



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Kenneth Janda

Reviewed work(s):

How Political Parties Work: Perspectives from Within by Kay Lawson

Source: *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 89, No. 4 (Dec., 1995), pp. 1055-1056

Published by: American Political Science Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2082577>

Accessed: 01/04/2010 22:28

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=apsa>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Political Science Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Political Science Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

sophisticated analysis of trade-offs among social class, party, and vote; the relationship between a party's place in the government and opposition and its electoral fortunes; the consequences of economic performance, especially the presence of economic and retrospective voting and business cycles; and the effect of various structural arrangements of the political economy, alone and in combination. The analysis denies the explanatory power of each and all of these hypotheses.

In their place, Kitschelt offers a complex argument drawn from an extended version of rational choice theory and more general themes. Moving beyond "thin" definitions of rationality that view political parties as only maximizers of votes, he examines conditions under which parties might prefer to serve as "pivots" in a party system or to engage in oligopolistic competition. "Thick rationality" also includes the role of the internal organization and the party's ideological inheritance as factors that condition the strategic choice of party leaders. Kitschelt joins a powerful analytic tradition that underscores the active role of political parties in the creation of their electorates. In addition to the longstanding typology of political preferences that emphasizes trade-offs between liberty and equality, he posits a second dimension, fraternity, and ties this theme to the recent emergence of new left-libertarian issues. Kitschelt applies a complex theoretical apparatus to the question of variations in the electoral success of socialist parties.

Having provided demanding tests of alternative conceptualizations, measures, and explanations, however, Kitschelt is rather kind to his own ideas. The categorization of winners, "stabilizers," and losers rests on an inadequately defended selection of time periods and elections. Furthermore, by Kitschelt's own count, the Italian socialists (a winner, average gain between 3.2%) are more like the stabilizers (Belgian socialists +1.6%, the Dutch party +2.4%, and the Swedish party +1.3%) than the other winners (French socialists +9.5% and Spanish socialists +14.3%). The case histories of the nine socialist parties examined too often turn on the author's not-well-substantiated interpretations of critical political events. As a result, there is reason to doubt the summary assessments of the validity of the theory's predictions. In addition, the presentation of the left-libertarian cleavage rests on a factor analysis in which education plays too powerful a role, given the necessarily high correlation between education and white-collar/student positions and the long-standing willingness of the highly educated to claim to be willing to join social movements, whatever the groups' political colors. Furthermore, the analysis overstates the impact of issues on vote choice and provides a rather constrained view of ideas and values as things that deviate from decisions based on interest. In sum, a series of not-always-tenable assumptions and analytic decisions moves the study through critical empirical crossings.

Given the long history of the European socialist movement and the volume's general concern with its transformation, Kitschelt does not pay adequate attention to the decades before the 1970s and thereby misses the extent to which fluid electoral and preference patterns have always been present. He offers no fine-grained analysis of earlier periods. As a result, there is insufficient reason to accept one of the volume's major arguments about the future: powerful organizations necessarily limit a party's strategic flexibility. After all, the initial successes of the well-organized socialist parties

occurred during decades in which most voters did not have enduring political or social class loyalties. Furthermore, it is not evident that crossing the equality-liberty dimension with a set of political preferences based on fraternity adequately captures the diversity of mass politics. Indeed, there are strong grounds on which to claim that most voters change their electoral choices and their views on political issues at least once during three adjacent elections. The high levels of electoral and issue fluidity cannot be contained in the static, two-dimensional model. Kitschelt's analysis does not demonstrate that strategic politicians, in any one country or across the diverse cases of European socialist parties, can devise a set of appeals that will substantially affect the electoral fortunes of their parties.

How successful is the analysis? At best, there is a plausible account in which the factors drawn out of an extended version of rational choice theory seem to be associated with variations in the electoral success of socialist parties during the 1980s. I would suppose that rational choice theorists will be very pleased with the effort; other political scientists will doubt that the results of the analysis justify or require the elaborate theoretical structure.

Brown University

ALAN S. ZUCKERMAN

How Political Parties Work: Perspectives from Within.

Edited by Kay Lawson. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994. 317p. \$59.95.

Once again, Kay Lawson has edited a book on comparative political parties with a punchy title and pithy contents. In her earlier and often-cited *When Parties Fail* (1988, with Peter Merkl), Lawson assembled a series of case studies describing organizations that replaced or supplemented traditional party organizations that failed. In *How Political Parties Work*, she offers a set of studies intended to "explore the internal dynamics of political parties with the intention of finding out how parties really work" (p. x).

Excluding Lawson's brief introduction and her substantial conclusion, the book contains 12 chapters neatly organized into four equal parts. The three chapters of part 1 deal with internal practices that impede or promote party democracy. Thomas Poguntke clearly explains how the German Green party managed to obtain a high degree of internal democracy but at the cost of efficiency in decision making and even at the impairment (ironically) of grassroots democracy. Geoffrey Debnam describes, less clearly, how the New Zealand Labour party created a layer of "policy committees" to bring the parliamentary party back into line after it had strayed too far in pushing its own political agenda. Analyzing six cases of French parties' efforts to regulate internal difficulties outside formal channels, Andrew Appleton divines five "informal rules" that guided their efforts.

Part 2 deals with the interaction between leadership and organization. Mildred Schwartz reports on her innovative "network analysis" of the Illinois Republican party, which uncovered such unofficial actors as "financial contributor" and "interest group advisor" within the party leadership. Drawing on his earlier insightful work, Kaare Strøm models party behavior as a simultaneous effort to seek three distinct goals—votes, offices, and

policies—and examines data on six Norwegian parties to see whether different combinations of goal seeking explains differences in party organization. (Unfortunately, as Strøm recognizes himself, the Norwegian parties did not differ sufficiently on either goal seeking or organization to test the model adequately.) David Morris probes into the nature of factionalism in the Japanese Liberal Democratic party, with particular reference to the Komoto faction, contending that factions were not particularly well defined nor uniformly devoted to the factional leader.

Part 3, which examines the impact of internal organization on external performance, is probably the least cohesive section of the book. Subrata Kumar Mitra describes the transformation of the Indian National Congress from a programmatic party to a catch-all party to one of personal authoritarianism. Working within the framework of contingency theory in the organizational behavior literature, Kris Deschouwer researches the impact of party organization on electoral and political effectiveness both across nations and among local party sections in Belgium. Drawing on the Israeli experience in the 1988 election, Yael Yishai introduces the innovative concept of an “interest party”—an interest group that chooses to try running candidates for legislative elections. If the group does so at the next election, she classifies it as a party. Of the five groups studied, only two became parties, and Yishai explains why.

Part 4, which I found to be the most rewarding, describes how parties change in response to external events. Two articles discuss how Gorbachev's reforms in the USSR impinged on communism in Central Europe. Jerzy Wiatr, a well-known Polish scholar even under the old regime, describes how the division between hardliners and moderates within the Polish United Workers party (PUWP) evolved into a split between hardliners and radical reformers that culminated in the historic party conference of January 1990. The conference began with a call for terminating the party. Then it recessed long enough to create a new party—Social Democracy of the Polish Republic—to which the PUWP's assets could be transferred before voting itself out of existence. Dealing with Czechoslovakia, Josef Blahoz focuses not on the dissolution of the Communist party but on the formation and dissolution of its democratic successors—Civic Forum in the Czech Republic and People against Violence in Slovakia. Blahoz contends that these broad antidemocratic movements should not have been expected to survive and that even subsequent party splits helped moved the two republics (now two countries) toward more democracy. In the last essay on changes in the social democratic parties of Britain, France, Germany, and Spain, Frank Wilson elaborates on his well-known model of party change, now stressing the importance of leaders' decisions about how parties should adapt to competitive challenges. Socialist leaders in France and Spain read the environment properly and modified their parties policies and tactics appropriately, whereas those in Britain (and, to a lesser extent, Germany) did not—with negative political consequences.

In her concluding chapter, “Toward a Theory of How Political Parties Work?,” Kay Lawson considers alternatives posed by the *how* question: “Do we want to know how well the party works to achieve what the party itself is working for? Or do we want to know how well the party works for the system in which it operates? Or both? And what do we mean when we say, ‘for the

system?’” (p. 285). Although she recognizes all these questions as legitimate, Lawson chooses to define the problem for theoretical explanation as “how to make policy making parties, as opposed to power-seeking parties, work” (p. 287). Lawson creatively constructs a set of concepts that capture key ideas in the 12 articles, although none of the authors discuss their work in her terms. She argues, “How political parties work depends very largely on four variables: on the active members' motives; the means they employ; the boundaries they set, however temporarily, for the organization's identity; and the external situation in which they find themselves, as determined by the degree of power they have in government and the degree of stability of the system in which they function” (p. 299). On the last page, Lawson offers a set of prescriptions concerning how policymaking parties ought to work.

Unfortunately, Praeger allowed some flaws in the book's production. For instance, Deschouwer's chapter refers to regression coefficients that went unreported; Blahoz's notes are not properly matched to the text; and Lawson's conclusion contains a confusing typographical gaffe at the start of a paragraph. Although the collection of articles in this volume is probably too disparate for a text in a political parties course, scholars will value those parts relating to their interests and benefit from individual articles in this collection.

Northwestern University

KENNETH JANDA

Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America. Edited by Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. 578p. \$60.00.

The study of Latin American political parties can be dated largely from a handful of pioneering works appearing in the 1960s. With the subsequent wave of authoritarian regimes and the powerful if impermanent theorizing that accompanied the demise of democratic regimes, however, attention to parties was dramatically diminished. Now that at least formally democratic government has resurfaced, scholars are returning to research on parties. Perhaps the most ambitious undertaking is the collection under review here. Despite its merits, the work is ultimately disappointing, the whole being less than its constituent parts.

Although the initial effort to construct a unified and conceptually cohesive study dates from an October 1990 conference at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, the result reflects the dangers and difficulties of multiauthored books. A comparison of the country-oriented chapters reveals a lack of organizational or analytic symmetry, and a number of the authors have ignored the thematic emphases set forth by the coeditors in the introduction. Some regurgitate far too much historical background. While others weave the history of parties into more contemporary events, there is an inclination to move from historical description to simply a more contemporary accounting of political events.

For a number of chapters, then, the contributions are relatively modest. For those seeking basic information about parties over time, there are such readily available source books as Alexander's *Political Parties of the Americas* (1982) and its companion work, Ameringer's *Political Parties of the Americas, 1980s to 1990s* (1992). More schol-