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NOTES

PREFACE


CHAPTER ONE: CONCEPTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES


10. Sartori, Parties, p. 64; italics in the original omitted.


12. These specific phrases are from Frank Sorauf and Paul Beck, Party Politics in America, 6th ed. (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1988). The basic framework was


16. These dimensions have a family resemblance to those developed by Joseph Schlesinger to define parties: market orientation, collective goals, and indirect incentives. In the approach used here, these characteristics are regarded not as constant features of any political party but as themselves varying among party concepts. See Schlesinger, “Theory,” 369–400.

17. The figures in this chapter were machine-drawn by Patricia Michaels and Rayna Pomper and are gratefully acknowledged here.


CHAPTER TWO: INTERESTS WITHOUT PASSIONS


6. Ibid., pp. 78–79.


23. Ibid., pp. 16, 18, and 36 n. 1. The authors claim that the consumer price index's (CPI's) increasing 275 percent is not a valid measure of the effect of inflation on party budgets (which increased less than 100 percent). Major items in the CPI, however, such as housing, food, and benefits, would probably be reflected in party budgets for headquarters or staff. Moreover, parties faced unusual inflationary pressures in this period in above-average increases for transportation, postage, and media.
38. Ibid., p. 87.
45. George Washington, “Farewell Address,” in *Messages and Papers of the*
CHAPTER THREE: COMMON INTERESTS


44. Ibid., p. 222.

**CHAPTER FOUR: COMMON PASSIONS**

4. Ibid., p. 15.
5. Ibid., pp. 14, 28.
17. Ibid., pp. 231–32.


32. Miller and Jennings, Parties in Transition, pp. 97, 84; the quotation is on p. 96.


CHAPTER FIVE: PASSIONATE INTERESTS

19. Riordan, *Plunkitt*, pp. 82, 70.
35. Bridges, *City in the Republic*.

**CHAPTER SIX: INTERESTS AND PASSIONS**

6. Ibid., pp. 53–55.
7. Ibid., p. 28.
9. Downs, *Economic Theory*, p. 136. Martin Wattenberg further extends the appli-


22. Ibid.


32. Ibid., "Introduction," p. 28.

34. Ibid., p. 27.

CHAPTER SEVEN: PARTY CONCEPTS AND VOTING BEHAVIOR

12. Frank Friedel, “Election of 1932,” in Coming to Power, pp. 322–54; the quotations are on pp. 349 and 354.


41. This is the common thread of several studies: Gerald Pomper, *Voters’ Choice* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975); Sidney Verba, Norman Nie, and John Petrocik, *The Changing American Voter* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976); Eugene DeClerq, Thomas Hurley, and Norman Luttbeg, “Voting in American Presidential Elections,” *American Politics Quarterly* 3 (July 1975), updated in Gant and Luttbeg, *American Electoral Behavior*, p. 64. Sophisticated probit analyses underline changes in the relative impacts of the factors affecting voters (private communication by John Kessel). If the voting decision were a recipe, it would today include, roughly, three measures of issues to two of candidates to one of partisanship. In the 1950s, the blend was, respectively, two to one and a half to one.

42. The expectations of the governing caucus model fit the voting pattern on three of
the four factors, the only case of such high agreement. If we use a different standard, the office-seeking model is also close to the empirical evidence. This alternative standard is the arithmetic, algebraic difference between expectations and reality, with "low" scored 1, "moderate" 2, and "high" 3. In these calculations, the governing caucus model is only two total units from the empirical reality, and the office-seeking model three units. All other models show a greater difference.


44. Judson James early suggested a similar concept of parties although with greater emphasis on party loyalty and the president. See his description of "national executive-centered coalitions" in *American Political Parties in Transition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), chap. 11.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE REFORM OF POLITICAL PARTIES


3. The national primary was supported by 65 percent of a national sample in 1988; *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1988* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1989), p. 60.


13. Ibid., at 78–88.


16. In 1964, Jack Dennis found 22 percent agreeing that, "It would be better if, in


23. Ibid., at 19.


25. Denise L. Baer and David A. Bositis, *Elite Cadres and Party Coalitions* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1988), p. 172. These authors use the term "responsible parties" for what I have called the "party government" perspective, but our meanings are essentially the same.


30. Committee on Political Parties, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," passim.


33. Ranney, Curing the Mischiefs, p. 114.

34. Polsby, Consequences, p. 152.


46. The position is most strongly argued by Polsby, Consequences, and James Ceasar, Reforming the Reforms (Cambridge, Mass.: Bellinger, 1982).

47. See Baer and Bositis, Elite Cadres; David Price, Bringing Back the Parties (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1984); Larry Sabato, The Party’s Just Begun (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1988).


49. E. E. Schattschneider, Party Government (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1942), p. 60. This is of course the dilemma originally stated by Michels. See William Wright’s classification of parties as “rational-efficient” or as examples of “party democracy” in A Comparative Study of Party Organization (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1971), pp. 17–54.


CHAPTER NINE: COMMON IMPULSES
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