

SOS POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

M.A.POL.SC.204

SUBJECT NAME: COMPARATIVE POLITICS

UNIT-V

TOPIC NAME: PARTY SYSTEM

PARTY SYSTEM

A party system is a concept in comparative political science concerning the system of government by political parties in a democratic country. The idea is that political parties have basic similarities: they control the government, have a stable base of mass popular support, and create internal mechanisms for controlling funding, information and nominations. The concept was originated by European scholars studying the United States, especially James Bryce and Mosey Ostrogorsky, and has been expanded to cover other democracies. Giovanni Sartor devised the most widely used classification method for party systems. He suggested that party systems should be classified by the number of relevant parties and the degree of fragmentation. Party systems can be distinguished by the effective number of parties.

TYPES OF PARTY SYSTEMS

ONE-PARTY SYSTEM: a system in which a single political party has the right to form the government, usually based on the existing constitution, or where only one party has the exclusive control over political power.

DOMINANT-PARTY SYSTEM: a system where there is "a category of parties/political organizations that have successively won election victories and whose future defeat cannot be envisaged or is unlikely for the foreseeable future".

TWO PARTY SYSTEM: a system where only two parties or alliances, typically placed either side of the center, have a realistic chance of forming a majority. Other parties are very minor or solely regional. Example: The United States

MULTI-PARTY SYSTEM: a system in which multiple political parties have the capacity to gain control of government offices, separately or in coalition.

NON-PARTISAN SYSTEM: a system of government or organization such that universal and periodic elections take place without reference to political parties.

PARTY SYSTEMS BY COUNTRY OR REGION

EUROPEAN UNION

Two structures of party system have been identified in the European Parliament since its first universal direct election in 1979, albeit the main EU party groups remained the same: 1979–1994: a system split in two blocs on the left/right dimension, with the left bloc (Socialists, Radical Left and Greens) opposing a right bloc (Popular, Liberals, Gaullists and British Conservatives) 1994-onwards: a system in which the three central parties (the conservative EPP, the socialist PES and the liberal ALDE) have voted as much with each other as with their smaller allies, thus 'governing' the system, and facing different oppositions from the left (European Left and Greens and leftist euro skeptics) and from the right (Gaullists, British Conservatives, rightist euro skeptics and nationalists).

ITALY

Italian party systems are usually considered only since the foundation of the Italian Republic (1946) as pre-fascist parties lacked a wide popular base. The party system of the so-called First Republic (1946–1994), though based on a proportional electoral law, saw the dominance of the Christian Democracy (DC) and the convention ad excludendum against the Italian Communist Party (PCI). DC and PCI together gathered around 85% of the votes in average. The system was thus a blocked bipolar system; governments were very short (in average lasting less than one year) and post-electoral, but the supporting parties and personnel could not change. With time, some parties (especially the Italian Socialist Party, PSI) gained momentum, till reaching the role of government-making in the 1980s. The system was completely destroyed by the bribery scandals of Tangentopoli, which shattered DC and PSI. According to Sartori, the two possible degenerations of proportionalism (fragmentation and lack of party discipline) were reduced by two factors: the strong role of parties ("partitocrazia") and the polarization between Christian-democrats and communists. Therefore, the first republic saw a maximum level of 5 effective parties, with only one dominant party. The so-called Second Republic party system (since 1994) bears the following characteristic marks: a majoritarian electoral law, introduced by referendum in 1993, which brought about a bi-polarization of the game (although limited by the 1/4 of votes still gathered proportionally) the birth of Forza Italia as personal party of Silvio Berlusconi, with a strong polarization effect the rise of new parties (the environmentalists Verdi and the autonomist Lega Nord since the late 1980s, Alleanza Nazionale through a reform of the post-fascist Italian Social Movement) the split of old parties (between reformed post-communist Democratic Party of the Left and neo-communists of Rifondazione Comunista; between left-wing and right-wing of old Christian Democrats and Socialists, siding with or against Berlusconi) Though more fragmented in the number of parties, the system was bipolar in its functioning. With time, both sides saw a strengthening of coalitions (even if with ups and downs) and the birth of unified parties (the Ulivo federation and then the Democratic Party on the left, and the People of Freedom party on the right side). The change in the electoral law in 2005 and the return to proportionality (although with a majority premium able to transform, in the lower chamber, the plurality in a 55% majority) didn't bring about a return to collusion, while still leaving such prospect open for the future.

GERMANY

The 2009 Bundestag election in Germany was characterized by widespread public apathy and record low voter turnout. Weldon and Nüsser (2010) argue that it solidified a new stable, but fluid five-party system that they see as a defining feature of the emerging German political system. The three minor parties each achieved historical bests at the polls with steep losses for the two traditional Volksparteien. They report that the increased volatility and fluidity of the party system is structured along the left-right ideological spectrum with the parties divided into two major camps and vote-switching much more likely within the respective camps rather than between them. The 2009 election also marked a devastating defeat for the SPD, leading some commentators to speculate about the end of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) as a "catch-all party" and, against the backdrop of recent poor performance of center-left parties all across Europe—perhaps evens "the end of social democracy."

The 2013 election saw the first time that the liberal Free Democratic Party (FDP) that had been represented in parliament since 1949 and formed part of government as a coalition partner to either SPD or CDU (Christian Democratic Union, the major conservative / center-right party) for almost all of the period from 1949 to 1998 and again from 2009 to 2013 fell below the 5% threshold for parliamentary representation. The same election also saw the rise of the "Alternative for Germany" (AfD) party that ran on an anti-Euro platform and failed to enter parliament on their first federal election just barely with 4.8% of the vote. After this election the second "große Koalition" (big coalition of the major parties CDU and SPD) since 2005 was formed. Prior to that Germany had only had one big coalition that governed from 1966 to 1969, preferring coalitions of one big and one small party at the federal level instead. Whether this

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Four party systems have been identified in post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe:

I system (late 1980s - early 1990s): dominated by the opposition between communists and anti-communists, i.e. from supporters and opponents of the old regime; spontaneous mass movements formed on idealistic bases and transformed into 'umbrella parties'

II system (early 1990s): opposition between winners and losers of the economic transition to a market economy. Anti-communist parties split and formed unstable coalition governments. Many parties, with a narrow political base, grew up

III system (late 1990s): the social conflicts of market transition aggravated, and social-democratic post-communist parties took over. The party system concentrated, while electoral volatility was extremely high

IV system (2000s): rise of a relatively stable and modestly concentrated party system, organized on a left-right dimension, including post-communist parties. Fragmentation did not rise again after the fall of many social-democratic parties from government.

FINLAND

Finland was a Grand Duchy controlled by Russia until 1918. Nationalistic demands from the peasants and workers for greater use of the Finnish language led to the first political party: the Finnish Party in 1860. In response, the Swedish-speaking aristocracy, landowners and businessmen formed their own political party. Thus emerged the first party system.

CANADA

According to recent scholarship there have been four party systems in Canada at the federal level since Confederation, each with its own distinctive pattern of social support, patronage relationships, leadership styles, and electoral strategies. Political scientists disagree on the names and precise boundaries of the eras, however. Steve Patten identifies four party systems in Canada's political history. The first party system emerged from pre-Confederation colonial politics, had its "heyday" from 1896 to 1911 and lasted until the Conscription Crisis of 1917, and was characterized by local patronage administered by the two largest parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives.

The second system emerged following the First World War, and had its heyday from 1935 and 1957, was characterized by regionalism and saw the emergence of several protest parties, such as the Progressives, the Social Credit Party, and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. The third system emerged in 1963 and had its heyday from 1968 to 1983 and began to unravel thereafter. The two largest parties were challenged by a strong third party, the New Democratic Party. Campaigns during this era became more national in scope due to the electronic media, and involved a greater focus on leadership. The dominant policy of the era was Keynesian economics. The fourth party system has involved the rise of the Reform Party of Canada, the Bloc Québécois, and the merger of the Canadian Alliance with the Progressive Conservatives. It saw most parties move to one-member-one-vote leadership contests, and a major reform to campaign finance laws in 2004. The fourth party system has been characterized by market-oriented policies that abandoned Keynesian policies, but maintained the welfare state. It could be argued that a fifth party system has emerged at some point over the past decade as Canadian politics is no longer defined by the regionalism and fiscally conservative orthodoxy of the 1990s and early 2000s. The current make-up of the House of Commons, dominated by three nationally oriented parties (Liberal, Conservative and NDP), bears a far more striking resemblance to that of the third party system rather than the fourth; the governing Liberals have arguably abandoned or loosened their commitment to fiscal conservatism and free market economics by returning to a more Keynesian outlook; and the left of center New Democratic Party (NDP) has been a contender in the past two elections, having occupied the role of official opposition in between 2011 and 2015. This greatly differs from the post-1993 situation in which aside from the governing Liberals, Canada's two other nationally oriented political parties (the NDP and PC Party) were marginalized, allowing the opposition benches to be dominated by the Western-based Reform Party and separatist Bloc Quebecois. However, it is difficult to pinpoint precisely when the fourth party system came to a close. As mentioned earlier, the Canadian Alliance and PC Party merged in 2004 creating the Conservative Party of Canada, but the Bloc Quebecois continued to dominate Quebec, benefiting from First Past the Post, until 2011. The Liberals, in opposition to the governing Conservatives after 2006, gradually moved leftwards as centrist parties often do when in an

opposition role to a conservative government. Clarkson (2005) shows how the Liberal Party has dominated all the party systems, using different approaches. It began with a "clientelistic approach" under Laurier, which evolved into a "brokerage" system of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s under Mackenzie King. The 1950s saw the emergence of a "pan-Canadian system", which lasted until the 1990s. The 1993 election — categorized by Clarkson as an electoral "earthquake" which "fragmented" the party system, saw the emergence of regional politics within a four party-system, whereby various groups championed regional issues and concerns. Clarkson concludes that the inherent bias built into the first-past-the-post system, has chiefly benefited the Liberals.

UNITED STATES

Main articles: Realigning election, First Party System, Second Party System, Third Party System, Fourth Party System, Fifth Party System, and Sixth Party System The concept of the party system was introduced by English scholar James Bryce in *American Commonwealth* (1885).

American Party Systems was a major textbook by Charles Merriam in 1920s. In 1967 the most important single breakthrough appeared, *The American Party Systems. Stages of Political Development*, edited by William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham. It brought together historians and political scientists who agreed on a common framework and numbering system. Thus Chambers published *The First Party System* in 1972. Burnham published numerous articles and books. Closely related is the concept of critical elections (introduced by V. O. Key in 1955), and "realignments." Critical elections or Realigning elections involve major changes to the political system, regarding the coalition of voters, the rules of the game, finance and publicity, party organization, and party leadership "Scholars generally agree that realignment theory identifies five distinct party systems with the following approximate dates and major parties: 1. 1796–1816, First Party System: Jeffersonian Republicans and Federalists; 2. 1840–1856, Second Party System: Democrats and Whigs; 3. 1860–1896, Third Party System: Republicans and Democrats; 4. 1896–1932, Fourth Party System: Republicans and Democrats; 5. 1932–, Fifth Party System: Democrats and Republicans."

There have been at least six different party systems throughout the history of the United States:

First Party System: This system can be considered to have developed as a result of the factions in the George Washington administration. The two factions were Alexander Hamilton and the Federalists and Thomas Jefferson and the Democratic-Republican Party. The Federalists argued for a strong national government with a national bank and a strong economic and industry system. The Democratic-Republicans argued for a limited government, with a greater emphasis on farmers and states' rights. After the 1800 Presidential election, the Democratic-Republicans gained major dominance for the next twenty years, and the Federalists slowly died off.**Second Party System:** This system developed as a result of the one party rule of the Democratic-Republicans not being able to contain some of the most pressing issues of the time, namely slavery. Out of this system came the Whig Party and Henry Clay's American System. Wealthier people tended to support the Whigs, and the poorer tended to support the Democrats. During the Jacksonian era, his Democratic Party evolved from Democratic-Republicans. The Whig party began to break apart into factions, mainly over the issue of slavery. This period lasted until

1860.**Third Party System:** Beginning around the time of the start of the Civil War, this system was defined by bitter conflict and striking party differences and coalitions. These coalitions were most evidently defined by geography. The South was dominated by the Democrats who opposed the ending of slavery, and the North, with the exception of some major political machines, was dominated by the Republicans, who supported ending slavery. This era was a time of extreme industrial and economic expansion. The Third Party System lasted until 1896.**Fourth Party System:** This era was defined by Progressivism and immigration, as well as the political aftermath of the American Civil War. Northeastern business supported the Republicans while the South and West supported the Democrats. Immigrant groups were courted by both parties. The Fourth Party System came to an end around 1932.**Fifth Party System:** This system was defined by the creation of the New Deal Coalition by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in response to the Great Depression. This coalition supporting new social welfare programs brought together many under-privileged, working class, and minority groups including unions, Catholics, and Jews. It also attracted African-Americans, who had previously largely supported the Republican Party due to Lincoln's freeing of the slaves. This era lasted approximately until 1968. **Sixth Party System:** The transition to this system appears to have begun with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with the Democrats subsequently losing their long dominance of the South in the late 1960s, leading to a Republican dominance as evidenced by election results.

ARGENTINA

Scholars of Argentina identify two distinct party systems, one in place between 1912 and 1940, the other emerging after 1946. The first party system was not consistently class based, but the second was, with the Radical Party representing the middle classes and the Peronists, workers and the poor.

INDIAN PARTY SYSTEM

Definitions .Characteristics .Functions

What is a Political Party? Gilchrist says " A political party may thus be defined as an organized group of citizens who prefer to share the same political views and who by acting as a political unit try to control the government" Edmund Burk defines " A political party is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some political principle in which they agreed." Characteristics of a political party Organized group of persons Similar views on political and economic problems of country Aim to control government by constitutional and peaceful means. Functions of Political Parties Educate people of the emerging problems and help in formation of public opinion. Fight elections and try to get maximum candidates elected. ☐ Gives political education to the people Serve as a link between the people and government. They also serve as a link between legislature and executive organs of government 1. One party system - 2. Bi-Party system - 3.Multi party system One Party System In a single party system, only one party is allowed to take the government. The other parties are either outlawed or are limited to some extent only. ex : China - Communist party of China Cuba - Communist party of Cuba Merits : 1. helps in establishment of stable government 2. Formation and execution of long-term planning 3. Unity and discipline in the country De-Merits : 1. Democracy is eroded and dictatorship arises 2. No freedom of expression in a single party state . Bi-Party System It is where two

major political parties dominate politics within a government. The one which holds government is majority party while the other is called minority party. Ex : U.S, England etc.. Merits: 1. Government becomes more stable. 2. Formation of government is easier. 3. Direct election of the government. De-Merits: 1. Limited choice to voters 2. Dictatorship of the cabinet 3. divides the nation into two camps. Multi-Party System In a Multi-party system, there are more than two political parties which indulge in the government either separately or in coalition. Ex : India, France etc.. Merits : 1. Wider choice to voters. 2. Chances of cabinet dictatorship is less 3. Parliament is not a puppet in hands of cabinet ☐ De-Merits: 1. No long term planning 2. Indefiniteness of policies 3. Lack of administrative efficiencies. Regionalism in India the differentiation made by the certain section of people based on their cultures, traditions, languages is termed as regionalism. Political Parties are formed under these regional basis and are called regional parties or local parties. There are 48 regional parties in India. How Regionalism hinders growth of Indian Political system? They create a wall between one party and another on the name of region. Regional party focuses only on the local issues but not national issues. People go on with regional party to encourage their own culture and language. Communalism in India

Communalism can be said as a blind loyalty of people towards their religious group. It is a tool to mobilize people for or against by raising an appeal on communal lines. Communalism is engineered by political and economic interest of contending groups and factions within a political party or by political parties.

CAUSES OF COMMUNALISM IN INDIA Lack of awareness ☐ Lack of education prefer community goals Economic reason ☐ Secularism of the country

POSSIBLE MEASURES FOR COMMUNALISM Education ☐ Socialization ☐ Proper government policies Proper economic provision.

THE POLITICAL PARTY SYSTEM OF INDIA: FROM ONE-PARTY DOMINANCE TO NO-PARTY DOMINANCE

The Indian party system is one of the most paradoxical systems in the world. As a system, it is rigid enough to withstand continuous defections and yet fluid enough to absorb new alliances; inclusive enough to accommodate the immense diversity and yet exclusive enough to be controlled by one family; mature enough to allow peaceful turnovers and yet inapt enough to arouse spontaneous violence; and, finally, old enough to become “one of the world’s oldest” and yet youthful enough to produce new parties overnight. Its ever-evolving character, with strong qualities of adaptation and resilience, defies the conventional wisdom on political parties.

1. ONE PARTY DOMINANCE SYSTEM:

The party system operating in India does not conform to the two party systems of Britain and the USA. At the same time, it is basically different from the multi-party model of countries like France and Italy because one of India’s several parties has over-shadowed all others by having dominated the political scene ever since independence. The Con-gress system emerged after the country had attained independence. From 1947 to 1967 and from 1971 to 1977 as well as from 1980 to 1989, this system was at the center of Indian Politics, spanning three distinct stages in its post-independence development.

Thus, the Congress, which functioned as broad-based nationalist movement before independence, transformed itself into the dominant political party of the nation. That is why the observers of Indian politics like Morris Jones described the Indian Party system as a system of “one party dominance” While Rajni Kothari went to the extent of calling “One Party Dominance System” or “The Congress System”.

2. A MULTI-PARTY SYSTEM:

Since the disintegration of the consensus based Congress system in 1967, the Indian Parties have fit the category of a multi-party system. India has as many as Seven National Parties and 48 State parties.

3. LACK OF STRONG OPPOSITION:

India lacks a strong well-organized opposition party. A strong opposition is essential for the success of parliamentary democracy. The main function of the opposition is to highlight the shortcomings of the government and to compel it to become responsive to the public opinion.

4. PERSONALITY CULT:

Indian Party system values the role of the leader. When a party ceases to have a charismatic leader, it starts declining. After the death of Jawaharlal Nehru and Mrs. Indira Gandhi Congress suffered adversely. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee’s death caused irreparable loss to the Jan Sang. Similarly the Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and C. Rajagopalachari witnessed very fast decline of the socialist forces and Swatantra Party respectively.

5. LACK OF IDEOLOGICAL COMMITMENT:

In India politics has become issue oriented rather than based on ideology. The existence of the National Front Government at the centre was a canid example of issue oriented politics which got support from the extreme left CPI (M) to the extreme right (BJP). Since 1971, elections have been won not on the basis of the inherent strength of the ideology of a political party but on the basis of issue of immediate concern to the electorate.

6. EMERGENCE OF REGIONAL PARTIES:

In India, several all-India parties have suffered in strength and regional parties have grown in number and influence. Thus, Tamil Nadu has become a stronghold of the DMK followed by the ADMK; the Punjab is dominated by the Akali Dal; Assam has been ruled by the AGP; Jammu & Kashmir is governed by the National Conference and Shiv Sena has emerged a powerful force in Maharashtra politics. Some regional parties such as the DMK, Shiromani Akali Dal and National Conference emerged soon after the country’s independence. These parties articulate and seek to defend a regionally-based ethnic or religious-cultural identity.

7. FACTIONS WITHIN THE PARTIES:

All political parties tend to be fictionalized. In non-communist parties the faction leaders tend to be community, caste or religious leaders who have skillfully built-Patron-client relationship among the

members of different castes or communities. Such factional leaders vie among themselves for political influence within the party and the government, entering into political alliances with one another in order to keep their political rivals out of power. Most of these factional alliances are non-ideological; they also tend to shift a good deal, thus keeping the parties in a state of flux.

8. COMMUNALISM AND CASTEISM:

Communalism is not a phenomenon confined only to India and other countries of Asia but it can be seen in many parts of the world like Germany, Sweden, and Denmark etc. What is peculiar about India is that even the so called secular persons and parties adopt an opportunist attitude towards communalism.

9. THE USE OF EXTRA-CONSTITUTIONAL MEANS TO POWER:

Although electioneering and campaigning is an effort to capture a maximum number of seats in public offices are said to be the main functions of the parties, very few parties are able to make a respectable showing using only these legitimate methods. As a result political parties of all ideological persuasions frequently try to exploit political or social discontent to their advantage. They do not hesitate to use such non-parliamentary means as civil disobedience, mass demonstrations, strikes and protest rallies to embarrass the party in power and some of these tactics may become violent.

10. POLITICS OF DEFECTION AND ANTI-DEFECTION ACT:

Defection is the term used for opportunistic transfer of loyalties from one political party to another. When a legislator is elected on the ticket of one party, but later joins another party, for selfish reasons, without his voters' consent, it is called defection. The Anti-Defection Act, 1985 sought to stop defections, so that representatives elected on certain principles and on certain party tickets would not be allowed to betray the trust which was reposed in them by the electorate at the time of their elections.

CONCLUSION

In the parliamentary system of government, manifestos constitute and represent an important aspect of electoral politics. The object of analyzing party manifestos is to understand the approach as well as responses of national political parties on various complex issues. A manifesto is statement of a party's policy on a range of issues. Political parties in India and elsewhere also try to derive electoral support not only through their image but also through the articulation of concrete policy proposals. Political parties in India have been playing an important role in directing the policies of the government. Most of the policies and programmes are part of the party's election manifesto which they promise to carry out, if elected. However, in the literature on political parties in India, little attention has been given to the manifesto both as an input to the policy process, to the politics of its formulation as well as a comparative perspective on the issues and approach of different national political parties.