One of the more interesting developments in the comparative study of political parties is a new focus on the internal life of political parties. One group of scholars taking this approach is the Elections and Political Parties Work Group, a subcommittee of the Committee on Political Sociology which is a Research Committee of the International Political Science Association and the International Sociological Association. The Committee is headed by Peter Flora, Chairman, and Derek Urwin, Secretary, and I have the honor of serving as the Convenor of the Work Group.

In the past this work group has studied voting patterns and party systems, with less attention to individual parties. However, just as the Political Organizations and Parties section of APSA was formed in the late seventies in response to the need many of us felt for more emphasis on political organizations, so the international group has responded to a similar conviction in the late eighties: we need to know more about how parties work, from inside.

We began this new work with a workshop in Paris in April 1989 at which 15 scholars presented papers on topics relevant either to the internal dynamics of parties or to the relationship between such internal dynamics and external factors. Nine of the papers produced for that meeting are now being developed for a volume tentatively entitled, “How Political Parties Work: Perspectives from Within,” and an additional six papers have been commissioned (see below). Most of the original papers took European and North American parties as their focus, but contributors are also working on studies of individual parties in Japan, India, Israel, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The last two studies were recruited after the recent events in Eastern Europe made it clear how important it would be to include such nations in our work and are being written by those who have observed the new parties forming at firsthand.

The Work Group is also scheduling panels on the internal life of the parties at various professional meetings. In July of 1990 we will meet in Madrid at the meetings of the International Sociological Association, where Kenneth Janda is leading a panel on “Modeling Party Change” and Leonard Weinberg will chair a two-part session on “Political Parties and Terrorist Organizations.” At the end of August, (continued on page 6)
Dear POP members:

The annual business meeting and awards presentation will be held at 5:30 p.m. on Friday, August 31, at the American Political Science Association annual meeting in San Francisco.

At the business meeting a set of resolutions will be offered by the By-Laws Revision Committee to bring our by-laws and operating practices in agreement. Enclosed is the Report of the By-Laws Revision Committee, chaired by Anne Costain, University of Colorado. The other members are James Guth, Furman University, and Sarah McCauley Morehouse, University of Connecticut. I am enclosing a copy of the original By-laws, adopted in 1983, and their proposals for amending the By-laws. Both the original and the proposed revisions are listed below.

The Nominations Committee chaired by Marian Palley, University of Delaware, and including Paul Herrnson, University of Maryland, and Richard Boyd, Wesleyan University, will propose the following nominees for two-year terms on the Council:

Charles Barrilleaux, Florida State University
Joyce Gelb, City College of New York
Anne Hopkins, University of Minnesota
John S. Jackson III, Southern Illinois University

The Awards Committee chaired by Frank Feigert will present three awards on behalf of POP; see enclosed list of award winners.

POP’s program chair, Jim Gibson, has organized a set of panels sponsored by POP, those panels are also listed in the newsletter.

We hope to see you at POP’s annual meeting and award ceremony.

Margaret Conway

By-laws, POP Organization
September 2, 1983

1. Executive Authority of the APSA Section on Political Organizations and Parties (POP) shall reside in the office of Chair, elected at the annual business meeting for a two-year term in odd-numbered years, beginning in 1983.

2. Responsibility for submitting an annual report to the APSA on POP’s activities shall reside in the office of Secretary-Treasurer, elected at the annual business meeting for a two-year term in even numbered years, beginning in 1982.

3. Governing authority of POP, including power to propose By-Laws for membership approval and to nominate candidates for Chair and Secretary-Treasurer, shall reside in a Council of eight persons.

1. Nominations of candidates for the Council shall be proposed to the Chair, who shall prepare a mail ballot for election to the Council for inclusion in POP’s newsletter.

2. After the 1983 Business Meeting and before the 1984 Meeting, the first mail ballot for the Council shall be held for all eight positions. After the vote, half of those elected shall be determined by lot to serve for two years beginning in 1984 and half for one year.

3. In subsequent years, four persons shall be elected by mail in advance of the Business Meeting to two-year terms on the POP Council.

4. The Council shall meet annually in conjunction with the Business Meeting.

Proposed Amendments

1. Add to Section 1 the following new sections:

1. The Chair shall be responsible for submitting an Annual Report to the APSA on POP’s activities.

2. The Chair appoints By-Laws committees, when needed to propose new by-laws for membership approval at the Annual Business Meeting, and Nominating committees to propose candidates for Chair, Secretary-Treasurer, and the POP Council. These nominations shall be forwarded to the Chair who will in turn send them to be published in the POP newsletter.

2. Amend Section 2 to read: The Secretary-Treasurer is elected at the Annual Business Meeting for a two-year term in even years.

3. Amend Section 3 to read: Governing authority of POP shall reside in a Council of eight persons.

4. Delete 3(l) which now says that, “Nominations of candidates for the Council shall be proposed to the Chair, who shall prepare a mail ballot for election to the Council for inclusion in POP’s newsletter.”

5. Delete 3(2) which now says that, “After the 1983 Business Meeting and before the 1984 Meeting, the first mail ballot for the Council shall be held for all eight positions. After the vote, half of those elected shall be determined by lot to serve for two years beginning in 1984 and half for one year.”

6. Amend 3(3), which is now re-numbered 3(l) to read: Four persons shall be elected at the Annual Business Meeting every year to two-year terms on the POP council.

7. Add a new 3(2) to read: The major responsibility of the Council is to advise the POP chair.

(continued on page 7)
EARLY RETURNS

IPSA/ISA WORK GROUP ON ELECTIONS AND PARTIES WORK IN PROGRESS

The following notes on work in progress give an idea of the range of activities of members of the Work Group, in addition to their joint activities within and for the Group.

FRANK BELLONI, European University Institute, Florence, Italy, is presently working on change in the Italian Communist Party—how and why it is moving toward possible dissolution and reconstitution as a newly composed democratic-progressive party.

VENIAMEN Y. CHIRKIN, Institute for State and Law, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow, is working on revolutionary democratic parties in socialist oriented Third World nations. He is also preparing a paper on the grass-roots communist parties in socialist nations, examining the extent to which local cells adhere to party rules, how democratic centralism works in practice, and recent changes in grass-roots activities in Eastern European parties.

DAVID FARRELL, School of European Studies, University of Wales, Cardiff, U.K., has recently completed “Campaign Strategies and Media Coverage,” for Michael Gallagher and Richard Sinnott, editors, How Ireland Voted, 1989 (Galway: Political Studies Association of Ireland, 1990). Farrell is a member of the research project, “Party Organizational Change and Adaptation,” directed by Richard Katz and Peter Mair. He recently directed a workshop (with Shaun Bowler of UC Riverside) on Election Campaigning in Western Europe at the meetings of the European Consortium of Political Research in Bochum, West Germany, April 1990.

GEOFFREY PRIDHAM, Director of the Centre for Mediterranean Studies at the University of Bristol, U.K., reports that the Centre has recently completed a project on “Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Southern Europe” and is pursuing the possibility of working on new party development in Eastern Europe “from a comparative Southern European perspective.” Pridham’s own interests lie in the role of political parties and regime change.

RICHARD ROSE, Strathclyde, Glasgow, U.K., has recently coauthored (with IAN McALLISTER) The Loyalties of Voters: A Lifetime Learning Model (Sage Publications, 1990). The book builds on previous work to test influences as they occur in the lifetime of the voter, starting with pre-adult socialization, and then introducing adult socio-economic interests; political values; social context; and the current performance of parties. Their evidence is drawn from voting studies made from 1964 through the 1987 election in Britain.

EVERT VEDUNG, Uppsala University, Sweden, is writing a paper on “The Greens, the Freezing Theory, and the Growth-Ecology Dimension.” In this paper he considers how the Swedish Greens succeeded in breaking into that nation’s “frozen” five-party system by entering parliament in 1988 and why they are always stronger in municipal elections and opinion polls than in parliamentary elections.

THE 1990 POP AWARDS

FRANK SORAEU, University of Minnesota, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.

SEYMOUR M. LIPSET, Stanford University, and STEIN ROKKAN, editors, winners of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field (for Party Systems and Voter Alignments).

NOT A NEW GERMANY, BUT A NEW FEDERAL REPUBLIC
Rainer Nick, University of Innsbruck

Nearly one year ago Erich Honecker, the Communist Party Chairman and Head of State for the German Democratic Republic (GDR), declared the Berlin Wall would be standing in a hundred years. Nearly six months ago the world watched in amazement as Poland held semi-competitive elections with a pre-arranged partial retreat of the Communist leadership. Honecker’s statement and the Polish election make clear the rapid developments in Eastern and Central Europe over the past several months. Communism and its authoritarian leaders in this region, including the German Democratic Republic, are a thing of the past. All of the Eastern and Central European countries are undergoing radical change. Despite the similarity of their problems in the transition from dictatorship to democracy and from centrally planned to market economies, each country should be considered separately on the basis of its historic, cultural, economic and social peculiarities.

The German Democratic Republic is taking a course of action logically not possible for the other former Soviet Union satellites because it will cease to exist in the very near future. While the word used to describe the fusion of the two Germanys, “reunification,” is certainly incorrect, the newly favored “unification” appears equally misleading. With everything to pave the way for this “unification” process, only one conclusion can be drawn: the “new” Germany will be the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) enlarged by the population and territory of the (then) former German Democratic Republic. While other East European countries have to rid themselves of the Soviet system and establish new political structures, the German Democratic Republic, even before its official dissolution and merger, will have the political suprastructure of the Federal Republic. Two important factors make this evident: the outcome of the March 1990 elections in the German Democratic Republic and the international treaty signed by the two Germanys to create an economic and currency union effective July 1, 1990, with the FRG’s Deutsche Mark (DM) as its legal tender.

Election Outcome. What East German citizens saw in the spring election actually was not an election campaign waged by East German political parties, but one waged by the established West German parties: CDU, SPD, CSU and FDP. (This summer and fall, before the two countries unite, most of the Federal Republic’s political parties officially will merge with their sister parties in the Democratic Republic.) The other, new democratic parties in the German Democratic Republic that distanced themselves from the political structure imported from the West suffered an overall electoral loss despite the fact they generally acknowledged the merits of the “peaceful revolution.” East Germans already had accepted the West German suprastructure because it was seen as a means of accelerating the German unification process.

International Treaty. The international treaty with the economic and currency union at its core is the result of this political decision to adopt the Federal Republic model of democracy and economy. This means primarily that the fundamental rules of West German society will take force of law on East German soil on July 1, 1990. With all the special regulations needed to manage the transition from a planned economy with its subsidies to a market economy with its social framework, economic unification with the Federal Republic will take place in summer 1990. Shortly thereafter, there will be no further raison d’être for the Berlin Wall or for the border between the two Germanys.

With the economic and currency union the German Democratic Republic (i.e., its government and its freely elected parliament) will systematically adopt the laws, regulations, and procedural rules of the Federal Republic of Germany. Thus, Article 23 of the Constitution, which stipulates the requirements for a country joining the Federal Republic, will come to pass as a matter of logical consequences. Either the German Democratic Republic as a whole through its national parliament or the yet to be created individual Länder (states) from its territory through their individual Land parliaments will petition to join the Federal Republic of Germany and receive ready acceptance.

It follows that no “new” Germany will emerge despite all these changes, rather the Federal Republic of Germany will continue to exist economically, politically and constitutionally. Despite all of the problems related to integrating the German Democratic Republic, this “new” Federal Republic of Germany will be larger, with an increase in land area by about the size of its present Land North Rhine-Westphalia and with an increase in gross national product by about that of its present Land Hesse. In other words, once the two Germanys are united, the Federal Republic will be larger but there will be no extreme change in its size. Underscoring this fact can serve to calm Germany’s neighbors (including the Soviet Union) on the one hand, and can provide a domestic argument for convincing the people of the “old” Federal Republic that the problems of East German integration will not be insurmountable on the other hand.

Economically, the German Democratic Republic will (continued on page 7)
CALL FOR PAPERS
Forthcoming Symposium
The Politics of Abortion Rights

The American Politics Quarterly invites submissions for its upcoming symposium issue on The Politics of Abortion Rights to be published late in 1992. The debate over abortion has had an impact on many elements of American politics at all levels of government, including voting behavior, interest group and party activity, legislative and judicial behavior, and executive action. Any of these aspects, and others related to abortion politics and policy, would be appropriate subjects for the symposium we are planning. Papers comparing the U.S. to other nations are appropriately as long as the U.S. is a major focus. By sponsoring a symposium on this controversial issue, the editors of APQ hope to draw together the diverse literature on the politics of abortion policy, stimulate new research, and in so doing to shed light on several aspects of American politics.

The deadlines for submission of manuscripts is November 1, 1991. Obviously, we are looking for scholarly manuscripts, not advocacy tracts. All papers will be sent for anonymous review to three referees, APQ's regular review process.

MONEY, ELECTIONS, AND DEMOCRACY
Reforming Congressional Campaign Finance

Edited by
Margaret Latus Nugent and John R. Johannes
Boulder, CO: (Westview Press)

Although critics of our present system of congressional campaign financing claim abuse and corruption are commonplace, threatening values fundamental to a representative democracy, little has been done to eliminate these concerns since the passage of the Federal Election Campaign Act and the creation of the Federal Election Commission in the 1970s.

In Money, Elections, and Democracy, leading scholars illuminate the current debate over the present system and its apparent consequences for democratic government. In doing so, they articulate the values an ideal campaign-financing scheme should promote—government effectiveness, legitimacy, representation, accountability, political equality, liberty, competition, and participation—and propose prescriptive programs for reform.

POP SPONSORED PANELS
1990 APSA Annual Meeting
San Francisco

D-1 Candidate Recruitment in Comparative Perspective
Sunday, September 2, 10:45 a.m.

D-2 New Right and Party Politics: U.S. and European Perspectives
Friday, August 31, 8:45 a.m.

D-3 The European Electorate on the Eve of Unification
Saturday, September 1, 3:30 p.m.

D-4 Candidate Strategies, Party Activists, and Decision Making
Friday, August 31, 1:30 p.m.

D-5 Political Parties and Local Politics
Thursday, August 30, 3:30 p.m.

D-6 Major Concepts and Theories in Research on Political Parties and Interests Groups
Friday, August 31, 3:30 p.m.

D-7 The Effects of Interest Groups on Public Policy
Thursday, August 30, 8:45 a.m.

D-8 State and National Party Coalitions
Saturday, September 1, 10:45 a.m.

D-9 Political Participation and Voter Turnout
Sunday, September 2, 8:45 a.m.
STUDYING PARTIES FROM THE INSIDE (continued from page 1)

I will chair a panel composed of work group members on “Political Parties: Electoral vs. Linkage Criteria for Success” at the APSA meetings in San Francisco. In July of 1991 our group will present a panel, “Political Parties from Within: Articulation between Center and Periphery,” at the meetings of the International Political Science Association in Buenos Aires. Just prior to those meetings we will hold a two- to three-day workshop of our own, also in Buenos Aires. We hope to continue to meet at least once a year until our work is done.

Of course, this kind of work is never really done, but we have laid out some long-range plans that should go a long way toward clearing up the mysteries of the internal lives of political parties around the globe. The purpose of our continuing work is to move toward the publication of as many country-specific volumes as seems feasible, with each of these volumes edited by a recognized national expert on the parties of that nation. The authors in each volume will be expected to cover certain questions, but will be encouraged to give full acknowledgment and coverage to the specific environmental variables that shape the internal lives of the particular parties on which they are reporting. Derek Urwin and I will serve as series editors for this enterprise. Once a significant number of country-specific volumes has been produced we plan to proceed with a more rigorously comparative study of parties as organizations.

In sum, the Work Group on Elections and Parties is prepared to take the time to do the job right. We are stressing the importance of covering political parties in all parts of the world, developing testable hypotheses and using direct observation of party meetings and activities. In this last regard, we argue that although interviews and the analysis of party rules and statutes are useful, there is no real substitute for being there: some measure of participation is required. We also insist that key variables that do not lend themselves to quantification must not be overlooked or omitted just on that account.

If your own work fits in these parameters, please get in touch with me or other members of the working group. In addition, I know many of the members of POP have friends and colleagues abroad who may be interested, and we would be very grateful to have their names as well. This is comparative work that must be done in large part by native political scientists, on the spot observers of the developments they document and analyze.

Recent publications on comparative parties include the following. Those marked with * are reviewed in my “Political Parties: Inside and Out,” a review article forthcoming in Comparative Political Studies.


Thomas C. Bruneau and Alex Macleod, Politics in Contemporary Portugal: Parties and the Consolidation of Democracy, Lynne Reinner, 1986.


*Hans Daalder, editor, Party Systems in Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Belgium, New York, St. Martins, 1987.


HOW POLITICAL PARTIES WORK
PERSPECTIVES FROM WITHIN

Kay Lawson and Derek Urwin, Editors

Forthcoming volume organized by the IPSA/ISA Work Group on Elections and Parties

Table of Contents (Tentative)

I. Introduction. By Kay Lawson and Derek Urwin

II. Internal Party Dynamics


David Morris, “Factionalism in the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan: A View from Inside.”


(continued on page 7)
III. The Relationship between Internal Party Dynamics and External Political Developments.

Josef Blahoz, "The New Legal Framework for Political Parties in Czechoslovakia and Their Actual Political Activities."

Kris Deschouwer, "The Internal Dynamics of Local Party Sections in Belgium and their External Effectiveness."


Jerzy Wiatr, "How the Polish United Workers Party Transformed Itself Into the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic."

Frank L. Wilson, "The Sources of Party Change: Change in Social Democratic Parties in Britain, France, Germany and Spain."

Yael Yishai, "Interest Parties: Groups in the Electoral Process: The Israeli Case."


NEW FEDERAL REPUBLIC (continued)

join the Federal Republic this summer, but complete political integration has several remaining policy hurdles. These consist not only of a consideration to be shown toward the U.S.S.R. and its justified interests, but also of permitting Soviet political leaders, whose liberalization and tolerance ultimately made a reality of developments still unimaginable a year ago, to save face. The fact that the future world will not have to reckon with a "new" unified Germany, but with a "new" Federal Republic of Germany and its proven and known political structures, makes this new Federal Republic a calculable factor, even with its membership in the European Community and NATO.

The political leadership in Bonn and East Berlin aim to facilitate the unification of the German Democratic Republic with the Federal Republic as quickly as possible to create a fait accompli and to turn the events of 1989/90 to the best advantage for the Germans in the German Democratic Republic. Nevertheless, Bonn and East Berlin must remember that things have happened in that one short year that would have been dismissed as utopian, as political science fiction. Needless to say, many people inside and outside Germany will need a long time to become accustomed to the new Federal Republic of Germany.

Rainer Nick, a West German native, is Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Innsbruck, Austria. Charles Hadley assisted in the translation of this essay.

BY-LAWS (continued)

Because we are currently out of cycle in our selection of Secretary-Treasurer and Chair, since both last took place in an odd-numbered year (1989), we recommend that either:

(a) The current Secretary-Treasurer be asked to extend his/her term for one year (until 1992) to re-establish the cycle. Or

(b) That the Secretary-Treasurer who is nominated in 1991 be asked to serve just a one-year term to return that office to an even year electoral schedule.
INTEREST GROUPS IN POST-INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACIES

A Report for Vox Pop on a Roundtable held at the 1989 Meeting of the American Political Science Association

Clive S. Thomas, University of Alaska, Southeast

The purpose of this roundtable was to bring together experts on interest groups in major western democracies to provide an overview of recent developments in their country’s interest group politics. In relating these developments, participants were asked to focus on the relevance of recent literature on comparative interest groups to their country’s group activity in the policy-making process in a post-industrial society. In all, 12 democracies were represented including Australia (John Warhurst and Trevor Matthews); Canada (Paul Pross); France (Frank Wilson); Israel (Asher Arian); Italy (Ray Zariski); Japan (Ron Hrebenar and Akira Nakamura); New Zealand (Jack Vowles); Sweden (Michele Michelelli); Switzerland (Harmon Ziegler); United Kingdom (Jeremy Richardson); United States (Clive Thomas); and West Germany (Klaus von Beyme).

The discussion revealed that there have been several similar developments in the 12 countries over the past 20 years. Without exception, interest groups appear to have enhanced their power at the expense of political parties, as citizens become more politically sophisticated and ideology, even in countries like Sweden and France, is on the wane. Interest groups appear to be the big winners in the increasing pragmatism of the citizenry in the western world. Other recent similar developments include: a significant increase in the number and range of groups, including many post-industrial-type lobbies such as environmentalists; the decline of so-called traditional labor groups and the rise of white collar unions/associations such as public employees; and the rise of single issue groups such as anti-abortion and pro-choice groups.

One particularly interesting phenomenon which is affecting democracies which are hybrids of the America and British systems of government, such as Canada and Australia, is the appearance of lobbyists in the traditional American sense. That is, organizations are hiring contract lobbyists, particularly to access the bureaucracy. The registration of lobbyists has also been an issue in Canada in recent years.

Yet, while we may be witnessing the “internationalization of interest group activity in western democracies,” there remain many distinguishing features among these 12 countries in terms of the legitimacy of groups and their involvement in the policy making process. In Sweden, for example, the government encourages the creation of interest groups, including organizations for recent immigrants. This is in sharp contrast to countries such as the United States and West Germany. Israel stands alone of all the western democracies in the dominance of its interest group politics by the military. While New Zealand, it appears, has made the leap from the second to the fourth wave of interest group development.

Trying to classify these 12 democracies on a pluralist-corporatist scale is difficult and may be a rather pointless task. Japan, for example, is corporatist in many respects with the major exception that labor is not part of the relationship. Switzerland and Sweden probably exhibit the most corporatist tendencies of all; but major recent changes in both countries are having the affect of fragmenting old corporatist alliances and moving both systems—as well as those of Italy and France—towards a more pluralistic situation. Indeed, many of the participants in the roundtable argued that their interest group systems are spawning corporatist-pluralist hybrid which best described their systems in the recent past and is likely to characterize them in the near future.