Politics as a method or a goal?

Oksana Poltovana
University of Latvia

Abstract: In those countries where there are fewer comparativists is where they believe in their system as something unique (Great Britain and France).

For most comparative policy theorists the discipline is characterized by a specific methodology that is the comparative method.

However, in the U.S. In the US, comparative politics is not this. It is the study of the political phenomena of a country, or in different countries although no comparisons are made between them. In the United States, comparative politics is a study of political phenomena in one or more countries, although they do not make real comparisons between them. Comparative politics as an object.

Specialists in RRII, in the American political system, studies of other countries also called comparativists. This difference has to do with the geopolitical weight of the United States.

For most theorists it is characterized by a specific methodology applied to the analysis of political objectives. It would be a rare discipline that would be defined by its method and not by its object.

Keywords: Politics, goals, political achievements.

Introduction

There are three categories of studies:

- RRII
- Americanists.
- Comparativists.

This problem is typical of a great powerhouse. Where we find fewer comparativists (in the sense of applying the comparative method) is in those countries where their political system, for some reason: time, pioneer ... They consider it something unique. This is France and Great Britain.

In the other Western countries there is much more comparativism. Almost all small European countries have many comparative studies. The best observatories of comparative politics are in these.

4. The comparative method in policy analysis

Dogan and Pelassy talk about up to six different strategies, from the simplest to the most complex.

- **Analysis of a single case:** In strict terms it does not correspond to the comparative methodology. It serves to provide background material for future comparisons. With a single case we cannot validate a theory, but it helps us to generalize a little more. Nor can we invalidate.
- **Binary comparison:** It consists of comparing two precisely selected political entities. This strategy is the one that produces the best results. Maybe:
  - **Implicit:** The scholar speaks of a country other than his own, therefore implicitly comparing with his own (e.g. **Tocqueville** in "Democracy in America").
  - **Explicit:** Work in which two countries are explicitly examined: similarities, differences, in-depth historical analysis that serves as a basis for explaining the differences.

The specific advantage it offers is the possibility it offers the researcher to cover the political system as a whole.

The disadvantages are that as you understand everything it is a very global analysis (not very intensive).

- **Comparison of analogues:** Comparison between a large number of countries (+ two) that have in principle a large number of characteristics in common. It is the best strategy for controlling context variables.

- **Comparison between opposites:** Countries with few characteristics in common, useful when you want to compare particular types (development versus underdevelopment; democracy versus dictatorship...). Specially designed to highlight differences, others to explain the survival of certain equal characteristics when everything else is different.

- **Planetary correlations:** All possible cases are considered; We work with databases, it is about multiplying the correlations between as many as possible. It is a statistical strategy. They were successful during the 60s; Today it is in disuse because the databases are not of the same quality in all parts of the world.

- **Conceptual homogenization of a heterogeneous field:** Try to create a concept that unifies partially different situations. Eisenstadt on the ancient empires creates the concept of bureaucratic empire that serves to study the different empires of history. Lijphart speaks of sociational democracy. Homogenization is a typological strategy that is not explanatory.

5. Institutionalism and neo-institutionalism.
5.1. Classical institutionalism.

The study of institutions is ancient. He has resorted to some methods to explain the institutions, the classical method is descriptive-inductive, of a formal legal, historical-comparative type.

- **Descriptive:** Uses the techniques of the historian and investigates times, events, people... producing studies that systematically describe and analyze phenomena that occurred in the past and that explain contemporary political events. Classical institutionalism places its emphasis on explaining and understanding, not on enumerating laws. The hallmark is hyperfactualism.

Es formal-legal porque hace hincapié en dos aspectos:
- Estudio del Derecho público.
- Estudio de las organizaciones formales de la A.P.

Este doble énfasis coincide en el estudio del Derecho público que afecta a sus organizaciones (estructura constitucional).

- **Histórico-comparativo:** Inserta dentro de un teoría del Estado y un contexto histórico, económico. Se intenta examinar las principales instituciones políticas no sólo en su estructura sino que se preocupa también de su funcionamiento real y su evolución histórica.

Cuando surge la política comparada nace como la gran esperanza de la C. Política. Nace con un objetivo que va más allá de la mera descripción de los hechos políticos. Treinta años después esas expectativas se han visto frustradas y nos encontramos con una crisis de la política comparada por la ausencia de operacionalización de los conceptos comparativos, exceso de teorías que no se han podido verificar; la política comparada nace con un pretendido universalismo que se ha quedado en occidente.

Neo-institutionalism

As we have just commented, It arises after the critique of institutionalism. Headed by **March** and **Olsen**. It appears in the late 70s, early 80s. It regrets that contact with political and governmental institutions has been lost.

He accuses the Political Science of the 60s and 70s of reductionism: political phenomena have been reduced to mere aggregate consequences of individual behavior. He also accuses this C. Politics of a radicalization that has been particularly devoted to comparative and Third World studies and as a consequence of the Vietnam War and militancy in movements for civil rights and cultural revolution. It has also been influenced by the methods of economics.

Stresses the relative autonomy of political institutions; Political institutions are not mere arenas of political behavior but can also be actors. In his view, most of the main agents in modern political systems are formal organizations and legal and bureaucratic institutions.

Neo-institutionalism is not exclusive to C. Política but affects other CCSS. It is not exactly the same as classical institutionalism but is a mixture of it with new contributions of modern political theory. It insists on a more autonomous role for political institutions because the state is not only affected by society but also affects society. Political democracy depends not only on social and economic conditions but also depends on the design of its political institutions. For neo-institutionalists, this autonomy of institutions makes it possible for us to treat them as political actors.

Lesson 2: Political parties. Ideology. Institutionalization and organization. Case studies.
- **Ideology**
Dimensions.
- **Organizational**

2.1. Ideology
The relationship between political parties and political ideology deserves some clarifications:
- **Ideology** is the set of ideas and values that have the function of guiding collective political behavior.
- According to **classical theory**, the ideological requirement is not substantial because the first political parties do not defend a political ideology opposed to others.
- In the *model of mass parties*, ideology is going to be a very important component.
- **Catch all party:** It is defined in terms of a loss in the radicalization of ideology to get votes from all social groups.

Ideology is a very important but not substantial requirement. The union between party and ideology has been basic in the last two hundred years because they enable (together) the irruption of the masses in politics. Ideologies have a revolutionary character.

Panebianco: "Estudio sobre los partidos políticos".
He warns of teleological prejudice: attributing a priori ends to parties. Those ends would be ideology. According to Panebianco this is a prejudice because it is thought that political parties are defined by those ends and the object of study cannot be clearly seen.
Incorrect ideas:
- Political parties pursue certain ends.
- The ideology of each party is the best indicator of these ends.

Panebianco claims for ideology its rightful place within the party. Ideology is the collective incentives that a party gives to its members.
Ideologies together with political parties are of great interest for an explanatory virtue. Linking them serves to know the self-location of citizens. This advantage of the left-right axis has as its counterpart an enormous imprecision.
Left Change, horizontality and progress.
In general terms
Right Order, verticality and tradition.

2.2. Ideological families and party groups
(a) Liberal parties:
Ideologies arise in the eighteenth century (liberalism). Political parties from a modern conception appear in the early nineteenth century. As political parties emerged in Great Britain in the nineteenth century these first parties are parties *of cadres or notables* and have an internal origin (Duverger): arise within the parliamentary sphere, (external origin: workers' parties). The cadre parties arise within the new political scenario and that is why they are called *bourgeois parties*.
Ideologies will present a chained development: an ideology is imposed and counter-ideologies arise.
The first ideology is liberalism that arises as a rejection of the old regime. They are liberal and radical parties. The liberal parties defend an ideology built through the ideas of some political thinkers (Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu...).
The difference between liberals and radicals emphasizes two key ideas of liberalism: freedom and equality.

Radical Liberals
Liberalism maintains a struggle against the privileges of the aristocracy. At the moment his discourse is egalitarian but then he does not want this egalitarianism to be radical.
The radicals will advocate a greater extension of suffrage (including universal suffrage); They also have an anticlerical component (it is verified in Catholic countries). They also defend the republican form against the monarchy of the liberals.

The evolution of liberalism has been:
- Setback after the PGM that supposes the crisis of the traditional liberal State. Fascism and communism emerge as an alternative.
- Welfare State. 1945 is imposed and entails the "end of ideologies", that is, relativization of the social question.

- Liberalism has been expanding towards unsuspected concessions for the first liberalism (pluralism, political rights, civil rights...).

(b) Conservative parties:
The next group of parties corresponds to the ideology that arises as opposed to liberalism. They are the **conservative** parties, these parties are born as a rejection of the establishment of liberal values. It raises a reflection on the scope of liberal revolutions (independence from the American colonies and French Revolution).

Burke raises a serious reflection on these revolutions. Conservatism assumes that there has been a change and it is not a return to the Ancien Régime. It raises the need to curb liberal ideas and the preservation of certain inalienable values: Monarchy as a form of government defense of tradition and religion that is based on the fact that the liberal revolution has produced a loss of values and a disorientation. Conservatism emerged in England in the early nineteenth century as the ideology of the landed nobility against the liberal image of the urban bourgeoisie.

The evolution of these parties has been enormous, they have been modulating positions that have been bringing them closer to the economic positions of the liberals and have achieved an important variation in their electorate. For some authors, such as **von Beyme**, conservative parties are those that have transformed in a deeper and faster way.

Today there is talk of neoconservatism. It is very difficult to distinguish between neoconservatives and neoliberalism. On the left-right axis, the word conservative is more to the right than the word liberal, but the difference is not clear. The word neoliberal is used more around economic attitudes, while neoconservative is more political.

Wright provides a systematic exposition on the content of the word neoliberalism. It would be composed of:
- A conception ethically rooted in the primacy of the individual.
- Physical conception of the legitimacy of the market.
- Practical prescriptions of economic policy (monetarism, budgetary rectitude, reduction of state regulation, favouring privatisations...).

c) Los partidos socialistas y socialdemócratas:
El siguiente grupo de partidos son los socialistas y socialdemócratas. No pertenecen a los partidos burgueses sino que se distinguen no sólo por su ideología sino por su origen. Surgen fuera de la vida parlamentaria. Estos partidos defienden la posición del proletariado; además son fruto de la organización del movimiento obrero (primera mitad del S. XIX). En el segundo tercio del S. XIX aparecen ya los partidos socialistas.

Uno de los rasgos más significativos es el internacionalismo proletario; la clase obrera entendía que debía organizarse con la clase de obrera de otros países porque había que luchar contra las burguesías nacionales. Contribuye a que además se cree un pujante movimiento asociativo que va más allá de las fronteras nacionales (internacionales obreras; Primera Internacional Londres 1869, dura poco por el choque entre Marx-Engels y Bakunin. Se produce la II Internacional como movimiento internacional de los partidos socialistas. La III Internacional es creada por Lenin en 1919 y es la Internacional Comunista).

Estos partidos están fuertemente vinculados a sindicatos cuyas luchas con paralelas y conjuntas. Esto da origen a tres modelos distintos de relaciones entre ambos:
- Partido dominante sobre el sindicato modelo alemán, SPD.
- Trade union dominance over the British Labour Party and Trade Unions until the arrival of Blair.
- Symmetrical model parallelism of forces between party and trade union French Socialist Party (SFIO:
- French Section of the Workers' International) and its trade union.

The values on which these parties are based have evolved. At first he made a claim about freedom and equality (liberal principles). In its ideology there is also a message of denunciation about the living conditions of the working class (capitalist system that sacralizes private ownership of the means of production). They are going to try to gain a space in political life; They claim universal suffrage because it was the means of winning. They consider it one of their main achievements.

In the twentieth century these parties suffer an internal debate between possibilism and radicalism. Possibilism is in favor of the participation of socialists with the bourgeois parties, that is, they defended the reformist way. Against these, radicalism is totally opposed to collaboration with the bourgeois parties and

defended a revolutionary road. This debate takes place in the main socialist parties and there is a split, emerging the communist parties. The socialist parties continue to propose a close relationship between state and society (the state is an engine of change in society).

The events that took place in Europe in the 30s moved socialists away from the communist and fascist models and were moving closer to the model of liberal democracy.

In 1945 the Socialists contributed to the Welfare State; it is an interventionist and welfare State that would be the engine of change in social transformation. It is the only possible practical outcome of utopian aspirations.

This ends up bringing socialists closer to liberalism and parliamentarism. From the 50s onwards, socialist parties moved away from Marxist ideas.

Today these socialist and social democratic parties are the representatives of the centre-left and it can be said that they have become catch-all parties.

(d) The Christian Democratic parties:

Sometimes labeled as bourgeois parties. They arise as a response to the political organization of the proletariat. They are, therefore, a novel attempt to organize political interests in the face of the advance of liberalism and secularism; on the other hand they are the defenders of the Catholic Church. The Church was traditionally linked to conservatism, but the Church realizes that its position is in danger before new parties with interests different from its own. The church assumes liberal parliamentarism and conveniently arms itself into a political party.

These parties have variations:
- Southern Europe (Belgium, Austria) The church must uphold a tradition. The parties are more conservative.
- Other countries where these parties are more progressive.

These parties have been evolving. Part of the decision of the church to create a party and the Encyclical of Leo XIII of the late nineteenth century.

Thanks to the Second Vatican Council, a radical change took place in the Catholic Church and human rights and individual freedoms were emphasized. In addition, the Church gives its support to the social and democratic State of law. This guides the Christian Democratic parties.

Social ethics speaks of alleviating social inequalities by presenting itself as a third way between socialism and capitalism.

We must not forget the Christian Democratic parties of Protestant origin (northern and central Europe). The clearest example is in the Scandinavian countries. The cleavage that originates these parties is in the predominant role that the national church occupies in these countries. Another cleavage that acts in the maintenance of these parties is the advance of secularism in these societies that leads to the vote for these parties.

In the current political spectrum they are located in the center or center-right trying to capture as many votes as possible. They are matches catch everything.

(e) The Communist Parties:

They have their origin in the proclamation of the 21 Leninist conditions and the creation of the Third International that welcomes the radical wings of the socialist parties.

Among these conditions is obedience to the Soviet model of the Communist Party (CPSU).

There is a radicalization of social ideology (1919) and other forms of exit other than possibilism. The only model is the Soviet one and hence its supremacy.

The Communist Party is the most ideologically charged. In addition, the Leninist conception of the vanguard political party of the proletariat must be composed of professional revolutionaries.

Ideological principles permeate all party activity and a very hierarchical internal organization (democratic centralism) is established. This organizational transformation is due to the fact that in their origin they coexist in a great hostility.

These parties develop best in those countries that suffered a process of late industrialization (Marx thought otherwise) where the movement for the emancipation of the masses in politics occurs later. In those countries where industrialization was earlier, the space was won by the socialist parties.

During the WWII the Western communist parties developed an activity against fascism and after the war collaborated with the reconstruction of certain countries. This gives him enormous popularity but does not translate into a political reward.

Raschke distinguishes two large groups:
- Traditional communist parties.
- Autonomist communist parties.

Its criteria are twofold:
- Understanding democracy and the rule of law.
- Party relations with the USSR.

Since the triumph of the revolution of 1917 the Soviet model was the model to follow until the Stalinist stage was unmasked. The invasion of Hungary and Czechoslovakia will be a position against the communist parties to the USSR. The traditionalists remain loyal to the USSR, as well as the Chinese CP and those of Eastern Europe, who defend the dictatorship of the proletariat as an intermediate step towards a classless society and are against liberal democracy. The autonomists demand independence from the various communist parties (e.g. Eurocommunist: PCI (Italy)).

(f) Peasant parties:
Its origin dates from the end of the nineteenth century and its period of greatest validity coincides with the interwar period. They are known as agrarian parties, they are small groups fruit of the cleavage countryside-city due to the abandonment of the countryside. This encourages the emergence of these parties. They act much more as pressure groups than as parties.

Von Beyme points out some factors contributing to its appearance:
- Existence of slow urban development (Central Europe, Scandinavia).
- Rapid urbanization but contrary to urbanization (Canada, USA).
- Processes of late national unification where the demand of the peasants supposes a struggle against the landowner who is usually a foreigner (Norway, Finland, Iceland).
- Where there are sectarian religious groups to which they usually appear linked (central and northern Europe).

The political space of these parties is small and today their demands have been absorbed by parties of very different signs.

(g) Nationalist parties:
It is a very complex phenomenon because nationalism is an ideological ingredient that is difficult to explain and that also does not go alone. Despite this, we must distinguish between two types:
- **Political nationalism.** Nationalism that helps build the great European nations after the liberal revolutions. Sum of different peoples and different ethnicities.
- **Cultural or romantic nationalism**. It is based on the idea of a natural community composed of all those who share the same differential features (people). Basis of claim of different minority types.

Political nationalism is aggregative while cultural nationalism is disintegrating, atomizing.
In addition, nationalism never goes alone but mixes with the most diverse ideologies (liberal parties, conservatives, peasants, etc ...).
Nationalism appears linked to the theory of independence, to the solutions to colonialism.
It is also an ingredient in fascist parties, communists and parties that defend religious fundamentalism.
Right now there is a rise of the ethno-linguistic phenomenon and therefore there is a rise of these parties, which get votes and whose influence is increasing.

Müller-Rommel makes a classification:
- **Ethno-regionalist parties**. He excludes from his analysis nationalist-fascist parties and parties that display a discriminatory nationalism (extreme-right).

These parties are composed of representatives of geographically peripheral minorities who pose a constant challenge to the democratic order of the nation state by demanding recognition of their identity.
Even so, M-R builds a typology based on the degree of intensity that these parties demonstrate in the vindication of their ideas. There is a meter:

International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 06 - Issue 04, 2023
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 31-46

- **Groups that defend separatists with greater intensity.**

Defenders at all costs of historical traditions and the significant features of the people. They always stand to the left of the axis, declaring themselves as radical socialism. They expressly condemn the authority of the political institutions of the nation state and demand self-determination. Axes: Sinn Fein HB.

- **Libertarian left-wing federalists.** Representatives of an idea of a Europe without states or with one state = Europe. They strengthen the old European regions within a hypothetical federation of Europe. Axes: Scottish National Party. Welsh National Party. EA. CKD.
- **Autonomists.** Parties that demand the recognition of the historical rights of the peoples feeling satisfied with the granting of autonomy within the nation state. Examples: CiU, PNV, Front Democratique des Bruxellois Francophoners (Belgium), Christeijk Ulaame Volksmie (Belgium).
- **Protectionists.** Composed of those parties that preach the need to maintain ties of union between the majority and minority ethnic groups within the framework of the nation-state. Examples: Sudtiroler Volicspartei (South Tyrol in Italy), Suenka Folkpartiet (from the Swedish village but operating in Finland).

- There are other types of nationalist organizations, the parties of Eastern Europe and in the defunct USSR that arise under the banner of nationalism. After the disappearance of the Communist Party, there remains a fragmentation of the party. They are weak and mix nationalistic ingredients sometimes with religious ingredients. They are acting as actors of some relevance in the transition to democracy. (National Party of Moldova, Hungarian Democratic Forum...).

(h) Far-right parties:

They are the political groups linked to the idea of conservative dictatorship. When they act within a democratic system they are considered anti-system.

In the twentieth century appears one of the best instruments for the maintenance of the dictatorship: *the single party*.

The clearest model is in the totalitarianisms that were lived in Europe in the 20s, 30s and 40s.

To better distinguish them, it must be said that there are two types:

1. Fascist parties: They arise as a result of the social and political crisis that is unleashed after the PGM (bankruptcy of the classical liberal state).

There are therefore different solutions to the liberal state: communist parties, fascist parties, welfare state.

They emerge as extremist movements defending the interests of the bourgeoisie in response to the growth of socialist and communist parties. They propose to end parliamentary democracy and create an authoritarian state led by a charismatic and undisputed leader and in their ideology there is a mixture of different ingredients: nationalism and militarism.

They attach great importance to the concept of political party. Organizationally they are a copy of the socialist mass parties but they add different elements to make the party a mobilization machine. They are well adapted to the control of militarization. They have their climax in the rise of fascism and Nazism.

2. New far-right parties: Organized political groups that defend conservative principles but emerge after the defeat of fascism and sometimes their ideology has little to do with fascism.

With the defeat of fascism in the SGM it seems that they were going to disappear but in the 50s interest groups with a very small political weight appear that are classified as petty-bourgeois protest movements whose clearest example is the French "poujadism" movement. Parties emerge that criticize some aspects of the Welfare State.

Anti-tax parties Danish Progress Party (1973).

In the late 80s and early 90s is a stage where there is a relative electoral boom of these parties against silent revolution.

They do not defend a clear ideology: impact of neoconservatism, tendency to a new ideological polarization and make their own the critical discourse on traditional politics (criticism of conventional parties). To this is added the economic crisis that contributes to their electoral success (emigration is the cause).

They are parties capable of extracting votes from all social strata from any previous political realignment.

Ignazi recommends the adoption of three distinct criteria:
- *Spatial.* How they are placed on the left-right axis.
- *Ideological.* Whether or not they make references to historical fascism.

- *Systemic attitudinal*. What is the attitude of the party towards the system as a whole?

The spatial criterion leads us to an attitude to the right. The attitudinal criterion to the right. They do not usually allude to historical fascism.

They are parties, generally, anti: anti-parliamentarism, anti-social pluralism, anti-partisanship.

They have a negative discourse, against, but they do not propose great things. To this they add the rejection of immigration (they have a racist and xenophobic ideology).

There is a critique of excessive freedom and a lament for the loss of traditional values. Ex: French National Front (LePen), Republikaners (Germany), Liberal Movement (Haider in Austria).

There are other political phenomena that are difficult to frame: the Italian leagues. They are a movement that emerged in the 80s; They are a mixture of populism trying to emphasize interest that has to do with territory and nationality. There are racist elements. Lombard League or Northern League (Bossi).

- **The environmental parties:**
They are born more as social movements or pressure groups. When these groups organize and stand for election, they are considered parties. They are the fruit of the new leftism. They lack settlement in a single social class and are difficult to locate.

Its ideology revolves around the degradation of the environment by the indiscriminate action of man. They also include pacifism, which emerged in the 70s and 80s against the arms race and nuclear power of the Cold War.

They introduce other elements: Third World and criticism against the traditional political class (too corseted).

They start from a discourse against the established order (60 and 70); Today we find that the demands of these parties have been absorbed by other traditional parties. These parties undergo a process of domestication, according to **Offe**.

(j) Far-left parties:
They arise with the ideological rebirth of the late 60s. It is not an ideological revival in the sense that a new ideology defeats a previous one, but it is a partial ideological debate (partial political debates). They are partial debates on certain problems, they are minority and give rise to groups of little real weight characterized by a great radicalism.

New social movements appear and it is difficult to find, at times, the border between these groups and the new movements.

Many of these groups will fly the flag of Marxism in its many currents. The general label is the new left, new leftism, new Marxist left...

The germ of these groups predates the 60s. 1956 is the starting point, in this year there are some definitive historical events:
- XX Congress of the CPSU. The crimes of Stalinism are denounced.
- Invasion of Hungary by Soviet troops.
- First Suez Canal crisis. Egypt closes the Channel. It is the first great conflict of the new colonialism.

These events are the origin of these groups that rethink a way out by adopting heretical positions of Marxism and are a response to Soviet communism.

Teodori starts from an affirmation and says that such is the tangle of groups and organizations that exist within the new left but that these groups are more intellectual than mass movements although they defend the working class.

There are two distinct groups:
1. Organizations that, although their presence is a minority, find an echo in more than one country.
Inside are the Trotskyist and Maoist groups. There were Trotskyists before the late 60s. In 1949 Mao's revolution triumphed.

May 1968. The movement that is taking place provokes in the face of the crisis of the French state, the existence of small groups that propose a new revolutionary response since it is also against Soviet communism.

Maoists develop earlier. France will take the lead; In June 1966 the communist movement of France (Marxist-Leninist) was born. The repression and persecution of this group causes the emergence of other groups. In 1968 the Ganche Proletarienrie (proletarian left) emerges in its discourse the only option is revolution but it is a spontaneous revolution of the masses.

In Italy there are also Maoist groups, the first of them is the Communist Party of Italy (Marxist-Leninist), which appears with a strong criticism of the traditional Italian CP, which it accuses of right-winging. Italy is one of the countries where there are more Maoist groups: Umone dei Comuniti Italiani (marxisti-leninisti) and Potere Operario. Both are splits from the CP Italy (m-l).

In Spain there are also Maoist groups: basically two: Revolutionary Organization of Workers and the Communist Movement of Spain (Marxist-Leninist).

The other parties are the **Trotskyists**. The Fourth International inaugurates the possibility of Trotskyist parties throughout the world. Its peak occurs in the movements of the French May. The Trotskyists advocate the revolutionary road but criticize the spontaneity of the revolution and the Party has a role to play.

Almost all Trotskyist parties are called the same: Communist League (France, Italy, Spain).

2. Organizations that have their beginning, their explanation and their existence limited to a single country.

It is much less known. Their explanation can only be limited to their respective countries.

<u>Great Britain</u> The boundaries between what is a party and what is a social movement is practically impossible to distinguish (in all countries).

There is a protest movement, the campaign for nuclear disarmament although in reality it was a fierce criticism of the traditional forces of the left (right-winging, comfortable).

The New Left emerges that poses itself as a radical left to the Labour Party. It is a movement closely linked to the Labour Party; They declare themselves socialists and their criticisms go against advanced industrial capitalism and the society that sustains it.

<u>France</u> The groups are generated by the Algerian war and the Suez conflict that will initially affect the French.

Union National des Estudiants de France (UNEF) It is a movement that is the germ of the movements of contestation. It starts from a very strong criticism against the actions of the French authorities in Algeria.

Parti Socialiste Unifie Party of extreme left with a curious approach: it allies with the USSR in the conflict of the Cold War.

<u>Germany</u> (FRG) Late 60s and 70s: divided country militarily invaded and that is that the border of the two Germanys is the European border.

There are campaigns against rearmament; Then they move on to a danger they see closer: atomic death. This is the germ of the leftist movements in Germany. Two events of our own must be taken into account:

- 1956. The German Federal Constitutional Court declares the Communist Party illegal.
- Since the beginning of the 50s the SPD celebrates the Congress of Bad Godesberg where Marxism is abandoned (1951).

People's Party for all Germany GVP
German Union for Peace DFU

They are the first groups to emerge and their life is very ephemeral. Their messages intertwined issues such as the nuclearization of the country and the allusion to the working class.

In the 60s a better-known leftist group appears: the German extra-parliamentary opposition. Its basis was criticism of the grand coalition of the federal government between Social Democrats and Christian Democrats.

We must mention the urban guerrilla, a phenomenon typical of the 60s and 70s, fed by the slogan of violence against institutions. They developed a terrorist strategy. His model was the Latin American guerrilla of the 60s.

Baader-Meinhof Group Merger of two groups.

<u>Italy</u> In the 60s there is an event that conditions the appearance of these groups: 1962 the Italian Socialist Party enters the Government with the Christian Democrats. This was understood as an abandonment of the communists of the PCI. This sparks the emergence of ultra-left groups to revitalize the debate on the left.

Two very radical small parties are born: Social Democratic Party and Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity.

Its ideology was based on the revitalization of the class struggle and the refusal of any alliance with the bourgeois parties.

There is a phenomenon of intellectual terrorism that theoretically defends the working class: Red Brigades. The only way is armed struggle against the Italian Government.

(k) United States parties:

They are not ideological parties, although this statement is debatable. This has to do with the mentality of the country.

The US develops a very peculiar electoral behavior compared to the European one. It presents a higher level of electoral abstention, it is solved by talking about institutional obstacles. The U.S. doesn't care about whether its citizens vote or not.

In most countries the electoral roll is carried out ex officio; in those countries where this is not the case, except in the US, the State establishes a series of fines for people who do not point to the census. This affects the consideration of political parties.

The popularity of the two major American parties is proven at the moment of their genesis. The first parties appear at the beginning of the nineteenth century: the first of them is "The Federalists" (Republicans) and its founder is **Jefferson** and would be the defenders of the interests of small landowners and the Member States of the Union. The other group is **Hamilton's** supporters, the "federalists" who support a strong federal government and defend trade. In the 30s (s. XIX) the Republicans suffer a split: on the one hand there are the National Republicans (**Andrew Jackson**); This last group loses the nickname of Republicans and remain with the name of Democrats. These Democrats defend **Jefferson's** legacy, while the followers of **Q. Adams will have budgets** similar to those of the Federalists. A political group called the Whigs (liberals) is going to emerge (30s) who are going to compete with the Democrats for about a decade. Today's Republicans are born into civil war.

Patterson says that the long duration of the two-party system is not due to the ideology of political parties but fundamentally to their ability to adapt to periods of crisis; This is concretized in knowing how to go at all times new bases of support, defend a certain philosophy or defend certain policies and ability to capitalize on the mistakes of the other.

Alignments, misalignments and realignments This theory is based on the concept of critical choices. These elections are the ones that occur from time to time and that are considered turning points that change American politics, the period of domination of one party by another.

Patterson says what those critical election periods or critical moments are:
- Civil War that means the predominance of the Republican Party (majority in the North)
- Elections of 1896 because they coincide with a serious economic crisis that plunges the country into a huge depression and that occurs under the mandate of a Democratic President (Cleveland). It favors a domination of the Republicans for the next four decades (even if there are some Democratic presidents).
- Great Depression of 1929 that occurs during the presidential term of a Republican (Hoover). The Democratic Party will become a majority in the following years.

President **F. D. Roosevelt** personifies the golden age of the Democratic Party (New Deal). It will be interrupted by a Republican mandate in the Presidency in 1952 (**Eisenhower** who gets re-elected in 1956). The social bases of both parties are taking shape.

The Democratic Party is considered the party of the middle class and Social Security. The Republican Party is considered the defender of the rich and the business world.

The Democratic dominance is broken in the 60s: Vietnam War (**Johnson's** presidency) and struggle for civil rights.

Split from the Democratic Party in Alabama: American Independent Party (**George Wallace**) defense of the interests of whites over blacks.

This is profited by the Republican Party that dominates in the 80s: **R. Reagan** (1980 and 1984) and then Bush. They control the Senate. Twelve years of Republican rule.

Currently, American political parties have the following profiles:
- Republicans advocate less intervention by the federal government.
- Democrats defending the opposite.

There are other parties that are called minor parties that also have an ephemeral existence. They arise to defend the positions of those citizens who are not defended by the big parties at any given time. There are two groups within the minor parties:
- **Parties motivated by a single issue:** They are born around a single problem very concrete but vital for their followers but unattractive to the rest of the voters. They are failing to expand their voter base. In addition, their only demand is usually absorbed by the big parties. Ex: Right-tolife Party (against the legalization of abortion).

International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 06 - Issue 04, 2023
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 31-46

- **Ideological parties:** Their ideology is based on philosophical, ethical or ideological presuppositions in the European sense. It should be noted how at the end of the nineteenth century the Populist Party (defense of agrarian interests) appears. Ex: Citizen Party, Socialist Workers Party, Libertarian Party.

2.3. Organization.

The various studies on political parties have been carried out from different perspectives. Classical studies are carried out by classical authors; they can be framed in a morphological approach: they are concerned with the form taken by the party and its internal world (structure and organization) **Ostrogorsky** ("Democracy and political parties" 1902) **Weber** (parties within the sociology of domination) and **Michels** (enunciates the Iron Law).

In the 50s there is the study of Duverger (Political parties). From the 60s there is an important turn in the study of political parties: **systemic paradigm.** This causes political parties to be studied as systems and works on party systems appear. 60s, 70s and 80s. At the beginning of the 90s a new line of research appears that recovers the morphological approach (as a unit of analysis).

When we talk about organization, therefore, we must return to the morphological approach. There are two distinct lines:

- **Panebianco.** Recover the classics and observe the matches as a unit of analysis.
- **Katz and Manr.** They combine the morphological approach with that of the party system.

a) Panebianco: Study the party seen from within; Above all, it is necessary to investigate what its internal power structure is.

Power: in relative terms. Power is a relationship of exchange between leaders and followers, but this relationship is asymmetrical yet reciprocal. Power within a party cannot be absolute, but leaders at times need their followers. Leaders fundamentally within the party control the resources of the organization and distribute incentives. These incentives are of two types:

- **Collective:** They can be distributed equally to everyone (ideology, political project...)
- **Selective:** For some but not for others (status, money...).

What leaders need, from time to time, is participation. If there is no participation, the party would not exist.

Actors: important differentiation from Duverger's (electorate, militants, leaders) *concentric circles*.

Duverger Panebianco
Electorate Genuine militants
Militants
Leaders.
Dominant coalition
Voters+supporters
+ a part of the affiliation.

Militants is the hard core of the party. Numerically it is the most important and the one that most interests the leaders. There are two ideal types:

- **Militant believer:**

Whose participation depends fundamentally on collective identity incentives (ideology and political project...) They cause major headaches for leaders when the party is going to change its political line. It poses greater problems for leaders when they have to make alliances. Leaders when they think of this group is when they make references to the ideological aims of the party.

- **Careerist militant:**

Their fundamental participation is due to the obtaining of selective incentives (materials, status). They supply the main mass of manoeuvre in factional games constituting the human basis for splits of parties. These militants are a major area of turbulence that leaders have to take care of.

Dominant coalition Duverger's concept of leader is too formalistic and does not explain what really happens within the party. Coalition means consensus between different groups. All parties have a complex power structure even though there is apparently only one leader. Power within the party is not merely an internal matter because sometimes there are people who have control over the party and who are not party members.

The dominant coalition leads to the idea that at the head of the party there are different allied groups and that this coalition is unstable and precarious.

Panebianco resorts to the concept of <u>*zones of uncertainty*</u>: all those factors that if not controlled would threaten or could threaten the survival of the organization and / or internal organizational stability. Any unsolved or poorly solved problem can be covered in a breach that threatens the survival of the party. The areas of uncertainty are innumerable. Panebianco talks about six vital zones of uncertainty that can be clearly seen:

- **Competence.** Understood as the power of the expert. The big parties need the internal division of labor. They are the holders of the knowledge of the positions in that division. There is always a group that controls the area of competition. That technical and specialized knowledge has nothing to do with the specific knowledge that can be obtained by studying but is obtained over the years. It has enormous internal power because it manages a neuralgic zone in political-organizational relations.
- **Management of relations with the environment.** The group that controls at this point, that designs the tasks that stipulate, define and redefine the relationships with the environment, coalitions, dialogue ... He would be the one to control this zone of uncertainty.
- **Control of internal communication channels.** A group that controls the distribution, manipulation, delay, deletion of information, or practice disinformation. This group has a very important resource.
- **Formal rules (statutes).** They are very important because they point out the rules of the internal game, the scenarios of conflict, of negotiation, within the party. The group that controls it is the one that defines them, manipulates the organizational rules, and interprets the rules.
- **Financing of the organization.** It is vital and the group that controls it has enormous power in its hands. This group generally, depending on their work, maintains privileged contacts with outside the party that end up generating influence peddling.
- **Recruitment.** It controls the structure of opportunities within the party, they design the profile of the militant who makes a career within the party (itinerary to ascend). This group also has power of influence over certain individual political careers.

Panebianco says that in modern parties there is no party in which a single power group can control all areas of vital uncertainty. Therefore different groups of the party control these areas and that is why we must talk about coalition.

In addition, power is cumulative and that is why within that dominant coalition there will be some groups superior to others (that control more areas of uncertainty). The dominant coalition is always a negotiable and unstable order by nature. Therefore there are no monolithic parties.

There is no monolithic party. We will always find ourselves with divided parties; This division can be larger or smaller:

- **Faction.** Very organized, hierarchical group. It's like a party within the party. absolutely vertical cut within the party: Militants, leaders.
- *Trend*. Minor internal division. It can be a current and is not hierarchical. Cuts that only affect the dominant coalition.

A party divided into factions does not necessarily have to split or break up, but that is its structure. Although there is a greater risk of breaking.

2.4. Institutionalization.

A political party is a structure in motion and therefore constantly evolves both externally and internally. They suffer external and internal pressures and must respond to them.

According to **Panebianco**, the factors that mainly affect the organizational structure of the parties and that better explain their physiognomy and functioning are:

- Organizational history (past).
- Relationships that at all times establish with the environment.

Concepts:

- **Original model**. Factors that combine leave their mark on the party and define its original characteristics.
- **Institutionalization**. How the organization has been consolidated.

Original Model

The organisational characteristics of a party depend on its history, its past, how it was born and how it has evolved.

Duverger's old distinction between parties of *internal* origin (formation within Parliament, cadre parties) and *external origin* (mass parties. They arise outside parliament.)

This cataloguing is not satisfactory because there are parties with different origins that could be included within these two labels. He proposes a more complex model: The formation process is a complex process and often consists of the agglutination of sometimes heterogeneous political groups. Each party forms a historical unicum but it is possible to identify some characteristics that indicate uniformities and differences in origin.

Three factors contribute to defining the original model of each party:
- How the organization is started and developed.
- Presence or absence of an institution sponsoring the birth of the party.
- Existence or absence of charisma in the formation of the party.

1.- How the organization is initiated and developed.
Three different paths.
- When the party originates by *territorial penetration*, it consists of a center controlling, stimulating and directing the development of the periphery.
- **Territorial diffusion** Development occurs more or less by spontaneous generation, first we have the existence of local elites in the different territories; They are then integrated into a national organization. Contrary to A.
- **Combination of the previous two.** The initial development is by dissemination, once the national organization is achieved, it is at the helm and develops by penetration local groups where there are none.

E.g. conservative parties cadre parties internal origin according to Duverger. External communist parties. Both by diffusion.

Development by penetration implies by definition the existence of a sufficiently cohesive centre from the first steps of a party's life.

Diffusion Party in which the construction of leadership is much more complex because there are many local leaders, and everyone wants to aspire to national leadership. More divided ruling coalition and ongoing internal leadership conflicts.

2.- Presence or absence of an external institution that sponsors the birth of the party.
If it exists, the party is born and conceived as the political arm of the institution. Two consequences:
- The loyalties that are formed in the party will always be indirect, first loyalty to the institution, then to the party.
- The external institution becomes a source of legitimacy for leaders. It is the institution that tips the balance in favor of one or the other in leadership conflicts.

We can distinguish between:
- Parties of external legitimacy with institution.
- Parties of internal legitimation.

It is not the same as the party being sponsored by a national or international institution.
E.g. KOMINTER and communist parties. Labour Party and TRADE UNIONS.

3.- Existence or absence of a charisma in the formation of the party.
Is the party separable or inseparable from the personality of the leader?

Robert **Tucker** makes a differentiation with respect to **Weber's** concept of charisma, he says that he only speaks of pure charisma (extraordinary qualities that move to follow him). Tucker speaks of the charisma of situation that is fundamentally due to the fact that a society at a certain moment is going through an enormous crisis and that situation of anguish predisposes it to follow a leader who offers it a way of salvation. Once the crisis is over, the charisma ends.

Pure charisma Hitler, Mussolini.
Situational charisma Churchill, Roosevelt, Adenauer, De Gasperi.
Parties that have a strong charismatic component in the formation are quite rare, they are often small parties that remain outside the political game, they are the flash-parties that are born and die without institutionalizing.

- **Institutionalization.**

In the phase we have just seen, leaders play a crucial role, working to build a collective identity. In this first stage the organization is an instrument for the realization of these objectives.

In the institutionalization phase, there is a very important qualitative leap. It is a process by which the organization incorporates the values and aims of the founders of the party. It ceases to be an instrument and acquires value in itself. A process of institutionalization is achieving a depersonalization of the leaders who created it.

A symbiosis occurs: what is good for the organization is good for its purposes.

Processes that cause institutionalization are essentially two and are simultaneous:

- Development of interests in the maintenance of the organization.
- Development and dissemination of organizational loyalties.

Both processes are linked to the formation of an internal system of both selective and collective incentives.

The two processes are absolutely necessary if they do not occur there is no institutionalization and the party dies.

Institutionalization will mark an organization because by consolidating its structures the organization is "atomized" from the outside world.

Institutionalization is a process, so the first distinction we can make is between those who are institutionalized and those who are not.

Those who do not disappear.

There are different degrees of institutionalization: weak and strong.

How do we measure the strong or the weak? Two dimensions:

- Degree of autonomy with respect to the environment that has been achieved.
- Degree of systematization, of interdependence between the different parts of the organization.

1.- Degree of autonomy.

Autonomy - dependence It refers to the relationship that the organization maintains with the environment around them.

Every organization is necessarily involved in exchange relations with its environment. All parties need to draw their human and material resources out of their environment.

A party also has to distribute incentives of different types not only to its members but also to other people in the environment (external users of the party: pressure groups, voters ...)

We would speak of autonomy when he develops an ability to control those relationships with the environment.

Dependence The indispensable resources that the party needs from abroad are controlled by other institutions.

The institution means that the party can control its relations with the outside.

The ideal type is Duverger's Mass Party (it is financed by the dues of its members, controls external groups, its own bureaucracy...).

Dependent party He practically depends on the outside for everything: pressure groups that decide whether to finance him or not, he is forced to include in his lists people outside the party.

The more autonomous a party organization is with respect to the environment, the more defined its borders are.

Conclusions

Internal structural coherence of the organization. Low degree when we find a party in which its internal subsystems function autonomously from the center of the organization. This supposes an important dispersion in the control of areas of uncertainty and therefore strong organizational heterogeneity.

High internal subsystems function in the same way and this operation is guaranteed through a centralized control of organizational resources as with exchanges with the outside. Control of areas of uncertainty and greater organizational homogeneity.

Bibliography

[1]. Armstrong, J. A. (1988). Toward a framework for considering nationalism in East Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, *2*(2), 280-305.

[2]. Andor, L. (2015). Fair mobility in Europe. *Social Europe Occasional Paper*.

[3]. Bergson, A. (1991). The USSR before the fall: how poor and why. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *5*(4), 29-44.

[4]. Daviddi, R., & Ilzkovitz, F. (1997). The Eastern enlargement of the European Union: Major challenges for macro-economic policies and institutions of Central and East European countries. *European Economic Review*, *41*(3-5), 671-680.

[5]. Delsoldato, G. (2002). Eastward enlargement by the European Union and transnational parties. *International Political Science Review*, *23*(3), 269-289.

[6]. Draxler, J., & Van Vliet, O. (2010). European social model: No convergence from the East. *European Integration*, *32*(1), 115-135.

[7]. Dreger, C., Kholodilin, K., Lommatzsch, K., Slačálek, J., & Wozniak, P. (2008). Price convergence in an enlarged internal market. *Eastern European Economics*, *46*(5), 57-68.

[8]. Dunay, P. (1994). NATO and the East: A Sea of Mysteries. *World Policy Journal*, *11*(3), 123-127.

[9]. Gorodetsky, G. (1990). The impact of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on the course of Soviet foreign policy. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 27-41.

[10]. Grieco, J. M. (1995). The Maastricht Treaty, Economic and Monetary Union and the neo-realist research programme. *Review of International studies*, *21*(1), 21-40.

[11]. Guiraudon, V. (2001). Weak weapons of the weak? Transnational mobilization around migration in the European Union. *Contentious European*, 163-86.

[12]. Healey, D., & Healey, D. (2002). Homosexual existence and existing socialism: New light on the repression of male homosexuality in Stalin's Russia. *GLQ: A journal of lesbian and gay studies*, *8*(3), 349-378.

[13]. Hillion, C. (2014). The Copenhagen criteria and their progeny. *EU enlargement (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2004)*.

[14]. Kandogan, Y. (2000). Political economy of eastern enlargement of the European Union: Budgetary costs and reforms in voting rules. *European Journal of Political Economy*, *16*(4), 685-705.

[15]. Kojevnikov, A. (2002). The Great War, the Russian Civil War, and the invention of big science. *Science in Context*, *15*(2), 239-275.

[16]. Levesque, J. (1974). Modèles de conflits entre l'URSS et les autres états socialistes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, *7*(1), 135-142.

[17]. Pejovich, S. (2006). 3. The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Institutions, Globalisation and Empowerment*, 56.

[18]. Peterson, J. (2017). Juncker's political European Commission and an EU in crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *55*(2), 349-367.

[19]. Price, J., Sloman, L., Gardner, R., Gilbert, P., & Rohde, P. (1994). The social competition hypothesis of depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *164*(3), 309-315.

[20]. Sapir, A. (2006). Globalization and the reform of European social models. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *44*(2), 369-390.

[21]. Scherpereel, J. A. (2010). EU cohesion policy and the Europeanization of Central and East European regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, *20*(1), 45-62.

[22]. Stephanson, A. (2002). Fourteen notes on the very concept of the Cold War. In *Rethinking Geopolitics* (pp. 74-97). Routledge.

[23]. Threlfall, M. (2003). European social integration: harmonization, convergence and single social areas. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *13*(2), 121-139.

[24]. Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP. Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, (34), 1-14.

[25]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). The European Union Facing the 21st Century: The Digital Revolution. *TalTech Journal of European Studies*, *12*(1), 60-78.

[26]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). La estrategia de las instituciones de la Unión Europea ante el reto de digitalización. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 17-40.

[27]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). El futuro digital de la política europea.

[28]. Waaldijk, K. (1994). Standard sequences in the legal recognition of homosexuality-Europe's past, present and future. *Australasian Gay & Lesbian LJ*, *4*, 50.

[29]. Walby, S. (2004). The European Union and gender equality: Emergent varieties of gender regime. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, *11*(1), 4-29.

[30]. Whitman, R. G. (2004). NATO, the EU and ESDP: an emerging division of labour?. *Contemporary security policy*, *25*(3), 430-451.

[31]. Wivel, A. (2005). The security challenge of small EU member states: interests, identity and the development of the EU as a security actor. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *43*(2), 393-412.

[32]. Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of language and politics*, *14*(1), 87-109.

[33]. Young, J. W. (1994). Cold War Europe, 1945-1989: A Political History. *The English Historical Review*, *109*(433), 1039-1040.