



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Review

Reviewed Work(s): *Political Parties: Organization and Power* by Angelo Panebianco

Review by: Yonathan Shapiro

Source: *European Sociological Review*, Dec., 1989, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Dec., 1989), pp. 316-317

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/522352>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *European Sociological Review*

JSTOR

service. The typology of jobs in the civil service is a combination of the conditions of labor market entry and the degree of state specificity of jobs. Five types of labor market segments result: two types in the state-specific segment, two types in the craft-specific segment and one type in the external segment. In my view, the variable 'state specificity' as an indicator for the degree of state monopoly of functions is not operationalized in a clear manner. Therefore problems must arise in its empirical application.

The empirical analysis in chapter five is disappointing compared with the theoretical part of the book and with other published results of this project. The full possibilities of the data are not explored. Unfortunately, Langer does not test his hypotheses in

a multivariate setting. The descriptive analysis leads to hasty conclusions. Some of his interpretations are plausible, but the results require more careful examination. In addition, the investigation of the question of how the labor market segments function—that is, the important questions about dynamic effects of labor market segments for the labor force and for employees—does not agree with the reader's expectations. Thus, some issues like the exchange of manpower between segments, indicating the degree of openness of labor markets, the impact of some characteristics of labor markets on mobility processes, occupational careers and job rewards are neglected. Further research must be invested in these topics.

Rolf Becker
*Max Planck Institute for Human Development
 and Education, Berlin*

Angelo Panebianco: Political Parties: Organization and Power. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 318 pp.

The study of political parties had a grand start in the social sciences with the brilliant work by Robert Michels on the structure of the German Social-Democratic party which he published in 1913. His theoretical insights and empirical generalizations provide the foundation for numerous studies of political parties to this very day.

Michels' contribution was acknowledged by Maurice Duverger when he attempted forty years later to examine the state of theory on political parties. Notwithstanding the many studies published on parties since Michels, he came to the conclusion that no general theory beyond Michels had emerged. He therefore took upon himself 'to sketch a preliminary general theory of parties, vague, conjectural and of necessity approximate which may serve as a basis and guide for detailed studies'. This he did in his book published in 1951 (the English translation appeared in 1953). Now we had two seminal works on the theory of political parties.

In the mid-1970s, Giovanni Sartori decided that the wealth of studies on political parties published since Duverger required a new codification of the theory. This task was never accomplished. A first volume devoted to the party system appeared in 1976, but the promised second volume, on party structure, did not materialize.

Now Angelo Panebianco has addressed himself to this difficult task. Since Duverger, Panebianco contends, sociologists and political scientists—mainly in

the United States—moved away from the study of parties as organizations and concentrated instead on the relations between parties and the electorate. This, he argued, was a mistake which must be corrected if we wish to improve our understanding of political parties.

To change the direction of the study of parties, Panebianco took upon himself to build a new model, an ideal type of party organization, drawing on the theoretical advances of the past thirty years in the sociology of complex organizations. This, he maintains, will continue the work of Michels and Duverger and bring their theories up to date. It will also open up new areas neglected by the two scholars. The sociology of organizations has taught us that the formative period of an organization's history affects its structure far more extensively than they had realized. Another important area overlooked by them concerned the effects of changes in the larger society—social, economic and political—on the organizational structure of parties.

Let me illustrate Panebianco's work with a few examples. Michels claimed that an important source of the leaders' power in the party is the expertise gained in their many years of experience in the organization, hence their indispensability in the eyes of the party members. To this, Panebianco adds insights gained from more recent studies of bureaucracies. Power in bureaucracies is attained by those who control areas in the organization with the

help of their expert knowledge and information which they do not share with others in the organization; consequently their actions are beyond the others' control. This creates zones of uncertainty in the organization, and makes the experts, adds Panebianco, indispensable in the eyes of other members. Here, then, is an explanation of Michels' observation that party leaders are able to use threats to resign in order to increase their power. This observation leads Panebianco to another elaboration and modification of one of Michels' major insights. The group of leaders in control of the party is not an oligarchy, as Michels thought, but a dominant coalition of leaders who are able to control strategic zones of uncertainty in the organization.

Another example is Panebianco's handling of the problem of bureaucratization. Michels attributed the degree of a party's bureaucratization to the size of the party organization. The larger the organization, the more elaborate its bureaucracy. We know now, argues Panebianco, that other and more important factors than size affect the degree of bureaucratization. These are, for example, environmental factors: the more complex the environment, the less stable or the more hostile it is, the more elaborate and complex the party bureaucracy will become.

The book abounds with such hypotheses which, I believe, may prove very useful for future research. Some hypotheses, however, make use of concepts which are too vague and imprecise. Such is Panebianco's concept of institutionalization, a key idea in his model, which he defines as 'the way the organization solidifies' (p. 49). The institutionalization of a party, he claims, is either strong or weak. In a party

with strong institutionalization, the leadership enjoys greater autonomy, while in a party with weak institutionalization, its dominant coalition will not be 'very cohesive', etc. These concepts undoubtedly require further elaboration.

A more serious flaw in the otherwise brilliant exposition is, to my mind, the author's ignoring, until the last chapter, of a major trend in the study of parties over the past twenty years. It was inaugurated by Otto Kirchheimer who in the mid-1960s, claimed that mass bureaucratic party organizations were declining, and parties were becoming instead electoral agencies. This was said to be the result of developments in the social, economic and political structures of the advanced capitalist societies in Western Europe, such as: the breaking up of class distinctions, the introduction of post-materialist values, and the growing influence of the electronic media in politics.

Panebianco accepts this analysis in his short final chapter, but in the rest of his book ignores the developments in question, as well as the growing number of studies of political parties by social scientists who refer to them. In the last chapter Panebianco tries to incorporate these new studies into his model, arguing that we are witnessing a process of de-institutionalization in the party structure. This is not very enlightening.

But apart from this weakness, though important, Panebianco's is a very important contribution to the study of political parties, a field of study which suffers from a poverty of theoretical conceptualization. I therefore highly recommend it to students of political parties.

Yonathan Shapiro
Department of Sociology
Tel-Aviv University