

## The Party Paradox

### \* **CRISIS** | People are being \* **alienated** from the political processes

- acceptance of the political system is declining
  - dwindling voter turnout
  - voters get frustrated with political parties
    - lower rates of party membership
    - diminished levels of attendance at party-sponsored political activities
  - trust in politicians decreases
  - *Fenno's Paradox*: people generally disapprove of the legislative body as a collective but support the individual representative of their own district
  - disenchanted perceived self-efficacy
    - in Germany 94 % believed to have no influence on governments actions, 90 % agree that engaging politically is pointless
    - Gallup poll on subjective well-being
  - frustration not over democracy and politics but over parties and politicians
  - detrimental for democratic legitimation
    - reduced acceptance of presumed legitimacy of state decisions
    - reduced acceptance of the political system altogether

### Starting point is the model underlying our notion of democracy

- democracy modeled as aggregation of interests through competition (*Schumpeter*)
  - individual interest
  - elections and votes as decisions in a competition of interests
  - democracy as a procedure of “regulated rivalry” => \* **athletes**
- consequences from this competitive set-up
  - intertwined personnel decisions and decisions on subject-matter
  - representation as a depiction of interests
  - permanent competitive aggregation of interests

### Why do we have political parties in the first place?

- evolved as a “\* **rational response**”
  - to the prevailing historical and institutional circumstances
  - concept of democratic representation
  - analogy of the combustion engine
- representation as a mechanism to map political decisions to the people
- \* **combustion engine analogy**

## We need political parties: \* no democracy without parties

- political parties indispensable tool for a democracy
  - Edmund Burke: “when bad men conspire, the good must associate”
  - E. E. Schattschneider: “modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of the parties.”
- current setup of political process requires political parties
  - political parties structure the political debate
    - pooling political capital
    - platform-building
      - > reduce complexity of policy issues
      - > structure the political agenda
      - > fulfil people’s need for identification
  - political parties identify personnel (leadership)
    - recruiting and control of political personnel
    - binding candidates and members in office to the “party ID”
      - sets of values and choice menus, that create the platform
      - the candidates and the elected politicians are accountable to the parties, and the parties are accountable to the voters
    - mitigate information asymmetry
      - principal/agent scenario
      - voters = principals
      - politicians = agents
      - adverse selection: political party as signaling/screening device
  - political parties give meaning to elections
    - “indispensable preparatory organization” for elections
    - mobilize the electorate by mitigating the voting paradox
      - in the US, parties increased the political influence of their adherents
      - through bundling vital interests of different groups
      - giving them leverage
  - political parties decide on policies
    - one (or a coalition of) platform(s) will win the election and form the government
    - party bound politicians will be determining the political decisions during the term of office
  - political parties control decisions
    - control their own elected officials
    - assure their alignment with party interest
    - opposition party tries to show deficits of government policies

## But political parties also cause problems: \* no democracy *with parties*

- parties have been subject to harsh criticism
  - Thomas Jefferson: “If I could not go to heaven, but with a party, I would not go there at all”.
  - Jonathan Swift: party “is the madness of many, for the gain of few”
- political parties introduce structural problems into the political process
- structuring political debate
  - parties fixed on partisan or special interests
  - contribute to social division
    - differentiation of political platforms and partisan polarization
    - overstating group differences and social conflicts
- identifying leadership
  - political parties add principal-agent problems
  - monopoly of access to a political career
    - without a party affiliation no prospects to be elected
    - impedes recruiting elites for leadership
  - control over the public sector
    - appoint top bureaucrats
    - judges and audit courts
  - reduces choice of candidates for the voters
    - a number of candidates is factually already “elected” by the party before the election
    - lower quality of candidates
    - reduced competition
  - party identification as the most important selection factor
    - sacrifices quality of candidates
    - bad politicians lead to bad policies
    - strong party ties, less accountability towards the constituents
- giving meaning to elections
  - political parties reduce electoral competition
  - problem of gerrymandering
    - influencing boundaries of electoral districts
    - with the aim to gain political advantages
    - named after Governor Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts
    - 1812 new borders for the district Essex South, MA to favor the democratic-republican party
    - examples for gerrymandering can be found around the globe
  - less competition leads to less voter turnout
  - parties transform into means for fighting and winning elections
    - policy problems need to be suitable for simple-message campaigns
    - complex issues are reduced to dichotomous decision patterns

- deciding on politics
  - problem of special interests (already discussed earlier)
  - partisan politics are inherently incapable of addressing problems across space and time
- controlling decisions
  - parties have short-circuited the separation of powers (electricity analogy)
  - politicians and bureaucrats are no longer contenders
  - control through judiciary is limited
  - they all “report” to the same party organization
- hence the “Party Paradox”

### Why does the competitive aggregation of interests fail?

- orientation towards self-interests leads to behavioral effects
  - self-interested behavior because of a focus on interests
    - competition reduces cooperation
    - economization of political issues
  - »Is Public Choice Immoral?« (Geoffrey Brennan & James M. Buchanan, 1988)
    - knowledge shapes expectations, expectations shape behavior
    - Madisonian approach to devise a system that will not only work with well-behaved actors but also with self-interested or even bad motives can become a self-fulfilling prophecy, a race to the bottom
  - have political parties become *too* successful? (before reading Sam’s contribution)
- competition frame
  - behavior in competitive settings
  - mice experiment (Falk & Szech *Morals and Markets*, Science 2013)
    - market interaction changes how human subjects value harm and damage done to third parties
    - in the experiment, subjects decided between either saving the life of a mouse or receiving money
    - the willingness to kill the mouse is substantially higher in a market setting
  - evolution under competition conditions
  - party-interests/party-competition
- aggregation of interests
  - uncertain what needs to be aggregated
  - difficult to aggregate individual preferences into a decision that maximizes utilities (Arrow vs. Sen)
- do away with myths – we need “good” fair-minded people with other-regarding preferences, and we need deliberation and debate

**Result: Party Paradox, political parties no longer the solution, they are “vestigial” (Sam)**

**What \* alternative model could be set up to define democracy and ensure representation?**

- interest reconciliation through balancing as a model (as opposed to interest aggregation through competition)
- concord not rivalry
- through the decision-makers
  - identifying and implementing balanced policies
  - by independent political personnel
  - inquisitorial system, role of a judge as leading figure
- separation of self-interests and decision-makers as a modification of the notion of competition
  - discourse and interests
    - no competition of interests
    - organized interests as mechanism to articulate needs

**What are the consequences of valuing reconciliation of interests?**

- separation of personnel decisions from decisions on a matter
  - direct election of candidates
  - direct decisions on subject matters by either the electorate or elected delegates
- representation as eligible proxy
- might lead to dispensability of political parties