ENCYCLOPEDIA OF GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Volume I

Edited by
Mary Hawkesworth
and
Maurice Kogan

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

CONCLUSION

Neither pluralist nor corporatist systems are superior in representing the view of members of voluntary associations. Whereas the reliance upon selective benefits is less crucial when membership is almost compulsory and access assured, no evidence or theory suggests that the functional representation of corporatism is more likely to be 'accurate' than is the 'accidental', *laissez-faire* mode of pluralist representation. As Keeler (1987:19) suggests, in pluralist systems elite response to members' demands is imperfect, whereas in corporatist systems elites can afford insulation.

Is either more likely to balance narrow interests against a large public good? Here the answer is less ambiguous. Corporatism can deliver more. As Wilson puts it:

> [Corporatist] systems have aroused the interest and envy of other states for some years now. Their success in securing above-average incomes and economic growth with lower than average inflation has fueled both admiration and envy…. [Corporatist] systems have provided their inhabitants with 30 years of high employment, low inflation, and considerable economic growth.
>
> (Wilson 1985:110, 113)

Of the United States, said by Rose to be so fragmented that it lacks a government in the true sense of the word, there is reason to assume that:

> America's economy has been slowly unraveling. The economic decline has been marked by growing unemployment, mounting business failures, and falling productivity…. America's politics have been in chronic disarray. The political decline has been marked by the triumph of narrow interest groups.
>
> (Reich 1983:3)

Corporatism is more fiscally sound, providing stable growth without massive debt (Zeigler 1988:99–100).

If interest groups—subordinated by corporatism or at least structured and balanced by unitary, parliamentary governments—are beneficial, and if they—inhibited by the impotence of strong pluralism—contribute to economic stagnation and decline, is this not a paradox for pluralism? For, as the linchpins of pluralism, interest groups are hastening its death. In an internationally interdependent economy, governments that can govern will prevail over those that surrender to narrow coalitions.

However, one can hardly attribute the rise and decline of economies solely to the relations between interest groups and the state. British economic decline since the 1870s is attributable as much to the accidents of empire as to narrow distributional coalitions. As the British empire and the industrial revolution developed simultaneously, the British relied more on their colonies for commercial and industrial development than did other, less imperialist countries.

British firms continued to sell to semi-industrial colonies while other countries were competing in the more developed European market and were producing more technologically sophisticated products. The seeds of decline were sown by empire rather than modes of interest group intermediation (Hall 1987:9–12). France has become more corporatist and has prospered; Germany has become less corporatist and has prospered even more. Nations need an institutional articulation of a public interest.

REFERENCES

Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1965) *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations,* Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Cox, A. (1988) 'The failure of corporatist state forms and policies in postwar Britain', in A.Cox and N.O'Sullivan (eds) *The Corporate State,* Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Dahl, R.A. (1956) *A Preface to Democratic Theory,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

––(1982) *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hall, P. (1987) 'Decline and fall', *New Society* (January): 9–12.

Hancock, M.D. (1989) *West Germany: The Politics of Democratic Corporatism,* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Kariel, H. (1961) *The Decline of American Pluralism,* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Katzenstein, P. (1984) *Corporatism and Change: Austria, Switzerland and the Politics of Industry,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

––(1985) *Small States in World Markets,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Keeler, J. (1987) *The Politics of Neocorporatism in France,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, P. (1987) *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers,* New York: Random House.

King, R. (1985) 'The organization, structure and political function of selected chambers of commerce', in A.G.Jordan and J.J.Richardson (eds) (1987) *Government and Pressure Groups in Britain,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kogan, M. (1975) *Educational Policy-Making,* London: Allen & Unwin.

Kreiger, J. (1986) *Reagan, Thatcher, and the Politics of Decline,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lindblom, C. (1977) *Politics and Markets,* New York: Basic Books.

Lowi, T. (1967) 'The public philosophy: interest group liberalism', *American Political Science Review* 61:5–24.

––(1969) *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy, and the Crisis of Public Authority,* New York: Norton.

Madison, J. (1961) '*Federalist* no. 10', in C.Rossiter (ed.) *The Federalist Papers,* New York: New American Library.

Manley, J. (1983) 'Neopluralism: a class analysis of pluralism I and pluralism II', *American Political Science Review* 77:368–84.

Marsh (1976) 'On joining interest groups: an empirical consideration of the works of Mancur Olson, Jr', *British Journal of Political Science* 6:257–71.

Meier, C.S. (1975) *Transforming Bourgeois Europe,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Moe, T. (1980) *The Organization of Interests,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newton, K. (1976) *Second City Politics,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
––(1982) *The Rise and Decline of Nations,* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Opp, K.D. (1986) 'Soft incentives and collective action', *British Journal of Political Science* 16:87–112.
Panitch, L. (1977) 'The development of corporatism in liberal democracies', *Comparative Political Studies* 10:61–90.
Reich, R. (1983) *The Next American Frontier,* New York: Times Books.
Richardson, J.J. and Jordan A.G. (1985) *Government Under Pressure: The Policy Process in a Post Parliamentary Democracy,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Riddell, P. (1989) *The Thatcher Decade,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Rose, R. (1988) *The Postmodern Presidency,* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
Rothenberg, L. (1988) 'Organizational maintenance and the retention decision in groups', *American Political Science Review* 82:1130–52.
Salisbury, R. (1969) 'An exchange theory of interest groups', *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 12:1–32.
Schlozman, K. and Tierney, J.E. (1986) *Organized Interests and American Democracy,* New York: Harper & Row.
Schmitter, P.C. (1974) 'Still the century of corporatism?', *Review of Politics* 85:85–131.
Truman, D. (1951) *The Governmental Process,* New York: Knopf.
Walker, J. (1983) 'The origins and maintenance of interest groups in America, *American Political Science Review* 7:390–406.
Ware, A. (1989) *Between Profit and State: Intermediate Organizations in Britain and the United States,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Wilson, G. (1985) *Business and Politics,* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
Wolferen, K.van (1989) *The Enigma of Japanese Power,* New York: Knopf.
Zeigler, H. (1988) *Pluralism, Corporatism, and Confucianism,* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Zeigler, H. and Peak, G.W. (1972) *Interest Groups in American Society,* 2nd edn, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

FURTHER READING

Dahl, R.A. (1982) *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy,* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Katzenstein, P. (1984) *Corporatism and Change: Austria, Switzerland and the Politics of Industry,* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
––(1985) *Small States in World Markets,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Keeler, J. (1987) *The Politics of Neocorporatism in France,* New York: Oxford University Press.
Moe, T. (1980) *The Organization of Interests,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
––(1982) *The Rise and Decline of Nations,* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Richardson, J.J. and Jordan, A.G. (1985) *Government Under Pressure: The Policy Process in a Post Parliamentary Democracy,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Schlozman, K. and Tierney, J.E. (1986) *Organized Interests and American Democracy* New York: Harper & Row.

Wilson, G. (1985) *Business and Politics,* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Zeigler, H. (1988) *Pluralism, Corporatism, and Confucianism,* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

25

POLITICAL PARTIES

JOSEPH LAPALOMBARA AND JEFFREY ANDERSON

Political parties are about power. In democracies, they represent the principal instrument through which segments of the population compete to secure control of elective institutions, and through them to exercise predominant influence over public policies. Everywhere, including in dictatorial regimes, rulers try to legitimize their domination via this same instrument. In recognition of the basic power role of political parties, V.O.Key once remarked that they 'provide a good deal of the propulsion of the formal constitutional system' (Key 1964:154).

It is not simply that parties are central to elections and to policy making, or that they make and break governments, administer patronage, and take decisions that deeply affect a nation's welfare. Under their aegis, mass publics are mobilized for good and evil, revolutions are fomented, dissidents are arrested, tortured and killed, and ideologies are turned into moral imperatives. Not only democracies, then, but political systems of every conceivable variety seem unable to function without the presence of one or more parties. The recent scramble to form political parties across Eastern Europe, in anticipation of the first free elections held in these countries in a half century or more, provided a most vivid confirmation of the continuing and universal relevance of parties.

The omnipresence of parties suggests that they perform important functions independent of the level of economic development or of the type of regime. In other words, the British Conservative Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and El Salvador's ARENA party all carry out comparable tasks as 'organizational instrumentalities' (LaPalombara 1974:515). Among other things, each organizes public opinion, transmits demands from society to its governors and vice versa, recruits political leaders, and engages in oversight of the implementation of public policies.

Admittedly, some would deny the comparability of democratic and totalitarian parties (Friedrich and Brzezinski 1966). Neumann, a noted scholar of

parties, virtually rules out comparisons altogether, arguing that 'a party's character can be spelled out only in time and space' (Neumann 1956:396). Our premiss is that we can indeed compare political parties and make certain generalizations about them. In order to clarify what these human organizations have in common, and how such characteristics have evolved and changed, we require a working definition of the political party itself.

A DEFINITION

Political parties are not quarks. That is, they are visible and easily recognized in the wild. Despite these tangible qualities, the scholarly literature has yet to reach consensus on a definition of party. One long-standing disagreement centres on the glue that binds together a party: public interest or private gain. Edmund Burke is perhaps the first and certainly the most eloquent spokesperson for public interest. 'Party is a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest, upon some particular principle upon which they are all agreed' (Burke 1839:425–6). Joseph Schumpeter, the best-known antagonist of the public interest school, counters with the following definition of party, full of the grit of power and political gain:

> A party is a group whose members propose to act in concert in the competitive struggle for power…. Party and machine politicians are simply the response to the fact that the electoral mass is incapable of action other than in a stampede, and they constitute an attempt to regulate political competition exactly similar to the corresponding practice of a trade association.
>
> (Schumpeter 1976:283)

E.E.Schattschneider, an early political scientist who minced no words about the power-centred nature of politics, promotes this narrowly instrumental view of parties in even more forceful terms (Schattschneider 1942:35). For him, the essence of party is the urge to gain and keep power.

Such conceptual disunity should not surprise us. Parties occupy the main intersections of the political process–conflict regulation, integration, public opinion formation, policy formulation. They are therefore complex, multifaceted aspects of the political system. As nothing more than a working definition, we offer the following: a party is any political group, in possession of an official label and of a formal organization that links centre and locality, that presents at elections, and is capable of placing through elections (free or non-free), candidates for public office.

There are numerous advantages to this formulation, an amalgam of LaPalombara and Weiner (1966) and Sartori (1976). By stressing both free and non-free elections, it preserves comparability across regime-type. Moreover, unlike the Burkean and Schumpeterian definitions, it addresses several broader considerations (Sartori 1976:58–64). First, the definition delimits parties from

other actors that are or have been involved in the rough and tumble of politics: court factions, parliamentary clubs, mass movements, interest groups, bureaucracies, church organizations and the military. As the only organizations to operate formally in the electoral arena (Panebianco 1988:6; Schlesinger 1965:767), political parties are distinctive. Second, the definition is minimal. That is, it contains only those elements necessary for delimitation, and it leaves all other properties as hypotheses subject to empirical verification. Too often, parties are defined in functional terms, which makes it almost impossible to disprove that the putative functions are in fact carried out by parties (King 1969:116). Finally, our working definition avoids any identification of parties with party systems, a common confusion that often leads to the conclusion that parties found in dictatorial settings are aberrations.

THE ORIGINS OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The arguments of Madison and Tocqueville–namely, that parties emerge wherever there exist salient differences of interest among the public (Madison 1961:77–84; Tocqueville 1969:174)–are clearly incomplete. The presence of conflicting interests is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the emergence of parties. Were this otherwise, parties would surely number among the oldest forms of social organization. Instead, parties are a phenomenon of the last 150 years, the creatures of modernity.

There are three distinct explanations of the recent origins of parties (LaPalombara and Weiner 1966:8–21):

1 institutional theories that stress the transformation of parliaments;
2 historical theories that emphasize systemic crises tied to the nation-building process; and
3 theories of modernization and political development.

While each successive approach seeks to embed political parties in progressively more inclusive theories of social and political change, they all acknowledge a common determining factor in the appearance of parties: social mobilization, or the entry of the masses onto the political stage. Once politics could no longer be confined to a small circle of aristocratic elites, parties emerged as the instruments to link the centre of political power with the masses. In this parties proved consistently indispensable, whether the transformation of politics was induced by competition among elites or by mass pressures from below.

Parties and the evolution of parliaments

Institutional theories, informed primarily by the Western experience, locate the origins of political parties in the gradual extension of suffrage and the resulting transfiguration of parliamentary bodies. Scholars credit Duverger with the

seminal contribution, though Weber is often mentioned in the same breath (Duverger 1954:xxiii–xxxvii; Weber 1946:102–7). Duverger suggests three stages in the development of parties: the birth of parliamentary groups, the formation of local electoral committees, and the creation of permanent links between the two. The expansion of the electorate and the responses of elites in and outside the parliamentary arena drive the process.

Under a restricted suffrage, politics is very much an elite intramural affair. Factions and other loose associations of notables form within assemblies, but these are often ephemeral groupings. Even where they endure, they display little continuity of purpose, and no institutionalized connections to the extra-parliamentary environment. Disrupting this cosy state of affairs, the initial expansion of the suffrage prompts and indeed compels like-minded notables to create local electoral machinery to woo the new electors, and to organize them as reliable supporters. Disraeli's efforts on behalf of the Conservative Party in mid-nineteenth-century Britain represents perhaps the classic example of this dynamic. As the electorate expands still further, and party notables begin to face competition from emergent parties outside of parliament (see below), they seek to improve the integration of the national and local levels, both vertically and horizontally. The result is a modern mass political party. Whatever the specific circumstances of its origins, the party emerges to deal with the incorporation of unprecedented numbers of persons into the political process.

The preceding describes the genesis of political parties created by the legislators themselves. Classic examples include the British Conservative and Liberal Parties, the Democratic and Republican Parties in the United States, the National Liberal Party of Wilhelmine Germany, and the Liberals of nineteenth-century Italy. Duverger distinguishes these 'internally created' parties from those that originate outside the established representative institutions, and that typically present ideological and electoral challenges to the ruling elites. Externally created parties also derive their sustenance from an expanded electorate, yet they seek to enter the corridors of power to pursue the interests of previously excluded groups, or even to transform the political system itself. The vehicle is again a mass political party. Typical examples in the European context are socialist parties, communist parties, christian democratic parties, as well as parties of agrarian defence.

Although Duverger's analysis retains a certain plausibility where the Western experience is concerned, its limited reach is all too apparent. The theory is space-bound; it does not connect with the experience of colonial regimes or developing nations, where parliamentary assemblies—centre ring for Duverger—were either non-existent or excluded the indigenous population, and yet political parties emerged nevertheless. The theory is also time-bound, in that it does not illuminate the process by which new parties form in places where universal

suffrage has been the norm for many decades. The recent emergence of ecological and environmental parties in Western democracies is a prime example. To correct these deficiencies, scholars have offered more complex theories to explain the origins of parties.

Parties and the nation-state

As political elites cope with the economic, social, political, military and administrative problems that typically accompany the nation-building process, they create institutions that endure long after earlier moments of crisis, despair and euphoria have passed. The rise of parties accompanies certain types of crises, in particular those relating to national integration, the nation's legitimacy, and demands for increased participation. More importantly perhaps, the content and sequencing of these crises will determine the pattern of evolution that parties will follow. In Europe and in developing countries in the past, in Eastern Europe at the present, and in China in the future, we can and will discern how intimately related are legitimacy, integration and participation, on the one side, and the nature of political parties on the other.

According to proponents of this approach, legitimacy crises explain the emergence of some of the earliest examples of political parties, both on the European continent and in the developing countries. Duverger's internal parties formed at a time when the legitimacy of existing representative institutions was placed in doubt. In the post-colonial era, which saw an effervescence of new nations, political parties emerged from nationalist movements that questioned the legitimacy not just of representative institutions, but of the existing state as a whole. The rise of fascist and communist parties in the twentieth century also reflected legitimacy crises in liberal democracies. Ironically, these crises were engendered to some degree by the malfunctioning and negative repercussions of party pluralism (Sartori 1976:39).

Participation demands prove to be even more closely linked to the formation of political parties. The timing, as well as the nature, of elite responses to them will tend to influence not only the parties' organizational forms and political behaviour but their ideologies as well. The incorporation of new social groups into the political system typically requires extended suffrage. As nations develop along this particular participatory dimension, the creation of political parties is the natural outcome. As a rule then, almost all externally created parties are formed either along with system-expanding crises of electoral participation, or with more or less sweeping attacks on the inadequacies of the extant system.

Parties and modernization

A broader formulation is that mass parties are the product of societal modernization. New social groups seek more direct access to the political process as the results of 'increases in the flow of information, the expansion of internal markets, a growth in technology, the expansion of transportation networks, and, above all, increases in spatial and social mobility' (LaPalombara and Weiner 1966:20). Other factors associated with modernization, like secularization of values, the emergence of voluntaristic collective action and improvements in the means of communication, also facilitate the emergence of the political party as the prime form of political organization.

Samuel Huntington goes so far as to argue that the political party–not public bureaucracy, not parliament, not election–is *the* distinctive institution in the modern polity (Huntington 1968:89). Modern society is everywhere mass society and, as such, requires an institution (the party) to organize the inclusion and integration of mass publics into the system. Others pursue a less deterministic line, but nevertheless associate the emergence of political parties with the effects of industrialization. In this vein, Daalder states, 'the modern political party…can be described with little exaggeration as the child of the Industrial Revolution' (Daalder 1966:52). As Marx anticipated, the concentration of workers in industrial urban centres carried political consequences. He did not fully appreciate, however, that the political party would emerge to mobilize these masses not for revolution but rather for quite routine and indeed productive and system-reinforcing forms of electoral participation. Yet whatever the aims of power-seeking elites they have found the political party of extraordinary instrumental utility.

Industrialization also generates substantial costs for traditional social groups like artisans, small shopkeepers and farmers. In self-defence, therefore, industrial society spurs the creation of political parties whose purpose it is to defend these threatened groups. The agrarian parties of Scandinavia, as well as the fascist parties elsewhere in Europe, are examples of such reactions to modernization. Later in the modernization process, negative externalities of industrial activity–like the threat to the environment–lead to another wave of party formation, as with the so-called Greens and other ecology-sensitive parties.

Modernization theory also has its shortcomings. Most obvious among these is that we have not yet clearly delineated alternative paths to modernity or nation building. For this reason, there is little that can be said with assurance as to when, in what circumstances and with what probable consequences particular kinds of political parties will in fact materialize. With this caveat in mind, we turn to some additional observations regarding these important institutions.

Party origins: so what?

One might well suppose that a party's origins would affect its organizational structure, internal dynamics, functions and ideological principles. Duverger offers an unalloyed statement to this effect: 'It is the whole life of the party which bears the mark of its origins' (Duverger 1954:xxxv). According to him, internally created parties are less ideologically coherent and disciplined, less centralized, open to greater influence by their parliamentary wings, and more likely to place supreme emphasis on the parliamentary arena of political conflict than are other parties.

Similar, though not as deterministic in tone, are propositions that derive from those who associate the advent of parties with modernization or national development. For example, parties that are associated with crises of legitimacy of older orders, or that are involved in the dismantling of the latter, will rely on ideology as a means of cementing relationships among party members, motivating them and others to action, and establishing the legitimacy of the new order. Such parties also develop hierarchical and secretive organizational structures to protect themselves against penetration by opponents. The 'vanguard party' outlined by Lenin is the classic example (Lenin 1969). Emphasis on mass membership, self-conscious attention to ideology, and political activism are presumably characteristics of parties that have their origins in demands for expanded participation. Only the modernization school seems to be reluctant to ascribe political party characteristics to the circumstances that surround their birth.

These arguments or propositions are neither wholly implausible nor incorrect. For example, Duverger's distinctions between elite-based parties and mass-based parties are reasonable and interesting (Ware 1987:6). As formulated, however, they are static and therefore ill-equipped to help us understand changes in the structure, ideology and functions of parties that may have occurred since their birth. Preconditions and context will certainly leave their imprint. But it stands to reason that these will eventually fade and that, in any case, parties that persist in time do so because they manage to adapt–that is, to change–as they encounter modifications in their respective environments. The graveyards of history are strewn with political parties that failed to respond to such challenges.

Two attempts to grapple with these shortcomings are worthy of mention. Von Beyme, pursuing the line of inquiry begun by Duverger, ascribes the often complex relationship between a party's parliamentary and extra-parliamentary wings neither to the parties themselves nor to their origins, but rather to other aspects of the political system (Von Beyme 1983). His work amplifies the arguments of scholars like Mckenzie who assert that the organization and behaviour of political parties tend to adapt to structural and configurative dimensions of the systems in which they operate (Mckenzie 1963). He cites as particularly important the type and institutional position of the governmental

executive, the role of interest groups, and the professionalization of politicians. Unlike Duverger, Von Beyme does not see the two party wings locked into a zero-sum relationship. He suggests instead that twentieth-century developments of the kind mentioned have simultaneously strengthened both groups (Von Beyme 1983:392).

A striking and promising recent application of organizational theory to political parties (Panebianco 1988) takes as its starting point the work of Michels, who proposed the Iron Law of Oligarchy for political parties (Michels 1962). Panebianco suggests a three-phase model of party development, namely, genesis, institutionalization and maturity. Over time, a party's internal hierarchy, its objectives, and even its principles are determined by the changes in the needs and power positions of party elites and rank-and-file members (Panebianco 1988:18). His work is an intriguing answer to those who lament the lack of theories that address the internal workings of parties (Daalder 1983:22).

PARTY FUNCTIONS

Theories of course can be hopelessly abstract, and nowhere is this more apparent than in the many efforts to delineate the functions of political parties. More often than not, these functions are simply imposed on the parties, by theoretical or logical fiat, and without regard to empirical verification as to what parties do in practice. Yet as Sartori reminds us, 'What parties are–that is, what their functions, placement, and weight in the political system are–has not been designed by a theory but has been determined by a concurrence of events' (Sartori 1976:18). With this admonition in mind, we can ask what specific functions parties have carried out, whether these vary (in space or time), and which are shared with other actors in the political system. If we can specify party functions, we may also ask how well and in what circumstances they perform them.

Leadership recruitment

Wherever they exist, parties are a critical aspect of the structure of political opportunity (Schlesinger 1966). They serve the interests of ambitious men and women. They help to cull from society individuals who assume positions to which considerable power and authority attach. In the system within which political elites operate, parties are powerful 'gatekeepers' (Putnam 1976:49–61). Given our definition of the political party, it would be a real puzzle were this not the case.

Recruitment is far from a simple matter; to understand its nuances requires more detail than is typically provided in the literature. Analysis in depth is

required of such things as 'the motives that lead individuals to seek or accept political roles or inhibit them from doing so; the "catchment pools" from which the political classes are drawn…; the criteria by which they are selected; and the characteristics and aims of those selecting them' (King 1969:129). Another critical question is the extent to which the political parties monopolize the recruitment of persons to key political positions. Were parties to share this responsibility widely with other organizations (like interest groups) or actually fall into their shadow, they would lose a principal *raison d'être* (Daalder 1966:75; Katz 1980:4).

It goes without saying that, in pluralist democracies, parties do share this particular function with other organizations, including the military, the public bureaucracy, the court, the academic community, trade unions, business enterprises and a wide variety of other interest groups. All of them represent competing channels through which individuals enter the leadership stratum of a given society. In practice, then, the weight of parties in the selection of lawmakers and bureaucrats, and in some places judges as well, will vary. The United States, even in the era of Jacksonian Democracy, would be at one extreme. At the other, we might place Austria during the heyday of the *Proporz,* when the two leading parties monopolized access to elite positions in the polity.

Even where parties are strong, however, it is useful to think about them in part as 'an abstraction–a label under which a number of organized groups compete for a share of the elective offices to be filled' (LaPalombara 1974:546). In many developing countries, weak party organizations take a back seat to the military or the civil bureaucracy in the recruitment of the political elite. Only in established one-party states of the fascist or communist type is political recruitment performed on a virtually exclusive basis by parties. These dictatorial parties by definition seek to negate pluralism. Even there, however, party monopoly of recruitment may have its negative side, encouraging the creation of a narrowly based, conservative, and even reactionary leadership stratum. Lenin understood this danger, as did Mao, whose 'mass line' campaigns were explicitly designed to loosen the party bureaucracy's hold on recruitment.

Formation of governments: the ruling function

According to Katz, the key function of the party is 'to rule and to take responsibility for ruling' (Katz 1987:4). This is the truly distinctive function of the party, one which sets it apart from other organizations. In short, it intends to capture control of the political system under its own name, exclusively if possible or, failing that, in coalition with another party or parties. Bagehot remarked upon the close connection between party and government in his pathbreaking nineteenth-century treatise on the English constitution (Bagehot 1963:158). The

modern literature also highlights this critical aspect of the political party (Schattschneider 1942:ix; Neumann 1956:400). Daalder identifies the spectacular collapse of the Weimar Republic in 1933 and its horrible aftermath as the principal source of the discipline's overwhelming concern with effective party control of the apparatus of government (Daalder 1983:6).

The notion of 'grasp' is one way of conceptualizing a party's capacity to form governments, to rule, and to be responsible for rulership itself (King 1969:132). We know that the capacity varies–from country to country, within the same country, and, indeed within the same political party over time. This last type of variation signals why parties, as opposed to party systems, should be studied in their own right, as complex organizations that may be well or poorly endowed with leadership, well or poorly managed, and so on. Panebianco's recent study provides important evidence that these capacities are strongly influenced by the circumstances that surround not the birth but, rather, the institutionalization of each political party, and by the type of party, i.e. 'mass bureaucratic' or 'electoral professional', that emerges (Panebianco 1988: part II and chapter 14).

Examples of extensive party grasp would be Austria during the period of the Red-Black coalition (1945–66), the *Parteienstaat* in the Federal Republic of Germany, and the established one-party government in the pre-Gorbachev Soviet Union. One source of a party's capacity to penetrate a system is its ability to dominate the elite recruitment process. Presumably, the greater the number and diversity of positions a party is able to fill with its people–the military, the judiciary, the public economic sector, the bureaucracy–the more likely it is to forge an effective and purposeful government.

Extensive grasp may facilitate the formation of government, but it does not automatically produce effective rulership. One reason for this is, again, to be sought within the party itself. Parties are not necessarily coherent organizations, and even more rarely are they the monoliths that we sometimes imagine. Thus, the Italian Christian Democrats and the Japanese Liberal Democrats are both dominant, hegemonic parties whose grasp in the sense just described is extensive. But both are also faction-ridden; they encompass fluid and shifting internal coalitions of 'notables', each of which represents a somewhat autonomous power base (LaPalombara 1987; Calder 1988; Zuckerman 1979). Even the Soviet Communist Party, despite its domination of the instruments of government, faces formidable internal obstacles to its effective rulership; witness the ability of lower-level party functionaries to thwart Gorbachev's economic reform programme.

In thinking about parties, rather than impute to them certain 'functions' of the kind we review here, we should ask what it is they actually do or achieve. Where the formation of government and rulership are concerned, we must ask not only what are the capacities of individual parties to do these things; we must also probe to establish whether these represent the mission of the parties, that is, the

intentions of those who control them (Katz 1987:7–11). Theories of democracies and of one-party governments suggest that parties exist to provide political direction to the institutions of government. In practice, however, parties often cede the field to the bureaucracy, the military or interest groups. The typical result is policy drift, or a segmentation of political authority exercised by narrow coalitions of interest that colonize the governmental apparatus. Moreover, if rulership or 'party government' implies the formulation of coherent, distinctive and purposive public policies, the empirical evidence suggests that the impact of political parties remains at best contingent. The position of a given country in the world economy, or the strength of its labour unions, strongly conditions and limits party performance (Hibbs 1977; Cameron 1984).

Political identity and the vote

Parties are also described as instruments that structure a person's political identity and that channel the popular vote (Schattschneider 1942:52; Key 1964:314). This particular function, unlike the others so far discussed, requires an electoral market in which more than one party competes for political currency, that is, for the citizen's vote. To encourage loyal customers who will stay with the party over the longer course, parties utilize techniques that range from official labels and symbols to party platforms and complex ideologies, from propaganda and educational programmes to a vast apparatus of auxiliary party organizations. For many parties, election day is simply a recurring opportunity to display how well their efforts to instil a particular political party identity in the voter have proceeded. This matter is so obviously vital to the survival of the party that it is given the highest priority, even by parties in dictatorships that face no electoral opposition at all. George Orwell chillingly captures the extremes to which these parties will go in pursuit of this goal (Orwell 1949).

Parties of course will also seek to shape public opinion in the broader sense that encompasses the identification of public issues, the assignment of valence to them, and the specification of policies designed to deal with them. In one-party systems, the party line will be handed down from on high and disseminated by the party faithful. The phenomenon of 'agitprop' under Stalin and of the 'mass line' under Mao are good examples of this approach. In more open and democratic systems, not only do party lines compete with each other for the voter's support, but other voluntaristic organizations, as well as the mass media, compete with the parties to register the same effect.

It is self-evident that the grasp of the party–that is, how far and deeply it can actually penetrate a society–will bear directly on its capacity to structure political identities and to attract voters at the polls. The relationship, however, is not linear; absolute monopoly control by the party of the instruments of

communication and of political socialization does not translate into equal success in the moulding of citizen identity and voter support. Recent events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union attest that, even after decades of such control, the party may actually fail.

In fact, not even in so-called totalitarian systems does the single party ever really monopolize all of the institutions and channels of communication that mould public opinion. Schools, churches, village markets, the factory, the halls and labyrinths of the bureaucracy, the military and even the units of the party itself become places where information is exchanged–and where subversive thoughts are born, matured and disseminated. Furthermore, advances in literacy and the untrammelled transmission of sound and visual images across space make it unlikely that one party can successfully impose an Orwellian Newthink or Newspeak on a national population.

Therefore, on this matter of moulding and reinforcing the citizen's political identity and structuring his or her vote, the party not only competes with other institutions but must also seek to achieve this particular purpose indirectly, through the mediating influence of these self-same institutions. This is quintessentially and increasingly the case in pluralistic democratic societies where, in an era that some call 'post-modern', the individual citizen does a lot of independent shopping around before selecting a party to support at the polls. And as for strong and long-enduring party identification, the cards now seem permanently stacked against any party that seeks to achieve this degree of knee-jerk allegiance. Indeed, the advent of the electronic revolution, and the political salience of the media, have raised in some minds the thought–not entirely reassuring for any democratic society–that the political party itself may go the way of the dinosaur.

Mobilization and integration

This leads us to ask whether parties may be of particular salience where mass mobilization and/or the integration of national political systems are concerned. The mobilization of masses of people has typically been associated with single party systems in both developed and developing nations (Friedrich and Brzezinski 1966:47). This is obviously too narrow a view. As complex organizations driven by persons with great ambitions to exercise power and influence, parties tend to be opportunistic everywhere. Thus if they are unable to have their way through the regular and orderly procedures of governmental institutions, they may easily shift to mass mobilization techniques. In the West, left-wing parties have not hesitated to use their affiliated trade unions or youth organizations to bring hundreds of thousands of persons into the streets and squares. Similarly, right-wing political parties use forms of mass mobilization as one of the weapons in their political arsenal. Indeed, as the suffrage is extended

to include earlier non-participants, the process (with the party situated typically at the very centre) whereby these persons are incorporated is itself described as 'social mobilization' and 'political development' (Huntington 1968:32 ff., 132–7; LaPalombara and Weiner 1966:400–7).

In recent years, parties like the Greens in Germany and the Radicals in Italy have deliberately combined both parliamentary and extra-parliamentary forms of political intervention and opposition. Furthermore, events of the late 1960s in the West showed that the line between 'normal' political participation and forms of mobilization ranging from mass demonstrations to riots and acts of terrorism can be very thin indeed. Historically, political parties have served as models for every conceivable type of political intervention, including mobilization.

Parties may not be the only organizations in society that lean in this direction, but they are certainly those from which we *normally* expect such efforts to emanate. Indeed, one way to gauge the stability of any democratic system is to weigh the relative frequency of modes of political intervention engaged in or promoted by its political parties, as opposed to other organizations whose main purpose is *not* that of linking the citizenry to governmental institutions or to the policy-making process (Lawson 1980; Barnes and Kasse 1979).

It is also true, of course, that mass mobilization can occur outside party channels and is often associated with mass movements. When this occurs, it implies a challenge to existing political institutions and authority, and may actually represent a direct assault on the political system *in toto*. The 1926 General Strike in Britain, student revolts of the late 1960s followed by waves of terrorism in some countries, the rise of Solidarity in Poland after 1980, the Chinese June 4 Movement and the awesome display of people power in the Eastern Bloc during 1989 and after are prime examples. Where such movements occur, one finds existing parties, including previously dictatorial single parties, scrambling to catch up with these outbursts of collective action and new manifestations of the public mood.

Where parties do succeed in becoming and remaining the main linkage between citizen-voters and ruling office holders, they clearly contribute to the integration of the overall political system. Psychological and social affinities to the party, at least where the latter are not clearly of the anti-system variety (Sartori 1976:132–4), serve as an integrative mechanism that brings the individual more meaningfully into a political regime, thus indirectly benefiting the latter as well (Kirchheimer 1966:188–9).

Political parties that lead successful revolutions, as well as nationalist movements that overthrow colonial rule and then assume party form, may also be described as aiding the effective integration of new regimes. The earliest example of both of these phenomena is the United States (Lipset 1963). Parties in established liberal democracies perform an integrative function too. For

example, the British Conservative Party, with its intimate ties to the Church of England, the Royal Family and other symbols of British nationality, accomplishes similar ends. Indeed, even in the case of allegedly anti-system parties, like the communist parties of Western Europe, active involvement in the normal and constitutional types of political mobilization and participation have the effect of reinforcing the legitimacy as well as the integration of the same systems these parties presumably would like to overthrow.

In some cases, the principal beneficiaries of integration are the party itself and a social order yet to be realized. Neumann speaks of parties of 'social integration', typically on the left and engaged in 'permanent revolution', that seek to envelop the individual in an all-encompassing ideology and a self-contained network of social, political and economic relationships (Neumann 1956:404). These integrative efforts often, but not always, challenge the principles and values of the existing political order.

National integration is one of those important but elusive concepts for which precise empirical indicators are hard to specify. This being so, it is even more difficult to show whether parties are any more effective than other organizations or institutions in bringing about minimum or higher levels of integration (King 1969:124–6). Indeed, far from winning much praise on this particular score, parties are often condemned as the principal reason why so many modern societies seem to wallow in deep-seated crises—evidenced by citizen apathy, mass alienation and antisocial behaviour. As important as that particular allegation may be, it addresses the political party *system* and not the political parties that are our prime concern in this essay.

POLITICAL PARTIES: FACING THE FUTURE

Bagehot, writing in 1867, predicted that parties would change the face of British parliamentary politics, substituting an unstable and even dangerous form of 'Constituency Government' for the more virtuous 'Parliamentary Government' (Bagehot 1963:161). His gloomy assessment has been echoed by others writing in this century. The recurring message has been that mass-based, disciplined parties are not necessarily healthy for democracy (Ostrogorski 1902; Beer 1966). Schattschneider attributes the 'plebiscitary presidency' in the United States to political parties, which 'took over an eighteenth-century constitution and made it function to satisfy the needs of modern democracy in ways not anticipated by the authors' (Schattschneider 1942:2).

Whether sanguine or discouraging, the prognoses of early students of parties generally agree upon one unassailable fact: parties, the product of expanded suffrage, quickly transcended election-oriented tasks and arrogated to themselves responsibilities and authority belonging to other, more formal,

institutions. As complex and effective instrumentalities, parties triumphed over older and less specialized organizational competitors. In doing so, these newer, complex and ubiquitous organizations managed to transform the struggle for power itself, and in ways that the framers of older regimes and constitutions neither anticipated nor intended. As the key instrumentality designed to give substance to the concepts of participation and representation (Huntington 1968; Schumpeter 1976), or to provide linkage between the electorate and the formulation and execution of public policy (Lawson 1980:3–24), the advent of parties represents a quantum change in the nature of the polity.

Nevertheless, in less than two centuries, we find claims that these same organizations are now of dubious relevance as components of modern political systems. If they are not on the verge of extinction, so one argument goes, they risk losing the centrality they once enjoyed. In less developed countries, they have tended to give away to military or other forms of dictatorship that do not tolerate party organizations–at least not those they are unable to control. In developed countries, the claim is that technological advances in communication and information-processing have undercut their role as the principal links between governors and governed. In addition, new social movements, particularly among the young and the emerging professional middle classes, have emerged apart from and even in open hostility toward parties.

There is more. In advanced industrial society, a growing *lumpenproletariat*–unskilled, illiterate, and increasingly isolated–is said to be impervious to direction from parties. The complexities of a vast, interdependent and volatile world economy are said to privilege organized capital and labour at the expense of parties in the policy-making process. Indeed, the brave new world of neo-corporatism is said to make impotent bystanders of parliaments as well as parties (Berger 1981; Schmitter and Lehmbruch 1979). In this framework, it is easy to conclude that parties are indeed institutional has-beens, whose time has come and gone.

In fact, almost all such formulations are at best only half-truths. One reason, as a seasoned observer points out, is that parties are typically victims of the inflated expectations of those who theorize about them (King 1969). As scholars looked more closely at reality, earlier notions, sometimes raised to the status of myth, as to what parties are all about had to be recast. These second looks have produced much more reasonable statements as to what these institutions really mean, what it is they might or might not, can or cannot, do in one setting or another.

Of course, literacy, the electronics revolution and the advent of new modes and norms of collective behaviour will have an impact on the parties too. Of course, parties are not today what they were even as recently as a generation ago. Nevertheless, rumours of their atrophy or demise are greatly exaggerated. On the contrary, they remain the only organizations that operate on the electoral and

governmental scenes in the sense we have described. Until this changes, parties will rightly continue to occupy the attention of journalists and politicians, citizens and academic researchers.

The sophisticated treatment of parties as organizations (Panebianco 1988) marks a refreshing return to earlier modes of studying these institutions. For decades now, research has centred on parties as seen from the vantage point of the individual citizen and voter, or alternatively, as the components of the party system itself. Thus, in certain respects, the newer trend brings us full circle, back to the focus suggested by writers like Michels (1962), Ostrogorski (1902), and Duverger (1954). Equipped with new analytical techniques and better data than were available to them, we can explore questions of our own as to, for example, the relationship between parties and the particular configuration that a variety of political systems now in transition might eventually assume.

On that score, recent developments in Eastern Europe seemingly conspire to make this a most promising time to return to the study of parties as organizations. In almost all of these countries, communist parties, once the monopolizers of power, were compelled to adapt to electoral competition. New parties literally emerged by the dozen, alongside trade union movements like Solidarity in Poland or intellectual circles like Civic Forum in Czechoslovakia. If, as some scholars have claimed, the unions, the bureaucrats and the plant managers are the 'natural' components of corporatist systems of policy making, we must seek to explain why there has been such a veritable explosion of political parties in these countries.

In all of these countries, one encounters unlimited opportunities to observe parties that are born anew or that seek to reconstitute themselves from a past that only a handful of persons can remember as part of an earlier and different experience. It may very well be, as some claim, that the establishment of the market is a necessary condition for the eventual emergence of democracy. Be that as it may, it seems apparent that, long before the economic market is established or reemerges, all of these countries will have had to deal with the critical issue of the *political* market, and of the degree and kind of competition that can take place within it without causing additional and unwanted upheaval.

Whatever the outcome of the transitions currently under way, we can predict with confidence that the political party as a complex organization will play a major role, and perhaps *the* central role, in these processes. Not only is this prospect intellectually exciting in its own right, but it will also provide the opportunity to test a wide range of extant propositions about the nature of political development, and the precise role of the political party in settings where degrees of tolerance of organized efforts to win control of the machinery of government, and/or to oppose those who succeed in this undertaking, now vary quite markedly.

In dealing with the political party, it is essential to avoid all forms of sociological reductionism of the kind that notoriously suggest that the form, meaning and function of political institutions are the abject dependent expressions of much deeper societal determinants. The more accurate reality, as Panebianco (1988:275–6) has reminded us, is that the political party was and remains prominent among the *political* institutions that shape the configuration and plot the direction of social institutions, as well as the destinies of humankind. They richly deserve to be studied in this vein, and in their own right.

REFERENCES

Bagehot, W. (1963) *The English Constitution* (1867), Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Barnes, S.H. and Kasse, M. (eds) (1979) *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies,* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Beer, S. (1966) *British Politics in the Collectivist Age,* New York: Knopf.

Berger, S. (ed.) (1981) *Organizing Interests in Western Europe,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, E. (1839) 'Thoughts on the cause of the present discontents' (1770), in *The Works of Edmund Burke,* vol. 1, Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Calder, K. (1988) *Crisis and Compensation,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cameron, D. (1984) 'Social democracy, corporatism, labor quiescence, and the representation of economic interest in advanced capitalist society', in J.Goldthorpe (ed.) *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Captialism,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Castles, F. and Wildenmann, W. (eds) (1986) *Visions and Realities of Party Government,* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Daalder, H. (1966) 'Parties, elites, and political developments in Western Europe', in J.LaPalombara and M.Weiner (eds) *Political Parties and Political Development,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

––(1983) 'The comparative study of European parties and party systems: an overview', in H.Daadler and P.Mair (eds) *Western European Party Systems: Continuity and Change,* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Duverger, M. (1954) *Political Parties,* New York: John Wiley.

Friedrich, C. and Brzezinski, Z. (1966) *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy,* New York: Praeger.

Hibbs, D. (1977) 'Political parties and macroeconomic policy', *American Political Science Review* 71:1467–87.

Huntington, S. (1968) *Political Order in Changing Societies,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Katz, R.S. (1980) *A Theory of Parties and Electoral Systems,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

––(ed.) (1987) *Party Government: European and American Experiences,* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Key, V.O. (1964) *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups,* New York: Thomas Y.Crowell.

King, A. (1969) 'Political parties in Western democracies: some skeptical reflections', *Polity* 2:112–41.

Kirchheimer, O. (1966) 'The transformation of the Western European party systems', in J.LaPalombara and M.Weiner (eds) *Political Parties and Political Development,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

LaPalombara, J. (1974) *Politics within Nations,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

––(1987) *Democracy Italian Style,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

LaPalombara, J. and Weiner, M. (1966) 'The origin and development of political parties', in J.LaPalombara and M.Weiner (eds) *Political Parties and Political Development,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lawson, K. (ed.) (1980) *Political Parties and Linkage: A Comparative Perspective,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lenin, V.I. (1969) *What is to be Done?* (1902), New York: International Publishers.

Lipset, S.M. (1963) *The First New Nation,* New York: Basic Books.

Mckenzie, R. (1963) *British Political Parties,* New York: Praeger.

Madison, J. (1961) 'No. 10.', A.Hamilton, J.Madison and J.Jay (eds) in *The Federalist Papers,* New York: New American Library.

Michels, R. (1962) *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy,* New York: Free Press; translation of (1911) *Zur Sociologie des Parteiwesens in der Modernen Demokratie,* Leipzig: Klinghardt.

Neumann, S. (1956) 'Toward a comparative study of political parties', in S.Neumann (ed.) *Modern Political Parties,* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Orwell, G. (1949) *Nineteen Eighty-Four,* New York: Harcourt Brace.

Ostrogorski, M. (1902) *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties,* 2 vols, London: Macmillan.

Panebianco, A. (1988) *Political Parties: Organization and Power,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, R.D. (1976) *The Comparative Study of Political Elites,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sartori, G. (1976) *Parties and Party Systems,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schattschneider, E.E. (1942) *Party Government,* New York: Farrar & Rinehart.

Schlesinger, J.A. (1965) 'Political party organization', in J.March (ed.) *Handbook of Organizations,* Chicago: Rand McNally.

––(1966) *Ambition and Politics: Political Careers in the United States,* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Schmitter, P. and Lehmbruch, G. (eds) (1979) *Trends Toward Corporatist Intermediation,* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Schumpeter, J. (1976) *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (1942), New York: Harper & Row.

Tocqueville, A.de (1969) *Democracy in America,* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Von Beyme, K. (1983) 'Governments, parliaments, and the structure of power in political parties', in H.Daadler and P.Mair (eds) *Western European Party Systems: Continuity and Change,* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Ware, A. (1987) 'Introduction: parties under electoral competition', in A.Ware (ed.) *Political Parties: Electoral Change and Structural Response,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Weber, M. (1946) 'Politics as a vocation', in H.Gerth and C.W.Mills (eds) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Zuckerman, A. (1979) *The Politics of Faction: Christian Democracy in Italy,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

FURTHER READING

Baerwald, H. (1986) *Party Politics in Japan,* Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Barnes, S. (1967) *Party Democracy: Politics in a Socialist Federation,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Blondel, J. (1978) *Political Parties: A Genuine Case for Discontent?,* London: Wildwood House.

Budge, I. Crewe, I. and Farlie, D., (eds) (1976) *Party Identification and Beyond,* New York: John Wiley.

Butler, D. and Stokes, D. (1969) *Political Change in Britain,* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Castles, F. (1979) *The Social Democratic Image of Society,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

––(ed.) (1982) *The Impact of Parties: Politics and Policies in Democratic Capitalist States,* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Chambers, W.N. (1963) *Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience 1776–1809,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coleman, J.S. and Rosberg, C.G. (1964) *Political Parties and National Integration in Tropical Africa,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dahl, R. (ed.) (1966) *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Downs, A. (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy,* New York: Harper & Row.

Epstein, L. (1975) 'Political parties', in F.Greenstein and N.Polsby (eds) *Handbook of Political Science,* vol. IV, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Esping-Anderson, G. (1985) *Politics against Markets: The Social Democratic Road to Power,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Irving, R.E.M. (1979) *The Christian Democratic Parties of Western Europe,* London: Allen & Unwin.

Jowitt, K. (1978) *The Leninist Response to National Dependency,* Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California at Berkeley.

Lipset, S. and Rokkan, S. (eds) (1967) *Party Systems and Voter Alignments,* New York: Free Press.

Maisel, L. and Cooper, J. (eds) (1978) *Political Parties: Development and Decay,* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Paterson, W.E. and Thomas, A.H. (eds) (1977) *Social Democratic Parties in Western Europe,* London: Croom Helm.

Pizzorno, A. (1981) 'Interests and parties in pluralism', in S.Berger (ed.) *Organizing Interests in Western Europe,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Powell, G.B. (1982) *Contemporary Democracies,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rokkan, S. (1966) *Citizens, Elections, Parties,* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Rose, R. (1969) *The Problem of Party Government,* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

––(1980) *Do Parties Make a Difference?,* New York: Chatham House.

Schapiro, L. (1971) *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* New York: Random House.

Weiner, M. (1967) *Party Building in a New Nation: The Indian National Congress,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

26

CAMPAIGNS AND ELECTIONS

DAVID DENVER

National governments are freely elected in only a minority of the world's states. Although elections in some countries of the communist bloc have recently assumed a significance undreamt of before the late 1980s, it remains the case according to Harrop and Miller (1987:7) that in a world of over 160 states there are only about thirty in which there is a real chance of the government being replaced through the ballot box. More precisely, the journal *Electoral Studies* keeps track of national election results in just thirty-seven countries which have a population of more than a million and 'which have an established record of competitive multi-party elections'.

None the less, the study of elections and voting behaviour has generated an enormous literature. The subject attracts the interest of sociologists, geographers, economists and psychologists, among others, and is one of the major sub-fields of political science. In part, this wide interest is explained by the fact that elections are a central element in theories of democracy. Different versions of democratic theory vary in the precise importance they attach to elections, and they assign them various functions, but all agree that the open, competitive election of the national government is a fundamental and distinguishing characteristic of states that would normally be described as democratic. It is via elections that citizens participate directly in the political process and are able to hold governments accountable.

Interest in elections extends well beyond academic social scientists, however. National elections are major events in the life of a nation. They are accompanied by greatly increased discussion of, and interest in, politics on the part of the population as a whole, by intense political activity and by massive coverage in the mass media.

Election campaigns are a familiar and integral part of free elections. For as long as there have been elections there have been campaigns during which candidates and their supporters seek to persuade the electorate to vote for them. In most democracies today there is a formally defined campaign period –usually

prescribed by a combination of law and custom (see Penniman 1981:110–5)– during which various rules which regulate campaigning come into force. Although election campaigns and the electoral process itself can be separated conceptually, the two are so inextricably linked that in common usage any reference to 'the election' is usually intended to include the period of 'hot' campaigning which precedes actual voting.

The literature dealing with election campaigns and campaigning is diverse and extensive. It includes survey studies of voters of the kind pioneered in the 1940 American presidential election (Lazarsfeld *et al.* 1968) as well as descriptive/analytical accounts of single national elections. Examples of the latter include the series of 'Nuffield Studies' of British elections (see, for example, Butler and Kavanagh 1988), the 'Making of the President' series by Theodore H.White (see White 1982) and the 'At The Polls' series produced by the American Enterprise Institute, which has covered elections in a variety of countries from (alphabetically) Australia to Venezuela. There are numerous studies of the development of campaigning (see Salmore and Salmore 1985) and the role of the mass media in campaigns (see Patterson and McClure 1976). Other works have focused on campaigning techniques (Leuthold 1968) and local campaigning (Kavanagh 1970). There have been, however, relatively few comparative studies which get beyond the somewhat arid listing of points of similarity and difference between states in terms of their campaign laws (for a notable exception, however, see Butler *et al.* 1981).

Part of the reason for the relative absence of comparative studies is the sheer diversity in campaigning in different countries. Variations in the nature of the political system (federal versus unitary systems, for example, or presidential versus parliamentary systems) and in the electoral system (proportional versus plurality) make for wide variations in campaign styles. Variations in geography can also be important (Dutch party leaders do not need private jets as American presidential candidates do). Differences in political culture or tradition make for differences in electorates' receptiveness to or aversion from particular campaign styles.

Campaigning styles and techniques have also changed dramatically over time. Factors such as an increase in the size of the electorate due to extensions of the suffrage and simple population growth, the rise of mass circulation newspapers and the introduction of various campaign laws have prompted major changes in campaigning. In this essay, however, four factors which have had a marked impact upon election campaigning in more recent years are considered. The four are the growth of television, the use of public opinion polls, the development of computer technology and the cost of campaigns. In all four cases the effects of these developments are clearest in the United States, but they are evident too in other modern democracies and it seems

likely that campaigning in the latter will, in some respects at least, develop in a similar way.

TELEVISION

There is no doubt that the growth of television has revolutionized election campaigning in modern societies. Its importance derives mainly from the fact that television reaches a mass audience and that it is by far the most important source of political information for voters. British party leaders can now talk to more people in a few minutes that did Gladstone and Disraeli together throughout their entire careers. Writing of the United States, Hunt observes: 'Any modern presidential campaign is dominated by the awesome importance of television' (Hunt 1987:57). The more prosaic view of an anonymous American gubernatorial candidate is quoted by Salmore and Salmore: 'If you're not on television, you don't exist' (Salmore and Salmore 1985:145).

It is not simply the size of the television audience that gives the medium its importance in campaigns, however. Television reaches the mass of voters whose interest in an election is largely passive and fleeting–those who would rarely follow a campaign in newspaper reports or attend a campaign meeting–to a greater extent than the printed media. In addition, in most democratic societies television coverage of domestic politics in news broadcasts, campaign reports and so on is required to be neutral or even-handed. This kind of coverage is generally regarded by voters as being more trustworthy and reliable than the political reporting in the (often avowedly partisan) press.

The enormous potential of television to influence voters has been recognized (and perhaps even feared) by politicians in most states, and various rules, regulations and conventions have grown up which control coverage of elections (see Smith 1981). In some countries (most obviously the United States), paid advertising by candidates and parties is allowed, but in most it is prohibited. In many of the latter, parties are granted free air time in which to put their case (as in party election broadcasts in Britain). As indicated above, almost all countries have a rule requiring balanced coverage.

Despite restrictions of this kind, the impact of television upon campaigning style has been enormous. To a great extent parties can-control the format and content of their advertising spots or the free slots provided for their campaign broadcasts. They take great pains to ensure that these are used to the fullest effect. The art, or science, of 'spot' political advertising is most developed in the United States (see Diamond and Bates 1984), where parties and candidates are advertised in the same way as commercial products like coffee or beer. As with commercial adverts, election adverts have developed from relatively crude pitches in the 1950s to highly sophisticated, professionally produced,

meticulously planned minor masterpieces of the art today. In countries where there is no paid advertising, party election broadcasts have likewise become more professional In Britain, for example, 'talking heads'–party leaders speaking directly to camera–are now less common than they used to be. In the 1987 general election a Labour broadcast

> opened with a warplane streaking across the sky, switching to a seagull soaring effortlessly, backed by the muted strains of the party's theme from Brahms's first symphony. Distant figures, soon revealed as Neil and Glenys Kinnock, walked hand in hand across a sunny headland with Neil Kinnock voicing over his belief that the strong should help the weak.
>
> (Harrison 1988:153–4)

Examples like this could be multiplied.

Parties have less control over how they and their campaigns are reported in news bulletins, current affairs programmes, election reports and so on. In the United States coverage of this kind is referred to as 'free time', for obvious reasons. The special importance of this sort of coverage (and the effects that it has on campaigning) arises from the fact that voters are suspicious, on the whole, of broadcasts and adverts which are partisan in origin and content. They expect news reporters and commentators, on the other hand, to be impartial and consequently may be more open to their influence. Campaigners make great efforts, therefore, to secure the best possible coverage in this kind of political television. Projecting a 'good image' on television has become the key to successful campaigning.

Campaign events and plans are made primarily to fit in with the schedules and requirements of television. It used to be, for example, that in British elections party leaders would address large meetings at which opponents would barrack and heckle. Today they address audiences composed of only their own supporters and rather than speaking to the live audience–who are occasionally glimpsed glassy-eyed with incomprehension–they speak to the audience which will see clips from the speech on television. Speeches are carefully planned to include 'sound bites'–brief quotable patches–which begin and end with applause to make the task of the videotape editor easier. Politicians also used to meet electors personally, 'pressing the flesh' in the street. They still do this, although usually surrounded by security men and 'minders', but only so that they can be *seen* doing it by the television audience. 'Pseudo-events' are organized–visits to schools, factories, individual families and so on–whose sole purpose is to provide 'photo-opportunities' for the media. Contact between candidates/party leaders and the voters is now mediated through television.

Television, particularly in relatively short news broadcasts, deals more easily with images and personalities than with political issues, which are often complex and detailed. This has led to a style of campaign reporting that is more candidate-

oriented (including detailed probing of private lives). This process has gone furthest in presidential systems like the United States and France, but American congressional elections are also now more candidate-oriented than before and in parliamentary systems party leaders are projected in almost the same way as presidential candidates.

Ever since the famous Kennedy-Nixon television debates in the 1960 presidential election, when Nixon's 'five o'clock shadow' and general physical appearance apparently told against him (see White 1964:279–95), campaign managers have paid detailed attention to how politicians look and sound on the small screen. After Mrs Thatcher became Conservative leader, she had her teeth capped, her hair restyled and her make-up improved, and she undertook exercises which lowered the pitch of her voice by 'almost half the average difference in pitch between male and females voices' (Atkinson 1984:113). Later in her prime ministership she began to engage in 'power dressing'.

Similar attention is paid to the background against which politicians are viewed on television, to ensure that these too convey the 'right' images. Thus, in the 1984 presidential election, President Reagan made a major campaign speech near the Statue of Liberty which figured prominently in clips broadcast later on television news. British parties employ professionals to ensure that their leaders are appropriately lit for television, that the colours and symbols used as backdrops convey the desired messages to the viewers, and so on.

In sum, modern campaigns are media campaigns. The distinction between election campaigns and television coverage of campaigns has become non-existent and, as a consequence, parties and candidates are now thoroughly packaged for television (see McGinniss 1969; Jamieson 1984).

In parliamentary systems, the growth of television has increased the importance of the national campaign at the expense of local electioneering. Party activists in local constituencies or electoral districts still canvass voters, put up posters, deliver leaflets and mount 'get out the vote' operations on election day. Candidates address local meetings and go for 'walkabouts'. But for most voters 'the campaign' is the national campaign which they see reported on television. In the United States, the same is true for presidential elections but 'local' campaigns for the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as for state and local offices, are also commonly dominated by television (although the importance of television is affected by the match between electoral areas and the areas covered by television stations).

The need to adapt to television-dominated campaigns has had two important consequences in terms of campaign management. First, it has greatly increased the cost of campaigning (see pp. 422–4). Second, parties and candidates have increasingly turned to media experts, advertising agencies, specialist advisers and so on for guidance. The British Conservative Party, for example, used the advertising firm of Saatchi and Saatchi in the general elections of 1979, 1983 and

1987, and the role of the firm went well beyond devising advertisements. At the 1986 Conservative conference the firm 'devised the conference theme, suggested some of the contents of ministers' speeches and coordinated the publicity' (Butler and Kavanagh 1988:35). Labour has less money and has relied largely on volunteer help from individuals in the advertising and media industries.

The trend towards the professionalization of campaigns has gone furthest in the United States, where, according to Senator Proxmire, 'a candidate's most important decision is not necessarily his stand on the issues but his choice of media advisor' (quoted in Luntz 1988:72). In all modern societies, however, the pressure upon politicians to use television effectively forces them to employ or obtain the help of professional media specialists.

The extent to which television campaign coverage affects voters' decisions, and hence the outcomes of elections, is a matter of considerable debate. Most research on the question concludes, however, that television has little *direct* effect on party choice other than to reinforce voters' previously-held opinions (see, for example, Blumler and McQuail 1967; Patterson and McClure 1976). It should be stressed, however, that these sorts of studies have usually been undertaken in situations in which all parties have access to television and use it with roughly equal effectiveness. Where coverage is disproportionate or a candidate comes across particularly badly (or well) then aggregate effects are clearly discernible. In the New Hampshire primary election of 1972, for example, Edmund Muskie was seen on television weeping over newspaper attacks on his wife, and his candidacy for the presidency never recovered. Labour's humiliation at the hands of Mrs Thatcher in the 1983 general election was due in part to the fact that the Labour leader, Michael Foot, appeared badly dressed, rambling and quaintly old-fashioned in television coverage; Neil Kinnock's popularity in the polls shot up overnight after the screening of the election broadcast referred to above (p. 416). Studies of media effects on elections also tend to concentrate upon short-term changes in voting intentions during campaigns. The influence of television may be more long term, slow and indirect.

There is general agreement, however, that television is now the major campaign agenda setter. Parties or candidates no longer determine what the election is 'about': it is television producers and commentators who decide which campaign issues will be discussed and which events reported. Interviewers pursue topics with party leaders which the interviewers, not the politicians, think are important. In the United States, a more specific form of agenda setting occurs during presidential primary elections. In reporting results, commentators regularly make assessments, based on expectations that they themselves have helped to create, of how well or badly the various candidates have performed. These assessments tend to be accepted by the electorate and can help or hinder candidates' future progress, even though the election results themselves may

bear different interpretations. In the 1972 primary election mentioned above, for example, Muskie was widely reported as having 'lost' despite the fact that he obtained 46.4 per cent of the vote compared wth 37.2 per cent for his closest rival (Kessel 1984:8). In this way television can define not just 'what' an election is about but also 'who' it is about.

One final clear effect of television in elections is a change in the kind of politician who is successful. Modern party leaders simply must be good on television. Old campaigning skills, such as 'glad-handing' or the ability to electrify a large audience with passionate speeches like William Jennings Bryan did, are largely irrelevant. More important is a friendly, conversational manner such as that displayed by Ronald Reagan. It is difficult to imagine the crusty and diffident Clement Attlee, who was a highly effective post-war Labour prime minister, ever being a successful party leader in the age of television.

OPINION POLLS

Public opinion polls are a familiar feature of modern election campaigns. In Britain the number of nationwide polls published during the formal campaign period more than doubled, from twenty-five to fifty-four, between the elections of 1970 and 1987 (Denver 1989:105). A similar growth in political polling has occurred in other democracies (Kavanagh 1981). Public polls usually concentrate on reporting the current voting intentions of the electorate, although they also often detail voters' opinions on campaign issues, assessments of party leaders or candidates, and so on.

Even more remarkable, however, has been the growth of private polling. In parliamentary systems, major parties now usually hire polling firms to provide them with regular information, while in the United States, all serious aspirants to the presidency since the 1960s have included a massive polling operation as a routine element in their campaigns. Numerous candidates for Congress and state and local offices also frequently employ pollsters to provide a polling package. This normally includes a 'bench-mark' poll, undertaken well before the election, to gather basic information about the relevant electorate, a series of 'trend' polls in the run up to the election and a series of daily 'tracking' polls during the final stages of the campaign (see Salmore and Salmore 1985:119–24).

The purpose of such private polls—which are much more detailed than public polls—is to provide reliable information to candidates and parties so that they can campaign more effectively. Slogans, symbols and themes are tested before being adopted; the popularity of various policy positions is gauged, and some consequently emphasized at the expense of others; the impact of campaign broadcasts and advertisements is assessed. Polls tell campaign managers which voters where are most or least receptive to their messages, and enable them to