
Conclusion

7 I HOPE I HAVE SUCCESSFULLY DEMONSTRATED that the claims of the realignments genre do not hold up well, and that its illuminative power has not proven great. Notably, the various features said to be associated with realignments or critical elections—the causes, precursors, defining properties, measures, indicators, concomitants, consequences, and so forth that I have discussed—do not line up on the historical calendar the way they should.

Yes, the 1932 election stands out for its durable realigning effects, but no one has come anywhere near establishing 1828, 1860, 1896, and 1932 as an exhaustive set of elections that share that property. Instead, on the evidence of Clubb, Flanigan, and Zingale and of Bartels, there is a downward cascade from 1932 through the ranks