CHAPTER-II

POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

The political parties are lifeline of modern politics and are indeed critically significant in democratic systems. They contest elections over the years. They woo people daily through the means of mass media particularly radio, television, press and propaganda. Their actions and reactions, their direction and control, become more significant for government at work, than constitutional structures and succession of Cabinets.¹

The modern form of representative democracy brought party system as an indispensable part in every political society. The political parties, in one form and other, are omnipresent as well as are creatures (offshoot) of modern political system. Whether one thinks of Anglo-American democracies or totalitarian system particularly the Soviet Union, China, Fascist-Italy, Nazi-Germany, African states or Latin American Republics, they exist everywhere.² Therefore, political parties of some kind exist from Brazil to Burundi and from Norway to New Zealand. They may be authoritarian or democratic, which may seek power through elections or through revolution and they espoused ideologies of the left, right or center or, indeed disavow political ideas altogether. The growth of political parties and the acquisition of party systems came to be recognized as a mark of political modernization.³

The evolution of political parties, clearly implies that the masses must be taken into account by ruling elites, either out of commitment to ideological notion, that the people enjoy right to participate in the determination of public policy, the selection of leadership or out of the realization that even a rigidly dictatorial elites

---

must find the organizational means of assuring stable ‘conformance’ and control.\(^4\)
This phenomena lays stress on the maximization of political participation in the sense that it enjoins upon the members of elite class to take masses at large in confidence either for the sake of observing the myth that ‘voice of the people, voice of the God’, or justify the very legitimacy of their leadership and authority.

A system of political party is a necessary condition of the existence and operation of modern political system, which provides indispensable link between the people and representative machinery of government. The people cannot govern themselves freely unless it has ‘freedom of choice’-choice between different candidates, who seek to be its representative and choice between different policies for which, those candidates stood. The citizens must have alternative before it and these alternatives offered by different political parties. This ‘freedom of choice’ or citizen’s choice is a great thing, which make political parties inalienable.\(^5\) Barker says;

\begin{quote}
The ‘citizen’s choice’, as it may called, is the tap-root of democracy. I must be free to choose if I am to have a free government, and if I am to free to choose I must have alternative before me-the alternative offered to me by different political parties.\(^{5a}\)
\end{quote}

Yet, one hundred and fifty years ago, their place and function were generally unknown. In theorizing about parties, the study finds the four typical concerns of theoretical analysis: origins, objectives, patterns (structures) and functions (operations).\(^6\) As a matter of fact, Sartori states;

\begin{quote}
We cannot build theory of parties and of system unless we establish what is not party and unless we are clear headed about the essential, what, for the parties.\(^7\)
\end{quote}

\(^4\) La Palombara and Weiner, n.2, p.4.
\(^5a\) Ibid.
The name ‘party’ came into use gradually replacing the derogatory term faction, with the acceptance of idea that a party is not necessarily faction. Etymologically and semantically seeking ‘faction’ and ‘party’ do not convey the same meaning.\(^8\) Madison states that faction means number of citizens, whether amounting to majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to rights of other citizens or to the permanent and aggregate interest of the community.\(^9\) Madison did not here make any distinction between party and faction. The political scholars’ remark that Madison definition historically fit many contending groups such as the Partricians and Plebeians of ancient Rome, the Guelfs and Ghibellines of the middle age and so forth, but these groups perhaps better be called faction.\(^10\)

The term party derives from Latin verb ‘partire’, which means ‘to divide’. However, it does not enter in a significant way in the vocabulary of politics until the seventeenth century. It implies that it does not enter the political discourse directly from Latin, its longstanding predecessor with very much the same etymological connotation is ‘sect’, which took from the Latin word ‘secare’ that means to serve, ‘to cut’ and thereby ‘to divide’.\(^11\)

However, the political party basically conveyed the idea of ‘part’, and part is not, in and by itself derogatory term like faction. Nonetheless, the part had long lost its original connotation. The term ‘part’ enters in the French vocabulary/politics as “partager”, which means sharing, as it enters in the English vocabulary as partaking, that is, partnership and participation. When part becomes party, then term party is subjected to two opposite semantic pulls, the derivation from ‘partire’, to divide, on the one hand, and the association with taking part and thereby with sharing, on the other. While, the word ‘party’ entered into the vocabulary of politics whereas ‘sect’ was on its way out and associated with religion especially with Protestant sectarianism.\(^11a\) Therefore, it should be clear that political parties do not relate with those sects, cliques, clubs, factions and small groups that can be identified as the

\(^8\) Ibid, pp. 3-4.
\(^10\) Friedrich, n.6, p.444.
\(^11\) Sartori, n.7, p.4.
\(^11a\) Ibid.
antecedents of the modern party in most western countries. In England, it is possible to trace incipient parties back to the early seventeenth century, in France the development of small groups that were embryonic parties, materialized somewhat later, but clearly preceded the French Revolution in 1789.\textsuperscript{12}

It is generally explained that a political party, as an association, organized in support of some principles or policies by constitutional means, it endeavours to make the determinant of government. Without party organizations, there can be no unified statement of principles, no orderly evolution policy, and no regular resort to the constitutional devices of parliamentary elections, nor, of course, any recognized institution by means of which a party seeks to gain or to maintain power.\textsuperscript{13}

This statement is based on two fundamentals of human nature: one that men differ in their opinions and other is that, they are gregarious by nature. They try to achieve those goals by coming together and acting together, which they cannot achieve individually. The religious and communal loyalties and the attachment to a dynasty or leader also helped the political parties to develop. The party enthusiasm is maintained by such elements of human nature as sympathy, imitation, competition and pugnacity (expressing an argument very forcefully or fight).\textsuperscript{14}

In other words, the political parties find its roots in human nature, which marked by diverse opinions and personal rivalries, that come to surface in the event of clash of interests with regards to public business. The diverse and conflicting interests in society lead to the formation of various groups, which are based on different social and economic demands and expectations of the people. When, these groups or associations organized themselves and represent demands as well as aggregate the interests of the society known as political parties. These groups may be considered as the ‘specialized aggregation structure’ of modern society. In a competitive system, the political party aggregates certain interests into set of policy proposals and then attempts to garner victory at polls, to install decision makers.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} La Palombara and Weiner, n.2, pp.5-6.
\textsuperscript{14} A. Appadorai, \textit{The Substance of Politics}, New Delhi: Oxford University, 2006, p.538.
Edmund Burke states that political parties are group of men, united for providing by their just endeavors, the national interests upon particular principles to which they are all agreed. Reiterating the same idea, Friedrich characterized “a political party as a group of human beings, which is stably organized”. It has objectives of securing or maintaining for its leaders, the control of government or rule over the political community, linked with another objective, namely that of giving to members of such a party, ideological and material satisfactions, benefits and advantages.\(^{16}\) Schumpeter, however, did not agree with the classical definitions or traditional ideas on parties. Schumpeter argues that this idea is so tempting and party cannot be defined in terms of its principles, because, principles or planks may be characteristics of the party, that is important for its success as the brands of good, as in a departmental store, but the departmental store cannot be defined in term of its brands and a party.

According to Schumpeter, “political party is a group, whose members propose to act in concert in competitive struggle for political power.”\(^{17}\) Similarly, in German definition, a battle fellowship in the form of a permanent association, to obtain power over the state to realize political aims.\(^ {18}\) In other words, political party is a group of persons, who organized themselves, with the aim of winning government machinery by electoral or other means.\(^ {19}\)

Max Weber gives sociological explanation of party, is an associative type of social relationships, memberships, which rests on formally free recruitment. The end to which, its activity is devoted to secure power within a corporate group for its leaders, in order to attain ideal or material advantage for its active members.\(^{20}\) They may consist of charismatic leaders, of traditional retainers or of the rational adherents. By definition, a party can exist only within a corporate group, in order to influence its policy or gains control over it.\(^ {21}\) So the political parties live in ‘house of

\(^{16}\) Friedrich, n.6. p.442.  
\(^{19}\) Heywood, n.3, p.248.  
\(^{21}\) Ibid.
power’. Therefore, they are only possible within communities that are societalized, which have some rational order and a staff of persons available, who are ready to enforce it.\textsuperscript{22} Jean Blondel states;

\begin{quote}
Political parties are groupings, but groupings of a particular kind. Clearly, it is not sufficient to say that they are ‘political’, while other groups are not; politics being a procedure, a body is political only to the extent that it participates in the procedure of solution of conflicts.
\end{quote}

However, sometimes, it is said that parties aim at taking over power, while the group aims only at influencing decisions, which are taken by others. This distinction is valid, which is based on decision makers and mere influential.\textsuperscript{23} Jean Blondel further adds;

\begin{quote}
We shall consider a political party as any group, which is both, open in its membership and concerned potentially with the whole spectrum of matter, which related to the polity.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Moreover, there are various groups’, having different characters, some are religious, economic, and educational or some are even political bodies, which distinguish them from other groups of the society. The party is ‘self-governing club’ with voluntary membership, voluntarily deciding by its own motion, the objects for which it exists by methods of persuasion and propaganda at the time of general elections.\textsuperscript{25} Ernest Barker gives another explanation;

\begin{quote}
We may rather call party a ‘channel’ analogous to a channel of water, which serves a mill and turns the water-wheel, which works the mill; and we may say, the party collect the currents of opinion formed in water shed of society, direct them along its channel towards the wheel of the state and supplies the motive-force of thoughts, ideas and policies, that make the wheel revolve.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[24] Ibid., p.102.
\item[25] Barker, n.5, pp.29-30.
\item[26] Ibid., p.31.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Neumann summarized that political party, generally, as the articulate association of society’s active political members, those who are concerned with the state (government) power, compete for popular support with another group(s), holding different opinions. As such, it is great intermediary, which connected with social forces and ideologies to governmental departments and link them to political action within the larger political community.  

It is, here hard to make differences between pressure groups or interest groups. Although, specific interests may constitute the foundation of a political party, the differences between or among political parties may be drawn on the basis of specific interests. The channelizing of various interests in the society serves as the broad basis of political party. The interests can either be individual or group. Usually the interests of the group are one which struggle to translate themselves into type of social control activity through the political process of government. Neumann clearly differentiates pressure group from political party; “fundamentally pressure groups are representative of homogenous interests, seeking influence, on the one hand, political parties seeking office and directed towards policymaking, combine of heterogeneous group”, on the other.

The political party is an organization of numerous people, openly committed on broad questions of policies and assumes direct responsibility of their policies, by seeking to monopolize or share with other parties in the position of political power. Whereas, pressure groups do not work of interest aggregation and strive to protect and promote its specific interests without being ready to assume direct responsibility for same.

Maurice Duverger, a well known authority on the topic throws light on another aspect of political party by defining that it is ‘communities’ and ‘social group’. Duverger says;

---

A party is not community but a ‘collection of communities’; a union of small groups, dispersed throughout the country (by branches, caucuses and local associations, etc.) and are linked by coordinating institutions.\(^\text{30}\)

Duverger emphasized on the social composition of parties rather than their doctrines. For present day, the political parties are distinguished far less by their programmes or the class of their members than by the nature of their organization. The political party is a community with particular structures. Sartori defines;

\[
A \text{ party is any political group identified by an official label, that present at elections and is capable of placing candidates for public office through elections (free or non-free).}\text{\(^\text{31}\)}
\]

Clearly, battery of scholars proposed numerous definitions that are quite lengthy though short of being a synopsis of a description. In general, political parties can be defined in terms of actors, actions (activities), consequences (purposes) and domain. The political party can also be defined with exclusive respect to its functions, to its structure or to both, or in the light of the input-out scheme, and in still other ways.\(^\text{32}\) From the above analysis, the definitions of political party are limited to its one aspect or another. However, Joseph La Palombara and Myron Weiner give very comprehensive and detailed definition of political party. Palombara and Weiner define;

\[
\text{When we speak of political parties, we do not mean a loosely knit of group of notables with limited and intermittent relationships to local counterparts. Our definition requires instead: (I) continuity in organization, i.e., an organization whose expected life span is not dependent on the life of current leaders; (II) manifest and presumably permanent organization at local level, with regularized}
\]


\(^{31}\text{Sartori, n.7, p.63}\)

\(^{32}\text{Ibid., p.61.}\)
communication and other relationship between locals and national units, (III) self-conscious determination of leader, at both national and local levels to capture and to hold decision making power alone or in coalition with other, not simply to influence of exercise of power; and (IV) a concern on the part of the organization for seeking followers at the polls or in some manner striving for popular support.\textsuperscript{33}

It is crystal clear that political party without a well-knit organization, is nothing and is neither able to present, nor to promote its programmes. Therefore, without the proper organization, the people just make disorganized crowd. It is the organization, which turned into permanently cohesive body that enables them to acquire strength, so as to act in concert. From the above discussion, it is observed that the notion of party vary from time to time and country to country. Generally, the old conception that party is group of men professing the same political doctrine is not true, now. The emphasis shifted from principles to organization. While, the theory developed earlier one differs from them in several respects. For one, everyone speak of government or rule of an organization, rather than of power within it.\textsuperscript{34} David Hume, in his essay on parties made the shrewd observation that programmes play an essential part in the initial phase, when it serves to bring together scattered individuals, but later on organization come to the fore, the platform becoming subordinate.\textsuperscript{35}

Max Weber differentiates political parties from ‘Aristocratic’ faction. Weber emphasizes the fact that political parties rested upon formally free recruiting. They allowed anyone to join up. But many parties do not permit free recruiting, such as Communist Party and others. The parties either, will, all free recruiting and then these parties may be called constitutional parties or if they will not allow, and then they are considered autocratic parties.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} La Palombara and Weiner, n.2, p.6.
\textsuperscript{34} Friedrich, n.6, p.442.
\textsuperscript{35} Duverger, n.30, p. XIV.
\textsuperscript{36} Autocratic parties:- These parties constitute, the organized following group, which gained complete control of government, but which feels the need for large-scale popular support. If,
Some of the scholars notably Gerhard Leibholz are of the view that the political existence and operation of parties at the center of the political system is the distinguishing feature of contemporary politics and that we should speak of a “party state” or \textit{parteienstaat} (French word) in contradiction to earlier forms of political order. This typology is clearly derived from French politics; it has little application to British and American development of parties or to the present behaviour of parties in these countries or indeed in Germany and elsewhere.\footnote{Ibid., p.445.}

Sigmund Neumann makes a dichotomist distinction between political parties on the basis of functional aspect, which is of two types of parties with sharply contrasting major functions: parties of representation and parties of integration.\footnote{Neumann, n. 27, p.402} There can be no question that a shift occurred in this direction that political parties more concerned with integration than with the representation of individuals, but not only have they continued to be concerned with both.

Besides this, American scholars treat political party as a machine (vote-catching) or an agency to mobilize people’s support for a candidate at polls and above all, a platform for taking part in struggle for power in democratic set up. In recent years, the Marxian ideas on political party are contrary to liberal viewpoints and the Marxist conception of party as class, give a new direction to political parties.\footnote{Duverger, n.30, p. xv.}

Karl Marx in \textit{Communist Manifesto}, states that “the united proletariat will represent the overwhelming majority; its dictatorship will lead to dissolution of all classes and therewith to the liberation of the society as a whole”.\footnote{Neumann, n. 27, p. 397.} Vladimir Lenin modified Marxian ideas on political parties by adding that;

\begin{quote}
in its struggle for power, the proletariat has no other weapon but organization, divided by rule of anarchic competition in bourgeois world, ground down by slave labour for capital, constantly thrust back to the “lower depths” of
\end{quote}
utter destitution, savagery and degeneration, the proletariat can become and will inevitably become, an invincible force only when its ideological unity around the principles of Marxism is consolidated by material unity of an organization, which unites millions of toilers in the army of the working class.41

Lenin further says that the workers do not spontaneously become socialist, but trade unionist and then revolutionary ideology is must in consequence be brought to them by middle class intellectuals.42 Lenin favoured, Communist Party is “a small compact core, consisting of reliable, experienced and hardened workers, with responsible agents in the principal districts. They connected by all rules of strict secrecy with the organization of revolutionists, can with the wide support of the masses and without an elaborate set of rule, perform all the functions of trade union organization and perform them more over in the manner the social democratic desire”. Lenin’s party was nothing less than a project for taming human destiny.43

Lenin describes Communist Party as the ‘vanguard of the revolution’ for the working class. The party had three main characteristics. (I) the party was assumed to posses in Marxism, a unique type of knowledge and insight; (II) Lenin’s party, being in principles a carefully selected and rigidly disciplined elite, was never designed to become a mass organization and (III) party was designed to be tightly centralized organization44—‘democratic centralism’.45 When, Lenin established a government in Russia, he called it “a government for the working people by the advanced element of the proletariat (the party), but not by the working masses”. In fact, the theory of 1902 was not yet the party of 1917, and the party in Lenin’s life time was not Stalin’s party.

41 Vladimir Lenin, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Selected Work, Vol.11, 1904, p.466.
44 Ibid., p.734.
45 Democratic centralism was the key feature of the Communist party’s organization, based on two principles. The first was that lower levels must accept decision made by higher levels. The second was that each level was elected by the one immediately beneath, thus forming a pyramid of indirect elections. But only one person would nominate for each election, but in reality this candidate was chosen from above. So, it was centralism without democracy, in Rod Hague and Martin Harrop, Comparative Government and Politics, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.203.
Duverger rightly points out that, the ideas of Lenin seem to be concerned not only with the leaders but also with the militants. They naturally give position of control, because they alone dispose of sufficient leisure to fill those effectively. To create a class of professional revolutionaries is equivalent to creating a class of professional leaders of revolutionary parties, an inner circle, stirs up the masses and finds upon the official duties, perform within the party. It is equivalent to create bureaucracy, or an oligarchy.\textsuperscript{46}

Liberal scholars criticize Marxian ideas and did not find political party and its role based on class antagonism. Duverger analyzed that Marxist opposition of middle class to working class will also often be used in wider sense. Nevertheless, this schema is true in one respect: the bourgeoisie and proletariat do not perhaps constitute two classes. It defined strictly in economic terms, but they characterize two states of mind, two social-attitudes and two ways of life, the distinction between, which throws light on certain problems, concerned with the structures of parties.\textsuperscript{47}

Indeed, Communist Party is not only vanguard of working class, but also custodian of all power and any opposition to party suppressed by severe punishment. Lenin argued for small party of professional revolutionists, who would lead the masses because they are incompetent to find the correct road, without direction. Robert Michels also discusses about the “incompetence of the masses” which coincides with Lenin’s idea. The masses are incapable of taking part in the decision-making process and desire strong leaderships.\textsuperscript{48} Michels here, distinguishes the character of political party on the ground of leadership. Michels is of view that;

\begin{quote}
Those who become full time officials of unions, political parties or who serve as parliamentary representatives, whilst belonging by social position to the class of ruled, have in fact, come to form part of the “ruling oligarchy”.\textsuperscript{49} It is organization which gives birth to the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{46} Duverger, n.30, p.155.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 30. p.xv.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p.17.
domination of elected over the electors, of the
mandatories, over the mandators, of the
delegates over the delegators, who says
organization, say oligarchy.\textsuperscript{50}

These words first published in 1911, which sum up Michels famous idea, “iron law of oligarchy”. He examined the behaviour of the Socialist Parties of Germany and elsewhere, which to be appeared, at that time, the most committed to the extension of democracy.\textsuperscript{50a} The iron law of oligarchy is rule by and for the few. The power within parties, as within other organizations, end up at the top or in the hand of leaders.\textsuperscript{51} The leaders have many resources, which give them an almost complete advantage over members, who try to change policies. The assets of the leaders can be counted as: (a) best knowledge; (b) command over the formal means of communication with membership and (c) expert in the art of politics-(speeches, writing articles and organizing group activities etc). These occupational skills strengthened leader’s role in organization, in general and parties, in particular. As a result, political parties formally committed to democracy generally dominated by ‘ruling elites’.\textsuperscript{52}

In other words, every political party works under the stewardship of person or leader, who can enthuse, influence, inspire, and control other persons, in a manner that leader can guide or direct the thoughts, feeling and actions of other persons, whom he leads.\textsuperscript{53}

Despite this fact, the leadership is essential for the success and survival of every organization. It is an organization that provides ‘strategic post’, which gives power and advantage to leader(s), who cannot be checked or held accountable by their followers. Therefore, leadership is essential phenomenon in every form of social life. The process start in the consequence of differentiation of functions in party, is completed by complex of qualities, which leaders acquire through their detachment from the masses. At the beginning, the leaders arise suddenly; their

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., p.15.
\textsuperscript{50a} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} Hague and Harrop, n.45, p.188.
\textsuperscript{52} Michels, n.48, pp.16-17
functions are accessory and gratuitous, soon, they become professional leaders and in the second stage of development, they are stable and irremovable. Michels further adds that;

_The majorities are only the evidence of that which is whereas; minorities are often the seed of that which will be. In the life of modern democratic parties, it is only a minority, which participates in party’s decisions and most important resolutions are taken by handful members. The great majority of the members will not attend meeting unless some noted orator is to speak, or unless some extremely striking war cry is sounded for their attraction._

Robert Michels observed that all phrases representing the ideas of rule of the masses, in terms of civil rights, popular representation and nation, are descriptive merely legal principles; do not correspond to any actual existing facts. They contend that the eternal struggles between aristocracy and democracy, which we read in history, have never been anything more than struggle between old minority and new ambitious minority, which intent upon conquest of power, desiring either to fuse with former, or to dethrone and replace it. On this theory, these class struggles consist merely of struggle between successively dominant minorities. Others prominent scholars including Gaetano Mosca, Wilfredo Pareto, James Burnham, C. Wright Mill and Lasswell also support the idea of ‘minority rule’ or ‘elite class’. Above all, leadership is personalized; it finds that these trends are seen in almost all political parties.

Robert Mckenzie observed that party leaders in the legislature are key actors in parliamentary systems of Europe. The distribution of power within two parties as Conservative Party and Labour Party of England were controlled by nexus of parliamentary leaders. It is interesting to note that, in the third world countries, political parties are identified with single person, and his will is will of all party

---

54 Michels, n.48, p.364.
55 Ibid., pp.85-87.
56 Ibid., p.342.
members. The name of the Indira Gandhi in India, Nasser in Egypt, Bhutto in Pakistan, Soekarno in Indonesia are prominent, on the one side, and Mao in China, and Fidel Castro in Cuba, on the other.

However, Michels’ laws explained the inevitable failure of democratic socialism and indeed, exploded the myth of political democracy. But, critics point out that Michels generalizations made on the basis of single political party at particular moment in time, and also rest on questionable psychological theories.\textsuperscript{58} Michels glittering generalization might be found to be an overstatement of the undeniable existence of oligarchic, hierarchic and centripetal trends in every society. But, it might be matched by data conforming the equally omnipresent democratic, leveling and centrifugal force encountered even within present-day totalitarian order. Michels deeply imbedded bias in favour of the predominant bureaucratic, authoritarian values.\textsuperscript{59} Although, the oligarchic character of every party does not prevent it from pursuing democratic policies, in practice every party seeks to have the label of a democratic character.

On the basis of above discussion, there are numerous ideas, views and concepts on political parties, which are given by prominent scholars, notably De-Tocqueville, Lord Bryce, Ostrogorski, Max Weber, Maruice Duverger, Robert Michels, Sigmund Neumann, Myron Weiner, Giovanni Sartori and David Apter etc, from time to time, according to circumstances that prevailed their respective periods. There are wide variations between the two extremes of democracy and dictatorship. The British, American, French, Indian and Scandinavian democratic structures differ from totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany, Fascist-Italy, Soviet Union and Peronist Argentina. In brief, the peculiar character of each party system must be explained in terms of the political system of which it is an integral part, if not its kingpin.

What is common in all the political parties, beyond partnership in a particular organization and separation from other, is their participation in the decision-making process or at least an attempt at and a chance for such a mobilization.\textsuperscript{60} In brief, it is

\textsuperscript{58} Heywood, n.3, p.256.
\textsuperscript{59} Neumann, n.27, p.407.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p.395.
an organization concerned with the process of capturing power, running government and providing an alternative.

**Party Systems and Classification of Parties**

A party system denotes the interaction among political parties. In democracy, they respond to each other’s initiative in a competitive interplay. The political parties, like countries copy, learn from and compete with each other, with innovations in organization, fund raising and election campaigning, spreading across the party system.⁶¹

The party system is the whole assortment of inner party rivalries in a single country, at any single time. It is a web of competition, something related to ‘democratic competition’ for the right to rule.⁶² It implies a pattern of competition, consisting of an interaction of its units (parties). This competition is political, manifestly an electoral competition, whereby all the political parties take part in an open, formalized genuine elections.⁶³ With the exception of single-party state, several parties co-exist in each country: the form and modes of their co-existence define the party system of particular country, being considered. Two series of elements enter into this definition.

In the first place, there are the similarities and disparities that can be discovered in the internal structure of individual parties, which makes up the system. (A distinction will be made between system with centralized parties and those with decentralized parties, between the flexible party and the rigid party and so on). In the second place, a comparison between the various parties makes it possible to make distinction among new elements in the analysis, that do not exist for each party community, considered in isolation: number, respective size, alliance, geographical localization, political distribution and so on. A party system is defined by a particular relationship, amongst all these characteristics.⁶⁴

---

⁶¹ Hague and Harrop, n.45, p.194.
⁶⁴ Duverger, n.30, p.203.
At last, each nation state has its own party system, which makes it possible to classify and compare the countries by the type of party system, they possess. The most obvious distinction rests upon the number of parties in each country. In addition to number-based classification, party system can also be classified into totalitarian and non-totalitarian, constitutional and non-constitutional, democratic and non-democratic and so on. Moreover, these can also be classified as class or ideologically basis. Giovanni Sartori and Maurice Duverger, who were pioneers in this field, presented comprehensive theories on parties systems.

**Duverger’s Model**

Duverger scheme of analysis is based on number of parties, which is influenced by various factors. He classified party system into single, two and multi-party system.

**Two Party System**

It is not easy to differentiate between the bi-party system and multi-party system. Because of number of small groups exist, alongside the major parties. Duverger states;

> The simple-majority, single ballot system favours the two party system. An almost complete correlation is observable between the simple-majority, single ballot system and the two party systems. The dualist countries use the simple-majority vote and simple majority vote countries are dualist.

Duverger is of the view that this electoral system is capable of maintaining and establishing dualism, in spite of schisms in old parties and birth of new parties. This is made possible by the process known as ‘fusion’ and ‘elimination’. Under the fusion mechanism, if more than two parties are competing in a constituency, with no one having a clear majority or chance of win, then like mind parties may reach an agreement that one withdraw its candidate for some more of compensation in other constituency. In that case, two-party system is restoring, as result of alliance or

---


66 Duverger, n.30, p.217.
fusion. The scholar, in his study, quoted the case of political parties of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Britain, South Africa, and America etc.

The elimination is the second way by which bi-partism is restored. It consists of two factors: ‘mechanical’ and ‘psychological’. The mechanical factor refers to the representation of third party (weak party), that is, its percentage of seats being inferior to its percentage of the polls. The psychological factor work, where electors realize that their votes are wasted if they continue to give them to third party. In other words, if third party or weakest party insists to contesting, then it is gradually deserted by electorates, which is called elimination. For example, elimination of Liberal Party of England.  

At present, it is generally understood that, a bi-party system is duopolistic, which dominated by two ‘major’ parties that have equal chance to win government power. In its traditional form, a bi-party system can be defined by three criteria: firstly, the number of ‘small’ parties may exist; only two parties enjoy sufficient electoral and legislative strength to have a realistic prospect of winning government power.

Secondly, the one of the major party is in a position to rule alone on the basis of majority in the legislature, the others are in the opposition.

Thirdly, Power alternate between these parties; both are electable the opposition serve as wings of government.  

Multi-Partism

Duverger says that typology of multi-party system is difficult to establish because of innumerable varieties. It can be imagined ranging from ‘three to infinity’ and within each variety, innumerable patterns and shades of differences are possible. The scholar constructed a theoretical pattern that two-party system is natural and tendency towards multi-partism is the result of two different phenomena; internal

---

67 Ibid., pp.218-227.
68 Heywood, n.3, p.260.
69 Duverger, n.30, p.228.
divisions of opinion and their overlapping. Duverger generalized for internal division that there are divisions between moderates and extremists, the conciliatory and the intransigent, the diplomatic and the doctrinaire, the pacific and the fire-eaters, in all parties. This distinction is limited in its effect to creation of factions, if they can no longer meet on common ground, which leads to ‘split’ and rise of Centre parties.\(^{69a}\) In this regard, he presented the case of political parties of Switzerland, Denmark, and Holland etc.\(^{70}\)

The overlapping is a phenomenon, which seems to be more widespread than split. It consists of non-coincidence of number of different dualism of opinion with such a result that their combination produces a multi-partite division stated by Duverger. He refers the cases of France, Belgium, Spain and Italy.\(^{71}\) Therefore, Duverger’s multi-party systems arise either from ‘split’ or ‘overlapping’ in natural two-way division. A split may come within either bourgeois or socialist parties and may be encouraged by the electoral system. Overlapping comes about as a result of a non-coincidence dualism in the society. Therefore, if the society is divided into classes and two sections but classes and section do not coincide, there is strong tendency for four parties to rise.\(^{72}\)

According to Duverger, multi-party system has different varieties according to number of rival parties, such as, tri-parties (three parties) quadri-partism (four parties) and poly-partism (many). However, each of these systems have common factor vis-a-vis the electoral systems. The scholar believes that “simple majority system with second ballot and proportional representation encourage multi-parties.” In Switzerland and Holland, the multi-party system is limited and orderly, in Italy it is anarchic and disorderly, in Germany and France the situation is intermediate between the two.\(^{73}\)

---

\(^{69a}\) A splits opinion gives rise to Centre parties. There exists no center view, no central tendency, no central doctrine, separate in kind from the doctrines of the Right or of the Left, but only a dilution of their doctrines, attenuation, a moderate doctrine. Duverger quoted if the Liberal Party spits into Liberals and Radical, then the former become a Centre party. Ibid., p.230.

\(^{70}\) Ibid.

\(^{71}\) Ibid., p.231.

\(^{72}\) McDonald, n.65, pp.348-349.

\(^{73}\) Duverger, n.30, pp.239-240.
Nowadays, it is believed that, when more than two parties got almost equal number of seats in the legislature and no party is in a position to form government by its own strength, normally known as multi-party system. This system emerges when; (a) three or more parties shared the bulk of the votes and public offices and (b) no single party won absolute majority. In a way, most of the governments have been coalition or fusion governments. Besides, in the multi-party system, there is competition among more than two parties, reducing the prospect of single party government and increasing the chance of coalitions. The post-elections ‘negotiations’ and ‘horse trading’ are basic tools to form the government.

**Single Party System**

Duverger believes that dictatorship based on a party, as was the case in Germany and Italy, today, which is a case in Soviet Russia, and the ‘People’s Democracy’, which is a new kind of political system. Duverger found that single parties imitated or retained structure that had their origin in multi-party system; the opposite course was only followed afterwards. It is true that the totalitarian nature of a party drives it to suppress all other parties if it can, but the tendency to unity is a consequence of its totalitarian nature more than cause. Therefore, there are several single-party system, not one.

Duverger draws some general characteristics of the single party system; (I) it is both an elite and bond. It refer to form ‘new elite’ and create a ‘new ruling class’, which unite and shape the political leader, who is capable of organizing the country because the masses cannot govern themselves, on one hand and decline of the traditional social elite, on the other. (II) Single party system was worked out in Italy and in Germany, which produced a theory that filled its own single party which differs considerably from one other. (III) The party established direct and permanent contact between the government and the country (masses) by the process of ‘people-leaders’ (upwards direction) and leaders-people (downwards direction). The downwards direction is more important because party spread the dictator’s orders among the public. (IV) Single party is a natural consequence of Marxist doctrines.

---

75 Heywood, n.3, pp.263-264.
76 Duverger, n.30, pp.255-257.
and structure of the Soviet Union. Hence, the retention of the Communist Party, the fighting organization of working class in its effort to destroy its rivals as well as the organization for seeing that they do not build up their strength again.

Duverger points out the differences between Communist optimism and Fascist pessimism.\(^\text{77}\) Furthermore, there is a variety of totalitarian single parties. All single parties are not totalitarian, nor are all totalitarian parties are single parties. These can exist even in even pluralist system as Communist parties in France and Italy. The Turkish single-party system was never based upon doctrine of single party. It was neither based upon cells, nor upon militia, and not even true branches. It might rather be considering a caucus party in which leading strata were more important than the members.\(^\text{78}\)

Jean Blondel suggests three ways for the development of one party system; (I) it can be the result of ‘legal compulsion’ that is, the Constitution of the state made provision of one party or allows only one party, as the case of Soviet Union and other Communist states. (II) It arises from extra-constitutional repression of opposition. This occurs, when opposition is harassed, either publicly through trials or less openly by means of preventive action against potential opponents. (III) The development of ‘one-party state’ is of the ‘natural kind’ in which only one party exist because of the natural structures of the polity. This situation is more likely to be maintained in relatively small states or in regions such as Brazilian party system before 1930 and Northern Nigeria party system before the military coup of 1966.\(^\text{79}\)

In nut shell, there are various types of one party systems. Some arise in the form of governing elites, which is merely a name for the ‘praetorian guard’ (loyal supporter) of a dictator. In other cases, it may be more fully developed in terms of doctrines and traditions. Duverger concluded that the Fascist and the Nazi parties came into power with revolutionary movement. Soon, these became dedicated to the prevention of change. However, the Communists are forever shaking up the regime with purges or other actions of a comparable nature.\(^\text{80}\) In this context, Joseph La

\(^{77}\) Ibid., pp.257-262.  
\(^{78}\) Ibid., pp.275-278.  
\(^{79}\) Blondel, n.23, pp.144-145.  
\(^{80}\) McDonald, n.65, p.349.
Palombara and Myron Weiner divided one party system into three categories on empirical basis.

(I) One Party Authoritarian:- These are authoritarian political system dominated by single, monolithic, ideologically oriented, but not totalitarian party. The classic example of Spain under Franco and Falange, others are Mali, Ghana, Guinea, South Vietnam and Cuba. Very often, the party and nation are led by a single dominant figure (such as Nkrumah, Diem, Franco and Castro), who is supposed to personify the goal of the nation.\(^{81}\)

(II) One Party Pluralistic:- These are quasi-authoritarian systems dominated by single party, which is pluralistic in organization. It is pragmatic rather than rigidly ideological in outlook and absorptive rather than ruthlessly destructive in its relationship to other groups. Some of the example of Mexico Republican Party, Senegal, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone and Cameroun, also included in this category. The differences between the two types of parties lies in the degree to which a pragmatic rather than ideological approach. A strong commitment to ideology will almost certainly lead, to form of ‘one-party state’ which is either authoritarian or totalitarian.

(III) One-Party Totalitarian:- In this political system, the state itself is an instrument of a monolithic party, which has one ideological goal, the total use of power for the restructuring of the society’s socio-economic system. Communist China, Soviet Union, North Vietnam, North Korea and East European states fall in this category.\(^{82}\)

For the deep understanding of the party system, Duverger assumes that organization has great importance in modern political parties. It constitutes the general setting for the activity of members and determines the machinery for the selection of leaders and decides their power. Duverger finds out that every organization is operating by direct\(^{83}\) or indirect (structure) party.\(^{84}\) Duverger

---

\(^{81}\) Palombara and Weiner, n.2, pp.37-38.

\(^{82}\) Ibid., pp.38-40.

\(^{83}\) Direct Party- member themselves form the party community without the help of social grouping, in similar way, in the unitary state. There is a direct link between the citizen and national community, Duverger, n.30, p.5.
contrasted direct and indirect parties in horizontal plans and the ideas of basic elements of organization referred to vertical plans. Duverger puts forward four-fold elements, which helps to distinguish between democratic, fascist and communist types of political party. These are (a) The Caucus (b) The Branches (c) The Cell and (d) Militia. Therefore, each party has its own particular form of elements.85

(a) The Caucus:- English political term, refers to committee, a clique or a coterie, which consists of small numbers and seeks no expansion. In other words, it is a group of notabilities chosen, because of their influence. There are direct and indirect caucuses. They play very important role in decision making process and are considered as chief election organizer or campaigners. For example, French Radical Socialist, American Democrat and Republican etc.86

(b) The Branch: - It is, unlike caucus wide open and basic elements of the organization. The caucus is a union of notabilities chosen only because of their influence, whereas, branch appeals to the masses. The branches are built up within the framework of the commune. In the large towns, it is based on the quartier or ward. Actually, the branch is a Socialist Party’s invention, which desires to maintain its intimate touch with people at large.87

(c) The Cell:- It is an intervention of the Russian Communist Party, which is constituted on the basis of occupation. It has much greater hold on its members than branches. The secretary of cell can easily control the activities of each member.88

(d) The Militia:- It is a sort of ‘personal or private army’, whose members are recruited on military lines. They are subjected to same disciplines and training as soldiers. The Fascist and Nazi Party in Germany and Italy respectively are the best examples.

Furthermore, Duverger also presents a detailed analysis of party alliance, which is based on electoral and parliamentary as well as governmental alliances. The

---

84 Indirect Party - It is made up of the union of the component, social group, like in confederation. The citizens are joined to the nation through the intermediary of member states. Nevertheless, this theoretical pattern is often modified in practical application, Ibid.
85 Ibid., p.17.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid., pp. 23-27.
88 Ibid., pp. 27-29.
scholar tries to measure the strength of political parties on the ground of members, voters and parliamentary seats. In this regards, he gives three fold classifications.

(I) Parties with Majority Bent:- have absolute majority in the Parliament.

(II) Major Parties:- They do not hope to attain absolute majority in legislature, due to their strength. But their strength allows them to play an important role and become part of alliance/coalition.

(III) Minor parties:- have not any role in government and in opposition.89

Duverger further divided political parties into two types, on the basis of membership as Cadre Party and Mass Party.

(a) Cadre Party:- It is a grouping of notabilities, who are experts in techniques of fighting elections (how to handle electors and organize campaign) and have ability to gather financial sinews for the organization. More or less, they constitute the structure of a political party. Therefore, what mass party secures by members, cadre party achieves by ‘selection’. So, Communist parties have cadre of their own in different organizations such as labour and peasant organization etc.

(b) Mass Party:- It, unlike cadre party, supports the principles of elections, so as to win little of popular legitimacy. The recruitment of member is a fundamental activity both from the political and financial point. Later on, regular subscription replaced the capitalist financing of electioneering by democratic financing.90

(c) Devotee Party:- The Leninist conception the party should not include the whole of the working class. It is only an advance guard, fighting wing, the most enlightened section of working class. The party as an ‘order’ is made up of best, most faithful, most brave and most suitable members. For example, Fascist doctrines are even more definite on this point.91

---

89 Ibid., pp.281-291.
90 Ibid., pp.63-65.
91 Ibid., p.70.
Table 2.1: Duverger’s Classification of Types of Party and Electoral Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Party</th>
<th>Cadre Party</th>
<th>Mass Party</th>
<th>Devotee Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic organizational units</td>
<td>Caucus</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Cell/ Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class nature of membership</td>
<td>Middle-class</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Working /Middle Class/ Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological direction</td>
<td>Conservative and center</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>Communist/Fascist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>Very oligarchic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elites</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Developed by party</td>
<td>Developed by party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of members</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm of members</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of activity</td>
<td>Strictly political</td>
<td>Entire political and community life</td>
<td>Entire political, personal and community life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of activity</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>All year</td>
<td>All year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of doctrine</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very high low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of parties and the type of ballot</td>
<td>Two-party system favour simple majority system and vice-versa</td>
<td>Multi-party system favours PR and vice-versa</td>
<td>Multi-party system favours second-ballot system and vice-versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of minor parties</td>
<td>Hinders</td>
<td>Aids</td>
<td>Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of alliances</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to sudden, deep changes in opinion</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a matter of fact, Duverger’s study is divided into two parts. The first part concerned with party structure, which includes cadre, mass and devotee parties. The second section is related to party system viza-a-viz electoral system. Both divisions are composed of clusters of elements, representing propositions, which form a definable pattern (see table 2.1). However, it is observed that the many components in particular classification are linked with another. Several critical questions emerge at this point. Are the Duverger’s classifications useful for comparative study of political parties? Even, Duverger’s divisions on party system is so narrow, that do not apply on all the political parties across the world, which have for long been subject of inquiry by political scientists. Finally, general theory of political parties must differentiate between institution and practices, which have identical or similar labels and yet manifest significant different behaviour. Unfortunately, Duverger’s work hides these differences instead of revealing them.\textsuperscript{92} Duverger evaluates both

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Distortion of electoral opinion as reflected in national legislature & High & Low & High \\
\hline
Political differences & Decreased & Increased & Indeterminate \\
\hline
Degree of demagogy & Low & High & High \\
\hline
Influence of extra-Parliamentary party over candidates & High or Low & High with list voting & Low if there are small constituencies \\
\hline
Antithesis of opinion & Largely coincident & Mutually exclusive & Mutually exclusive \\
\hline
Influence upon geographic location of opinion & Accentuates local differences & Strength national uniformity & Indeterminate \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparative Political Parties, Delhi: Surjeet Publications, 2003.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{92} Aaron B. Wildavsky, “A Methodological Critique of Duverger’s Political Parties”, in Eckstein and Apter, n.65, pp.371-373.
democratic and dictatorial parties, but did not impose geographic limits on his study; particularly his information on the parties in USA is not complete.\textsuperscript{93}

**Sartori’s Paradigm**

Sartori believes that party system is classified by counting number of parties whether one, two or more, than two is highly inadequate. Sartori states that;

\begin{quote}
Number of parties approach leads towards frustration. Because, we are incapable of deciding whether one is one, or two is two. Moreover, no accounting system can work, without counting the rule.\textsuperscript{94}
\end{quote}

Sartori does not present simple classification of the party system. He avoids purely numerical elements by adding other variables such as, strength of the party, ideology in order to make study more scientific and empirical. This is the point at which, the number of parties’ variables become secondary and ideology, variables take precedence. Sartori broadly categorized party system into two folds.

1. **Competitive System**

2. **Non-Competitive System**

Under this scheme, he differentiated bi-party system and multi-party system on the basis of ‘polarized pluralism’. Sartori says;

\begin{quote}
the classical distinction between two-party and multi-party system could be fruitfully replaced by a model, oriented distinction, between ‘bi-polar’ and multi-polar systems, which firstly, accounts for the positioning and pattern of interaction of parties (regardless of their numbers), secondly, breaks down, the undifferentiated category of the multi party system.\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{93} Frederick C. Engelmann, “A Critique of Recent Writings on Political Parties”, Ibid., p.381
\textsuperscript{94} Sartori, n.7, pp.119-120.
\textsuperscript{95} Giovanni Sartori, “European Political Parties: The Case of Polarized Pluralism”, in La Palombara and Weiner, n.2, p.139.
In brief, the real participation in power and actual interaction of parties is known as competition. He divided competitive system in following categories, which are considered as classes, not types.

I. Polarized Pluralism

II. Two Party System

III. Predominant Party System

IV. Atomized System.

(I) **Polarized Pluralism:**- It may be the combination of bi and multi-party system, that is supported by various features. It is further divided into following sub-categories.

(a) Simple Two Party Pluralism

(b) Moderate Pluralism

(c) Extreme Pluralism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party System</th>
<th>Poles</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Drives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Pluralism</td>
<td>Bipolar</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Centripetal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Pluralism</td>
<td>Bipolar</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Centripetal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Pluralism</td>
<td>Multi polar</td>
<td>Polarized</td>
<td>Centrifugal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Sartori, bipolar means, actual working of party system, which pivots around the poles, (no matter whether the parties two, three, or four), in this system, there is no center. The multi polar means, party system, pivots upon more than two poles. In a way, this system has a “center”. According to forgoing terminology, simple pluralism is related to English two-party system, which is bi-polar and not polarized. Moderate pluralism operates on three-four party basis, which is bi-polar and centripetal, whereas extreme pluralism is multi-polar,
polarized and likely to be centrifugal.\textsuperscript{96} He conducted a comprehensive study of Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Germany, Norway, Netherland and Switzerland in this regards.

\textbf{(II) Two Party System:-} Sartori does not agree with previous explanations on bi-party format, because it does not prevent existence of third party. Therefore, two-partism must be assessed in terms of seats and not of electoral returns. In a nutshell, two parties are in position to compete for absolute majority of seats.\textsuperscript{97}

\textbf{(III) Pre-dominant Party System:-} It is more-than-one party system in which rotation does not occur, when the same party manages to win an absolute majority in the Parliament, overtime.

\textbf{(IV) Atomized Party:-} It is fragmented leader by leader, with very small groups revolving around each leader, generally members of Parliament.\textsuperscript{98} In other words, it enters the classification as a residual class to indicate a point at which we no longer need an accurate counting. That is, as atomistic competition in economic (the situation where no one firm/organization (has) any noticeable effect on any other firm).\textsuperscript{99}

\textbf{Non-Competitive System}

This model does not permit to contest elections, wherever legal ruling competition ends and non-competition begins, wherever, contestants and opponents are deprived of equal rights, impeded (to slow down), menaced (cause of serious harm), frightened and eventually punished for daring to speak up.\textsuperscript{100} He classified it into following categories.

(1) Single Party System

(2) Hegemonic Party System

\textbf{(I) Single Party System:-} According to Sartori, “in this system only party exists, and is allowed to exist”. This is so because of party vetoes both de-jure and de-facto. He further categorized this system into three sub-systems.

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., pp.138-139.
\textsuperscript{97} Sartori, n.7, pp.185-188
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., p.75.
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., pp.124-125.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., pp.217-218.
I. One Party Totalitarian

II. Party Authoritarian

III. One Party Pragmatic

**Table 2.3: Characteristics and Types of Single Party System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Totalitarian Unipartism</th>
<th>Authoritarian Unipartism</th>
<th>Pragmatic Unipartism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>Strong and Totalistic</td>
<td>Weaker and non-totalistic</td>
<td>Irrelevant or very feeble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion, Extraction Mobilization</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies v/s outer groups</td>
<td>Destructive</td>
<td>Exclusionary</td>
<td>Absorptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-group independence</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Limited to non-political group</td>
<td>Permitted or tolerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrariness</td>
<td>Unbounded, unpredictable</td>
<td>Within predictable limits</td>
<td>Bounded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


First two subtypes are defined in Duverger’s and La Palombara and Weiner classification. Third one, single party pragmatic, means that totalitarian and authoritarian appear as different points of an ideological scale whose lowest point is called pragmatism. More precisely, the totalitarian and authoritarian politics are assumed to reflect different ideological intensities.101

(2) Hegemonic Party System:- It simply refers to such a party system that neither allowed for a formal, nor for a de-facto competition for power. Others parties are permitted to exist but as second class, as ‘licensed parties’. Sartori further puts into two sub-types.

I. Ideological Hegemonic Party

II. Pragmatic Hegemonic Party.102

He quoted the case of Poland and Mexican party system. So very briefly, Sartori framework shows that how various types of party systems performed very differently throughout the world.

101 Ibid., pp.221-223.
102 Ibid., pp.230-231.
Joseph La Palombara and Myron Weiner Party’s Configuration

Palombara and Weiner analysis on party system is based on competitive system and non-competitive system.

Competitive System

In this system, various countries from different continents as Asia (India, Malaysia, Ceylon, and Philippines), Africa (Nigeria, Kenya, and Uganda) and Scandinavia etc. are included for analysis. The competitive situation is based on internal characteristics of the parties and on the way political power hold. For that, they suggested ‘turnover’ and ‘hegemonic’ system for examination.\(^\text{103}\)

(1) Hegemonic System:– It is coalition dominated by the same/single party or one party in exclusive control of government machinery over an extended period of time. Palombara and Weiner referred the case of U.S. during the period of New Deal and Fair Deal; Congress Party dominating Indian politics from independence in India and post war politics dominated by Liberals in Japan etc.\(^\text{104}\)

(2) Turnover System:– In this model, there is relatively frequent changes in party that governs or dominates the coalition. Palombara and Weiner quoted the example of Canada.\(^\text{104}\) According to them, competitive system has second dimensions too, i.e. ideological pragmatism. It is related to the central tendency of the parties. They judge parties in terms of where they fall along this continuum (multi-party system). The central tendency is further divided into four categories:

I. Hegemonic-Ideological

II. Hegemonic-Pragmatic

III. Turnover-Ideological

IV. Turnover-Pragmatic

Non-Competitive System

It is a one-party pattern hegemonic, but not turnover. It has following three types.

\(^{103}\) Palombara and Weiner, n.2, p.35.

\(^{104}\) Ibid.
(I) One-Party Authoritarian

(II) One-Party Pluralistic

(III) One-Party Totalitarian.

These three types, have already been discussed in Durverger’s model. They are related to political parties with the phenomenon of political development.

Jean Blondel’s Model of Party System

Jean Blondel highlights the fact that ‘more than one party system’ was prevailing over thirty eight countries outside the Atlantic area at the end of the 1960, but these cannot be grouped into a small number of types. The number, relative strength, ideology and social structure generated variations, which influence party system. Blondel suggests four types of party systems, as follow;

(1) Two Party System: - It is a balanced system between two major political parties.

(2) Two and Half Party System: - It is unbalanced system. In this model, third party is much smaller than other two and first is substantially larger than the second.

(3) Multi-Party System with Dominant Party System: - It is much unbalanced with four groups/political parties.

(4) Multi-Party System without Dominant Party System: - It is most unbalanced system which will gradually disappear, except in very small and complex parties. These kinds of the characteristics are of Atlantic party system.

Almond’s Aggregative Classification of Party System

The empiricists did not agree with the previous approaches of classification of the party system. Gabriel A. Almond applied ‘input’ notion of the aggregative function for criteria of party system divisions, which are categorized as below.

(1) Authoritarian Party System: - The absence of free party system and an open electoral process, unusually reduced to the aggregative function to the formulation

105 Ibid., pp.36-40.
106a Ibid., pp.164-170.
of policy alternative, within the authoritarian party and authoritative governmental structures such as bureaucracy and army.  

(2) **Dominant Authoritarian Party System**: These are generally found in political systems, where nationalist movement have been instrumental in attaining emancipation. In emancipation period, nationalist party continues as a greatly dominant party, which is opposed in elections by relatively small Left-wings or traditionalists and particularistic movement.

(3) **Competitive Two-Party System**: It is exemplified with UK and USA.

(4) **Competitive Multi-Party System**: It is divided into two types; Working Multi-Party System and Immobilist Multi Party System.

(I) **Working Multi-Party System**: The relation between parties and interest of the parties are more consensual, which make stable majority and opposition coalition become possible. These types of party system exist in Scandinavian areas.

(II) **Immobilist Multi-Party System**: The aggregation functions performed by political parties are relatively narrow and coalitions are fragile, because of the cultural differences between political movements, as in the case of Italy and France.

From above discussions, the party system is a network of relationships through which political parties interact and influences the political process of the country. The principal classification of parties have distinguished between cadre and mass or later, catch-all parties, parties of representative and parties of integration, constitutional or mainstream parties and revolutionary or anti-system ones and Left wing parties and Right wing parties. On the one hand, the political parties are the basic units of every party system, not only affect the functioning of the party system, but also working of other structures including political system, on the other.

The number of parties or inter-reaction among parties are basic yardstick, which determines it one party system, bi-party system or multi-party system, which

---
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may further be subdivided. Generally, it is well known truth that, in one party system, ruling party effectively works as permanent government. The alternative between two major parties is feature of bi-party system. A single major party holds power for a long period, in dominant-party system. In multi-party system, no parties have enough strength to rule alone. As result of this, system leads to coalition government.

However, critics of political parties promote the idea of ‘party-less democracy.’ The founding fathers of nation-state notably George Washington, Thomas Jefferson; Conservative and Liberals as J.S. Mill etc. and leaders of mass movement in India, Mahatma Gandhi, Jayaprakash Narayan and M.N. Roy are inclined to express anti-party sentiments. They emphasize that political parties are supposed to be inherently divisive of the organic unity of the national community.\textsuperscript{109} The national interest used by one party to justify the suppression of rival parties.

But B.E. Brown rejected the idea of party-less democracy by saying that “demands for party-less democracy are utopia. The political parties are the main institutions through which responsibility of the rulers is enforced”.\textsuperscript{110} However, these initial reservations about political parties did not forestall their onward march to becoming one of the major pillars of the nation-state along with bureaucracy, because political parties are vital link between the civil society and state.\textsuperscript{111}

In spite of this, whether, it is a bi-party or multi-party system, but value lies in the fact that it encourages and effects the articulation and aggregation of the public opinion into one and influences the actions and decisions of the state.\textsuperscript{112} Therefore, the political parties perform various functions. As follow;

- To organize the chaotic public will.
- To educate citizens to political responsibility (political education).

\textsuperscript{111} Singh and Saxena, n.109, p.269.
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• To the representative of the social interest groups, which help in bridging the
distance between individual and the great community.

• To represent the connecting links between government and political opinion.
(democracy are pyramids built from below).

• To select the leaders.

• Political parties are the broker of ideas, constantly clarifying, systematizing and
expanding the party’s doctrine.  

• To organize voters into majorities behind platform and leaders.

• To work as broker, who arrange deal between different sections and finding
compromise that split the differences.

• To aggregate and articulate interests of the society.

• The political parties do political socialization and recruitment.

• To make the government accountable.

• To provide alternative team to run government.

Above all, parties make democracy workable, successful and true
representative by selecting candidates for elections, organizing election campaigns;
maintaining party discipline, the formulating of policies and short term
programmes. The prime objective of party is to capture power and control
governmental machinery. Byrce, rightly says that;

\begin{quote}
Political parties are inevitable because representative governments are not able to work
without them. The parties keep a nation’s mind live, as the rise and full of the sweeping tide
freshens the water of long ocean inlets.
\end{quote}
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