

#### Political Ideologies and Political Parties in America

Political Ideologies and Political Parties in America puts ideology front and center in the discussion of party coalition change. Treating ideology as neither a nuisance nor a given, the analysis describes the development of the modern liberal and conservative ideologies that form the basis of our modern political parties. Hans Noel shows that liberalism and conservatism emerged as important forces independent of existing political parties. These ideologies then reshaped parties in their own image. Modern polarization can thus be explained as the natural outcome of living in a period, perhaps the first in our history, in which two dominant ideologies have captured the two dominant political parties.

Hans Noel is an assistant professor of government at Georgetown University, where he teaches on political parties and statistical methods. He received his PhD in 2006 from UCLA and has been a Fellow at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics at Princeton University and a Robert Wood Johnson Scholar in Health Policy Reform at the University of Michigan. Noel is the recipient of the 2009 Emerging Scholar Award from the Political Organizations and Parties section of the American Political Science Association. He is the coauthor of *The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform*.





# CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN PUBLIC OPINION AND POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

#### Series Editors

DENNIS CHONG, University of Southern California and Northwestern University

JAMES H. KUKLINKSI, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology publishes innovative research from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives on the mass public foundations of politics and society. Research in the series focuses on the origins and influence of mass opinion, the dynamics of information and deliberation, and the emotional, normative, and instrumental bases of political choice. In addition to examining psychological processes, the series explores the organization of groups, the association between individual and collective preferences, and the impact of institutions on beliefs and behavior.

Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology is dedicated to furthering theoretical and empirical research on the relationship between the political system and the attitudes and actions of citizens.

Books in the series are listed on the page following the Index.





## Political Ideologies and Political Parties in America

HANS NOEL

Georgetown University





# **CAMBRIDGE**UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107620520

© Hans Noel 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data Noel, Hans, 1971-

Political ideologies and political parties in America / Hans Noel.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-03831-8 (hardback) – ISBN 978-1-107-62052-0 (pbk.)

1. Political science – United States. 2. Ideology – United States. 3. Political parties – United

States. 4. United States – Politics and government. I. Title.

JA84.U5.N54 2013

324.273′13-dc23 2013010574

ISBN 978-1-107-03831-8 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-62052-0 Paperback

Additional resources for this publication at www.cambridge.org/noel

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



For Grant Noel, who as a father was more than anyone expects
but what I think everyone deserves.

For John Zaller, who as a mentor was what everyone expects
but more than I think anyone deserves.





### Contents

Figures	
bles	xii
knowledgments	xiii
Introduction: Distilling Their Frenzy from Some Academic Scribbler	I
Interaction	Ι2
Creative Synthesis: Why Ideology?	38
The Independent Development of Ideology	67
Appendix to Chapter 4: Measuring Ideology among Pundits	93
Ideology Remakes the Parties	119
Issue Politics in Ideological Context	144
Ideological Parties and Polarization	165
Conclusion: Toward the Study of Creative Synthesis	181
orks Cited	197
lex	213
	Introduction: Distilling Their Frenzy from Some Academic Scribbler  The Coalition Merchants: Ideologies, Parties, and Their Interaction  Creative Synthesis: Why Ideology?  The Independent Development of Ideology  Appendix to Chapter 4: Measuring Ideology among Pundits Ideology Remakes the Parties  Issue Politics in Ideological Context



## **Figures**

4.1	Hypothetical relationships in a binary model	page 76
4.2	Hypothetical relationships in multinomial model	77
4.3	Fit over time of a one-dimensional binary model	79
4.4	Ideal points in the 1950 binary model	80
4.5	Fit over time of a one-dimensional binary model for economic, social, racial, and foreign policy issues	81
A4.1	1	
	(May 11, 1970)	113
A4.2	(Panel 1) Ideal points in the 1910 binary model	115
A4.2	(Panel 2) Ideal points in the 1930 binary model	116
A4.2	(Panel 3) Ideal points in the 1970 binary model	117
A4.2	(Panel 4) Ideal points in the 1990 binary model	118
5.1	The organization of pundits and Congress	121
5.2	NOMINATE scores in the 81st and 91st House	123
5.3	Party cohesion among Republicans and Democrats	125
5.4	The angles of ideological and partisan votes	127
5.5	Angles of select NOMINATE cutting lines, 1940–1980	129
5.6	1950s pundits into the 81st Congress	133
5.7	1970s pundits into the 91st Congress	134
5.8	1990s pundits into the 101st Congress	134
5.9	1950s pundits into subsequent Congresses	135
5 TO	Rotation of the estimated space relative to party and ideology	т 2 6

X



Figures		X
6.1	APRE for Congress and pundits on race issues	146
6.2	Discrimination parameters for race issues	148
6.3	Partisan realignment in Congress and among voters on abortion	159
6.4	Discrimination parameters for abortion and related issues	160
7.1	Distribution of pundit ideal points, 1910–1990	172
7.2	Responses to the seven-point ideology question in the ANES	174



### **Tables**

2.I	The Game of Politics	page 20
2.2	Hypothetical preferences over a set of issues	21
2.3	Effect of an ideology uniting A and B	29
3.1	Hypothetical preferences over a set of issues	41
3.2	The Game of Politics	53
4.I	Correlations among issue items, 2008 ANES	68
4.2	Correlations among issue items, 2008 ANES, most informed respondents only	69
4.3	Summary of data collected	73
А4.1	Sample issue codes	98
A4.2	Issues related to the first dimension	100

xii



### Acknowledgments

I have been working on this book for a very long time.

I think it may have started when I was a high school senior at Gresham Union High School, and I refused to write an assigned paper on the grounds that it assumed an exogenous, unidimensional policy space.

The teacher, Bill Tattam, did not use that jargon, of course. Neither did I. But the assignment asked us to consider two specific issues, and then, with the aid of political magazines arrayed from left to right across the back of the classroom, discuss the positions taken by communists, socialists, liberals, conservatives, reactionaries, and fascists on each of those issues. I didn't think this should be done because I felt that ideology was socially constructed (again, without the jargon) and ultimately an inaccurate way to understand political opinions. I instead wrote an essay explaining why this meant the entire project was a sham.<sup>1</sup>

My position on the nature of ideology has evolved a lot since high school. I no longer think that it is inappropriate to ask what liberals or conservatives believe on issues. Indeed, it is critical to ask, and to ask carefully. Once I arrived at that conclusion, this project was under way. That makes Mr. Tattam the first person to have influenced this project.

The last has to be my wife, Chloe Yelena Miller, who has been my most enthusiastic supporter, even when I found the project frustratingly incomplete. Chloe has dutifully read every chapter, with the eye of a poet, not a social scientist. It is a cliché to say that one could not have completed a project without one's spouse. Fortunately, as I am not a poet, I have license to use clichés.

I have been working on this book in many different places.

xiii

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This was a low-stakes experiment in civil disobedience. Being a coward, I worked into the paper a brief discussion of what the assignment would have required me to have written about the two issues of abortion and U.S. intervention in Latin America. But I still technically "refused."



xiv Acknowledgments

Between starting the project while in graduate school at UCLA and completing it as an assistant professor at Georgetown University, I have logged time at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics at Princeton University and as a Robert Wood Johnson Scholar in Health Policy Research at the University of Michigan. My time at the CSDP was perhaps the most rewarding in terms of working on this project, and perhaps of all my career. At Michigan, this project was both advanced and delayed by my time spent as an RWJ Fellow. Advanced because this project was my primary task at the time, but delayed because much of my time was spent opening up new lines of research that I still have not yet fully explored.

Over that time, and in all those places, I have been working on this book with the guidance and support of many different people, only some of whom I can mention here. All remaining errors and limitations are of course my own.<sup>3</sup>

I should first thank the teams of undergraduates who helped collect and process the data, and who helped with many other aspects of the project. I have worked with a variety of programs for undergraduate researchers, treating the excellent students at UCLA, Princeton, Michigan, and Georgetown as my own little distributed computing team. Nearly every task was double-coded for accuracy, but that only increased the total labor needed. All of these research assistants were invaluable to the project. Some put in an extraordinary effort and displayed uncommon skill. In fairness to them all, I can single no one out, but those who went further than they needed to know who they are. All of them deserve my thanks:

Adriana Ahumada, Ashley Alexander, Catie Bailard, Douglas Bogan, Lauren Burt, Hannah Cabot, MacKenzie Canniff, Virginia Carefoote, Glen Hai Chen, Francella Chinchilla, Faith Christensen, Julia Christensen, Laura Claster, David Congdon, James Cordes, Jeff David, Patricia Daza, Janice Dru, Chelsea Ehrke, Jon English, Jeremy Evans, Christine Fogle, Cristina Grant, Michael Gross, Helen Gurfinkel, Daniel Gutenplan, Lisa Hathaway, Mark Hines, Blake Holland, Jeff Hollis, Lance C. Huang, Monica Hughes, Tiffany Hwong, Goodman Joseph, Adam Kaplan, Joy Karugu, Christine Kim, Suneal Kolluri, Sean Kolodji, Patrick Lam, Jane Lawrence, Jonathan Leo, Andrew Levine, Camilla Liou, Jessica MacKenzie, Keith Martin, Katie Mason, Bryana Michael, Daniel Miller, Mirela Missova, Claire Mongeau, Alli Nash, Nicholas Nathan, Doug Nichols, D. Pierce Nixon III, Tina Park, Seth Peterson, Erika Raney, Roxanne Salas, Matt Schupbach, Justin Scott, Ingrid Seggerman, Matt Seibert, Marissa Siefkes, Kathryn Slee, Shawna Spoor, Laura Stewart, Kevin Thelan, Mike Tiernay, Mary Vardazarian, Naya Villarreal, Minh-Tam Vuong, Cynthia Wang, Rachel Ward, Mike Wendland, Taylor Wray, and Kevan Yalowitz.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> I have also spent a nontrivial amount of time at the Palmer House Hilton in Chicago.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Except for the second and fifth errors, which are Greg Koger's fault.



Acknowledgments xv

Greg Koger provided usefully compiled data on roll-call votes in the U.S. Congress, Keith Poole provided prompt responses to questions about auxiliary parameters in the calculation of NOMINATE scores, and Jonathan Ladd shared code used in analyzing the American National Election Study.

The editors and editorial team at Cambridge University Press have been very helpful. I thank Lew Bateman, Shaun Vigil, and Mark Fox, as well as Jayashree Prabhu and the rest of the team at Newgen Knowledge Works, for all their assistance and accommodation. I appreciate the suggestions from the anonymous reviewers for Cambridge (as well as from anonymous reviewers for the University of Chicago Press). My colleagues at Georgetown, notably Mike Bailey, Bill Gormley, Dan Hopkins, Jon Ladd, and Clyde Wilcox have been especially supportive and encouraging in this project.

I have also had the opportunity to present elements of this project at many academic seminars in the past several years. I thank seminar audiences at the University of Minnesota, the University of Pennsylvania, New York University, Georgetown University, Texas A&M University, Cornell University, the University of California at Davis, Northwestern University, the University of Rochester, the University of Michigan, the University of California at San Diego, Princeton University, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of California at Berkeley, George Mason University, the University of Virginia, the University of Denver, and the University of Wisconsin, and especially at book conferences dedicated to this project at the University of Michigan (organized by Rob Mickey) and at Georgetown University.

A great number of important ideas came from the feedback in those presentations. A number of people were particularly helpful and encouraging of this project: Chris Achen, Larry Bartels, Richard Bensel, Dennis Chong, Josh Clinton, Philip Converse, Jamie Druckman, Fred Greenstein, Rick Hall, John Londregan, Byron Shafer, and Rogers Smith.

I could not have done graduate school or this book without the Klugie Group, a cluster of mostly American Politics students at UCLA who encouraged, challenged, and entertained me. I appreciate the contributions of Seth Masket, Greg Koger, Ken Gaalswyk, Dan Rounds, Darren Schreiber, Wesley Hussey, Marty Cohen, and David Karol. My UCLA mentors were just as important, including Barbara Geddes, Scott James, Tom Schwartz, Barbara Sinclair, George Tsebelis, and Brian Walker. Jeff Lewis taught me almost everything I know about ideal point estimation. Kathleen Bawn both inspired much of the theory and encouraged my own interpretation.

Throughout graduate school and since, John Zaller has been an extraordinary advisor, scholar, and friend, and I cannot imagine this book without him. John has shaped my intellectual development in ways he may not know, and may not want to know. We have not always agreed on substantive matters, but I would shudder if I found myself disagreeing with his intellectual, professional, or personal example.



xvi

Acknowledgments

Finally, I must thank my father, Grant Noel, for all his help throughout this process. I would say I did not follow in his footsteps, but that would suggest he laid any path out for me at all. Aside from presuming that I would go to college, he left my future for me to decide. And decide I did, several contradictory times. I have grown into a very different person from my father, and yet most of the best in me can be found in him.