

Abstracts

Frank Decker

Maintaining the Dichotomous Typology of Parliamentary and Presidential Systems

There is an ongoing debate about the existence of mixed or hybrid systems beyond the two pure types of parliamentary and presidential systems. In No. 3/2008 of ZPol Steffen Kailitz added three systems (quasi-parliamentary, dual executive and quasi-presidential) to the pure types. However, Kailitz' proposal is lacking in content as well as in methodological consistency. Moreover, his own survey of party voting in parliament strongly supports the affiliation of semi-presidential systems to the parliamentary type stated by Winfred Steffani. Steffani's typology has been criticized for its insufficient definition of "removability". However, if the "selection" of the head of government is introduced as a "mirror criterion", the dichotomous distinction can be integrated in the fourfold typology forwarded by Lijphart in 1984, while at the same time avoiding Lijphart's misconception of semi-presidentialism.

Achim Goerres

Attitudes towards Re-distributive Policies in a Powerful Generation: A Comparison of Baby-boomers in Britain and West Germany

The baby-boomers grew up in an era of massive expansion of welfare. To what extent do they have different expectations from the welfare state than previous generations? This article analyzes British and West German data from the International Social Survey Programme Role of Government I-III from 1985, 1990 and 1996. The main finding is that baby-boomers do not differ from earlier generations as to their expectations from the major areas of re-distributive welfare policy (health, unemployment, education, pension). It is a myth that the baby-boomers have a different stance towards the state and its welfare objectives than earlier generations. Thus, political reformers do not have to treat the preferences of the baby-boomers differently than those of earlier pensioner generations.

Manfred Brocker

**Integration By Participation
Social Movements within the U.S. Political System**

The article analyzes interaction processes and development dynamics within the USA's system of intermediary representation of interests. Its theses, taking into account the New Social Movements and the Christian Right protest movement, are: Social movements have an incentive to form interest groups, but not a party. They have an incentive to infiltrate parties and influence them in their recruitment of candidates and formulation of programs. Parties, on the other hand, have an incentive to coopt these social movements to assure the votes of their members. Social movements generate growing ideological polarization within the USA's party system, at least intermittently, resulting in an extensive reconfiguration of existing voter coalitions. However, in the long run these effects are tempered by the centripetal forces within the system.

Steffen Ganghof

**Justification of a „Constitution of Justification“?
On the Role of Democratic Rules of Decisionmaking in Liberalism**

Gerald F. Gaus' normative theory of Justificatory Liberalism argues that the liberal ideal of public justification implies a "constitution of justification" whose core components include supermajoritarian legislative procedures. Supermajoritarian voter support is necessary to fulfill the requirements of liberal legitimacy. This article introduces Justificatory Liberalism, compares it to Rawls' Political Liberalism and criticizes the argument for supermajoritarian decision procedures. The role of these procedures in Gaus' theory is similar to the role of the "duty of civility" in Rawls' theory: both are constraints intended to help realize the ideal of public justification. Yet Gaus' theory is also subject to the same objection as Rawls': the constraint itself is not conclusively justified.