

-
- 0. Untitled introduction
 - A. Comparative political party systems at the national level
 - 1. One-party – Mexico for a long period; U.S. during Era of Good Feeling
 - 2. Two-party with minor parties & independent candidates – U.S. & U.K.
 - 3. Multi-party – much of the rest of the world’s representative democracies
 - B. Comparative political party systems at the state level in the U.S.
 - I. The national party system
 - A. Competitiveness at the national level, 1860-2004 T 2.1, p. 27
 - 1. Presidential elections
 - a. Great variation by era
 - (1) 1860-1892:
 - (a) The only 2 Republican landslides (victory margin $\geq 10\%$) came during the Civil War and Reconstruction – 1864 & ‘72
 - (b) After the end of Reconstruction in 1876 all 5 were competitive (victory margin $< 10\%$);
 - (2) 1896-1928: most (5/9) were Republican landslides – 1904, ‘08, ‘20, ‘24, ‘28
 - (3) 1932-1964: most were landslides (5/9)
 - (a) 3 Democratic – 1932, ‘36, ‘64
 - (b) 2 Republican – 1952 & ‘56 – but unlike FDR, Ike didn’t have strong coattails
 - (4) 1968-2000: most were competitive (7/9) – 2 were Republican landslides ‘72, ‘84
 - (5) 2004: smallest victory margin by an incumbent president
 - b. Some of closest in history have come in post-WWII era: 1960, 2000, 2004
 - c. The last presidential-election landslide was in 1984
 - d. Great variation by region
 - 2. House elections
 - a. Do not always reflect presidential outcomes
 - b. Usually more competitive (nationwide) than presidential outcomes
 - c. Increasingly less competitive in individual races because of rise of safe seats through redistricting
 - d. Great variation by region
 - II. The fifty American party systems
 - A. Measuring state party competition
 - 1. Measure: Ranney index
 - 2. Findings
 - a. 1945-1997
 - (1) More states lean Democratic
 - (2) More polarization – several one-party states for both parties – southern Democrats & northeastern & midwestern Republicans
 - b. 1999-2003
 - (1) More states lean Republican – especially since 1994 election
 - (2) Less polarization – no one-party states F 2.1, p. 29
 - B. Limits on competitiveness – incumbency in House races
 - 1. More than 3/4s of House seats are “safe” (victory margin $\geq 60\%$)
 - 2. This trend is growing with many safe seats uncontested
 - 3. Advantages of incumbency:
 - a. Name/media recognition
 - b. Casework
 - c. Fund raising
 - C. Other reasons for declining competitiveness
 - 1. Use of computers in redistricting
 - 2. Residential mobility leading to more homogeneous district populations – “voluntary political segregation”
 - 3. Consequence of less competitiveness in House races – less responsiveness to disadvantaged voters

- III. What causes a two-party system
- A. Institutional forces
1. Type of elections (Maurice Duverger) Box, p. 32
 - a. Single-member districts w/ plurality winners --> two-party systems
 - b. Multi-member districts w/ proportional winners --> multi-party systems
 2. Type of governments
 - a. Presidential (directly elected chief executive)
 - b. Parliamentary (legislative-elected chief executive)
 3. Direct primary in one-party regions (Leon Epstein)
 4. Co-optation and absorption of protest movements by open parties
- B. Social consensus theories
1. Duality of interests (V. O. Key, Jr.): [coast v. frontier; free v. slave; urban v. rural; have v. have-not] leads to a 2-party format
 2. Social/economic/geographic mobility (Frederick Jackson Turner) provides a safety valve
 3. Social pluralism v. feudal class system (James Madison) supports bargaining and compromise
 4. Democratic child rearing (Theodor Adorno) leads to democratic personalities
- C. Party self-protection: in controlling redistricting, ballot access, and campaign finance

- IV. Exceptions to the two-party pattern
- A. Nonpartisan elections
1. Where and when: since Progressive Era
 - a. Some local elections
 - b. Nebraska state elections
 2. Consequences
 - a. Increase Republican and incumbent success
 - b. Reduce turnout
- B. Pockets of one-party monopoly – local and regional
- C. Third parties Box, p. 39; T 2.2, p. 38
1. Differences in
 - a. Impact
 - (1) Seven carried at least one state
 - (a) 1832: Wirt, Anti-Masonic
 - (b) 1856: Fillmore, American (Know-Nothing)
 - (c) 1892: Weaver, People's (Populist)
 - (d) 1912: T. Roosevelt, Progressive (Bull Moose) – only one to run ahead of one of the major party candidates in either popular or electoral votes
 - (e) 1924: LaFollette, Progressive
 - (f) 1948: Thurmond, State's Rights (Dixiecrat)
 - (g) 1968: G. Wallace, American Independent
 - (2) Won at least 10 percent of popular vote
 - (a) 1856: American (Know-Nothing) -- 22%
 - (b) 1912: Progressive (Bull Moose) -- 27%
 - (c) 1924: Progressive -- 17%
 - (d) 1968: American Independent -- 14%
 - (e) 1992: Perot -- 19% (1996 = 8%)
 2. Types
 - a. Spoiler: Nader's vote total exceeded Bush's margin over Gore in Florida in 2000
 - b. Single-issue: slavery – Liberty & Free Soil; Prohibition; Right to Life
 - c. Ideological: Communist; Libertarian
 - d. Economic/social reform: Greenback; Granger; Populist; Progressive
 - e. Splinter: Gold Democrats; Bull Moose Progressives; Dixiecrats
- D. The rise of independent candidates
1. 1992: Perot
 2. 2004: Nader

- V. Will the two-party system continue?
- A. Yes, it is secure in the U.S. F 22, p. 43
- B. Major-party competitiveness
1. Increasing competitiveness at the national level
 - a. Presidential contests
 - b. Congressional seat totals
 2. Decreasing competitiveness in individual congressional and state races in many parts of the nation