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Students of democratic politics may have mixed feelings about the value of yet another book on political parties. Some scholars may have concluded that the existing literature on parties is sufficient, and that there is little more that can be learned through additional study in the aftermath of a century of scholarly research on the topic. Others may be led to dismiss further empirical study of parties on the grounds that parties are becoming increasingly irrelevant, since they are failing to respond successfully to a series of challenges, and many of their functions are performed better by less formally organized social movements, by direct contact between politicians and citizens through the broadcast media or the internet, or by innovations in direct democracy. In the view of this group of scholars, parties may be seen as in an inexorable process of ‘decline’. Finally, there may be some who have concluded that scholarly research on parties has failed to advance the task of developing rigorous and persuasive theory, and that further efforts along these lines are doomed to fail. Such an assertion might be especially appealing to those scholars who have embraced analytical approaches that place little value on the study of complex organizations or political institutions and who may simply dismiss the study of parties as irrelevant to the development of a more universalistic theory of politics.

We shall begin this introductory chapter by reviewing each of these assertions. It should not surprise the reader to find that we conclude that such negative views are unwarranted. We shall argue that political parties in the early twenty-first century are confronting a number of new challenges, many of which had neither been anticipated nor adequately addressed by the existing literature on parties. And while we acknowledge the general weakness of theory-building efforts regarding political parties, we believe that the continuing importance of parties in all democratic systems, in combination with the extent to which challenges facing contemporary parties have raised a wide
variety of new questions crying out for empirical research, make it all the more important to continue to push towards the formulation and systematic testing of more sophisticated and empirically grounded hypotheses, with the ultimate objective of developing a more compelling set of middle-range theories. While such advances have been made with regard to the study of party systems, we believe that a critical reassessment of traditional concepts and models of parties *per se* is long overdue, particularly concerning their capacity to deal adequately with recent developments and the new challenges that have confronted parties over the past two decades. Both the empirical and the more purely theoretical chapters included in this volume address these issues.

This introductory chapter will conclude with a brief overview of the contributions made by the authors of the following chapters to the literature on political parties, especially with regard to core concepts that have guided empirical research on parties, their organizational structures, and the changing and sometimes problematic nature of their relations with citizens in democratic political systems.

**THE GROWING LITERATURE ON PARTIES**

We must begin by conceding to the first hypothetical group of sceptics that there is no shortage of books and articles on parties. As Strom and Müller have noted (1999: 5), ‘the scholarly literature that examines political parties is enormous’. Indeed, parties were among the first subjects of analysis at the very birth of modern political science, as exemplified by the classic works of Ostrogorski (1964 [1902]), Michels (1962 [1911]) and Weber (1968 [1922]). Over the following years, a number of extremely important works were published (e.g. Merriam 1922; Schattschneider 1942; Key 1949), but it was really in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s when studies of parties fully blossomed as a subfield in political science. Such works as those of Duverger (1954), Ranney (1954), Neumann (1956), Eldersveld (1964), Sorauf (1964), La Palombara and Weiner (1966, which included Kirchheimer’s seminal contribution), Epstein (1967), Lipset and Rokkan (1967a) and Sartori (1976) established the conceptual and empirical bases for countless studies in comparative politics. In terms of the sheer number of publications, the growth of this subfield has been spectacular. Since 1945, approximately 11,500 books, articles and monographs have been published that deal with parties and party systems in Western Europe alone (Bartolini *et al.* 1998). Isn’t that enough?

The contributors to this book would reject such a conclusion. Contrary to assertions that ‘the golden age of party literature may now have passed’ (Caramani and Hug 1998: 520), we believe that it is more important than ever to study political parties and the roles they play in modern democracies. To begin with, parties have always been among the handful of institutions whose
activities are absolutely essential for the proper functioning of representative democracy. Given the centrality and fundamental mission of political parties, it is not surprising that students of democracy have, since the very beginnings of modern political science, recognized the importance of constantly monitoring and analysing their evolution and the quality of their performance. Bryce (1921: 119), for example, argued ‘that parties are inevitable: no free country has been without them; and no one has shown how representative government could work without them’. In the early 1940s, Schattschneider (1942: 1) succinctly summarized their importance by stating that ‘modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of political parties’. Several decades later, similar words were used by other scholars to illustrate the central role played by parties. As described by Stokes (1999: 245), parties are ‘endemic to democracy, an unavoidable part of democracy’. Americanists have long believed that ‘political parties lie at the heart of American politics’ (Aldrich 1995: 3). Not to be outdone, West Europeanists have asserted that ‘European democracies are not only parliamentary democracies but also party democracies’ (Müller 2000a: 309). As one might expect, the chapters in this book also recognize the importance of parties, and present illuminating discussions of the roles played by parties in various dimensions of democratic political life.

Following several years in which scholarly interest in political parties appeared to have waned, there has recently been a notable revitalization of the subfield of party studies. The appearance in 1995 of the journal _Party Politics_—which is devoted explicitly to the systematic examination of parties and party systems from a variety of perspectives—has been accompanied by a substantial outburst of comparative studies of parties.2 In the aggregate, the reawakening of interest in political parties has been so considerable as to make the temporary decline of this subfield following its ‘golden age’ appear as a puzzling aberration.³ As Peter Mair (1997: p. vii) has pointed out, ‘little more than a decade ago, students of party politics were often accused of being engaged in a somewhat passé branch of the discipline; today it is a field which is brimming with health and promise’. Far from declining in importance, we believe that a re-examination of both the prevailing theories of political parties and their actual behavior in a variety of political systems should continue to occupy a prominent place on the research agenda of political science.

**ASSESSING PARTY DECLINE**

Paradoxically, this revitalization of scholarly interest in parties has coincided with frequent assertions that parties have entered into an irreversible process of decline. Indeed, if the ‘decline of party’ hypothesis were found to be substantiated in many contemporary democratic systems, one might conclude
that new studies of political parties would be increasingly irrelevant. We believe that the exact opposite is true. Rather than assuming that an alleged decline of parties should imply a decline in the literature on parties, we think that the confrontation of new challenges suggests a reassessment of parties and the contemporary relevance of some aspects of the traditional party literature. As several of the following chapters will demonstrate, in recent years these venerable organizations have been forced to confront a wide variety of new challenges. What is not at all clear is the extent to which parties have failed to meet these challenges and have therefore begun to decline in importance as institutionalized actors in democratic politics. As Strøm and Svåsand (1997b: 4) have noted, ‘doom-and gloom treatises on political parties have become a growth industry over the past two decades. But this gloomy picture of contemporary parties is far from self-evident.’ Thus, one set of research questions arising out of this line of speculation concerns the extent to which parties have, indeed, declined organizationally, as objects of citizen loyalty, as mobilizers of votes, and as key actors in democratic politics. All of these are empirical questions, answers to which should not be assumed or generalized excessively.

Accordingly, a second line of potentially fruitful research that emerges from speculations about party decline concerns the nature of the challenges facing contemporary parties, as well as their reactions to those challenges. Some of these challenges have their origins in the changing nature of society. In many countries, levels of affiliation with parties and with allied mass-membership organizations upon which many mass-based parties have depended for support have declined significantly, thereby calling into question the viability of mass-based institutional structures that had their origins in earlier times. Trends towards secularization have sapped the strength of denominational parties, at the same time that increasing affluence and expanding middle classes have shrunk the potential electoral base of working-class parties. The greater participation of women in the labour force has both placed new demands on the policy agendas of parties, and created a transformed constituency in need of party representation. Massive international migration has introduced many individuals into societies who had not been represented by previously established parties, and in some quarters has given rise to xenophobic reactions feeding the growth of new kinds of right-wing parties.

Other challenges to parties have emerged as consequences of higher levels of personal resources possessed by citizens. Better educated individuals who had never experienced economic deprivation have tended to adopt post-materialist values that both conflicted with the traditional ideologies of many parties and have given rise to participatory expectations better suited to new social movements, single-issue interest groups, and unconventional forms of political involvement. Better informed citizens are also able to enhance their
participatory capabilities, expand the range of their access to independent channels of information, and develop their own attitudinal orientations towards politics and parties independent of guidance from secondary associations or ‘opinion leaders’. Some of these trends have weakened the structural and psychological linkages between citizens and parties, as reflected in lower levels of party identification, and increases in feelings of political dissatisfaction, cynicism and even alienation.

Still other challenges have their origins in technological developments. The mass-communications media have opened up new channels for direct access between citizens and their political leaders that need not pass through traditional partisan channels. The rapid spread of access to the internet has created massive and complex networks of direct horizontal communications among citizens, while at the same time establishing a potential basis for ‘narrowcasting’ messages between politicians and specific if not highly specialized sectors of society. The downside of these communications advances involves the enormous cost of establishing such networks, paying consultants for the purpose of crafting messages and attractive images of politicians, and in some countries (especially the United States) purchasing television or radio time for the broadcasting of commercial advertisements. Dramatic increases in the cost of campaigning has compelled parties to seek massive volumes of revenue from both public and private sources, and this has sometimes spilt over into the adoption (or suspicion) of corrupt practices of various kinds. Finally, the trend towards devolution of governmental authority from centre to regional or local levels of government in several countries has posed new challenges associated with electoral competition at both the national and sub-national levels.4

The cumulative effects of these challenges have given rise in some Western democracies to a literature characterized by its somewhat fatalistic analysis of the organizational, electoral, cultural, and institutional symptoms of party decline (e.g. Berger 1979; Offe 1984; Lawson and Merkl 1988a). Some scholars regard these challenges as so serious as to threaten the very survival of parties. As Lawson and Merkl (1988b: 3) have noted, ‘it may be that the institution of party is gradually disappearing, slowly being replaced by new political structures more suitable for the economic and technological realities of twenty-first-century politics’.

Parties in new democracies have had to confront an additional set of challenges, in addition to those described above. With the ‘third wave’ of democratization, party institutions have been born or re-established in dozens of political systems that had either lacked a tradition of democratic stability or never experienced truly democratic governance. Not only do they have to perform the standard functions of political parties in established democracies (including the recruitment of candidates for public office, the mobilization of electoral support, the structuring of policy agendas, and the formation of
governments), but have also been key actors in the establishment and consolidation of new democratic regimes, at the same time that they must institutionalize themselves as viable partisan organizations.5

These challenges have often been quite severe, and have forced parties to undertake considerable efforts to adapt to the changing conditions of political competition. They have also affected politics in Western democracies by facilitating the emergence of new types of parties associated with social movements. But in no instance have they led to the disappearance of parties and/or their replacement by other types of organizations (such as interest groups or social movements) or institutionalized practices (such as those of direct democracy). Thus, much of the alarmist literature regarding the decline of parties must be reassessed. As Tarrow (1990: 253) has pointed out, the literature on the relationship between parties and new social movements has been undermined by an overestimation of the distance between those two sets of actors, as well as an underestimation of the ability of parties to adapt to the demands of the New Politics. Aldrich (1995: ch. 8) is even more sweeping in his reassessment of this literature, suggesting that studies dealing with ‘the three Ds’ (party decay, decline, and decomposition) should be replaced by ‘the three Rs’ (party re-emergence, revitalization, and resurgence), in light of the profound changes in the functions and objectives of contemporary American parties.6 To an even greater extent, Western European parties have been, and still seem to be, able to successfully meet these challenges through processes of adaptation over the past three decades.7 Indeed, Kuechler and Dalton (1990: 298) have suggested that the principal (and clearly unintended) impact of the emergence of new social movements has been to force parties to adapt and initiate evolutionary processes of change that have helped to guarantee the long-term stability of the political system. This may very well be true, but if it is, it certainly suggests that the literature on party decline should be substantially reformulated in several ways. First, it should abandon the deterministic quality of its assessment of the negative impact on parties of a wide variety of causal factors. Second, it should acknowledge the important roles played by party elites in adopting strategies to meet external challenges and in successfully maintaining reasonably cohesive and electorally competitive organizations (see Rose and Mackie 1988). To date, the net effect has been that, despite suffering through periods of electoral dealignment over the past three decades, most available indicators suggest that ‘parties are alive and well within the governing process’ (as described by Dalton and Wattenberg 2000b: 273). And contrary to predictions of party decline in the 1980s, parties remain the most important actors in democratic systems. In the words of Peter Mair (1997: 90), parties continue to matter. Parties continue to survive. The old parties which were around well before Rokkan elaborated his freezing proposition are still around today, and, despite the challenges from new parties, and new social movements, most of them
still remain in powerful, dominant positions. . . . Following Rokkan, the party alternatives of the 1960s were older than the majority of their national electorates. Thirty years on, these self-same parties still continue to dominate mass politics. . . . Nowadays, in short, they are even older still.

To some extent, all of the chapters in this volume examine the factors that have contributed to the extraordinary continuity of parties, and they do so from complementary perspectives that have not been well explored in the existing party literature. Some of these chapters focus on the themes of party decline and public cynicism towards parties. As we will discuss at greater length in this introduction, Hans Daalder’s critical review of the party-decline literature brings to light the analytical biases and value-laden assumptions that underpin many such studies. Similarly, Juan J. Linz presents empirical evidence suggesting that many of the criticisms of parties by ordinary citizens may be derived from the holding of attitudes that are inherently contradictory, or from expectations of party performance that are impossible to meet, particularly in light of the increasing number of demanding roles that parties must perform in democratic systems. Mariano Torcal, Richard Gunther, and José Ramón Montero also examine the nature of citizen attitudes towards parties and politicians, and conclude on the basis of survey data from Southern Europe that anti-party sentiments are of two fundamentally different types—one fluctuating cluster of attitudes linked to satisfaction with the performance of the incumbent party, and another strikingly durable set of orientations rooted in the political cultures of these countries and the anti-party socialization experienced by older citizens under previous authoritarian regimes or prior unsuccessful democratic regimes.

Other chapters in this volume re-examine current conceptualizations of parties and the functions they perform in democratic systems. Stefano Bartolini undertakes a rigorous analysis of the complex dimensions that underpin the basic concept of party competition, and persuasively argues that this complexity defies the simplifying (if not simplistic) assumptions that underpin many rational-choice analyses of parties, party systems, and electoral behaviour. Steven B. Wolinetz examines the existing typologies of parties, particularly from the standpoint of party organizational characteristics, and reformulates some of them in an effort to better capture the extreme diversity of parties and reconcile that variation with specific analytical criteria. Richard S. Katz and Peter Mair argue that analyses of parties must acknowledge changes that have occurred with regard to their different faces (the party in public office, the party on the ground, and the party in the central office), and pay greater attention to the connection between the ascendancy of party in public office and some symptoms of party decline. In a similar manner, Jean Blondel introduces into the literature on party decline a series of observations about the ways in which differing practices regarding party patronage may affect public satisfaction with parties and their performance in public office. In
short, these chapters explore, from a theoretical perspective, the current conceptualizations of parties and party functions, and propose modifications in the ways in which analysts should approach these questions.

Three chapters present empirical comparative studies or case studies of the ways in which parties have attempted to cope with these challenges and adapt to changing circumstances. Hans-Jürgen Puhle presents a broad overview of the manner in which party elites were able to develop strategies that enabled them to adapt their organizational structures and mobilizing capacities to the new circumstances of the last decades of the twentieth century. In doing so, he raises important questions concerning the tendency of analysts to indiscriminately apply the term ‘catch-all’ to a wide variety of party types that depart in significant ways from Kirchheimer’s original formulation of that concept. Serenella Sferza systematically analyses the changing fortunes of the French socialist party over the past several decades. She also derives a number of broader theoretical implications from her case study, in particular in her criticism of ‘externalist’ approaches that have dominated the literature on party performance and party decline. Parties are not passive objects, she argues, and several aspects of their internal dynamics and the models of parties that are adopted have an important bearing on their capacity to successfully adapt to changing circumstances. Finally, Richard Gunther and Jonathan Hopkin present a detailed analysis of a once-powerful governing party that failed to meet various kinds of challenges, and, as a result, ceased to exist in the aftermath of destructive internal conflicts at the elite level. They concur with Sferza concerning the important role played by seemingly abstract models of parties, and conclude that fundamental conflicts over such models can destabilize a party and preclude its successful institutionalization.

**STRENGTHENING PARTY THEORY**

A third possible source of scepticism about the value of a new book on political parties might be rooted in disappointment over the underdevelopment of theory concerning parties, and in pessimism that it will ever culminate in a persuasive body of middle-range theory that might serve to orient future research in a coherent and consistent manner. While we acknowledge the general weakness of theory in this field (certainly compared with the broader consensus regarding concepts, terminology, and operational indicators which underpin research in some other related subfields of political science), we regard some of these criticisms as excessive, and we do not share their pessimism about the future evolution of this literature. First, it must be noted that the literature on political parties has, from the very beginning, sought to rise above the level of mere description (see Daalder 1983). Over the past half-century, in particular, many students of parties have attempted to generate
broad, theoretical propositions regarding the behaviour of parties, have proposed a number of typologies in an effort to make sense of the extraordinary variety of parties in existence, and/or have sought to establish concepts that might serve as the cornerstones of middle-range theoretical propositions. As Caramani and Hug have documented (1998: 507), over a third of the publications they surveyed concerning European parties are of a theoretical or analytical nature. Given the prominent role played by parties in democratic politics, the continuing impact of the classic contributions to this literature that we cited earlier, and the considerable volume of publications that have appeared in recent decades, one would have expected that by now there should have been some scholarly convergence on a systematic theoretical framework. Despite the potential presented by this rich and complex aspect of democratic politics, however, no such consensus has emerged. Much of the theorizing concerning parties has been unpersuasive, so inconsistent as not to have served as a basis for systematic hypothesis-testing or cumulative theory-building, or so divided among diverging research traditions as to have impeded cumulative theory-building.

This theoretical weakness was first noted by Duverger (1954: p. xiii). In the very first paragraphs of his classic book, he called for a breaking of the vicious circle that afflicted the parties literature: on the one hand, a general theory of parties must be based upon empirical studies; on the other hand, empirical studies should be guided by hypotheses derived from some putative body of theory, or at least a commonly accepted set of theoretical propositions. In actuality, neither of these conditions was met, to the detriment of the development of this field of research. A generation later, Sartori (1976: p. x) began his book with a criticism of the imbalance resulting from the continuing weakness of a theory of parties and the abundance of empirical materials which were not easily cumulative or comparable. And today, widespread dissatisfaction with this literature appears to have continued, in so far as it has made little progress towards the development of theory built upon systematic comparative empirical analyses, general and testable hypotheses, and valid explanations of key phenomena (Wolinetz 1998c: pp. xi and xxi; Crotty 1991).

Over the past several decades, there have been some noteworthy attempts to build theory based upon approaches that were sometimes complementary, and sometimes competing and even incompatible. These various approaches have been categorized by many authors as historical, structural, behavioral, ideological, and functional-systemic (for instance, Lawson 1976: ch. 1; Ware 1996: ch. 6). Other overviews, more centred on party systems than parties per se, classified them as genetic, morphological, competitive, and institutional (Bartolini 1986b; Epstein 1975). It is clear from this brief enumeration that such efforts have been both numerous and diverse.

One of the most significant of these efforts towards theory-building occurred in the midst of the great outpouring of party studies in the 1960s.
Since at the same time structural-functionalism was the most attractive paradigm in comparative politics, it is not surprising that many such studies were closely tied to its core premisses. This approach had a substantial impact on the study of parties in part because this was a critical period for the definitive institutionalization of parties in Western democracies, and it coincided with the appearance of many new parties in the short-lived democracies that emerged from decolonization in Africa and Asia (see Kies 1966). Under these circumstances, characterized by the proliferation of greatly divergent types of political institutions in societies at greatly different stages of socio-economic development, adoption of a common structural-functional framework offered an ambitious promise of serving as the basis for the scientific and comparative study of politics. It was claimed that theorizing about parties and other important political phenomena would be advanced by the identification of common attributes and functions played by parties in all political systems irrespective of their institutional, social, and cultural diversity. To facilitate comparison, or at least to try to discern common themes among widely diverging developmental trajectories, it was posited that parties are the principal performers of the functions of interest articulation and aggregation, and, to a lesser extent, political socialization, recruitment, and communication. It was thought that this common ground could serve as the basis for the elaboration of concepts, deductive reasoning, and ambitious theoretical propositions.9

For a variety of reasons, that analytical approach became extinct. Its disappearance may have been partly attributable to the disconcerting, anti-cumulative (and therefore non-scientific) trendiness that has too often led to radical paradigm shifts in the discipline of political science. But its extinction was also a consequence of flaws that were inherent in the approach itself—particularly its static quality, its ethnocentrism, and the tendency of many of its practitioners to stress equilibrium, stability, and the functionality of institutions over conflict and change. More radical criticisms focused on its tautological character, its confusion over basic definitional dimensions, and the often weak and tangential link between the theory’s core propositions and the actual empirical analysis carried out in its name, with this latter deficiency a logical outgrowth of its lack of operationalized concepts and testable hypotheses.10 In any event, this attempt to establish a universalistic framework for the analysis of politics in general, and parties in particular, disappeared as a guiding force for empirical analysis by the mid-1970s.

A second significant effort to develop a universalistic theory of party politics is the emergence over the past decade of a number of studies analysing parties from a rational-choice perspective. Following the classic book by Anthony Downs (1957), the various currents of rational-choice scholarship have sought to formulate compatible sets of highly stylized hypotheses based upon a common set of assumptions about individuals and their goals. In the
United States, this perspective has, since the mid-1960s, progressively transformed the study of American political parties. Previously, as Aldrich (1995: ch. 1) points out, American parties were seen as coalitions among numerous and diverse groups whose interests are aggregated around a platform that is attractive to the majority of voters, and which seek to advance those interests through their presence in government (see Key 1964; Sorauf 1964). A second earlier focus of the literature on American parties adopted a more normative tone in proposing the need for parties to be responsible by offering voters sets of policy commitments which they would implement when they are in office, or serve as alternative sets of choices when they are in opposition (see Ranney 1975; Epstein 1968). Beginning in the 1970s, the unfolding of a number of propositions derived from the works of Schumpeter (1942) and Downs (1957) served as the basis of a new phase in the study of American parties increasingly dominated by the rational-choice perspective.

This third phase, based upon an analogy between the functioning of economic markets and the so-called political market, has reduced parties to groups of politicians competing for public office. While party models thus focusing on electoral competition have facilitated an extraordinary growth of studies by distinct schools of rational-choice scholars, they are problematic for the purpose of generating a theory of parties beyond the extremely formalized model of the American two-party system. To be sure, the definition of party set forth by Downs (1957: 25) presents clear advantages over the functionalist approach in its characterizations of parties as goal-oriented, of politicians as rational actors, and of their objectives as ranked according to preferences which can be achieved through access to government posts. But this approach is also problematic in so far as its analysis is based on a series of highly simplifying assumptions whose correspondence with reality is most questionable. One of these conceives of the party as a unitary actor or a unified ‘team’. As Downs explained (1957: 25–6): ‘By team, we mean a coalition whose members agree on all their goals instead of on just part of them. Thus every member of the team has exactly the same goals as every other . . . . In effect, this definition treats each party as though it were a single person.’ Also problematic are simplifying assumptions about the motivations of politicians. Again as described by Downs (1957: 28), ‘We assume that they act solely in order to attain the income, prestige and power which come from being in office. . . . [T]heir only goal is to reap the rewards of office per se. They treat policies purely as a means to the attainment of their private ends, which they can reach only by being elected.’ Accordingly, ‘parties formulate policies in order to win elections, rather than win elections in order to formulate policies’. This extremely reductionist characterization ignores the organizational complexity of parties (but see Schlesinger 1984, 1991), interactions among party members, the obvious existence of party preferences over policies, and their sometimes conflicted stands regarding objectives and preferences.11 It
also focuses its attention exclusively upon interparty electoral competition, which it portrays as competition between candidates. Parties have virtually disappeared as significant actors in rational-choice analyses. Indeed, most analyses of this kind go so far as to avoid explicit references to ‘parties’, subsuming the concept of party under the rubric of ‘candidates’. And when such references do appear, they are often subjected to oversimplifications that run counter to reality and give rise to hypotheses that are of dubious validity. As Roemer (forthcoming, Introduction) contends, the Downsian model and many of those who have adopted it make a grave error when they simplify these dynamics to the point of eliminating politics from political competition.

As a product of these conceptualizations and core assumptions, the contribution of the rational-choice literature to the development of theory regarding parties has been notably weak (notwithstanding the exceptions noted below). The criticisms of rational-choice applications in political science (such as by Green and Shapiro 1994) have been particularly pertinent to the study of parties: the universalistic claims of the axioms and assumptions of this approach have improperly and arbitrarily ignored the great variation in types of political parties; the method-driven (rather than problem-driven) selection of their hypotheses have greatly restricted their applicability and even relevance to many actual facets of party behaviour; and the explanatory capacity of the interactions between parties and voters or with other parties is also weak. Thus, the very same consistency and simplicity of the assumptions underpinning this approach that are allegedly so beneficial for the purpose of launching complementary, mutually compatible and potentially cumulative theory-building and hypothesis-testing are also sources of weakness when applied to the study of political parties, particularly with regard to their inability to capture the complexity, multidimensionality, and interactive nature of the objectives parties and their leaders pursue, the strategies they adopt, and their actual behaviour in the real world of politics. As has been noted, the analysis of party competition is a good case in point. In this volume, Stefano Bartolini carefully analyses the problems inherent in the one-dimensionality and ambiguity of the concept of competition, borrowed initially from economics and applied, often uncritically, to the political arena. As he demonstrates, many of the simplifying assumptions inherent in that economic approach do not fit with important aspects of actual competition in the world of politics. Accordingly, theory-building concerning political parties has been undermined by the poor fit between an often complex, messy, and multidimensional empirical reality, on the one hand, and an ‘elegant’ but often simplistic and unrealistic theory-building enterprise, on the other. Given these incompatibilities between simple models and a highly complex reality, doubts even arise concerning the extent to which these efforts to establish a single common framework for the deduction of hypotheses and the construction of a cumulative theory of politics may, in the end, prove to be counter-productive.
Fortunately, over the past several years some scholars have employed ‘soft’ rational choice approaches in their studies of parties. They acknowledge that the reduction of ‘parties’ to individual candidates in their models of electoral competition has weakened empirical analyses of parties. As Strøm concludes (1990b: 565), ‘rational choice models of political parties . . . have failed to generate a simple, coherent theory of competitive party behavior or to produce robust results that apply under a variety of environmental conditions’. In contrast, these ‘soft-rational-choice’ studies have relaxed many of the core assumptions of the more rigid applications of this approach in their empirical analyses; their representations of the rationality of political actors are much more plausible (albeit still quite stylized); they have broadened the range of objectives pursued by politicians, and included in their analysis considerations of the constraints imposed on party behaviour by varying contexts; and they have paid more attention to empirical data in developing theoretical propositions regarding parties.\textsuperscript{15} These studies have been based on systematic empirical analysis, and have sought to improve theory-building by taking into account the organizational complexity of parties, distinctions among party goals (differentiating among vote-seeking, office-seeking, and policy-seeking parties), and the interaction between the demands of voters and the nature of the offers extended by parties. Accordingly, they treat parties as endogenous variables whose organizational, ideological, and institutional characteristics are conditioned by the strategies pursued by party leaders (functioning as rational actors), and by the various contexts of the political systems within which they act. This literature has made significant advances towards establishing a common framework for theorizing about the behaviour of parties, the preferences of their leaders, and the conditions which affect the formation of governments in polities with distinct institutional structures. In our view, they have much greater prospects for making significant contributions to theory-building relevant to parties than do applications of simplistic economic models to the study of complex party organizations, and their interrelationships with distinct set of actors in society and government. Some problems remain, however, particularly with regard to the ability of this approach to integrate assumptions about the behaviour of the leaders of different kinds of parties within similar political systems, or of parties with common organizational characteristics in different systems. In this sense, it is noteworthy that the chapter in this volume by Wolinetz makes an effort to connect the classificatory schemes based upon the differing objectives pursued by party elites with operational criteria better suited for the generation of testable hypotheses and theory-building with regard to parties.

A third intellectual tradition is one that seeks to generate theoretical insights by employing an inductive approach to the study of parties. This more traditional and time-honoured school has elaborated large numbers of models and typologies of political parties. While much has been learnt about
the structure, strategies, and behaviour of parties based upon middle-range hypotheses derived from these party types, this effort has also fallen short of expectations for the development of party theory. This is for a variety of reasons. First, most typologies of parties were based exclusively on the historical experiences of surprisingly few West European democracies during the first six decades of the twentieth century. This generally static conceptualization has limited applicability to parties in other countries (even in established democracies like that of the United States), is in many respects incapable of coping with the new challenges confronting parties that we noted earlier, and has become increasingly irrelevant to studies of the large numbers of parties that have emerged from the Third Wave of democratization that has swept across many parts of the world. Neither the classic (e.g. Duverger 1954; Neumann 1956) nor the more contemporary categorizing schema (e.g. Kirchheimer 1966; Panebianco 1988; Katz and Mair 1995) have been able to capture the full range of variation in the extremely large number of parties in the world today, particularly given the very small number of party types elaborated in each of these contributions.

Neither has this approach led to cumulative theory building, or even consensus on a categorization of parties according to a consistent set of criteria. Indeed, as Gunther and Diamond (2001) have pointed out, the various typologies have differed substantially with regard to the fundamental nature of the criteria used to distinguish among party types. Some (e.g. Neumann 1956; Kitschelt 1989a; Katz and Mair 1995) of these categorizations are based upon functional criteria, differentiating among parties on the basis of an organizational raison d'être or some specific goal that they pursue; others (Duverger 1954; Kitschelt 1994; Panebianco 1988) are organizational, distinguishing between parties that have thin organizational structures and those that have developed large infrastructures and complex networks of collaborative relationships with other secondary organizations; while others (e.g. Michels 1962 [1911]; Eldersveld 1964) have adopted sociological criteria, implicitly or explicitly basing their work on the notion that parties are the products of (and ought to represent the interests of) various social groups. Finally, there are some prominent scholars who indiscriminately mix all three of these sets of criteria, such as Kirchheimer (1966), who posits four party models: bourgeois parties of individual representation; class-mass parties; denominational mass parties; and catch-all people’s parties.

As useful as these typologies are in identifying distinguishing characteristics of political parties, they are not inherently explanatory. Their greatest utility, as Rokkan (1967: 174) noted, is when multidimensional criteria have been employed to capture complex configurations of features, including elements that may be significant in a particular political context but at the same time allowing for comparative analysis on various dimensions. When misapplied, however, these typologies can induce scholars to fall into a methodological trap
based upon the implicit assumption that a particular party type will become dominant and will characterize an entire phase in a long-term process of historical evolution, only to be followed by its displacement as the prototypical party by a different type in a subsequent period. Moreover, a superficial and inappropriate use of party models can actually weaken both empirical studies and theory-building by leading to gross oversimplifications of party characteristics, unwarranted assumptions of commonalities (if not uniformity) among parties that are in fact quite varied, and the inappropriate application of labels (such as ‘catch-all’) to parties whose organizational, ideological, or strategic characteristics differ significantly from the original prototype. In short, scholars may feel compelled to attempt to cram round pegs into square holes because the available options are insufficient in number and variety to capture the essential nature of many real-world political parties. This leads, in turn, to inattention to potentially significant differences among parties, or strains and evolutionary tendencies within parties, that might have considerable theoretical relevance.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The study of parties should not be fundamentally different from other sub-fields of political science. As a scientific enterprise, it should reverse the vicious circle mentioned earlier into a virtuous circle, in which theoretical propositions help to stimulate and structure empirical research, and will, in turn, be validated, rejected, or modified on the basis of the findings of that empirical research. Accordingly, the basic canons of science reserve important roles for both inductive and deductive analytical processes. Induction is most appropriate for the generation of theoretical propositions that accord with the reality that they purport to explain. Deduction is necessary in order to derive from putative theoretical propositions testable hypotheses that can either be supported or rejected on the basis of empirical evidence. To date, this dialogue between the inductive and deductive phases of theory-building has been inadequate with regard to the study of political parties.

We have briefly surveyed two predominantly deductive efforts to establish a general theory of parties (if not of politics, more broadly construed): one of them, structural-functionalism, was imported from the fields of anthropology and sociology; the other, rational-choice analysis, from economics. In our view, neither has achieved its objective of establishing a common analytical framework, generally acknowledged by a consensus among scholars within the discipline as an acceptable if not fully valid basis for research and for theory-building. The paradigmatic status of structural-functionalism in political science lasted less than a decade before it was virtually abandoned as a framework for analysis. Rational-choice approaches have been much more
persistent: with regard to the study of parties, they have been employed by a minority of scholars over more than four decades. But by the end of the twentieth century, the more rigid and orthodox versions of rational-choice theory had failed to approach remotely paradigmatic status in the field, or even to convince a majority of scholars working in this area that it provided a valid, or even useful, way of framing both theoretical and empirical studies of party behaviour. To be sure, much of value has been derived from 'soft' applications of this approach, which rigorously test selected rational-choice-generated hypotheses using empirical data. Given the advances made by practitioners of this related approach, it is unlikely that there will be many scholars who choose to employ the more orthodox, overwhelmingly deductive, and non-empirical versions of rational-choice theory: indeed, for the reasons also stated above (and more elaborately in the chapter by Stefano Bartolini), we have doubts about the validity of the fundamental analogy between simple economic models of profit-maximizing individuals, on the one hand, and complex, multidimensional parties, pursuing a variety of objectives within widely varying contexts, on the other. Indeed, we question whether it is reasonable to strive for the formulation of a single, all-encompassing theory of parties, let alone of politics in general. We share this scepticism with a number of other scholars who reject the notion that a general theory could be constructed that would explain, through a series of interrelated propositions, such diverse phenomena as those ranging from the organizational features of parties to the impact of party activities on the lives of citizens. In short, we fear that the search for a general theory of parties (or politics) may prove to be as fruitless as the search for the Holy Grail.

This is not to say that the predominantly inductive, empirically based studies that dominate the parties literature have culminated in the development of a satisfactory body of middle-range theory. While many interesting theoretical insights can be gleaned from this enormous literature, and many rich empirical studies represent significant contributions to political science, this field of study is excessively cluttered with concepts, terminologies, and typologies that are either unnecessarily redundant (with different terms used to describe the same basic phenomena) or not comparable or cumulative (being based on fundamentally different classificatory criteria). While 'let a hundred flowers bloom' may be an excellent strategy for encouraging the proliferation of novel developments in a new field, at a certain point it becomes desirable to remove the weeds from the garden and concentrate on the cultivation of the more fruitful offspring. Thus, we believe that the study of parties would benefit from adopting analytical strategies solidly based on the middle ground between the deductive and sometimes excessively simplifying, method-driven and barely empirical approaches, on the one hand, and the empirically driven studies that have occasionally culminated in a cacophony of sometimes compatible but redundant, sometimes incompatible and non-cumulative concepts, typologies,
and models, on the other. As Janda (1993: 184) has proposed, ‘Our challenge is now to assimilate, develop, and extend existing theory rather than to wait for a general theory to descend on high.’

What kinds of steps could be taken to strengthen middle-range theories and testable hypotheses concerning political parties? One approach (as proposed by Beyme 1985; Wolinetz 1998c) is to develop partial theories dealing with specific aspects of parties, but which go well beyond mere schematic description or empirical generalization. This approach has been effectively utilized in closely related subfields in political science. In the subfield of electoral behaviour, for example, this kind of approach is best exemplified by ‘social cleavage theory’, in which a coherent set of explanatory hypotheses (based upon a common set of assumptions and concepts, and consistently using a common vocabulary and generally compatible empirical methodologies) have been systematically tested over more than four decades. This body of theory has not only been able to reach broad consensus in its empirical findings, but it has also generated fruitful theoretical innovations, and has been highly sensitive to changes in the strength of the cleavage-anchoring of the vote over the past several decades. A second approach would be to further lower the barriers between predominantly deductive approaches, such as rational-choice theory, and more inductive traditional approaches. Such a course of action has been endorsed by prominent scholars in both camps. Barnes (1997: 135), whose roots are in the more traditional inductive-empirical camp, has, for example, called for the development of general theories through the integration of what he calls inductive islands of theory and the principal achievements of rational choice. In many respects, the gaps between the two approaches are not that great, as the recent flourishing of ‘soft rational-choice’ studies would attest. From the rational-choice camp, Schlesinger (1984: 118) has argued that claims concerning the absence of theory on parties are simply overstated, since there exists a common framework underpinning the majority of monographs on parties, even though it may be necessary to polish, systematize, and empirically test this theoretical framework. Relatedly, Müller and Strøm (1999b: 307) call for much more frequent engagement between research traditions characterized by formal modelling and by more empirical and inductive approaches. While such an approach would entail an abandonment of the universalistic pretensions based upon strict assumptions of rationality, which often preclude systematic empirical testing, it could also push otherwise atheoretical descriptive studies of parties towards the more conscious generation and testing of hypotheses oriented towards theory-building.

A third approach would be to maintain a largely inductive/empirical stance but to facilitate hypothesis generation and testing by consolidating the myriad existing typologies, and adopting a standard terminology to describe fundamentally equivalent models of parties that are currently grouped under
different labels. This, in turn, would require a standardization of the criteria upon which parties are categorized and, if necessary, elaboration of additional models to capture the essence of parties that have emerged in some of the new Third Wave democracies outside of the heavily studied West European and North American regions, or in the long-established democracies since the traditional typologies were formulated. The benefits of such an approach can be seen in another two closely related subfields, the dynamics of party systems and the effects of electoral systems: both have been greatly facilitated by a common set of concepts, vocabulary, and formulas for calculating their main operational indicators. General agreement on the meaning and operationalization of these concepts has made it possible to compare consistently and precisely democratic party systems with one another, and to monitor their evolution over several decades. No such standardization of concepts, terminology, or operational indicators has taken place yet with regard to the study of political parties, per se.

Another, more modest but necessary approach, which is adopted in this volume, is to re-examine critically these old typologies, concepts, and the assumptions underpinning them. The ultimate development of more comprehensive, systematic, and coherent models of parties, for example, requires an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing typologies. This book also explores some of the standard criticisms of political parties, with the objective of identifying common errors in empirical studies based upon these concepts, as well new questions upon which empirical research could profitably be focused. The chapter by Hans Daalder, for example, discusses the analytical biases and value-laden assumptions that undermine the credibility of many contributions to the party-decline literature. Similarly, Hans-Jürgen Puhle criticizes the misapplication of the term ‘catch-all’ to parties very different from those Kirchheimer had in mind when he formulated that concept. The chapter by Richard S. Katz and Peter Mair also goes beyond the traditional approach to the use of party models by analysing the interrelationships among different models of party organization (the cadre, mass, catch-all, and cartel parties) and among different ‘faces’ of parties. In a similar vein, Jean Blondel argues that the differing roles played by party patronage within various institutional settings have important implications for party performance and decline. Steven B. Wolinetz critically re-examines the existing classificatory schema and proposes that we focus our attention on the distinction among vote-seeking, policy-seeking, and office-seeking parties. And Stefano Bartolini rigorously explores the assumptions underpinning the application of simple economic models of competition to the study of electoral competition. The chapters by Serenella Sferza, and Richard Gunther and Jonathan Hopkin undertake analytical case studies of particular parties, and demonstrate the extraordinary importance of different party models for their performance and even survival. Finally, comparative
analyses of survey data enable Juan J. Linz and Torcal, Gunther, and Montero to challenge common assumptions about the meaning, the origins, and the behavioural consequences of anti-party attitudes among the general public. Linz concludes by raising a number of issues that he believes should serve as the basis of future empirical analysis.

**RECONCEPTUALIZING, RE-EXAMINING AND REVISITING PARTIES**

The principal objective of this book is to lay the groundwork for future theory-building efforts regarding political parties by re-examining some of the established concepts, models, and linkages that have underpinned this field for the past five decades, and by further exploring their applicability to parties today. The book is divided into three parts. It begins with chapters devoted to a reconceptualization of basic aspects of political parties. In the second part, our contributing authors re-examine party models based upon a set of organizational criteria. Finally, the last group of chapters revisit several significant dimensions of party linkages. From a variety of perspectives—both conceptual and empirical—these ten chapters are intended to contribute to the refinement of cumulative knowledge about political parties, to the formulation of testable hypotheses that can serve as the basis for the building of middle-range theory, and to theoretical propositions with greater explanatory power.

**Reconceptualizing Parties and Party Competition**

In the first part, Hans Daalder systematically analyses writings since the beginning of the twentieth century that have dealt with an alleged ‘crisis of parties’, or, as described since the 1970s, ‘party decline’. Daalder criticizes the normative or ideological pseudoconcepts used implicitly or explicitly in this literature with extraordinary frequency in generally negative assessments of the status of parties in Western Europe. The term ‘crisis of parties’, he finds, was commonly used as a euphemism to reflect a rejection of parties in general, or a party in particular. This is most clearly the case with the first of the four varieties of this literature, which he calls ‘denial of party’. Shortly after the appearance of mass parties, studies by Ostrogorski (1964 [1902]) and Michels (1962 [1911]) denounced the subordination of individual to organization, and of the latter to party leaders. Daalder identifies two distinct sets of arguments under this critical common rubric: one was articulated by those who were nostalgic for a traditional and supposedly harmonious political order; and the other by individualists and liberals who conceived of the party as a tyrannical and antidemocratic organization. The subsequent establishment of the
Parteienstaat (analysed in greater depth by Hans-Jürgen Puhle in this volume) conferred legitimacy on parties, but this did not preclude a second type of criticism, focusing on certain types of parties or party systems. Among European scholars, catch-all parties were the targets of this new round of criticism, while in the United States parties were criticized on the grounds that they were not ‘responsible’ (with the American Political Science Association passing a resolution in favour of a ‘more responsible two-party system’: APSA 1950). A third type of criticism, based on highly idealistic impressions of the British two-party system, focused on multi-party systems. Even though only a small minority of democracies have a two-party system, it was seen by some as the ‘natural’ party system by those who either preferred majoritarian electoral principles or preferred to analyse partisan competition from a rational-choice perspective. The fourth group of critics are those who view parties as ‘redundant’, having fulfilled their basic function of mobilizing the mass electorate, or having degenerated into mere electoral machines. In their view, parties are likely to disappear or, at least, continue to decline as a consequence of the emergence of new social movements and the acquisition of new personal resources by citizens. These waves of criticism in the literature are problematic from two perspectives, Daalder argues. The first is that each of these normative arguments is linked exclusively to a particular party, to a particular historical epoch, or to a particular country. Daalder warns that those engaged in concept-building should take care to avoid such normative biases, and should be specific in stating the criteria underpinning their formulation. And he concludes by noting that more a rigorous analysis of key concepts can debunk easy ‘generalizations’ or conventional wisdoms that commonly circulate within various academic circles or the general public, and, in turn, can yield more refined concepts and facilitate theory-building.

While Daalder critically re-examines the pseudoconcepts that have appeared in the ‘crisis of parties’ literature since the beginning of the twentieth century, Hans-Jürgen Puhle focuses his analysis on the ‘crisis’ of the catch-all party since the 1970s. He discusses in great detail the restructuring that Western catch-all parties have undergone in response to new challenges arising out of changes in society and in the Parteienstaat within which they function. Puhle’s chapter displays a rich combination of theoretical, typological, conceptual, and empirical elements in its analysis of the evolution of the catch-all party. He also presents a critical re-examination of theorizing about European political parties. In a manner similar to arguments set forth by Katz and Mair in their chapter, Puhle’s analysis distinguishes among three waves of party-building, culminating in four types of party that have emerged over the past century in Europe. And also like Katz and Mair, Puhle cautions us that these historical phases are merely suggestive: models of parties are ‘ideal types’ that do not neatly correspond to real-world political parties. Instead, most parties contain a mix of characteristics of different types,
although usually one or another is sufficiently pronounced as to allow the analyst to characterize parties as close enough to one or another as to be placed within the typology. Both because the historical phases he identifies are illustrative rather than definitive, and because most real-world parties only roughly approximate the defining criteria of the ideal types of parties that make up most typologies, it would be particularly inappropriate to assume that any one type of party was dominant within any given historical phase. Party types, argues Puhle, usually overlap the boundaries of historical periods, and the simultaneous interaction among parties of different types helps to drive the evolution of parties.

These caveats notwithstanding, Puhle makes three important points. The first is to remind us of that the catch-all party, as defined by Kirchheimer (1966), was an outgrowth of the mass-integration party, as described by Neumann (1956). Accordingly, this concept included certain specific criteria that make many misapplications of this term inappropriate: it is much more than simply a residual category to describe the full panoply of parties that have emerged since the heyday of the mass-based party. Second, he claims that most of the major parties of Europe are still predominantly catch-all. But, third, he points to a widespread tendency since the early 1980s towards lower levels of organization and societal penetration of parties. Social democratic, Christian democratic, and conservative parties in Western Europe have adapted to the challenges of the past two decades by re-equilibrating (not by breaking down or declining) on the basis of a new type of party, which he calls the ‘catch-all plus’ party. This new kind of party has a smaller and less structured organizational base, and is more flexible in its efforts to remain electorally competitive. The negative aspects of these characteristics, however, include a ‘short-termism’ and ‘ad-hockery’ in their programmatic and electoral appeals, coupled with a reduced capacity for social integration and mediation. Overall, this development is suggestive not of ‘party decline’ in the face of new challenges, but of adaptation and continuity, albeit in a somewhat different organizational form and with different behavioural characteristics.

More broadly, Puhle concludes that this process of adaptation underlines the importance for scholars of continuing to study parties, to reconsider their fundamental conceptualizations whenever they cease to conform to commonly accepted party models, and to avoid the conceptual paralysis that has too often characterized the study of parties. While parsimony remains a desirable characteristic of typologies, reconceptualization and the development of new models may be necessary in order to cope with new challenges in future historical periods and in different kinds of democratic systems that are emerging in other world regions.

The chapter by Stefano Bartolini focuses on the concept of electoral and party competition as the key mechanism leading party elites to respond to the preferences of voters. While competition is of central importance in both
democratic theory and in empirical studies of party behaviour, the concept (as operationalized in many studies) is vague and ambiguous. In particular, it has very different meanings in the real world of electoral and parliamentary behaviour, on the one hand, and in the formal models of rational-choice scholars, on the other. Bartolini presents a rigorous critique of the problems inherent in applying this import from economic theory to the study of competition between political parties. One significant problem (which we discussed earlier) is that this approach requires an excessive simplification of political reality. Perhaps even more fundamental are problems resulting from differences between the economic and political markets, to the extent that the analogy between the two breaks down in several important respects. Following an overview of its intellectual origins (e.g. Simmel 1955 [1908]; Schumpeter 1942; Downs 1957), the bulk of the chapter is dedicated to an impressively original criticism of this approach based on a detailed consideration of the basic nature of competition in these two different spheres of human and institutional interaction, or ‘markets’. Bartolini focuses his attention on several key dimensions of competition, not to mention of democracy itself—contestability, availability, decidability, and vulnerability. He further argues that these four crucial dimensions of competition interact with one another in ways that are fundamentally incompatible with the simplifying assumptions upon which the economic model depends. Each of the dimensions of party competition impinges on the others in an interactive, if not sometimes contradictory manner. A decrease in availability can create disincentives for electoral competition, while an increase can lead to high levels of electoral volatility. If decidability is low, parties are presented with powerful incentives to engage in collusive practices on the basis of their minimal differences regarding issues and policies; but if it is high, it can lead to ideological polarization. And if vulnerability is low, it can make parties unresponsive in so far as they feel secure; but if it is too high, it can culminate in a decisional paralysis by parties out of fear of alienating voters. As a result of these multidimensional interaction effects, party competition cannot be conceived of as a linear process that unfolds between minimum and maximum points on a single continuum, but rather as a moving point shifting about in a four-dimensional space within which no equilibrium point can be identified. Accordingly, electoral preferences cannot be regarded as exogenous to party competition, but are decisively influenced by parties and party elites.

In combination with the findings of the two previous chapters, these conclusions have important theoretical implications. Most importantly, they suggest that competition cannot be treated as a unidimensional phenomenon whose optimal conditions can be quantified. Instead, it is a multidimensional phenomenon in which the maximization of preferences on one dimension has direct and often negative repercussions for another dimension. Analyses of policy stands or electoral appeals can only be based upon a study of decisions
made by political elites, acting within particular historical contexts and weighing conflicting considerations of trade-offs among these various dimensions of party competition. This does not imply that generalizations cannot be made about various combinations among these dimensions of competition; nor does it preclude the systematic study of elite strategies and decision-making. But it does argue that analytical frameworks must stand up to the test of feasibility, and must take into consideration those factors that have empirically and theoretically significant impact on the behaviour of parties, candidates, and voters. The fact that party competition is affected by the interaction among several different dimensions is not symptomatic of imperfections in the market; it is, instead, a reflection of the true context within which party elites must make their strategic decisions.

Re-examining Party Organization and Party Models

The second part of this book reexamines various facets of party organization. As one might imagine, the literature on party organization is considerable. Many of the classic works on parties—such as Michels (1962 [1911]), Duverger (1954), Neumann (1956), Eldersveld (1964), and Kirchheimer (1966)—dealt extensively with typologies of party organizations and the problems associated with different party types. Subsequently, however, attention was shifted away from a concern with party organization, *per se*. Many studies focused on the relationship linking parties with citizens, especially through analyses of voting behaviour, or with governmental institutions, in public policy analyses. The abandonment of concern with parties as organizations is most extreme in the case of rational-choice studies, whose conception of the party as a unitary actor explicitly ignores its organizational complexity (Daalder 1983: 21). To be sure, there were significant exceptions to this trend. But we are far from achieving the goals of the research agenda set forth by Mair (1997: 41–4) to go beyond simplistic classifications of party organization, to develop empirical indicators regarding the internal life of parties, to monitor the relationships between organizational change and electoral volatility, and to test hypotheses accounting both for the diversity of, and change within, party organizations. The four chapters included in this part of the book address some of the questions arising out of this agenda, and make significant contributions to advancing this theory-building enterprise.

The chapter by Richard S. Katz and Peter Mair examines the interactions among models of party organization and the shifting internal balance of power over the course of the twentieth century. Specifically, it links four different models of party organization (the cadre or elite party, the mass party, the catch-all party, and the cartel party) with the three ‘faces’ of parties: ‘on the ground,’ ‘in the central office’, and ‘in public office’. They argue that the strategies of party elites, in combination with the institutional processes of
party competition in advanced democracies, have led to the ascendancy of ‘the party in public office’, and a commensurate subordination of the other two faces of parties. Consistent with the line of argument advanced by Puhle in this volume, Katz and Mair warn against simplistically linking party models with the developmental trajectory of parties: the basic nature of parties is not determined by a particular historical state, and various party types may coexist simultaneously in democratic party systems. Instead, over the course of history, organizational ‘inventions’ may appear, providing party elites with a new addition to the available repertoire of institutional forms that may be emulated. Inertia, contradictory developments, and mixes of factors help also to determine the more distinguishing features of the type of party at any one point in time. They further argue that each of these party models may be more compatible with one or another of the various roles played by parties. The catch-all party, for example, fits better with the role of the party-in-central-office, the elite party with the party-in-public-office under liberal regimes, and the mass party model with the nexus between the party-on-the-ground and the party-in-central-office. However, since the 1960s, when the catch-all party model crystallized, there have been significant changes, particularly with regard to the privileged position of the party-in-public-office. These conditions are associated with the emergence of the ‘cartel party’ (see Katz and Mair 1995, 1996), the electoral-professional party (Panebianco 1988), and the modern cadre party (Koole 1994, 1996). Among the factors that have facilitated these developments are public financing of parties and election campaigns (which are primarily allocated by party elites who also control public offices), as well as the increasing use of party staff by public office-holders, the personalization and centralization of election campaigns, and the increasing importance of professionals with expertise regarding campaigns and mass communications (also see Müller 2000a: 317–19). In turn, the privileged position of party elites, the cartelization of parties, and practices regarding party patronage or corruption have contributed to a delegitimation of parties, the growth of anti-party sentiments among citizens, and general dissatisfaction with party performance. As we will see below, the chapters by Blondel, Torcal, Gunther and Montero, and Linz explore these themes in greater detail.

The chapter by Steven B. Wolinetz approaches the subject of party organization from a complementary perspective: where Katz and Mair re-examine party organization on the basis of interactions among party models and the various ‘faces’ of parties, Wolinetz uses party organization as the basis for criticizing the validity of existing typologies of parties, and to propose new classificatory criteria. Among the sources of his dissatisfaction with the existing typologies are the inability of the strikingly small number of party models to capture the essence of the extremely wide variety of parties that exist today, the fact that these party models are in some cases primarily
oriented towards describing parties as they existed over a hundred years ago, and that they are largely limited in their applicability to West European parties. The net result is that they have largely been incapable of capturing the variations among the many new parties that have appeared since the beginning of the Third Wave of democratization in the 1970s. The homogenizing biases implicit in the static nature of the relatively few categories used to typologize parties, moreover, tends to give rise to an appearance of ‘convergence’ among parties, overlooking basic differences in their principal objectives, their strategies for achieving those goals, and their responses to constraints or opportunities arising from the contexts within which they function. He points out that these limitations are particularly noteworthy even with regard to their application to parties in France, the Netherlands, Canada, and the United States, let alone those in new democracies, with more recently formulated party types (such as Ware 1987a; Koole 1994; Grabow 2001). The criteria set forth by Kirchheimer (1966) defining the catch-all parties, for example, cannot differentiate between American and Canadian parties despite their manifold divergences. Panebianco’s (1988) contribution remedies some of these shortcomings, but it is substantially weakened by its assumptions of homogenizing trends among Western parties: he believes that his electoral-professional party is a type whose features will be adopted by all parties, irrespective of their distinct origins or basic organizational features. Finally, the cartel party of Katz and Mair (1995) is useful for identifying some features of parties that have emerged over the past two decades, but it is not clear that this is a model of a distinct type of party or a description of dynamic interactions between parties in a party system (see Koole 1996; Katz and Mair 1996). Given the limitations of these other classification schemes, Wolinetz proposes that we focus on the distinctions among policy-seeking, vote-seeking, and office-seeking parties, which he believes will make it possible to study significant questions regarding party behaviour and party organization. Wolinetz then discusses how operational indicators of these different orientations might be developed (see Müller and Strøm 1999a and 1999b; Strøm and Müller 1999). The development of this approach would, it is hoped, facilitate the formulation and testing of hypotheses concerning the behaviour of parties, cross-national comparisons among parties—especially with regard to how parties have responded to the challenges that have arisen over the past two decades—and, overall, in the enrichment of potentially cumulative theoretical propositions about parties.

Serenella Sferza’s study of the French Socialist party since the 1970s goes well beyond typical case studies of parties by explicitly analysing a series of theoretical propositions concerning party organizational behaviour. She begins with a criticism of the literature on party decline, particularly on ‘externalist’ interpretations of party development that portray parties as ‘passive takers’ or as actors who merely react to developments arising out of their
social-structural or institutional environments. Sferza argues that the behaviour of parties must be analysed both from ‘within’ and ‘without’. Particularly important factors relevant to explanations of strategic choices and party performance are the specific organizational form adopted by the party, the relationship between intra-party resources, and inter-party politics (see also Kitschelt 1989a; 1994). In the case of the French Socialist party, she argues that a series of internal changes in the 1970s helped the party to win two impressive electoral victories in 1981, electing François Mitterrand as President of the Republic, and securing a Socialist majority in the National Assembly. But by the mid-1980s, a number of problems of internal origin coupled with electoral defeats dramatically reversed the fortunes of the party. Sferza argues that the factionalism explicitly organized and recognized following the party’s 1971 congress greatly facilitated its growth and electoral success. But this same institutionalized factionalism made it difficult for the party to adapt flexibly to new challenges emerging from altered environmental circumstances during the following decade. Thus, the same organizational feature that proved to be such an asset under one set of conditions proved to be a liability when it faced different kinds of challenges. Sferza undertakes a detailed empirical analysis of her hypotheses both at the national level of French politics and in two strategically chosen provincial branches of the party. She begins with an exploration of the advantages and drawbacks of the traditional territorial format for party organization versus the factional structure that the party adopted in the 1970s. Among the advantages she notes are the contributions of a factional structure to ideological revitalization, to recruitment of party activists, to leadership renewal, and to party governance. Once the party was elected to large numbers of important public offices at all levels of government in the 1980s, however, factions abandoned their previous competitive stance and adopted a more collusive pattern of interaction, converting factionalism into a source of destabilizing paralysis. Three sets of theoretical implications emerge from this analysis. First, the adaptive capacity of parties depends to a considerable degree on the organizational forms adopted. Second, the substantial impact of the particular organizational form adopted by the party further illustrates why oversimplified party typologies do a disservice to comparative analysis by ignoring an important factor that so powerfully influences party behaviour. And third, the challenges that faced the Socialist Party in the 1970s when it was out of power were fundamentally different from those when it governed France in the 1980s, underscoring the importance of party–government relations.

Richard Gunther and Jonathan Hopkin also examine the impact of various organizational models on party performance in a detailed case study. They conclude that the demise of the UCD is attributable to the party’s lack of institutionalization. While invocation of this concept as an explanation of party failure could be construed as tautological, they break down the concept
of institutionalization into its key component parts and carefully document how one aspect of institutionalization, in particular, proved to be so important. The UCD’s institutionalization was not at all deficient with regard to the development of an extensive organization or to its penetration into Spanish government institutions at all levels. Instead, the failure of institutionalization affected interactions among the party’s top-ranking leaders in Madrid, far too many of whom saw the party in purely utilitarian terms as merely a vehicle for achieving their short-term objectives, and who failed to ‘infuse with value’ (to cite Selznick’s [1957] classic definition of institutionalization) or to develop a sense of abstract loyalty to the party. This lack of institutionalization was also manifested in fundamental and unresolved differences of opinion over the model of party that should guide its organizational development, its electoral strategies, and, most importantly, its norms of internal governance. The party’s founder, Prime Minister Adolfo Suárez, favoured development of a classic catch-all party under strong presidential leadership. But the party’s ‘barons’ had very different models in mind. Several of them implicitly favoured development of the party along ‘factional’ lines, which would be governed through collective decision-making processes by the leaders of the various factions, and which would allocate both party and governmental posts proportionately, in a quasi-consociational manner (see Huneeus 1985). Other party leaders demanded that the party establish strong institutional ties to, and stoutly defend the interests of, specific social groups (such as the Church and big business), virtually reducing the party to the status of a ‘holding company’. Differences over these party models were manifested in various aspects of the party’s performance in government, leading to an unseemly series of public squabbles, and ultimately schisms and defections of prominent leaders, that had the net effect of thoroughly discrediting the party. While tensions and conflicts are produced inside of all parties whenever there are differences of opinion regarding personnel appointments, the formulation of government policy, or the adoption of an electoral strategy, the lack of commitment to the party in the abstract, coupled with a lack of a common understanding of behavioural norms and intra-party decision-making processes—all of them aspects of institutionalization—made it impossible for the party to contain these struggles successfully. Accordingly, it abruptly disappeared in the aftermath of the single most disastrous electoral defeat in West European history.

Revisiting Party Linkages and Attitudes towards Parties

The three chapters in this third part of the book deal with two distinct sets of questions. What these have in common is that they explore the extent to which the progressive weakening of party linkages has contributed to party decline in Western Europe. The first of these questions deals with linkages
between governments and parties in parliamentary democracies, specifically, the extent to which party government is based in some European systems upon patronage and corruption. The second set of questions involves linkages between parties and citizens, in particular, the extent to which these ties have been undermined by the widespread emergence of anti-party sentiments. Those two distinct sets of questions have both been largely ignored in the comparative literature on political parties. Inattention to patronage or corrupt practices within the party–government literature has often meant that an important determinant of party or government performance is either not dealt with analytically, or is attributed in an ad hoc manner to spurious factors. And most studies of political behaviour by voters restrict their analytical focus to the act of voting, *per se*, or to positive linkages between citizens and parties, such as their psychological attachments to their preferred party in the literature on party identification or their membership in party organizations. This excessively narrow view of these relationships therefore neglects more generic orientations of voters towards parties, party politics, and politicians which have an important impact on their involvement in political life. The three final chapters in this book are oriented towards filling this gap in the literature on party linkages: the chapter by Jean Blondel explores party government, patronage, and party decline within Western European parliamentary systems; and the chapters by Mariano Torcal, Richard Gunther, and José Ramón Montero, and by Juan J. Linz, present preliminary analyses of anti-party sentiments, and their attitudinal and behavioural correlates, as well as empirically grounded speculation about the origins of such attitudes.

Blondel approaches the question of party decline from a novel perspective. His starting-point is a simple question: ‘To what extent is party decline a product of semi-legal or illegal practices adopted by parties?’ At first glance, the answer should be positive: the discovery of corruption or the distribution of favours by parties has made them the target of attacks of the mass media that have fed into increasing citizen dissatisfaction with or disaffection from parties. Blondel, however, adopts a more cautious and conditional stance: negative electoral consequences of illegal or semi-legal practices have been inconsistent among countries with significant levels of corruption. He therefore develops a series of analytical distinctions and empirical generalizations focusing on the concepts of party government and patronage. Starting from the notion that the most basic linkages between governments and their supporting parties involve policies and appointments, he notes that traditional parliamentary theory neglects patronage as one important aspect of these linkages. While these interactions are often regarded as unappealing if not distasteful, patronage does exist, is increasing in some countries, and is manifested in many different forms (see also Müller 2000b; Cotta 2000). In an effort to speculate about the origins of cross-national differences in the extent
of patronage, Blondel develops a classification scheme based upon two dimensions. The first is derived from the various types of party-government relationships as described in the classic studies by Lijphart (1984, 1999), which distinguish among ‘adversarial,’ ‘consensual’, and ‘conciliatory’ types of interaction. The second dimension involves the extent of parliamentary support for the government, ranging from minority government to oversized coalitions. In addition to these dimensions, it is important to distinguish among those parliamentary settings in which parties are, in general terms, dependent upon the government (as in Britain, France, and Spain), those in which parties predominate over the government (as in Belgium, Austria, and pre-1992 Italy), and those in which the government and its supporting party/ies are linked in a situation of mutual interdependence (such as the Dutch and the Scandinavian cases). These typologies enable Blondel to analyse the extent of patronage within differing institutional contexts. He finds that patronage is extensive and widely distributed in ‘partitocratic’ countries, is less common in Westminster majoritarian systems, and is greatly reduced in ‘conciliatory’ systems. Since the 1980s, there has been a notable growth in patronage, but only in the first two of these categories. Blondel suggests that this increase is the result of the predominance of governments with extremely ambitious programmes which would be difficult or impossible to implement; as a partial substitute for these unfulfilled programme commitments, favours, bribes, and corruption are utilized in an effort to maintain smooth and conflict-free party–government relations.

Blondel further argues that an assessment of the effects of patronage also requires a differentiation among types of party government. Given the extent to which patronage has always been widespread within partitocratic systems, it could not be argued that this factor can account for the decline in public support for parties in recent years. But given the significant differences in party performance among the partitocratic systems of Italy, Belgium, and Austria, some kind of explanation is still called for. In the majoritarian, Westminster type of parliamentary system, patronage has increased, but its contribution to party decline does not extend beyond some limited impact upon the short-term fortunes of the major parties. Blondel concludes with a note of caution. Even though it does not appear that patronage has contributed directly to party decline, it certainly poses considerable problems for the parties of Western Europe which vary depending upon the specific institutional framework of party–government relations. While some level of patronage is inevitable in any democratic system, a heavy reliance on favours, shady deals, corruption, and the like as a principal linkage between governments and their supporting parties poses significant problems with regard to the accountability of politicians and the responsiveness of parties.

The chapter by Torcal, Gunther, and Montero analyses, using survey data collected in Spain and (to a lesser extent) other Southern European countries
over the past three decades, the nature, evolution, and behavioural consequences of anti-party attitudes among citizens. It addresses one of the most uncontestable aspects of the ‘decline of party’ literature—that is, that large and increasing numbers of citizens in Western democracies have attitudes towards parties that are negative if not downright cynical (see for instance Poguntke and Scarrow 1996a). But it does so in a much more nuanced manner than is typical of this literature, which is often characterized by sweeping and undocumented assertions about the ‘crisis of parties’, if not a broader ‘crisis of democracy’. Empirical analysis of a number of the most commonly used survey items tapping into public attitudes towards parties reveals that such orientations are to two distinct types, which the authors call ‘reactive antipartyism’ and ‘cultural antipartyism’. Reactive antipartyism is a critical stance adopted by citizens in response to their discontent and/or frustrations with the performance of party elites and institutions. To some extent, it may be the product of the inability of parties to meet the unrealistically high expectations of voters. But it may also arise out of actual failures of party performance, particularly with regard to a lack of success in managing the economy or in enacting promised policies. It is also likely to emerge in reaction against corruption scandals. In any event, aggregate levels of such attitudes should be expected to fluctuate over time, in accord with citizens’ varying levels of satisfaction with the performance of parties, particularly the party or parties in government. The authors find that, indeed, the evolution of such attitudes accords with this prediction. The second kind of anti-party attitude, cultural antipartyism, in contrast, is more durable over time. The authors find that this set of beliefs is rooted in the core values and historical traditions of a political culture, and independent of short-term changes in a country’s political conditions. Accordingly, such attitudes are acquired at a particular stage in an individual’s socialization process, and remain generally stable throughout the life of the individual citizen. As several cohort analyses confirm, there are systematic differences among age cohorts that reflect differences in their respective socialization experiences during that particularly intense state of political-attitude development.

The authors argue that much of the literature on antiparty attitudes has produced inconsistent and unpersuasive conclusions as a result of an analytical inattention to the differences between these two varieties of attitudes. They point out that reactive and cultural antipartyism have distinctly different attitudinal and behavioural correlates. Respondents with cultural antiparty attitudes tend to avoid the development of a sense of identification with parties, shun involvement with organized secondary associations, vote for anti-system parties, and abstain from both conventional and unconventional forms of political participation and protest. Reactive antipartyism is part of an attitudinal domain that is both conceptually and empirically distinct from the political disaffection syndrome. These attitudes are very much a function
of the respondent’s degree of satisfaction with the performance of the incumbent government, which is, in turn, strongly influenced by his/her own partisan preferences. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find that in Spain and Greece (but not Portugal or Italy) a principal behavioural consequence of holding reactive anti-party attitudes is to vote against the incumbent party. The authors conclude from this empirical analysis that much greater caution should be exercised in extrapolating system-wide implications from the presence of anti-party attitudes than is typically the case in the ‘decline of parties’ literature. Reactive anti-party attitudes are quite limited in their behavioural ramifications, and do not imply any significant threat to support for democracy. In so far as such sentiments periodically increase, they tend to culminate in mass behaviour that is perfectly consistent with democratic theory—votes for the incumbent party (but not support for democracy) tend to fall. Cultural antipartyism has more negative implications for the quality of democracy in so far as it is associated with the marginalization of a sector of society from active participation in political life.

In the last chapter of this volume, Juan Linz examines the same theme of anti-party sentiments among the general public, but from an entirely different perspective. Supporting his speculative hypotheses with survey data from Spain and Latin America, he suggests that the increase in negative attitudes towards political parties may be less attributable to the behaviour of parties themselves than it is to inconsistencies or outright contradictions among relevant beliefs held by citizens, to unrealistic expectations concerning the extent to which parties can achieve a series of demanding objectives, or to the increasing number of the functions that parties must play in representative democracies (see also Linz 199, 2000). Linz notes, for example, that people tend to give high marks to non-partisan figures who represent national unity. In part because they are ‘above politics’ and they do not pit segments of society against one another, heads of state in parliamentary systems are highly valued, while parties, which divide people and compete with one another for office, are consistently given lower marks. The unsolvable problem that parties face in this respect is that the basic function they are supposed to serve in democratic system is to represent the interests of one or another segment of society, and seek to advance those interests through victory in electoral competition. Large majorities of citizens in most countries acknowledge that ‘Without parties there can be no democracy’, but those same individuals often criticize parties for their ‘divisive’ behaviour. Another striking inconsistency is that most citizens in democratic systems want parties to represent ‘their interests’; at the same time, they criticize parties in the abstract for representing ‘special interests’. This seemingly self-contradictory stand is usually rooted in one simple pair of assumptions. When they affect the individual’s own group, there are regarded as ‘our interests’ or ‘the interests of people like me’; but when these same kinds of issues involve the interests of others, they are pejoratively regarded as
‘special interests’. Similarly, many of them simultaneously complain that ‘parties are all alike’, while they also castigate parties for creating ‘conflicts that don’t exist’. These are just a few among the many inconsistencies and incompatibilities in popular attitudes that have often led to criticism of political parties that are explored by Linz in his provocative essay. Parties can thus be seen as stuck ‘between a rock and a hard place’. Citizens acknowledge that democratic systems require that parties perform certain roles, but then criticize them for performing those roles on the grounds that this would conflict with a different and incompatible set of values. The result has been the widespread adoption of anti-party attitudes among both old and new democracies. But what does this imply for the future of democracy? Apart from the occasional adoption of populist reforms (as in the case of the mandatory implementation of term limits in many American states in the 1980s and 1990s or the several proposed reforms which Linz examines in his essay), which may hinder party performance, the consequences and implications of the emergence of such attitudes has remained relatively benign to date. Unlike in the earlier decades of the twentieth century, anti-party attitudes have not been linked to support for anti-system parties or movements, or to a weakening of support for democracy per se. Thus, it appears from this chapter and the one preceding it that the ominous long-term implications of a ‘decline of party’ may have been substantially overstated.

NOTES

1. Of these publications, about half have appeared in journals, one-quarter in books, and the others in edited volumes; see Caramani and Hug (1998: 512); for two different and more limited databases, see Norris (1997); Karvonen and Ryssevik (2001).

2. Among the many such books that have recently appeared are Katz and Mair (1994); Kalyvas (1996); Scarrow (1996a); Ware (1996a); Mair (1997); Boix (1998a); Müller and Strøm (1999a); Dalton and Wattenberg (2000a); Diamond and Gunther (2001); Farrell, et al. (2002). In addition, Wolinetz has edited two very useful volumes (1998a, 1998b) reprinting noteworthy journal articles on parties and party systems that have appeared since the 1960s.

3. Moreover, over the past two decades, the study of political parties has emerged as a clearly identifiable field within the discipline of political science. Accordingly, chapters specifically devoted to political parties have been published in several systematic overviews of this academic discipline; see Epstein (1975, 1983); Crotty (1991); Janda (1993).

4. See the systematic exploration of these themes in Strøm and Svåsand (1997b). While that volume was focused on the case of Norway, its findings have broader implications for democratic political systems throughout the industrialized world; see also Dalton and Wattenberg (2000b); Bartolini and Mair (2001).
5. These arguments are developed more extensively in several recent volumes dealing with parties in the new democracies of Southern Europe (Pridham and Lewis 1996; Morlino 1998; Ignazi and Ysmal 1998; Diamandouros and Gunther 2001), Latin America (Mainwaring and Scully 1995), Central and Eastern Europe (White et al. 1993; Evans and Whitefield 1996; Hofferbert 1998; Hermet et al. 1998; and Kitschelt et al., 1999), and East Asia (Stockton 2001).


7. For critical reassessments of the party-decline literature, see Störm and Søsand (1997a); Reiter (1989); Beyme (1993: ch. 2); Schmitt and Holmberg (1995); Mair (1997: chs. 2 and 4); Dalton and Wattenberg (2000b); and the special issue of the European Journal of Political Research (29(3), 1996) edited by T. Poguntke and S. E. Scarrow and devoted to ‘The Politics of Anti-Party Sentiment’.

8. Another third of this literature has been dedicated to the study of party organization, to their participation in the electoral process, or to their bases of electoral support. The remaining third have dealt with studies of party ideologies, the formulation of public policy, and their roles in parliament and in government. Also see Bartolini et al. (1998).

9. Among the many classical contributions in this genre, see Almond (1960); Almond and Powell (1966: ch. 5); Holt (1967); and several of the chapters in La Palombara and Weiner (1966).

10. See Meehan (1967: ch. 3) and Flanagan and Fogelman (1967) for two critical evaluations of the basic approach, and Lowi (1963), Scarrow (1967), and King (1969) for specific criticisms of functionalist studies of political parties.

11. E.g. Gunther (1989) found through an extensive series of interviews with Spanish party leaders that their behaviour was often not guided by calculations of short-term electoral advantage. Instead, they sometimes formulated strategies and oriented their behaviour in efforts to achieve two other objectives—to consolidate fully Spain’s new democratic regime, and to establish durable party organizations—both of which proved to be incompatible on several notable occasions with short-term vote maximization.

12. The electoral process is conceptualized as a model of competition based upon the voter’s perception of the issue positions of candidates, with the voting decision based upon the perceived proximity among these issue stands; a party is therefore little more than the aggregation of issue stands by its candidates in a given election (see, e.g. Davis et al. 1970: 426 and 445). For a subsequent treatment of these themes which used formalized conceptions of parties, see Hinich and Munger (1997).

13. In the textbook of Shepsle and Bonchek (1997), for example, parties are notably absent from explanations of interactions among political actors, processes, and institutions. Parties only appear in the penultimate chapter on ‘Cabinet government and parliamentary democracy [in Western Europe]’.

14. Brennan and Lomasky (1993: 121), for example, assume as one of the premisses upon which they base their research ‘the existence of a stable two-party system in many Western democracies’.

15. See, for instance, Strom (1990a: ch. 2); Budge and Keman (1990); Aldrich (1995); Laver and Shepsle (1996); Müller and Strom (1999a, 1999c); and for case studies of two specific families of parties, Koelbe (1991); Kalyvas (1996).
16. As Bartolini has observed (1986b: 259), in no historical phase has there been a homogenization of parties. On the contrary, several different types of parties have coexisted throughout the history of multi-party democratic competition, with pre-existing parties overlapping with newly emerging types. This has continued to the present day: even though there has been a general trend towards ‘organizationally thin’ parties, a number of very different types of parties can be found in most democratic systems.

17. This stands in contrast with the discipline of physics, where a broad consensus has existed for decades concerning which kinds of phenomena can be adequately explained by hypotheses derived from the Newtonian paradigm, which phenomena entail dynamic processes best captured by relativistic physics, which require analysis rooted in the precepts of quantum physics, etc.

18. Also see Janda (1980, 1983), where the author contributes to comparative theorizing by empirically testing and analysing the concepts originally advanced by Duverger (1954).

19. See, for instance, Lipset (1960b, 1981); Lipset and Rokkan (1967a); Rose (1974a); Bartolini and Mair (1990); Franklin et al. (1992); Evans (1999); Bartolini (2000a); Karvonen and Kuhnle (2001); Gunther and Montero (2001).

20. See Gunther and Diamond (2001) for one such effort.

21. Among the many noteworthy analyses of party systems over the past five decades are Duverger (1954); Lipset and Rokkan (1967a); Sartori (1976); Merkl (1980); Daalder and Mair (1983); Beyme (1985); Wolinetz (1988); Ware (1996); Mair (1997); Pennings and Lane (1998); Broughton and Donovan (1999); Karvonen and Kuhnle (2001).

22. A continuous line of development of theory and operational indicators in this subfield can be traced from Duverger (1954) to Rae (1971); Nohlen (1984); Grofman and Lijphart (1986); Taagepera and Shugart (1989); Lijphart (1994); and Cox (1997). Although still in Spanish, an excellent recent contribution is Penadés (2000).

23. As already mentioned, these three ‘faces’ are those of the party on the ground, the party in the central office, and the party in public office, as restated in their earlier work (Katz and Mair 1993), and as originally formulated by Key (1964) and Sorauf (1964); see also Beck (1996); Dalton and Wattenberg (2000a). Aldrich (1995: ch. 6) has added as a fourth ‘face’, that of party in elections, and Blondel and Cotta (1996, 2000) have respecified the party in government inside the party in public office.

24. See Bartolini (1996, 1999, 2000b) for a more extensive exploration of these issues.


26. See also Thies (2000), Kopecký (1995), and Biezen (2001) for different conclusions regarding most new democracies. For recent analyses on party membership as the most visible dimension of the ‘face’ of the party on the ground, see Scarro (2000) and Mair and Biezen (2001).

27. Kitschelt (2000), however, presents a different interpretation of these phenomena.

28. This analysis of the demise of the UCD is the product of two different research projects (one carried out by Gunther between 1979 and 1984 [see Gunther 1986b;
Gunther et al. 1986], and the other by Hopkin in 1992–3 [see Hopkin 1999]),
based upon over forty-three hours of interviews with the party’s former leaders.
Despite the completely independent origins of their two research projects, they
reached a remarkable consensus in their interpretations of the dramatic collapse
of what was once Spain’s governing party.

29. For more extensive analyses along these lines, see Blondel and Cotta (1996, 2000),
and particularly Blondel (2000), Cotta (2000), Strøm (2000). For the related top-
ics of parties in legislatures and of parties as parliamentary groups, see respec-