

S U M M A R Y

On the Concepts Describing Basic Ideological Cleavages in a Multi-Party System. By Olavi Borg.

This paper includes a brief theoretical discussion and some empirical questionnaire results about the use and meaning of such concepts as »the right» and »the left», aimed to describe the basic ideological cleavages between political parties.

The main assertion in the theoretical discussion is that these concepts are strictly contradictory only in a very limited sense, e.g., when used to label the most extremist groups in a multi-party system. As a rule, they describe political groups opposing each other with regard to some basic ideological questions. Hence a sharp distinction is made here between two different kinds of oppositeness; one is empirical and the other logico-conceptual in nature, the former being termed the case of »contrast» and the latter the case of »contrariness». The two are not seldom confounded. This confusion is perhaps mainly responsible for the fact that these expressions — precisely as their frequently used substitutes »bourgeois» and »socialist» — are rather vague to describe empirical reality in politics. Like many strictly unidimensional classificatory concepts, they have their historical roots in dialectical materialism and, consequently, serve the purpose of a pragmatic dichotomizing of reality. The common usage of political language, tested here through the opinions of Finnish voters, reveals that these concepts discriminate the political parties fairly well. Hence it may be concluded that, in this sense, they actually focus on, and describe, some basic differences essential to our efforts to map out the ideological groupings in Finnish party politics.

The empirical results from voters' opinions seem to suggest that three main ideological groupings can be separated in the Finnish multi-party system, namely, the political right, the centre, and the left. According to the voters' opinions the right seems to consist of the National Coalition (in tables: Kok) and, at least in part, of the Swedish People's Party (Rkp). Two other parties, the Finnish People's Party (Kp) and the Agrarian Union (Ml), are generally called and considered, e.g. in newspapers, bourgeois parties. These parties, however, object to this appellation; they do not use this general label for themselves but characterize themselves as »centre parties». Our results reflected this discrepancy very clearly, for one-half of the respondents regarded these as rightist parties, while the other half considered them to belong to the centre. The same was true of the small Liberal Union (Vl).

As to the centre parties in general, the opinions are less clear-cut than those concerning both the wings of the party-system. Not more than small groups — only one of which, the Smallholders' Party (Spp), is of some nation-wide importance in politics — were considered to be centre parties by nearly two-thirds of the respondents. Incidentally the names of all the three contain the expression »centre», which is very suggestive in the present Finnish political environment. However, these three small parties — together with the Agrarian Union, the Finnish People's Party, the Liberal Union, and also, to some extent the Swedish People's Party — were associated so infrequently with the concept of the right, that we are justified in conceiving them as another ideological grouping of parties.

The left in Finnish politics consists of the two social-democratic parties and the communistic Democratic League of the Finnish People (Skdl). However, the old Social Democratic Party (Sdp) is considered to be left-oriented centre party in just the same manner as the Swedish People's Party is considered to be a right-oriented centre party. This means that, in the minds of voters, the Social Democratic Party has ceased to be a genuine party of the left. When the respondents were asked to consider the same parties with regard to the concepts »bourgeois» and »socialist», it turned out, however, that these two parties (Sdp and Rkp) are very strongly considered to bear their original Marxist labels. As regards the concepts of »the right» and »the left», the difference in terms of Hofstätter's index of majority was highly significant. In the case of Swedish People's, the index was +75.60 with respect to »bourgeois» and +42.84 with respect to »rightist»;

in the case of the Social Democratic Party the values with respect to »socialist» and »leftist» were +76.95 and +32.43 respectively. Hence, there is a considerable incongruence between the meanings of these two pairs of terms. This may point to different processes of change both in the meaning of these ideological concepts and in the empirical content of party cleavages. Therefore, further studies would be needed.

Some reconsiderations of Mannheim's political ideal types. By Veronica Stolte Heiskanen.

Although Karl Mannheim is well known among social scientists as one of the founding fathers of the sociology knowledge, because of his epistemological speculations the empirical side of his work has long been underrated. However, many of Mannheim's writings could furnish a good starting point for theoretical discussions aiming at conceptual clarification.

One of the most interesting articles by Mannheim from the point of view of a political scientist is »The Prospects of Scientific Politics» in *Ideology and Utopia*. There Mannheim discusses the theoretical foundations of political life and develops political ideal types that characterize the political currents of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this short article Mannheim does not carry his analysis very far; on the one hand he does not exploit fully his own »method of sociology of knowledge» and, on the other, he does not arrive at a more general scheme that would lead us beyond a particular historical period. However, his analysis can be carried further by using the theories and methodology of modern sociology.

First we can take main ideological dimension of Mannheim's analysis, »rationality-irrationality», and try to classify his ideal types along this dimension. The most rational of the ideal types are bureaucratic conservatism, liberal-democratic bourgeoisie thought and socialist-communist thought. This group we can call instrumental ideologies. Correspondingly, the other ideal types (conservative historicism and fascism) emphasize irrationality and can be called expressive ideologies.

Next we consider whether there are any differences in the position or structure of the group that support either instrumental or expressive ideologies. Our conclusions suggest that the groups that support instrumental ideologies are either stabilized or ascending, while groups that support expressive ideologies are descending or disintegrating groups in society. The rise and development of expressive ideologies can be explained by »normal» or optimal frustration.

In attempting to find further relations between the ideologies and the structure of the groups, Merton's conformity types can be used. The three types of conformity: behavioural, attitudinal and doctrinal, describe the ways group members orient themselves to the norms of the group. We can hypothesize that the way members adhere to the norms of their groups is reflected in the way the groups adopt the main ideological dimensions (among them »instrumental-expressive»). In relating the conformity types in turn with the group structure, Coser's proposition can be usefully employed. Coser's assumption is that the type of conformity is a function of social control based on observability of the individual performances to other members of the group or to individuals outside the group. This again leads us to examine and classify the patterns of interaction within and between groups.

The analysis above leads us to formulate six »basic» ideological types: instrumental and expressive ideologies based on behavioural conformity; instrumental and expressive ideologies based on attitudinal conformity; and instrumental and expressive ideologies based on doctrinal conformity. Translated into Mannheim's ideal types, bureaucratic conservatism is instrumental ideology based on behavioural conformity; liberal-democratic thought is instrumental ideology based on attitudinal conformity; socialist-communist thought is expressive ideology based on doctrinal conformity; conservative historicism is expressive ideology based on attitudinal conformity; and fascism is expressive ideology based on doctrinal conformity. Lastly, a preliminary hypothesis is advanced concerning the position and structure of the groups that support these different »basic» types (as well as Mannheim's ideal types).

This more general »conceptual scheme» formulated on the basis of Mannheim's ideal types gives us a hint of the kind of research strategy that could be profitably used in studying the relationships between the position and structure of the groups and their ideologies. Contextual analysis (formulated in most logical form by Lazarsfeld and Menzel) would be the best methodological device in empirical research based on the type of conceptual scheme formulated above.

Legislative voting behaviour and political theory. By Ilkka Heiskanen.

Stuart A. Rice, the grand old man of the legislative voting behaviour research, stated once that the votes given in elections and roll calls are as important for the quantitative study of political science as the results of monetary transactions are for economics. This paralleled as such is, however, inexact. The empirical indicators of voting behaviour alone cannot provide a basis for the systematic study and theory formation of political science.

Political scientists interested in the study of legislative voting behaviour are faced with two questions:

1. How can we objectively detect the differences in the legislative voting behaviour of sub-groups of a legislative body, and how can we decide whether these differences are significant? and

2. What is the »internal mechanism» that causes these differences?

Students of legislative voting behaviour have been primarily concerned with the first questions. However, it is not until we answer the second question that we have really found scientific information beyond mere historical description.

A piece of research made by the writer is used as an example of how far one can get in answering these questions by starting from the empirical indexes provided by legislative voting behaviour. The aim of the research was to find out how localism influenced the voting behaviour of the members of the French National Assembly during the Fourth Republic. The method used, the calculation of an index of localism based on the logic of analysis of variance, gives a satisfactory answer to our first question. A »theory sketch» of localism tries to give some insight into the latter question of the »internal mechanism» that causes the differences.

The index of localism and the corresponding expectation value was calculated for the representatives of three parties (MRP, Socialist and Radical-Socialist) in one hundred roll calls. Analysis of these indexes shows that when a party is split in a roll call, the split is due only to a small extent to the fact that the representatives from the same constituency voted together and against the party line. The analysis of the indexes also shows that parties differed little from each other in their extent of localism. There are, however, differences between the parties in different kind of roll calls. Especially the indexes of the MRP tend to be high in the roll calls where the indexes of Radical-Socialists are low and vice versa ($\phi = -.21$). This leads us to assume that the different factors of the »theory sketch» cause localism in different parties. Because of the primitive character of the »theory sketch» the analysis cannot be carried further on in more exact terms.

The writer argues that in most legislative behaviour studies the analysis dies off at this same level — the scientist is only able to detect the differences and possibly calculate their significance. Nothing decisive can be said of the »internal mechanism» and, therefore, new studies cannot begin where former studies end, but must again begin from the beginning and end in unproved assumptions.

The usual scapegoat in this state of affairs in legislative voting behaviour, as well as in other sub-fields of political science, is considered to be the lack of general theory that could coordinate the different fields of research. However, a coordinating theory cannot be created by abstract reasoning or rough classifications; it can be created only through coordinated research. What is needed in political science is a common strategy that will guide the research and help the scientist to see not only his own limited field but the whole field of political science (or still better, the whole field of social sciences) and lead him to plan his research accordingly. The writer suggests that the basis of such strategy in political science could be then building of areal macro-models which try to explain different types of political phenomena starting from common demographic, socio-economic and administrative variables. The irregularities in the macro-models can then be explained by more refined micro-theories based on psychological and social-psychological theories. Within this broader approach, the study of legislative voting behaviour can provide good indicators for building the macro-models and offer a starting point for explaining the irregularities in these models.