## Political Parties Wilson chapter 7

Parties				
	seeks to elect candidates to public	office by supplying them	n with a label (	
	), by which they are known to			
Arenas in which Parties Ex	xist			
•, in	the minds of the voters			
•	, recruiting and campaigni	ng for candidates		
• Set of	, organize and try to cont	rol the legislative and exe	cutive branches	
Parties Weaker in all 3 Are	enas			
• As label, because there	are more independents and more		voting	
<ul> <li>As set of leaders, thought</li> </ul>	th, parties are still somewhat stron	ng		
• As organization, partie	s have become weaker since	s		
U.S., European Parties Dif				
<ul> <li>European parties are direcently</li> </ul>	sciplined	, to which voter	es are very loyal, though this	has been declining
	powe	er in II S		
	most important government		were made by the state an	d local governments
	ost of the political jobs were		were made by the state an	a rocar go verminemes,
	ere then	of local parties		
	became more centralized, parties	=	tralized and weaker	
713 political power	occume more contrainzed, parties	became even more decem	tranzed and weaker	
U.S., European Parties Dit	ferent 2 by st	d f. d 1 1	ah aarahan dham	
	osen through by si			
				4
from many sources	from	m Congress and president	1a1	are drawn
from many sources				
Political Culture				
		in life; Americans do not	join or pay dues to a political	al party
<ul> <li>Political parties are sep</li> </ul>	arate from other aspects of life			
Rise & Decline of Politica	l Parties			
	(to 1820s)			
• The	(until Civil V	War)		
• The	and Sectionalism (until	1930s)		
• The Era of				
The Founding 1				
• Founders' disliked part	ies, viewing them as	<del></del>		
• For parties to be accept	able, people had to be able to dist	tinguish between policy di	isputes and challenges to the	2
	of government			
The Founding 2				
	, Federalists	: Jefferson vs		
<ul> <li>Loose caucuses of</li> </ul>				

- Republicans' \_\_\_\_\_\_ (Jefferson, Madison, Monroe) and Federalists' demise

— Reflection of the newness of parties is seen in the	of this sy	ystem
The Founding 3		
No representation of	economic interests—partie	es were always heterogeneous
coalitions		, .
The Jacksonians (to Civil War)		
Political participation became a phenomenous	n	
─ More voters to be reached – by 1832, presidential elect	ors selected by	vote in most states
<ul> <li>Party built from bottom up</li> </ul>		
Abandonment of presidential	composed of Congress member	ers
Beginning of national party conventions, allowing	control	
The Civil War and Sectionalism 1		
Jacksonian system unable to survive	and sectionalism	
• New Republicans became dominant because of		
Civil War—Republicans relied on Union		
—'s alienation of northern Democrats in	1896, deepening sectionalism	
The Civil War and Sectionalism 2		
<ul> <li>Most states were dominated byparty</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Factions emerge in each party</li> </ul>		
• Republicans with poli	ticians (Old Guard) and progress	sives ()
<ul> <li>Progressives initially shifted between parties to gai</li> </ul>	n power, but then began attacking	g partisanship when the Republicans
became dominant		
The Era of Reform 1		
beginning ins, but primarily since		
Progressives pushed measures to curtail parties' power and	influence	
elections favored, to replace		
elections at city and (s	_	
<ul> <li>No party-business alliances, on the grounds that they w</li> </ul>	*	
<ul> <li>Strict voter registration requirements in order to reduce</li> </ul>		
Civil service reform in order to eliminate		
– and		ectly on proposed legislation
The Era of Reform 2		
• Effects:		
Reduced the worst forms of political		
Weakened all political parties		
• parties became less able to hold officeholders		or to coordinate across the branche
of government		
National Party Structure Today		
• Parties on Paper		
• Party structure in late 1	960s and early 1970s	
National		
Parties Similar on Paper		
National convention has pow	ver: meets everv	ears to nominate the presidential
candidate	,	The problem in

	is composed of delegates from states
— manages affairs b	
	ign committees support the party's congressional candidates
National chair manage	es daily work
Party Structure Diverged	
- in late 60s & early 70s	
RNC moved to	structure; a well-financed party devoted to electing its candidates, especially
to Congress	
• Democrats moved to	structure and redistributed power
• RNC used	mailing lists to raise money
• learned from	
<ul> <li>adopted the same</li> </ul>	techniques, with some success
<ul> <li>DNC and RNC send in</li> </ul>	money to state parties
<ul> <li>to sidestep federal</li> </ul>	l spending limits ()
National Conventions 1	
<ul> <li>National committee se</li> </ul>	ets time and place
• Formulas are used to	
	ula shifts delegates away from the, to the North and West
	nula shifts delegates away from the East, to the South and
	s move, Republicans
National Conventions 2	
<ul> <li>Democrat formula rev</li> </ul>	wards states; while the Republican formula rewards states
<ul> <li>Democrats set new ru</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>In 1970s (under C</li> </ul>	George
proportions of wo	omen, youth, blacks, and Native Americans attending the convention
<ul> <li>Hunt Commission</li> </ul>	n in 1981 increased the influence of elected officials and made the convention more
<del></del>	
National Conventions 3	
	ms: parties represent different sets of upper-middle-class voters
	esent middle class—more conservative
<ul> <li>Democrats represent</li> </ul>	ent class—more liberal
National Conventions 4	
• To become more com	npetitive, Democrats adopted additional rule changes
<ul> <li>In 1988, the number</li> </ul>	per of was increased while the status of some special interest
caucuses was deci	reased
- In 1992, three rule	es were set
<ul> <li>Winner-rewar</li> </ul>	rd system of delegate distribution banned – this had previously given the winner of primaries and caucuses
extra delegate	vs
	representation implemented
• States that vio	plated the rules were penalized with the loss of convention delegates
National Conventions 5	
	nly choices made in primary season
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	,,

State and Local Parties	
State-Level	
The	
Parties	
Groups	
Sponsored Parties	
Personal Following	
State-Level Structure	
State committee	
committees	
Various local committees	
Distribution of power varies with the state, as different incentives are a	ıt work
Γexas Party Structure 1	
Executive Committee	
<ul><li>composition</li></ul>	
• 1 man & 1 woman from each	district
• chair and vice-chair	
<ul><li>responsibilities</li><li>establish party</li></ul>	
statewide election	
<ul><li>statewide election</li><li> convention</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>fundraising</li> </ul>	
• candidate	
<ul><li>promotion of candidates</li><li>voter</li></ul>	
• political organization	
Γexas Party Structure 2	
District Executive Committee	
<ul><li>composition</li></ul>	
• elected at S.D. convention	
— responsibilities	
• filling vacancies	
Γexas Party Structure 3	
Executive Committee 1	
— composition	
• precinct of each precinct	
• county chair	
<ul><li>– elected every 2 years</li></ul>	
<ul><li>in primary election</li></ul>	
Γexas Party Structure 4	
•	
- responsibilities of County Executive Committee	
• oversees the conduct of the elections,	
establishes general policy,     conducts fund raining activities	
<ul><li>conducts fund-raising activities,</li><li>fills Precinct vacancies,</li></ul>	
promotes the party's nominees in the general election,	
coordinates activities and	
•voter turnout on behalf of	the narty's candidates
voici turnout on ochian or	are party a candidates

Texas Party Structure 5		
• Precinct		
<ul><li>Precinct Chair</li></ul>		
<ul><li>elected every years</li></ul>		
• in primary election	TV	
	[Your teacher was the youngest (18) precinct chairman in _	County history.]
_ "		
- serves on		
- serves as Precinct		
• runs	election election if party is majority in the county	
Tuns	election if party is majority in the county	
The Machine 1		
	recruits members via tangible	(money jobs political favors)
High degree of leadership		(money, joos, pointeur lavors)
were extended and the second description of the second descriptio		
WCIC CXU	s – voter registration, civil service, Act	(1020)
	_	
Machines continued until voter	demographics and federal programs changed, decreasing the	need for the parties' resources
m		
The Machine 2		
	d public	
	l machine (regarding campaign	) and today's ideological party
traits (regarding	)	
Ideological Parties 1		
<ul> <li>Extreme opposite to machine</li> </ul>		
•is 1	nore important than winning election, so ideological parties	are contentious and factionalized
• Usually outside Democratic and Re	publican parties—" parties"	
• But there were some local reform cl	ubs in 1950s and 1960s	
• Reform clubs have generally been re	eplaced by more focused social movements, which advance s	specific demands
ζ ,		
Ideological Parties 2		
	m club" of the national party, but today's social movements p	perform that function
	is therefore more intense	Serioriii tilat railetion
<ul> <li>Party leaders have less freedom</li> </ul>	<del></del>	
Tarty leaders have less needon		
Solidary Groups		
• •	incentives ()	
• Advantage: neither corrupt nor infle		
<ul> <li>Disadvantage: not very hard working</li> </ul>	g	
Sponsored Parties		
• Created or sustained by another org		
	eveloped and led by the United Auto Workers ()	union
• Not very common in U.S.		
Personal Following		
• Requires an appealing	, an extensive	,
recognition, and money		
• Examples: Kennedys (MA), Talmac	lges (GA), Longs (LA), Byrds (VA)	

• Rarity among nations today
• Evenly balanced nationally, but not
• Why has the two party system endured for so long?
- Electoral system
•take-all and
• system limit the number of parties
<ul> <li>Opinions of voters</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>two broad coalitions work, although there may be times of bitter dissent</li> </ul>
State laws have made it very difficult for third parties to get on the
Minor Dorting 1
Minor Parties 1
• parties
- comprehensive, radical view;
- most enduring
- Examples: Socialist, Communist, Libertarian
• One parties
<ul> <li>address one concern, avoid others</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Examples: Free Soil, Know-Nothing, Prohibition</li> </ul>
• Economic parties
<ul> <li>regional, protest economic conditions</li> </ul>
- Examples: Greenback, Populist
Minor Parties 2
• parties
- from split in a major party, usually over the party's presidential nominee
- Examples: Bull Moose, Henry Wallace, American Independent Party
• Note that movements are not producing parties, either because
- There is a chance of success, or
The major parties accommodate the movements via direct primaries and national party convention
• Examples: civil rights, antiwar, and labor movements
Minor Parties 3
Factional parties have had probably the greatest influence on public
Ross Perot in and
Ross Felot III und
Nominating a President
• Two Contrary
• Are the delegates of the voters?
• Who in primaries?
• are the new delegates?
are the new delegates.
Two Contrary Forces
• party's desire to the presidency motivates it to seek an appealing candidate,
• but its desire to keep dissidents in party forces a with more extreme views
but its desire to keep dissidents in party forces a with more extreme views
Are Delegates Representative?
Democratic delegates much more
Republican delegates much more
Outcome cannot be attributed to quota rules for delegate selection alone
— women, youth, minorities have greater of opinions than do the delegates
women, youth, inmortues have greateror opinions than do the delegates

who votes in Primaries?				
<ul> <li>Primaries now more numerou</li> </ul>	as and more decisive			
- Adlai	(1952) and H	Iubert	(1968	) won the presidential nomination
without entering any prin	naries			
- By 1992: forty primaries	and twenty caucuses (som	ne states with both)		
<ul> <li>Yet studies find little ideolog</li> </ul>	ical difference between pr	rimary voters and	and	party voters
•: mee	ting of party followers at	which delegates are picked	l	
<ul> <li>Only the most dedicated</li> </ul>		attend		
<ul> <li>Often choose most ideole</li> </ul>	gical candidate			
• Jackson, Robertson in	1 1988			
Who are the New Delegates?				
Today's delegates are	oriented a	activists		
<ul> <li>Advantages of this new syste</li> </ul>	m:			
<ul> <li>Increased opportunities f</li> </ul>		v 1		
<ul> <li>Decreased probability of</li> </ul>				
<ul><li>Disadvantage: these delegate</li></ul>	s may nominate president	ial candidates		to voters or even to the
party's rank and file				
Parties vs. Voters 1				
Democrats				
- since 1968, have won mo	re	elections than	presidential cor	itests
<ul> <li>Candidates are out of step</li> </ul>	with average voters on s	ocial and	issues	
<ul> <li>So are Democratic delegation</li> </ul>	ates to the nominating con	vention		
• there's a	betv	veen the delegates' and the	candidate's pos	itions
Parties vs. Voters 2				
Republicans				
<ul><li>same problem with</li></ul>	(19	964)		
<ul> <li>Rank-and-file Democrats and</li> </ul>	l Republicans differ on ma	any political issues		
<ul> <li>differences are usually</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Delegates from the two major</li> </ul>	r parties differ	on these	same issues	
• So, the candidate needs to sh	are views with the average	e citizen or campaign on is	sues where dele	gates and voters agree
• Problem arises, though, beca	use candidates must often	play to the ideological		to win delegate support
<ul><li>produces "</li></ul>	to the	" after conventions		

The End!