

Key terms + ideas

- Institutionalized versus inchoate party systems
- electoral volatility
- *Autogolpe*
- Juan Perón and Peronism
- flash parties
- political establishment
- illiberalism
- populism

Key questions

Q: What is populism? What are the implications of the difference between the two conceptions?

A: There are two ways of defining populism. The first is defining populism as an ideology, or rhetoric, that divides society into two antagonistic groups. Under this definition, politics is an expression of the general will of the pure people against the corrupt elite. The second is characterizing populism as a strategy for mobilizing voters. This strategy relies on mobilizing voters or citizens who feel excluded from the elite through populist rhetoric. These voters perceive exclusion rather than always experiencing actual exclusion.

Q: How do parties relate to voters?

A: There are three ways that parties relate to voters, otherwise known as types of party linkages. First, programmatic parties use policy-based appeals to mobilize voters. An example of this is the Democratic Party's appeal to voters on abortion policy. Second, clientistic parties use the promise of goods or favors in exchange for votes. What's critical for a clientistic relationship is the promise of votes in exchange for goods. The PRI in Mexico is an example of a clientelistic party. Finally, personalistic parties use personality appeals from the leader of the party. The real appeal of the party is the leader, not policies or favors. Cambio 90 was a personal vehicle for Alberto Fujimori's political ambitions in Peru.

Q: Why have parties evolved historically? Why do political systems become party systems?

A: Parties evolve for many reasons, fundamentally based on how they relate and mobilize a potential voter. Ahmed argues that electoral systems evolved over strategies of containment and competition in light of democratization. Essentially, older parties navigated the impact of democratization by trying to expand their voter base (wooing voters to right-wing parties) while freezing working-class mobilization.

According to Hale, political party systems develop in response to the supply and demand for electoral goods or services. In his view, party systems form when candidates agree to run with party labels, effectively 'buying' into the party label. Over time, parties dominate the political system by establishing themselves as the main credible suppliers of these labels

or electoral goods and services. They can fail to monopolize the electoral market despite providing electoral goods and services if the party substitutes are equally strong.

Week's readings

- Norris, "Choosing Electoral Systems" pp. 297-312.
- Lijphart, "Constitutional Choices for New Democracies," pp. 162-174.
- Quade, "PR and Democratic Statecraft," pp. 181-186.
- Ahmed, "Democracy and the Politics of Electoral System Choice," pp. 1-29 and 64-88.
- Hale, "Why Not Parties in Russia?" p. 1-22.
- Norris and Inglehart, "Cultural Backlash", pp. 3-13 and 32-56.

Review questions

Check your understanding of this week's material and key ideas with the following questions.

1. According to this week's authors, how can democratic performance be evaluated?
2. If you were helping design the electoral rules of a country, would you implement a proportional, majoritarian, or mixed system? Outline your reasoning.
3. How do Norris and Inglehart define populism? In what ways does it differ or overlap with the definitions of populism that Professor Levitsky described during lecture?
4. Are authoritarian values always blended with populist rhetoric? Where are authoritarian populists successful? Why?
5. Why do political systems in democracies become party systems? Do all political systems effectively transition? Why or why not?
6. How does Norris and Inglehart's conception of an electoral market differs from Hale's?