was a development unanticipated by the framers of the Constitution.

• Framers such as Hamilton, Washington, and Jefferson regarded parties as divisive and potentially detrimental to the republic.

• Despite their antipathy toward parties, deep divisions over the future of the republic led Hamilton and Jefferson to lead the formation of the first American parties.
The Two-Party System

Though the framers of the Constitution did not anticipate nor want parties, America has a stable two-party system that first emerged in the late 18th century as a conflict between Federalists (led by Alexander Hamilton) and the Democratic-Republicans (led by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Democrats</strong></th>
<th><strong>Republicans</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The modern Democratic party emerged out of the party established by Thomas Jefferson in the late 18th century and revitalized by Andrew Jackson in the 1820s.</td>
<td>The modern Republican party emerged in the 1850s as an antislavery party out of the remnants of the Whig party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Two Party System

• First parties, Federalists vs. Democratic-Republicans

• Federalists
  – Northeastern mercantile, New England states
  – Led by Alexander Hamilton
  – Protective tariffs, assumption of state revolutionary debt, national bank, commercial ties with England
  – Disappeared after pro-British sympathies during War of 1812

• Democratic-Republicans
  – Southern agrarian factions, Southern states
  – Led by Thomas Jefferson, James Madison
  – Free trade, agrarian over commercial interests, friendship with France
Second Party System

• One political party after end of Federalists
• “Era of Good Feelings”
• More voters entered system with dropping of property requirement.
• Jackson and Van Buren developed party organizations at the state and national levels to help them get elected.
• Opposition party, the Whigs, grew during the 1830’s and 1840’s.
• 1840, Whig candidate William Henry Harrison, “Old Tippecanoe” was elected president.
Second Party System (cont.)

• 1840 election – made use of food and drink to elicit electoral favor. “Hard cider” campaign.

• The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1850’s gave rise to the Republican party
  – Coalition of Former Whigs, Know-Nothings, Free-Soilers, and antislavery activists

• Republicans – commercial and antislavery interests.

• 1860 – First Republican president, Abraham Lincoln
Third Party System

- From Civil War to Great Depression, Republicans were dominant party

- Growth of
  - Party Machines
    - Patronage of spoils system – government jobs
    - Tammany Hall – George Washington Plunkitt considered them “patriotic”

- Progressive Reforms
  - Reaction to Party machines
  - Voter registration, Australian ballot, non-partisan local elections.
Fourth Party System

• 1890’s – Rapid social and economic growth led to protest parties

• Populist party
  – Supported in South and West
  – 1892 election – carried 4 states
  – 1896 election – Democrats adopted Populist party platform – nominated William Jennings Bryan, lost

• Republicans won election and Republicans dominated the next 36 years in politics.

• Era of low taxes, high tariffs, minimum government regulation.
Fifth Party System

• Following the Great Depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt ushered in the New Deal and Democratic control.

• FDR built a party around a nucleus of
  – unionized workers, upper-middle class intellectuals & professionals, southern farmers, Jews, Catholics, and northern blacks.

• Strains in 1960’s due to civil rights, the Great Society, Vietnam
Sixth Party System

• 1964, Conservative Republicans sought to retake the political discourse.
  – Reducing taxes, less government spending and regulation, eliminate many federal programs.

• 1968 – Richard Nixon and the “Southern Strategy”
  – appealing to disaffected white southerners. Independent George Wallace helped.

• 1980 – Ronald Regan and religious conservatives formed a coalition.

• 2000 – George W. Bush won with less popular vote.
Although electoral realignments represent a shift in the balance of power *between* the two political parties and involve significant changes in American politics, America’s two-party system has proven remarkably stable over time.
At various points in American history, a new party supplants the ruling party becoming in turn the dominant political force; scholars call these enduring changes in party strength **electoral realignments**.

**Realignments tend to involve:**

- a large number of voters changing their party allegiance
- a great deal of voter participation in an election
- a stable change in the party controlling the government
Realignments:

1800 → Democratic Republicans dominate

1828 → Jacksonian Democrats “democratize” American politics

1860 → The emergence of Republicans (and their victory in the Civil War) yields to post-Reconstruction competitive balance between Democrats and Republicans
1896 → Republicans reassert their dominance

1932 → Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal produce an extraordinary era of Democratic dominance

1968 → Richard Nixon’s victory and the demise of the Democrats’ “Solid South” produces a highly competitive era of divided party control of government
FIGURE 11.4 How the Party System Evolved (top)
*In some cases, there was even a fourth party. Most of these parties listed here existed for only one term.

†The Anti-Masonics not only had the distinction of being the first third party but also were the first party to hold a national nominating convention and the first to announce a party platform.

**FIGURE 11.4 How the Party System Evolved** (bottom)
Party Eras in American History

• **Party Eras**
  - Historical periods in which one political party dominates/gains majority of support

• **Critical Election**
  - An election that changes the support a political party gets and helps end a party era
  - Also called realigning election

• **Party Realignment**
  - The removal of the majority party by the minority party, usually the result of a critical election
Party Eras in American History

• 1796-1824: The First Party System
  o Madison warned of “factions”
  o Federalists: first political party

• 1828-1856: Jackson and the Democrats Versus the Whigs
  o Modern party founded by Jackson
  o Whigs formed mainly to oppose Jacksonian Democrats
Party Eras in American History

• **1860-1928: The Two Republican Eras**
  o Republicans rose as the antislavery party
  o 1896 election centered on industrialization

• **1932-1964: The New Deal Coalition**
  o New Deal coalition: forged by the Democrats; consisted of urban working class, ethnic groups, Catholics, Jews, the poor, Southerners
Party Eras in American History

**Figure 8.3**
Party Coalitions Today
The two parties continue to draw support from very different social groups, many of which have existed since the New Deal era. This figure shows the percentage identifying as Democrats and Republicans for various groups in 2008.

- African American
- Hispanic
- Jewish
- White Catholic
- White Evangelical
- Income below $20,000
- Income above $100,000
- Labor Union Household
- Female
- Male

Source: Authors’ analysis of Pew Research Center polls conducted in January and February 2008.
Party Eras in American History

• 1968-Present: The Era of Divided Party Government
  o Divided government: one party controls Congress and the other controls White House
  o Divided government due in party to:
    ▪ Party dealignment: disengagement of people from parties as evidenced by shrinking party identification
    ▪ Party neutrality: people are indifferent towards the two parties
# Party Eras in American History

## Table 8.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vote</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of unemployment benefits</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution praising the Iraq War</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation spending</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting discretionary federal spending</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits on federal search powers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification cards for Mexican workers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending tax cuts</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay marriage prohibition</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate tax overhaul</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence gathering overhaul</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Party Eras in American History

Partisan Control of State Governments, 2009

- Blue: Democratic control
- Red: Republican control
- Purple: Divided party control
- Light yellow: Unclassifiable
Party Dealignment

• Dealignment
  o Voters moving away from two major political parties
  o Identifying themselves as independent
  o Increase in split-ticket voting

• Ticket-splitting
  o Voting with one party for one office and with another party for other offices
  o Independents are most likely to split tickets.
  o No state or race is completely safe due to split tickets.
Party Dealignment

**Figure 8.2**


*In percentage of people; the small percentage who identify with a minor party or who cannot answer the question are excluded.*

Table 8.1   Party Identification in the United States, 1952–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DEMOCRATS</th>
<th>INDEPENDENTS</th>
<th>REPUBLICANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In percentage of people; the small percentage who identify with a minor party or who cannot answer the question are excluded.

Third Parties
Periods of social flux, economic crisis, and uncertainty that the two main parties fail to address tend to produce a proliferation of third parties.
Third parties tend to compete (if weakly) against the two major parties in America, as they did in 2004.

On occasion, third-party candidates can have a great deal of influence over ideas and electoral outcomes.
Third Parties: Their Impact on American Politics

- Third parties: electoral contenders other than the two party parties; rarely win elections
- Third parties are important.
  - Are “safety valves” for popular discontent
  - Bring new groups and ideas into politics
- Two-party system
  - Discourages extreme views
  - Contributes to political ambiguity
Third Parties: Their Impact on American Politics

• Multiparty Systems in Other Countries
  o Winner-take-all system: legislative seats awarded only to first place finishers
  o Proportional Representation: legislative seats awarded based on votes received by the party - more votes, more seats
  o Coalition Government: two or more parties join to form a majority in a national legislature
Barriers to Third Party Success

- Wasted vote?
- Attract good candidates?
- Getting on the ballot very difficult
- Lack of widespread organization
Why do we have only two major political parties?

- Winner take all system!
- Minor parties give up and merge into the big parties
Influence of third parties

- Ross Perot 1992 Third Party candidate
  - 19% of the vote
  - Influenced the debate (NAFTA, free trade, and budget deficits)
  - Pulled votes from both Bush and Clinton

- Ralph Nader ran in 2000 and 2004
  - 3% of the vote
  - Pulled votes from Gore
  - Cost him the election????
Third parties tend to be short-lived because
– One of the two major parties adopts their issues
– The single-member plurality electoral system limits their opportunities for electoral success
– The periods of flux, the crises, and the uncertainties that produce them subside or are addressed by public policies.

Vote % for presidential candidates of US third-parties 1892-2004. Note vertical axis is logarithmic.
The Emergence of Third Parties – 1790s to 1990s


Note: Indicates number of major third parties that emerged in each decade.
Populist Party

- The party of the late 19th century found their political base primarily in rural areas of the Midwest.
- In the U. S., third parties are usually influential for only a short time because their ideas are usually absorbed by one of the major parties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>VOTE%</th>
<th>ELECTORAL VOTE</th>
<th>OUTCOME in Next Election</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Anti-Masonic</td>
<td>William Wirt</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Endorsed Whig Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Free Soil</td>
<td>Martin Van Buren</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5% of the vote, absorbed by Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Whig-American</td>
<td>Millard Fillmore</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Southern Democrat</td>
<td>John C. Breckinridge</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Constitutional Union</td>
<td>John Bell</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Populist</td>
<td>James B. Weaver</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Absorbed by Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Teddy Roosevelt</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Returned to Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>Eugene V. Debs</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Won 3% of the vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Robert M. LaFollette</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Returned to Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>States' Rights</td>
<td>Strom Thurmond</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Henry Wallace</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Won 1.4% of the vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>George Wallace</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Won 1.4% of the vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>John Anderson</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dissolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>H. Ross Perot</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Won 8.4% of the vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>H. Ross Perot</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did not run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>Ralph Nader</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ran Next election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Ralph Nader</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third Party Candidate

• In the last half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, candidate with most electoral votes polled by a third party candidate was by George Wallace.

• Polled nearly 10 million votes and 45 electoral votes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>60,693,281</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kerry</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>57,355,978</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Nader</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>407,992</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Badnarik</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>390,542</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. Peroutka</td>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>135,681</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cobb</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>113,318</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Peltier</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>25,101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter F. Brown</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>10,285</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Harris</td>
<td>Socialist Workers</td>
<td>6,984</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYZING THE EVIDENCE**

Though the Democrats and the Republicans are America’s dominant political forces, many minor parties nominate candidates for the presidency. Why are there so many minor parties? Why don’t these parties represent much of a threat to the major parties?

*TABLE 11.1 Parties and Candidates, 2004*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Calero</td>
<td>Socialist Workers</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Harens</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Van Auken</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Amondson</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parker</td>
<td>Liberty Union</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Jay</td>
<td>Personal Choice</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford “Andy” E. Andress</td>
<td>[Unaffiliated]</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl F. Dodge</td>
<td>Prohibition</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Caucus

• Political organizations are usually committees made up of a number of active party members.

• Local party meetings are often referred to as political caucuses.
National Conventions

• Perform the following functions
  – Nominate the party’s presidential and vice presidential candidates
  – Establish party rules
  – Draft the party’s platform for the presidential race
Democratic National Convention

• Former presidential candidate Howard Dean was made chairman of the national committee in 2006.
Federal Election Law

• State and local party organizations are permitted by law to spend unlimited amounts of money on “party building” activities that includes voter registration.
Fundraising Activities

• The Democrats have been slower to coordinate fundraising activities between all of its committees.
Political Parties

• Some political scientists claim that political parties have evolved into service organizations.
• Candidates receive services from the party that without them, it would be very difficult for candidates to win or hold public office.
Candidates

• Because of the rise in candidate-centered politics, party labels stand for nothing.
• Candidates have considerable independence and often chart an independent political course.
• Candidates benefit though if they maintain an unblemished party label.
Multi-member District

- Under the European multi-member district system with proportional-representation rules, a candidate may need to win only 15 to 20% of the vote to gain a seat.
- Better chance for third party candidates to gain entry into the government under this system.
- The American system of a single-member district is more difficult for a third party candidate.
Television

• Presidential election of 1964 showed the effectiveness of broadcast media.
• Using a 30 or 60 second television spot advertisement, these ads could send an unforgettable message.
• George Bush’s “Willie Horton” ad in 1988
• Lyndon Johnson’s “Daisy Girl” ad of 1964
Conservative Voters

• The *National Review* is a conservative newspaper.

• The *New York Times* or *The New Republic* are liberal newspapers.

• Subscription lists for these papers are used for direct mail appeals by fund raising political organizations.
Jeb Bush

• The Internet has been used increasingly by political candidates to get their message out, solicit funds, and establish a web presence.
• Jeb Bush sold clothing through his website while running for governor.
• Articles of clothing “Jebwear”
Summary

• Parties are a pervasive linkage institution in American politics.
  o Party in electorate, government, and as organization
• America has a two-party system.
• The decentralized nature of political parties makes major change difficult and encourages individualism in politics.