

- I. Introduction: the discontent with American parties
 - A. Two sets of critics
 - 1. Advocates of “responsible party government”
 - 2. Advocates of ideological parties
 - B. Ideological polarization of parties since 1960s
- II. The case for responsible party government
 - A. Goals
 - 1. Strong and decisive government
 - a. Liberal goal:
 - b. Conservative goal:
 - 2. Simplify the electoral choices:
 - B. How would party government (responsible parties) work?
 - 1. Clear and coherent (and conflicting) party electoral platforms:
 - 2. Candidates:
 - 3. Campaigns:
 - 4. Programmatic policy making to enact electoral mandate:
 - 5. Control of both elected branches:
 - C. The case against party government
 - 1. It would increase conflict
 - a. Rigid and dogmatic politics
 - b. Limits on representation of diverse interests
 - c. Undercut or destroy interest groups and other nonparty organizations
 - d. Splintering of the two-party system
 - 2. It wouldn’t work in American politics
 - a. Constitutional barriers
 - (1) Division of powers and representation
 - (2) Separation of powers and representation
 - (3) Sharing of overlapping powers
 - b. Statutory barriers
 - (1) Direct primary
 - (2) Campaign finance
 - c. Social barriers
 - (1) Voter ignorance, disinterest, and distrust
 - (2) Issue complexity
 - D. The Gingrich experiment: a temporarily responsible party
 - 1. Changed institutional arrangements
 - 2. Increased organizational discipline
 - 3. Increased ideological cohesion
- III. Party cohesion and ideology (the semi-responsible parties)
 - A. Are the American parties ideological?
 - 1. Pragmatic
 - 2. Brokerage function
 - B. Do they at least offer clear choices?
 - 1. Divisive issues:
 - 2. Attractive leaders with a simple message, such as Ronald Reagan:
 - C. But internal divisions remain
 - 1. Economic v. social conservatives
 - 2. Moderate v. extreme liberals

IV. Ideology and the American voter

A. How ideological is the American public?

1. Media answer:
2. Academic answer
 - a. Issue consistency:
 - b. Issue voting vs. results-oriented retrospective voting:
3. The dilemma of ideology:
4. Differences by social class:

B. Differences among activists, candidates, and voters Figure 15.1, p. 298 & Figure 15.2, p. 299

1. Differences among the party's three parts
2. Regional differences
3. Striking the right ideological balance:

V. When is party government most likely? pp. 300-02

A. When there is strong presidential leadership:

B. In times of crisis:

C. When the parties' supporting coalitions realign:

1. Single line of partisan cleavage
2. Greatest intra-party cohesion
3. Greatest inter-party polarization
4. One-party control of both elected branches at federal level (and the federal judiciary by appointments) and a majority of state governments:
5. But, not as much ideological purity and policy cohesion as in European parliamentary democracies:

D. Barriers to party responsibility: divided government

1. Definition:
2. Historical patterns
 - a. Prior to WWII:
 - b. Since WWII: Table 15.1, p. 298
3. Causes
 - a. Weakening of party identification:
 - b. Increased careerism in Congress
 - c. Separation and division of governmental powers
 - d. Insulation of legislative from executive elections
 - e. Proliferation of single-issue groups
 - f. Loss of control of electoral politics
 - (1) Nomination
 - (2) Campaign funding
4. Consequences:
 - a. Increased of partisan conflict
 - b. Increased policy gridlock
 - c. Increased political distrust & cynicism in electorate
 - d. Decreased political efficacy in electorate
 - e. Decreased popular sovereignty

VI. Party government and popular control