European Forum

"Beyond Left and Right": The New *Partisan* Politics of Welfare

FIONA ROSS

EUF No. 99/4

EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

European University Institute
3 0001 0036 3926 9

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

EUI Working Paper RSC No. 99/4

Ross: *"Beyond Left and Right": The New 'Partisan' Politics of Welfare*

WP 309
EUR

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

This Working Paper has been written in the context of the 1998-1999 European Forum programme on **Recasting the European Welfare State: Options, Constraints, Actors**, directed by Professors Maurizio Ferrera (Universities of Pavia and Bocconi, Milano) and Martin Rhodes (Robert Schuman Centre).

Adopting a broad, long-term and comparative perspective, the Forum will aim to:
· scrutinize the complex web of social, economic and political challenges to contemporary European welfare states;
· identify the various options for, and constraints on institutional reform;
· discuss the role of the various actors in promoting or hindering this reform at the national, sub-national and supra-national level;
· and, more generally, outline the broad trajectories and scenarios of change.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE

EUROPEAN FORUM

EUI Working Paper EUF No. 99/4

"Beyond Left and Right": The New *Partisan* Politics of Welfare

FIONA ROSS

University of Bristol and
Jean Monnet Fellow, European Forum (1998-99)

BADIA FIESOLANA, SAN DOMENICO (FI)

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

All rights reserved.
No part of this paper may be reproduced in any form
without permission of the author.

© 1999 Fiona Ross
Printed in Italy in April 1999
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I – 50016 San Domenico (FI)
Italy

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Abstract

The "new politics of the welfare state", the term coined by Pierson (1996) to differentiate between the popular politics of welfare expansion and the unpopular politics of retrenchment, emphasizes a number of factors that distinguish countries in their capacity to pursue contentious measures and avoid electoral blame. Policy structures, vested interests, and institutions play a prominent role in accounting for cross-national differences in leaders ability to diffuse responsibility for divisive initiatives. One important omission from the "new politics" literature, however, is a discussion of partisan politics. "Old" conceptualizations of the political right and left are implicitly taken as constants despite radical changes in the governing agenda of many leftist parties over the last decade. Responding to this oversight, Castles (1998) has recently probed the role of parties with respect to aggregate government expenditures, only to conclude that *parties do not matter* under "conditions of constraint". This paper contends that parties are relevant to the "new politics" and that, under specified institutional conditions, their impact is counter-intuitive. That is, in some notable cases, the left has had more effect in bruising the welfare state than the right. One explanation for these cross-cutting tendencies is that parties not only provide a principal source of political agency, they also serve as strategies, thereby conditioning opportunities for political leadership. By extension, they need to be situated within the "new politics" constellation of blame-avoidance instruments.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

I. An Era of Constraint: New Policies, New Politics

New policies bring new politics (Lowi, 1972).* This is the central contention of the "new politics" of welfare, a term coined by Pierson (1996) to differentiate between the popular politics of welfare state expansion and the unpopular politics of welfare state retrenchment. Building on Weaver's (1986) concept of blame-avoidance, the new politics literature attends to a number of factors that help leaders diffuse responsibility for conflictual and often painful welfare initiatives. Pierson's (1994, 1996) research emphasizes the importance of policy structures, institutions and interests. Past policy choices become part of the rules of the game and thereby affect future policy choices. Options for retrenchment vary with the extent of policy "lock-in" and the visibility of losses. Because retrenchment is unpopular, politicians must pursue strategies of "obfuscation", "division" (among opponents) or "compensation" (Pierson, 1994:24). Each strategy has its limits.

The importance of these strategies derives from the fact that electorates punish losses more readily than they reward gains (Lau, 1982, 1985; Weaver, 1986; Pierson, 1994). They are both more attuned and more reactive to the costs of cuts. The loss of public services (often regarded as basic public goods rather than benefits), are more salient than the potential gains of reduced taxation levels. Focusing on the power of vested interests embedded within prevailing welfare institutions, Pierson (1994) draws on the "logic of collective action" (Olson, 1965) to explain the inherent dangers of withdrawing resources: losers incur clear, high, concentrated costs, while winners receive unclear, small, thinly spread benefits. [1]

The new politics thesis, therefore, is founded upon three premises (a) retrenchment initiatives are unpopular either to the public at large or important vested interests; (b) policies affect politics and thus leaders must devise new, creative means of avoiding blame; and (c) policy is path dependent and, therefore, existing welfare programs will condition opportunities for blame-avoidance and retrenchment. Yet, despite its welcome attention to policy structures, institutions and interests, the new politics literature omits any explicit discussion of partisan politics. At best, "old" conceptualizations of the left and right remain implicit; parties of the right seek to "downsize" the welfare state while parties of the left continue to champion its cause to the greatest extent that global competition and fiscal restraint will permit.

Responding to this oversight, Castles (1998) has recently examined aggregate expenditures across OECD democracies only to conclude that parties *do not matter under conditions of constraint*. Perhaps a surprising argument from one of the most prominent proponents of the "parties matter" thesis, Castles (1998:32) contends that; "the impact of partisanship is contingent on

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

high levels of economic growth." Reacting to Pierson's depiction of the new politics, Castles (1998:33) elaborates; "in our account pressure group resistance to program cuts plays no discernible part. Thus, rather than identifying the characteristic mode of contemporary public sector decision making as a 'new politics' of blame-avoidance, our preferred focus in on the emergence of a 'new political economy' of economic and institutional constraint."[2]

It is our contention that parties do matter under conditions of constraint, but not necessarily in the neat, linear fashion that either ordinary least squares regression models will detect or highly aggregated expenditure data. It is not that parties are irrelevant, but rather that their effects are contingent and sometimes counter-intuitive. Indeed, several leftist parties, not least Britain's New Labour, have loudly trumpeted their pursuit of non-leftist policies (heralded by Giddens' slogan "beyond left and right").[3] This is particularly the case in the two-party systems characterizing the English-speaking nations, where core constituencies (and parliamentarians) do not enjoy opportunities for transferring their allegiances to parties further to the left and where there is no credible challenge to frames portending the inevitability of welfare cuts.

Before examining the role of parties and the critical interaction between parties and institutional settings, let us start by saying a few words about the dependent variable of the new politics: unpopular policies.

II. Unpopular Policies: Retrenchment and Restructuring

One premise on which the new politics rests is that welfare retrenchment is unpopular. On the broadest level, this assumption seems reasonably accurate (outside the United States) judging by polling data and recent election results sweeping the left to power across Europe. However, if we probe a little more deeply what we appear to find is that, indeed, some forms of welfare state retrenchment are highly unpopular whereas others, framed in terms of 'restructuring' and offering greater individual choice, have come to generate considerable support. This is especially the case in the English-speaking nations with their approximations to liberal welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990), where the normative role of the welfare state is to relieve abject poverty rather than ensure social equality or status maintenance.

Still, investigating trends in voter ideology across a sample of democracies, Kim (1997) reports that, despite the distinct ideological gap dividing the English-speaking countries and other western societies, both groups have shifted rightwards since the 1970s. Discrepancies between general beliefs and specific policy attitudes, of course, have long been noted. Over three decades ago, Free and Cantrill (1967) illustrated how many Americans

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

embrace conservative abstract values whilst concurrently favoring liberal policy solutions. In much the same way as students of American government have long observed the disjuncture between public support for democratic ideals and intolerant attitudes on specific issues, so the watch-words of neo-liberalism may have gained some acceptance without broad-based support for their policy implications (Prothro and Grigg, 1960; Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus, 1982; McClosky and Brill, 1983; Sullivan et al, 1984).

Public reaction to cuts, of course, not only vary by level of abstractness but also by instrumental factors. The new politics conception of unpopular policies best captures a specific type of welfare reform where losses are imposed without any clear, identifiable and present winners; that is, cutbacks where the only *potential* gains to be reaped are small, dispersed, and incrementally filtered through the tax system. Typically such initiatives involve tightening eligibility and benefit levels, freezing inflationary increments and letting demographics take their toll, or indexing benefits on the basis of inflation rather than wages. More unusually, programs may be terminated. These type of retrenchment initiatives are, for the most part, what Light (1991:78) might call "constituencyless issues".

The more favorable terminology of restructuring, on the other hand, may be best reserved for shifts in welfare provision that impose losses on some groups but provide clear, focused benefits to others. Programmatic structure may change and the state may partially or, less usually, completely withdraw, letting the private sector offer new market-based alternatives. Taking the British example, this type of restructuring has been most evident with pension reform, where the Thatcher government provided enticing financial incentives to leave the state pension system in favor of a private option. Indeed, while many Britons strongly oppose cuts in unemployment and disability benefits and majorities believe that private health schemes should be discouraged, a significant minority are now strongly in favor of compulsory private pensions (44%).[4]

The level of welfare state development, of course, affects the political costs of restructuring welfare in important ways. Underdeveloped welfare states (e.g. those of Southern Europe) incur significantly higher risks in restructuring because of skews in service provision. Favored groups (e.g. pensioners--who in Italy, for example, consume over half of all social expenditure) must incur losses in the restructuring process, while under-protected constituencies (e.g. families with an unemployed parent) must be awarded any surpluses (Ferrera, 1997). Leaders, therefore, face a doubly difficult task. They must impose pain on politically important groups and redistribute any savings to less pivotal constituencies.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

In sum, the new politics assumption that welfare reform is broadly unpopular rings true with respect to retrenchment initiatives: losses without beneficiaries. For the most part, it is these types of initiatives that require leaders to engage in blame-avoidance exercises. Some restructuring initiatives, of course, are also highly contentious among broad sections of the electorate. On balance, however, they tend to attract a wider pool of support owing to the personal material gains to be reaped.

III. Parties and Issue Associations: Nixon goes to China

a) Parties

The first issue concerning parties pertains to their motives and incentives to pursue unpopular policies. For the most part, parties of both the left and right have set an agenda that involves both retrenchment and restructuring. To assume invariable partisan effects across governing contexts demands that we conceive of parties as no more than preference maximizers, deeply insensitive to shifts in their governing environment. While preferences, values and institutional settings vary cross-nationally, we find that, for the most part, the left and center have turned to neo-liberal policy solutions, albeit often reluctantly (Kitschelt, 1993, 1994).[5] The Australian and New Zealand, of course, left not only pursued a politics of retrenchment more vigorously than the right, they actually initiated, rather than simply perpetuated, neo-liberal policies (Castles et al., 1996).

While it is usual for left-wing parties to move to the right in office, parties of the left and center have moved significantly to the right in their rhetoric, policies and governance. Britain's Tony Blair has been uncharacteristically shy in his condemnation of Conservative proposals to privatize state pensions. New Labour denounces wasteful public spending with as much vigor as the Conservative opposition. Workfare and ending state dependency flow readily from leftist lips across the Atlantic. And "thinking the unthinkable" has become common parlance on a whole range of "leftist" issues (most recently, patient fees for hospital stays and visits to general practitioners).

The role of parties in the new politics, therefore, needs to be reconceived. Preferences, values and ideals are surely important. They do not, however, provide the sole impetus for action. Part of the lefts movement rightwards is explicable in terms of the credibility gap plaguing leftist parties since the 1970s era of economic chaos, heavy taxes and spending, and strong, disruptive unions. The added need for the left to attract business confidence has pushed many social democratic parties to the right. Conversely, the right has found it necessary to minimize accusations of social brutality (not altogether

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

successfully as the 1997 landslide electoral victories of the French and British left testify to).[6] Indeed, the lack of electoral support for a radical reduction in public provisions, combined with the harsh rhetoric of retrenchment, has curtailed the policy latitude of the right due to the risk of repercussions at the polls.[7]

This was dramatically clear during the eighteen year reign of the British Tories where, irrespective of real funding increases in many public services (e.g. social security expenditures came close to doubling between 1979-1997), the British people repeatedly complained that their treasured welfare services were being residualized at best, dismantled at worst (Holliday, 1997:121,128). As King (1997: 192) reports, the Conservatives "suffered from the near-universal belief among the electorate that, under the Tories, the basic public services...had suffered, were suffering, and would continue to suffer." Yet, it was not until the third phase of Thatcherism (post-1987 electoral victory), that the government began to seriously direct its attention towards social welfare policy (and, even then, this proved to be a severe miscalculation) (Gamble, 1994:135). Indeed, viewed from a more dispassionate distance, the Tories overall approach towards the British welfare state was noticeable for its modesty, not flamboyance (Le Grand, 1990).

Additionally, partisan dealignment trends (Dalton, Flanagan and Beck, 1984; Franklin 1985, 1992; Rose and McAllister, 1986; Crewe, 1986; Dalton, 1988; Vowles and McAllister, 1996) across advanced industrial societies have provided the left with strong incentives to cover the policy ground of the right--assuming a spatial theory of voting (Downs, 1957).[8] The right, in turn, must incorporate center-left voters. This is not to suggest that parties engage in policy "leap-frogging". They rarely do (Klingemann, et al, 1994).[9] Movement for strategic purposes, of course, is not always easy. Non-elected, ideological party activists often play an important role in defining party policy. Policy and strategy, however, have increasingly converged for the left over the last decade.[10]

Electoral competition, however, cannot fully account for the individual-level transformations necessary for parties to reverse positions on many of their defining policies. The electoral competition argument, for instance, assumes that all members of a party's policymaking community are willing to radically suspend their policy preferences for the sake of electoral victory (irrespective of whether they themselves are subject to electoral pressures). It also assumes that power-seeking individuals can move freely and opportunistically, which, if the case, would lead us to expect a return to 'old' party policies once in office.

Jones's (1995) concept of "choice reversal" is useful in explaining why at least partially policy-driven individuals would be willing to abandon so many

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

of their defining policies. "Choice reversal" can occur quite independently of tastes, values or preferences. Jones (1995:13) explains: "changes in choice are caused not so much by changes in preferences as by sensitivity to contextual cues. Humans are sensitive to contextual cues because they are not just preference maximizers, they are also problem solvers and problem solving is related to changes in ones task environment".[11] With a radical swing rightwards in the governing paradigm since the late 1970s and early 1980s, choice reversals have been imperative at the level of the institutional agenda: as perceptions of the governing context change, so do conceptions of what constitutes a viable policy option. The old alternatives consistent with an age of redistribution and interventionism are no longer perceived to be appropriate for an age of market liberalism. While leaders preferences may not have changed, their choices are restricted by a "logic of appropriateness" (March and Olsen, 1989).

Still, preferences and values should not be discounted. Context may affect how leaders evaluate the "appropriateness" of their preferences, but preferences also influence how leaders interpret contextual cues. The transformation of the British Labour party, for example, owes much to the selection of a leadership cadre that is, by taste, more liberal than socialist, thereby providing a commitment to its new agenda that seems unlikely to emerge from sensitivity to contextual cues alone. Genuine non-leftist preferences on the part of Blair and many members of his central entourage (combined with the iron grip the leadership exerts upon leftist back benchers), are important to understanding why New Labour has shifted its agenda so far rightwards. Indeed, leaders basic policy preferences condition *how much* they are willing to shift for contextual reasons. Recall, for example, that John Smith had no designs on driving Labour nearly as far to the right as Tony Blair, irrespective of a broadly equivalent set of contextual cues.

In a word, the concept of choice reversal helps explain parliamentarian's willingness to be led rightwards. However, the commitment to actively initiate divisive measures, in defiance of the party's raison d'être, may require considerable conviction in the net worth of retrenchment. Dominant values and enduring cultural attachments to the welfare state affect both mass and elite reactions to new contextual cues. Leaders in continental Europe, for example, have interpreted contextual shifts much more modestly than their counterparts in the English-speaking world. Of course, in continental Europe, the structure of welfare programs and the vested interests defending sturdy welfare institutions also lessen the scope for retrenchment. Indeed, how far parties can move for contextual reasons also depends on how non-elected actors interpret contextual cues. Part of the retrenchment equation depends on how much leaders are willing to move for contextual reasons and part depends how much other actors and institutions limit their movement.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.
© The Author(s). European University Institute.

For sure, even in the English-speaking world, the left has not extolled neo-liberalism for the same reasons nor to the same extent as the right. However, the discrepancy between the rhetoric of the right and their actual policy achievements leaves the left with much room for at least equaling, if not in some cases out-retrenching the right without radically departing from their stated policy goals. Despite the fact that the political right has dominated government (longevity-wise) during the last decade, much of the welfare state remains intact. While parties do not leap-frog in intent, under some conditions they may well do so in effectiveness.

This has been vividly evident in Britain since New Labour's return to power. Despite the fact that the 1997 election was widely perceived to be a verdict on the Tories handling of social policy, in tandem with the associated baggage of crime, injustice and neglect, New Labour offered an agenda that involved "thinking the unthinkable" in its leaders words on a range of issues that Tory initiatives paled in comparison to. Within less than six months of returning to office, new Labour had initiated cuts in single parents benefit, leaked plans to chop disability benefit and sick pay, was busy developing its welfare-to-work scheme, and had placed university tuition fees squarely on the agenda. Surprisingly, the party maintained a remarkable 20-30 per cent lead in the polls--even with the revelation that hospital waiting lists had expanded (twice) since taking office. Indeed, the most strident opposition to the government arose from within the parliamentary party (47 MPs voted against the government and 14 abstained on the cuts on single parent benefit), leading to various proposals being shelved (e.g. child benefit for 16-18 year olds remaining in education) and others being withdrawn (the cut in single parent benefit).

Within one year in office, Tony Blair had begun to restructure public services in a way that successive Tory governments felt compelled to "leak" information over simply to test the tide of public opinion. Most importantly, when announced by the left, many of these measures have attracted support--even though similar proposals from the right culminated in fervent public opposition. After eight months of New Labour governance one survey reported that; "nearly half those classified as centrists and 23% of Conservatives said they would vote for Mr. Blair at the election." After twelve months of New Labour governance, a MORI poll reported that 45 per cent of Tory voters were satisfied with Blair's performance as leader.[12]

In a word, the role of parties in relation to the 'new politics' requires further reflection.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

b)Issue-Associations: Nixon goes to China

There is an old adage associated with Nixon's 1972 visit to China: leaders who are perceived to be closest to a politically delicate issue are likely to find themselves most constrained. The capacity for leadership is highest where a feared course of action is considered least likely. When unpopular policies are on the agenda, the latitude for successful policy leadership is largely reserved for those who seem least likely to act. It took a vehement anti-Communist such as Nixon to open diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China in 1972. It would have amounted to political suicide for a Democratic president to attempt such a move; exposing the party to the "soft on communism" charge--an accusation that would seem ludicrous if leveled against Nixon, a politician who had built a career on flouting the communist threat. Irrespective of the massive ideological gulf between the Democrats and the Chinese Communists, the more "liberal" image of the party foreclosed policy options--a factor magnified by memories of the Bay of Pigs fiasco.[13]

Underlying the Nixon goes to China thesis is the assumption that parties "own" issues (in accordance with a saliency theory of party competition, see Robertson, 1976), and/or positions on the same issues (in accordance with a spatial theory of voting, see Downs, 1957). By extension, parties own liabilities and opportunities flowing from these issues and issue positions. Contrary to Downsian (1957) spatial theory, where parties compete along the same issue dimensions, saliency theory envisions a more discrete form of party competition. Parties own issues. They try to persuade voters that their issue-set is most salient (Riker, 1993; Klingemann et al, 1994). Riker (1993) nicely summarizes, "parties do not debate positions on a single issue, but try instead to make end runs around each other on different issues"; Partisan debate is "orthogonal" and parties, therefore, "talk past each other" (Riker, 1993: 4; see Saarlvik and Crewe, 1983; Klingemann et al, 1994: 26). Saliency theory is particularly well suited to multiparty systems whose competitive dynamics depart from the classic two-party model associated with spatial theory.

The core issues belonging to a party tend to be stable over several decades. From their comparative analysis of party platforms, Klingemann et al (1994; 22) find that basic party programs display modest change over a twenty to thirty year period (with Canada and northwestern Europe showing the highest levels of continuity). This stability locks-in the relationship between party and issue, leading voters to develop deep-seated partisan issue-associations.[14] Issue-associations, in turn, come to serve as cognitive short circuiting devices. As cognitive misers, with scant time, energy and inclination to study the political world, issue-associations simplify partisan politics and the complexities of ideological exchange. Moreover, because voters do not rate the

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

trustworthiness of elected officials highly, issue-associations take precedence over new statements in their evaluative processes.

A range of factors limiting the flexibility of parties reinforce the linkage between party and issue in voters minds. Historical legacies, organizational inertia, party activists and supporters constrain the adaptability of parties. Importantly, they limit the extent to which parties can distance themselves from negative issue-associations.[15] The close connection between party and issue tends to become increasingly rigid where a party is negatively associated with an era of crisis. Changes in party policy tend to be viewed as opportunistic. Credibility problems surface as targeted constituencies are disbelieving of policy conversions while current constituencies find themselves alienated.

Indeed, one of the best examples of a long and painful, if ultimately successful, transformation is that of the British Labour party. Relegated to the opposition since 1979, it was not until 1994, under the new leadership of Tony Blair, that Labour managed to convince voters that it was a reformed organization. Despite the fact that, policy-wise, the party bore little or no resemblance to its predecessor of the late 1970s and early-mid-1980s, it took a largely symbolic act to erode Labour's socialist image among the public: the relinquishment of the controversial Clause IV of the party constitution, committing Labour to public ownership of the means of "production, distribution and exchange".

Where previous party leaders had failed to fully comprehend the deep-seated negative association between the party, the policy failures of the 1970s and especially the trade unions, Blair understood how image and policy were electorally indistinct. Convinced that one of Labour's central problems was the lack of business confidence, he strenuously argued that markets could expect a fiscally austere Labour government.[16] On top of Labour's widely publicized pledge to hold public spending to Conservative projections for the first two years in office, Brown adamantly ruled out any increase in personal taxation.[17] Yet despite these efforts (and, of course, much more rightist fare e.g. workfare, zero-tolerance on crime, curfews, and possibilities for additional privatization), voters remained skeptical:

> For all the emphasis placed by Brown on the party's break with the past, a substantial minority of the electorate remained unconvinced by his moderation on taxation and spending. According to polls, they persisted in thinking that they would pay more tax under a Labour government. In January 1992 57 per cent of voters thought taxation would increase. By March 1994 it had fallen to 40 per cent and, by the time Blair was elected leader in the July of that year, it was 34 per cent. But it fell no further and, during the next three years the figure was often higher (up to 42 per cent). In the same period between just 9 and 20 per cent thought they would pay less tax under a Blair administration. Only three months before the election, 60 per cent were worried that

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

> taxation would rise under Labour. In March 1997, 75 per cent expected increases. Whatever reason voters had for choosing the party, it was not because they believed the fine detail of Brown's promises on tax and spend (Wickham-Jones, 1997:24).

The transformation of the British Labour party illustrates the difficulties of partisan issue-*dis*association.[18] The problems parties face in overcoming deep-seated issue-associations in a manner that voters find convincing helps explain why leftist parties have taken such a sharp swing to the right. Radical issue reversals have been necessary simply to modify the tax and spend, big government image.

According to the logic of the Nixon goes to China thesis, party issue-associations interact with policy problems to limit and expand the scope for leadership. Parties matter, but not simply in the sense of responsible party theory where they offer voters a choice at elections and then implement their promises once in office.[19] Partisan differences (real or perceived) do not just define the *direction* of leadership, they also structure the *opportunities* for leadership.

In a word, "effect" becomes "cause" (Pierson, 1993), and "policies" structure "politics" (Lowi, 1972). But just as policy-structure (Pierson) and policy-type (Lowi) affect the scope for leadership, so do issue-associations. When issue-associations become a liability, the possibilities for leadership grow increasingly slim.

Unpopular policies, of course, carry risk for parties of both the right and left. It is the *degree* of risk that varies across issue-associations. According to this logic, rightist parties should be more vulnerable in their retrenchment efforts than parties of the left--and especially so on explosive issues like welfare reform. The principal psychological mechanism conditioning voters response to issue-associations appears to be trust--specifically the opportunities trust provides for framing retrenchment initiatives in a manner that voters find acceptable if not compelling. Drawing on experimental data, Druckman (1998) contends that successful framing depends on two issues relating to the credibility of the source. The first pertains to the source's knowledge of the subject matter. There is little reason to expect this criteria to discriminate between parties of the left and right, although it is possible that because the left is thought to care more about alleviating poverty they may be perceived to know more about welfare. The second criteria for successful framing, according to Druckman, relates to the trustworthiness of the speaker. This, we suspect, is the critical factor distinguishing the publics response to retrenchment efforts by the left and right. Very simply, voters do not trust rightist parties to reform the welfare state whereas they assume that leftist parties will engage in genuine reform rather than indiscriminate and harsh retrenchment.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.
© The Author(s). European University Institute.

Buttressed by a pro-welfare image, then, leftist governments may be subject to fewer accountability pressures. Cuts imposed by the left may be viewed as trade-offs for increased spending in other policy areas, absolute essentials, strategic necessities or, at a minimum, lower than those that would be experienced under parties of the right. Whereas rightist governments run the risk of been perceived as mean-spirited and socially negligent when they impose losses, the left may even be viewed as fiscally prudent and economically responsible. This is especially the case where there is a latent cultural and structural receptivity towards welfare residualization (e.g. in the liberal welfare regimes of the English-speaking democracies, Esping-Andersen, 1990), providing leftist leaders with an underlying support base that is susceptible to the shrewd marketing of retrenchment efforts.

The standard reasoning among political scientists is that parties of the left want to do more and parties of the right want to do less and, institutional conditions permitting, both will pursue their agenda. We have challenged the first part of this argument. Most major parties of the left are no longer committed to big government in general or an elaborate welfare state in particular. Furthermore, the incentives to impose losses go a lot deeper than ideological commitment. Voters do not reward policy cuts and, therefore, politicians must not be seen to impose undue losses. Ironically, the right's greater ideological commitment to retrenchment may inadvertently limit its scope for effectiveness.

IV. Institutions

Partisan theory assumes that governments can implement their promises (Hibbs, 1992). Yet leadership takes place within an institutional context. Rules and roles help define leadership choices.[20] Whose preferences are deemed legitimate, and where, when and how they may be brought forward as well as challenged, modified or changed are affected by the institutional distribution of power (Kiser and Ostrom, 1982: 179). Institutions influence who must be consulted prior to policy initiation. They influence who is likely to be mobilized over any given issue. They influence who must be consulted during policy formulation (must the entire government, opposition, interest groups or social partners be brought into negotiations or will only the relevant cabinet minister and a few departmental civil servants shape policy?). They influence whose approval is needed to proceed further (can a few legislators veto initiatives?). Institutions, therefore, influence how many actors must be consulted each step of the way, and the order in which they must be accommodated. In essence, the constellation of relevant actors, their policy remit and veto potential vary across institutional settings.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Much like parties, however, institutions can also serve as strategies in the retrenchment process by helping leaders diffuse responsibility for unpopular initiatives. Rarely conceived in these terms, institutions are typically depicted as a series of hurdles and obstacles to be maneuvered around in the pursuit of policy goals. Indeed following this logic, the capacity for leadership is thought to be higher where veto players are fewer (Burns, 1963, 1990; Hall, 1983, 1992; Scharpf, 1988; Powell, 1989; Immergut, 1992; Sundquist, 1992; Thelen and Steinmo, 1992; Schmidt, 1996). Majoritarian structures, concentrating power in the executive and at the national level of government, lower constraints on leadership. The fewer "access points" (Wildavsky, 1986) or "veto points" (Immergut, 1992), lessen the risk of minority veto. Initiatives are less dependent on the ability of leaders to piece together unlikely coalitions.

Britain is usually offered as the prime example of majoritarianism--although New Zealand was perhaps the purest case prior to the reforms of the early 1990s (Lijphart, 1984).[21] Between elections, the government of the day is assumed to possess virtually unlimited authority. Lord Hailsham coined the term "elective dictatorship" to capture this position of unrivaled power. The role of the parliamentary opposition often appears redundant between elections--an argument that could perhaps be extended to the government's own back benchers (depending, of course, on the size of the government's majority).[22]

The critical issue here is the type of leadership institutions encourage. Imposing unwelcome measures requires commitment in the face of resistance. The issue of *who* is willing to press for divisive policies against the forces of public and/or party resistance is an important one. Agenda change requires individuals to grab new issues and promote them. It requires active leadership even for those with a natural preference for change. Favorable contexts for leadership need to be exploited. As Jones (1995:24) contends, "ideas are not self-sustaining without advocates". Parties are organizations that suffer from many of the same inertial tendencies and vested interests that encourage stability in any other collective body. Moreover, as noted earlier, it seems unlikely that party elites will interpret a shift in contextual cues identically or be equally willing to review their choices in light of exogenous events.

In many respects, majoritarian institutions facilitate the emergence of "autonomous policy leaders" (APLs) (Wallis and Dollery, 1997). APL's are individuals who, convinced in the merits of their preferences, behave with seeming disregard for electoral considerations. By evaluating the net worth of policy options differently from power-seeking officials, APLs are willing to embrace risky alternatives that they ardently believe to be right. These individuals feel secure in the knowledge that once the fruits of their Labour come into bloom for all to appreciate, their alternatives will be widely favored.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Perhaps Thatcher was the ultimate APL. Wallis and Dollery offer the example of Roger Douglas (New Zealand's Minister of Finance, 1984-1989).[23]

Aside from personal and ideological drive, APLs must have the authority to act autonomously. Thus, it is hardly surprising that they have tended to emerge where executive power is concentrated. Indeed, it is not coincidental that APLs have emerged within the two most majoritarian of all OECD countries (at that time). In New Zealand, the heavy concentration of institutional power in a centralized, single party executive allowed the Lange government to adopt its "crashing through" strategy with little regard for public and parliamentary opposition. Indeed, its combative approach was specifically deployed as a means of eluding opponents (Douglas, 1993; Gregory, 1998).

Yet, the uncompromising certitude with which APL's promote their agenda often induces similar effects to unfavorable issue-associations: once APLs succeed in steering policy, concerns swiftly emerge that they have gone *too* far. Moreover, the capacity for unencumbered leadership is not without costs. The facility of leadership is directly related to the ease of pin-pointing blame. Power-concentration allows voters to draw clear linkages between leaders and policy. If voters do not care for government actions, they are in no doubt as to who is responsible. Centralized institutions reduce the power of opponents, but they simultaneously leave leaders politically exposed--a particularly important factor when leaders want to hide (Weaver, 1986; Jones, 1991a; Weaver and Rockman, 1993; Pierson, 1994). While "crashing through" is institutionally possible in majoritarian systems, non-negotiated settlements on contentious issues lack legitimacy, inviting the backlash that has been so evident in the case of New Zealand (in terms of sweeping institutional change, voter flight to new parties further to the left and right, and rising levels of political disillusionment).

Standing opposite majoritarian democracies are consensus systems, based on the principle of power-sharing (Lijphart, 1984, 1989). Power is widely dispersed through the institutional provision of access points at both the national and sub-national level of government. The relative ease of entry into the system provides incentives for veto players to bring their concerns to government. Policy initiation requires considerable fore-thought regarding the type of proposal that will generate least opposition. Agreements must be constructed at multiple levels of the policy process, with the likelihood of compromise or rejection each step of the way. The question before leaders is not only one of policy preference. It is also one of feasibility: which is the best option that can survive?

Lijphart lists Switzerland as the ultimate power-sharing country of the advanced industrial societies (Lijphart, 1984). Others take a different angle,

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

focusing on the United States as the principal democracy with the lowest capacity for directed leadership (Powell, 1989). The horizontal fragmentation of power stemming from the separation of powers and checks and balances, and the vertical diffusion of responsibility between the federal and state governments deriving from their "marble cake" relationship, presents a policy labyrinth (Grodzins, 1960; Elazar, 1984; Stewart, 1984).

Yet, as Schmidt (1996:173) summarizes; "Because policies result under these circumstances from extended bargaining and compromise-seeking, it is difficult or impossible for the voters to attribute the output to the individual players". In a word, while unilateral leadership is difficult, it is equally difficult for voters to situate blame.

This line of argument, however, does not make explicit the ways in which leaders may use institutions as governing strategies to shift responsibility and escape blame. Let us illustrate this reasoning with respect to federalism--a particularly useful means of devolving responsibility simply because voters generally lay blame at the level of service provision. Indeed, a favorite strategy of the Reagan administration was to devolve functions to the states while consolidating revenues. While Reagan's efforts were undermined by Congressional Democrats, federal grants-in-aid were cut--both in absolute terms (as a proportion of GNP), and relative to the cost of services. One estimate suggests that by the end of Reagan's first term, the proportion of state and local revenues coming from Washington had shrunk from a third to a quarter (Peterson, Rabe and Wong, 1986).

Similarly, federal officials have exploited the use of unfunded mandates. Despite the 1995 Unfunded Mandate Reform Act, a toothless measure in many respects, the 1996 Welfare Reform Act (The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act) requires states to create jobs for welfare recipients. More importantly, shifting welfare provision to the states has allowed for the dissolution of national standards.[24] Once the principle of national standards is successfully challenged, the capacity for fundamental retrenchment is considerable.[25] Note, for example, how states may limit lifetime benefits to less than the five year limit set by the federal government and how they may refuse non-citizens access to services and benefits.[26]

As well as the dispersion of power between levels of government, executive power-sharing seems crucial to the magnitude of risk leaders incur in pursuing contentious initiatives. Within the matrix of governing institutions, public attention and blame are very much centered on the executive. As such, coalition governments would be expected to possess a greater potential for blame-sharing. Still, however much consensus democracies diffuse responsibility, policy success remains dependent upon leaders' ability to enlist

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.
© The Author(s). European University Institute.

support for painful and conflictual policies. If assembling majorities on non-controversial issues is laborious, doing so on highly-charged matters is a Herculean task.[27] The difficulty of piecing together successive coalitions may well abrogate the benefits of reduced accountability pressures.[28]

This analysis, however, may be too blunt. First, it is possible that policy compromise is less a corollary of coalition government than is often supposed. While it is usual to assume that power-sharing governments fail to energize policy due to the inherent need for compromise, Laver and Shepsle (1993) argue otherwise. Taking ministers to have considerable authority within their own area of specialization, policy coverage is the same as the number of possible ways of distributing portfolios. By extension, power-sharing executives may enjoy the benefits of exercising a relatively free hand within their ministries while concomitantly hiding behind the coalition.

A second problem with the gridlock argument is its failure to take account of leadership goals, the implicit assumption that all veto players are equal, and, combining the previous two points, the conclusion that those who wish to prevent welfare cuts can successfully override those who wish to pursue them. For sure, institutional fragmentation produces additional veto points and encourages veto players to mobilize. However, it is unlikely that all veto players exercise a comparable influence. It would be usual to expect some asymmetry in the importance of interests in relation to specific policy problems.

In other words, institutionally fragmented systems may well be resistant to change when leaders wish to expand government programs. It is less clear that the same dynamic applies when leaders choose to do less. While public policy may not be "captured" by narrow, private, corporate interests (Lowi, 1979), there is some inequity of influence in favor of those who prefer the market over government.[29] When cuts are on the agenda, the most powerful activists may well be supporters of government policy.[30] The interaction between dominant interests and specific proposals determines the policy consequences of institutional power-sharing considerably more than the mere presence of veto points.

Of course, dominant interests and actors vary cross-nationally. In the English-speaking countries, with their approximations to two-party systems and weak union movements, the most powerful actors may well be those seeking to undermine the welfare state. Where trade unions remain significant political actors and parties of the far-left continue to attract support, power-sharing can greatly limit the scope for welfare retrenchment. While policy solutions negotiated with the social partners have proved to be among the most successful (Esping-Andersen, 1996), enjoying far greater authority and

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

legitimacy than the "crashing through" strategies adopted by some majoritarian executives, they have also proved more limited in their reach.[31]

In sum, it seems probable that different types of veto points encourage different types of veto players. Veto points may only limit the scope of retrenchment where they encourage veto players to mobilize on the left. Federalism, for example, does not exhibit any obvious relationship to the mobilization of left-wing interests and thus can enhance rather than weaken leaders retrenchment capabilities in the manner described above. Two institutional factors largely appear to be responsible for the presence of leftist veto players: the multiparty system and mechanisms for integrating trade union movements. Let us explore some of these ideas further by turning to the interactive relationships that condition the role played by parties in the new politics.

V. Issue-Associations and Institutions

Combining the institutional and issue-association arguments presented here would not lead one to expect a neat linear relationship between the two. Drawing on the above discussion, two institutional conditions should affect the power of issue-associations: (a) how they condition public reaction to unpopular policies through providing opportunities for blame-sharing, and (b) how they structure opportunities for veto players to emerge further to the left. As noted, the protection offered by issue-associations is unlikely to extend as far where parties (and unions) further to the left challenge retrenchment frames and provide added opportunities for voter flight. Under these conditions, the demands of power-sharing may be a complicating factor for leftist parties possessing a low-risk issue profile. conversely, majoritarian structures would only be expected to significantly enhance leadership to the extent that issue-associations are concordant with the task at hand.[32]

Where power is institutionally dispersed, the impact of issue-associations depends on *who* is sharing power. The source of power-sharing affects who the dominant veto players are and how they are likely to react to retrenchment initiatives. This point can be made more forcefully by looking at two systems with multiple veto points but where the source of power-sharing differs. First let us take a brief look at the beneficial (for retrenchment) interaction of party and power-sharing institutions in the United States in the wake of the 1994 Republican take-over to Congress, that helped produce the 1996 Welfare Reform Act. In contrast, we briefly describe some of the difficulties the Prodi Government faced in sharing power with the Reconstituted Communists and the Italian trade unions.[33] The critical component of the partisan-institutional relationship found in the American case

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

that is absent from European style coalition governments is that power-sharing occurs within the context of the two-party system, without the need to consult a strong union movement or far-left. While veto-points are plentiful in the United States, they are not found in a location likely to mobilize the political left (e.g. the electoral and party system).[34] Partisan power-sharing is thus centripetal, amalgamating the center-left and center-right and impeding gravitation towards either ideological extreme (thereby avoiding the obstacles to retrenchment deriving from the far-left and far-right in terms of issue-associations). Governing coalitions induced through a separation of powers (rather than through the electoral and party system) are most likely to provide for this condition.

In many respects, retrenchment seems to be best served by having a Democrat in the White House and a Republican-led Congress. Indeed, the coalition politics of the post-1994 era transformed the potentially explosive issue of welfare reform into a highly popular initiative for the Clinton administration. Electoral politics set the stage for serious reform on the part of the White House. Specifically, Clinton had strong electoral incentives to move to the right. His clear lack of an electoral mandate in 1992--reinforced after the whole-hearted rejection of the Democrats at the 1994 mid-terms--greatly undermined his incentives and authority to pursue a liberal agenda. Clinton's ability to move sharply to the right, however, would have been significantly stifled had the Democrats maintained even a small majority in either legislative chamber after 1994. Unlike a Democratic president, House Democrats have few incentives to accept belt-tightening measures and many incentives to oppose them. Shielded from national and international pressures, locally-oriented representatives have strong partisan, ideological, institutional, and electoral reasons to oppose the most divisive elements of a cost-cutting agenda. By the same token, Republican members of Congress are less reluctant to tenaciously pursue programmatic cuts than Republican Presidents. The impetus provided by the cohesive and zealous Republican Congress (energized after its years of minority status, by the ideological leadership of Speaker Gingrich, the influx of new members and its claim to a mandate), offered Clinton the opportunity to shed his damaging liberal persona, while appearing all the more cooperative and presidential in the process.

The pressure to cut public services, then, flowed from the Republican Congress (by virtue of ideology and the security of institutional position) and, to a lesser extent, from the Democratic president (who needed to dispense with his big-spending liberal image and attract the support of moderate conservatives). Electoral incentives, in combination with the practicalities of government in a coalition based system, more than compensated for the President's lack of ideological support for a conservative welfare agenda. In cultivating his "new" Democrat image, Clinton repeatedly spoke of ending

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

welfare as we know it. While at no point did Clinton desire that the state wither away, his commitment to a leaner federal government was such that his lack of ideological drive could be more than recompensed by other facilitative conditions. Republican proposals were twice vetoed by the President. The dramatic Welfare Reform Act represented a third compromised version that the administration chose to accept. The compromises, however, hardly reduced the enormity of the measure.

The power-sharing dynamic, combined with the specific institutional positions of the different partisan actors, produced a situation where fundamental reform could emerge without either party incurring a debilitating electoral risk. In addition, the federal structure of the government provided the president with the means to wipe his hands of costly welfare problems in the name of increasing state autonomy, and exogenous trends, especially the increasingly deficit-conscious mood of America, set a favorable climate for retrenchment. Certainly, the usual arguments concerning the perils of divided government could perhaps benefit from greater attention to who controls each branch of government. According to the argument advanced here, whether the Democrats occupy the White House and the Republicans dominate Congress or vice versa should make a substantial difference to policy outcomes. The important variable may be less divided government than the interactive relationship between party and institutional position.

In a word, *which* partisan actors occupy *which* institutional positions is *crucial* to the pursuit of unwelcome measures and, indeed, whether potentially explosive initiatives may even come to achieve some measure of popularity. Somewhat ironically, given the voluminous literature decrying the American system for its institutional sloth, the framework of the United States government, in combination with the post-1994 partisan composition of its branches, may have much to recommend it *with respect to loss-initiation*. The normal interaction of party and institutions (a Republican President and Democratic Congress, and more occasionally, a united Democratic administration), has been misleadingly equated with the systems structural attributes, rather than been understood as a conditional relationship (fluctuating with the interaction of institution, party and the specific policy capability under study).

In the American case, the politically centripetal power-sharing dynamic served to diffuse responsibility for a potentially unpopular initiative and facilitate considerable blame-avoidance. In contrast to this left-right, two-party power-sharing relationship, let us take a brief look at the left-far-left-trade union power-sharing dynamic operative during Prodi's first two years in office.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.
© The Author(s). European University Institute.

Failing to achieve a governing majority in the Camera at the 1996 elections, the new Olive Tree government found itself reliant upon the 35 seats held by Bertinotti's Reconstituted Communist party to effectively govern. This informal alliance placed the Olive Tree under a series of conflicting demands. On the one hand, a number of factors impelled the government to pursue a fiscally austere agenda: The inclusion of centrist parties in the coalition, the fact that Prodi had staked the governments reputation on gaining entry to the first round of monetary union with its 3 per cent deficit ceiling, the electoral pledge of fiscal toughness (not to mention additional privatizations) and the center-lefts need to attract business confidence. The Communists and their union allies, on the other hand, served as a powerful counter-pressure.

Upon taking office, the government pieced together a financial and economic scheme (the DPEF) covering the 1997-1999 period with the aim of qualifying for the EMU (Magara,1997:8). Not surprisingly, this drew instant criticism from the unions and the political left while failing to please business or pacify the political center and right. The Unions threatened imminent action unless Prodi revised the DPEF's plan to cut welfare by 21 trillion lire and, without equivocation, the Communists promised stringent opposition to the government when the DPEF came before the Camera (Magara, 1997:9).

Similar cross-pressure soon materialized over the government's 1997 budget plan. The Communists pledged vehement opposition to the treasury's proposals, especially concerning a cut of 2 trillion lire from welfare (including immensely unpopular cuts in health and pensions; see Magara, 1997:15). Indeed, Bertinotti threatened to force the dissolution of the government if it tampered with welfare; threats that were given weight by a mass demonstration protesting the 1997 budget. In response, the pension cuts were swept from the 1997 budget plan.

As expenditures exceeded predictions, the government sought to prepare a mini budget (including cuts of 15 trillion lira). Magara (1997: 22-3) offers a detailed account of the budgetary tug-of-war: while the Communists ardently objected to both cuts and tax increases, Berlusconi offered to support the government in exchange for welfare cuts. In turn, Bertinotti threatened the dissolution of the government if Prodi accepted Berlusconi's support. Then Dini issued an ultimatum concerning Prodi's pandering to Bertinotti. Eventually, the government succumbed to Communist pressure, although Bertinotti's authority was greatly enhanced by unswerving public opposition to pension reform. The welfare cuts were postponed until the 1998 budget (although it is noteworthy that these negotiations faired little better).

The unfavorable interaction of parties and institutions in this case is magnified by Italy's non-residualist welfare culture and electoral pressures for

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

additional welfare investment due to the distorted distribution of benefits (presenting conflicting demands for distribution, redistribution and retrenchment). By contrast, America's liberal welfare regime and heavily means-tested policy structures provide a far more conducive set of normative and empirical conditions for pursuing retrenchment initiatives. Indeed, a greater familiarity with market provisions may well allay natural antagonisms towards the loss of state services. In short, cultural contexts, ideational traditions, and historical legacies mediate political reactions to retrenchment efforts.

Let us conclude by placing the new *partisan* politics of welfare within the broader constellation of blame-avoidance instruments.

VI. Concluding Remarks

The likelihood of voters handing down punishment at the polls depends on their awareness of unpopular policies. Aside from issue-associations and institutions, leaders ability to escape blame also depends on how successfully opponents are managed. As noted in the introduction, Pierson (1994:19) identifies three strategies that leaders may use to lessen opposition to welfare cuts: "obfuscation, division and compensation".

Obfuscation is central to our issue-association and institutional arguments. Leaders may also obfuscate by choosing a low-profile policy method. For example, a decremental strategy may lower the visibility of cuts (Pierson, 1994). Leaders can also try to divide opponents. A common means of division is to impose pain on a sub-set of clients while leaving others untouched. Increasing eligibility thresholds for benefits is perhaps the most common strategy of this kind.[35]

Alternatively, cuts may be made in such a manner that they only affect future recipients--thereby targeting groups that do not presently exist (Pierson, 1994:23).[36] Losers may be compensated, although the immediate costs of compensation may exceed the benefits when the length of the governing term is considered. Compensation, of course, need not be targeted at injured parties. Compensatory policies can be offered to the electorate at large. Recall how Clinton, in the midst of imposing severe welfare losses, signed a bill into law that increased health coverage by prohibiting insurance companies from discriminating against those with pre-existing medical problems and protecting health care coverage upon change or loss of employment. This legislation was followed up by a highly popular bill requiring that mental health coverage be treated on a par with physical illness and that new mothers be granted a minimum two-day hospital stay after birth. These compensatory measures cost the federal government little compared to the savings amassed from the Welfare

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Reform Act. Moreover, they were bi-partisan consensus-building efforts; after all, compensation was aimed at the deserving, working, voting, middle class (who already had health care coverage).

These types of policy strategies can help minimize opposition. They may be especially important where leaders are ideologically or institutionally exposed. Policy structures affect leaders *capacity* to hide; they condition whether low-risk strategies are available to leaders. Partisan issue-associations, in interaction with institutions, condition both their *capacity* to hide and their *need* to do so. Parties not only provide a principal source of political agency, they also serve as strategies, thereby affecting opportunities for political leadership under conditions of electoral risk. By extension, they need to be situated within the new politics constellation of blame-avoidance instruments.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Notes

*The author is very grateful to Maurizio Ferrera, Morris S. Ogul, B. Guy Peters, Bert A. Rockman and two anonymous referees for their many helpful suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper. The paper has also benefited from comments by many members of the European University Institute's European Forum. Financial support for this project has been kindly provided for by The Training and Mobility of Researchers Program of the European Commission's Marie Curie Foundation.

[1] Sociotropic voting (where voters look beyond their own immediate economic concerns), heightens these risks (Kinder and Kiewiet, 1979; Feldman, 1982; Alvarez and Nagler, 1995). While personal economic conditions are more important to vote choice in Europe than in the United States, aggregate unemployment rates (and not just personal conditions), have been found to significantly increase the left's vote share (Lewis-Beck, 1983). In a word, voters respond to collective as well as individual grievances.

[2] Castles does acknowledge that his findings may not be generalizable beyond the confines of aggregate expenditure data.

[3] The idea of a new mode of political exchange is documented in Giddens, A. 1994, *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.

[4] Data from MORI and the Institute of Economic Affairs; reported in The Times, May 28th 1998.

[5] These comments are, of course, generalizations based on trends across advanced industrial democracies. Some cases naturally fit the pattern better than others. For example, though austerity measures have been haphazardly imposed in France, the virtues of neo-liberalism have not been extolled by the right or left in the electoral arena. Chirac came to power in 1995 promising to increase public spending, increase wages, cut taxes, lower unemployment and obliterate the deficit. Moreover, Juppe's conservative government made much of raising the minimum wage. Job-creation programs were expanded (with little effect), and taxes were increased. For the most part, the pledges of fiscal responsibility made by the left and right across many OECD democracies are rarely heard in France. When they do occasionally surface, as in 1997, voters respond accordingly.

[6] Both victories were partially interpreted as a backlash against the perceived social malevolence of the right. Pre-election surveys reported health and welfare services to be of principal concern to British voters. The French unemployment rate of 13 per cent was central to the Socialist victory. The government's failure to address joblessness was interpreted as more than simply a failure of economic policy. It said something about the government's whole attitude towards social inequality.

[7] While voters have gradually moved rightwards on economic issues (Kitschelt, 1994), opinion polls in both the United States and Britain vividly illustrated the lack of public support for core elements of the Reagan and Thatcher agenda. Succinctly commenting on the British case, Anthony King (1997;184) reminds us that the Tories "remained in power for eighteen years not because they were liked and admired but despite the fact that they were

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

not". The election of right-wing governments at the end of the 1970s and into the 1980s often appeared to be based on the issue of managerial competence more than policy support.

[8] While party convergence theses have enjoyed considerable support over the years, they have also attracted a number of critics (Grofman, Griffin and Glazer, 1990; Poole and Rosenthal, 1991; Morton, 1993). Alesina (1988), for example, has argued that even if platform convergence occurs for electoral reasons, once in office relatively unconstrained officials will return to their divergent preferences. Several observers have documented how plurality electoral rules and two-party systems produce incentives for "product differentiation" as a means of garnering electoral support (Hall, 1992) due to the risks of abstention deriving from "indifference" (Hinich and Ordershook, 1970), and the chance of third party entry (Palfrey, 1984; Laver and Shepsle, 1990). The "product differentiation" argument largely depends upon patterns of social cleavage. In an era of electoral volatility, convergence theses may have much to offer so long as no additional parties exist further to the left or right (where core supporters might flee), and where electoral rules make a significant third party threat unlikely.

[9] The Australian and New Zealand left who came to power in 1983 and 1984 respectively are a clear exception to this rule. The rhetoric of both parties was dogmatically anti-statist (James, 1992; Castles, Gerritsen and Vowles, 1996). The movement towards market-oriented solutions was partially a function of the severe recessionary economies of the Antipodes (Easton and Gerritsen, 1996), and, more importantly, the diagnosis offered by the left: Keynesianism as pursued by previous rightist governments (Castles, 1992). Of course, whichever party was out of office at the time of crisis had incentives to reject Keynesianism and embrace neo-liberalism.

[10] While convergence has occurred on socioeconomic issues, the left has increasingly sought to distinguish itself and compensate for the alienation of "old" constituencies by capturing "new" issues, such as environmentalism, women's interests and post-materialist concerns (Inglehart, 1990; Kitschelt, 1994; Papadakis and Rainbow, 1996). This pattern is evident from Scandinavia to the Antipodes. The issue of constitutional reform and devolution in particular (advocated by the left from Britain to Portugal), appears to serve similar purposes.

[11] Jones (1995:226) elaborates; "the term context is used to refer to what aspects of a complex environment are salient to a decision maker at a particular time. Contexts change more rapidly than basic values or preferences. Problems press in, causing a re-orientation of attention to preferences."

[12] See The Independent, December 7th 1997:3 and The Times, May 28th 1998.

[13]The decisive factor here is one of relative issue proximity, not partisan or ideological congruence.

[14] Issue-associations are logically independent from voters attachments to a party's issue-set or issue positions. Partisan dealignment can occur without any change in partisan issue-associations. Indeed, it is not implausible to argue that dealignment partially derive from the stability of issue-associations and the consequent perception among voters that old cleavage-based parties are increasingly irrelevant to contemporary concerns.

[15]The association of Hoover and the Republican party with the Great Depression locked the Republicans out of the presidency until 1968 with the exception of the Eisenhower years--and

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

even these two Republican wins demanded that the President embrace an activist and interventionist agenda (including the extension of New Deal policies, such as social security). Just as Clinton re-labeled himself a "new" Democrat and Britain's Tony Blair has renamed his party "New Labour" in an attempt to disown electorally damaging issue-associations, Eisenhower tried to disassociate himself from the Hoover years by heralding a doctrine of "Modern Republicanism".

[16] To avoid resistance from within the party and circumvent the delays of working through the formal channels of party policy making, Labour relied upon outside policy commissions (which proved to be a most useful means of marginalizing the trade unions in economic policy decisions). See Wickham-Jones, 1997.

[17] As one observer satirically commented prior to the 1997 election, "The debate about welfare has turned on its head: Scrooge has allegedly become Gatsby. For most of the time since 1979, Labour attacked the government for stinginess. Then in 1995 Tony Blair, the Labour leader, promised to 'think the unthinkable' about welfare and now accused the Tories of spending too much." (The Economist, Election Briefing, 1997; 36).

[18] In the aftermath of the 1994 mid-term elections when the Republicans took control of both houses of Congress for the first time in forty years, Clinton, with spectacular speed, re-invented his image from old "tax-and-spend" Democrat to new "slash-and-burn" Democrat. The seeming ease of the transformation, however, owed much to its individualistic nature. Having said this, it did not run deep in voters minds. When Clinton abandoned the middle class tax cut it had relatively little effect on his ratings because so few voters believed the "liberal" president would cut taxes anyway (Weatherford and McDonnell, 1996; 424). Conversely, George Bush was widely perceived to be electorally punished in 1992 due to his breach of the now infamous pledge, "read my lips, no new taxes". Voters believed the president, they expected no new taxes, and sought retribution at the polls.

[19] There is an extensive literature on the "parties matter" thesis. For a sample see Castles and McKinlay, 1979; Castles, 1982; Lewis-Beck and Rice, 1985; Hibbs, 1987, 1992; Gerand, 1988; Grofman, Griffin and Glazer, 1990; Poole and Rosenthal, 1991; Castles and Mitchell, 1992; Laver and Hunt, 1992; Blais, Blake and Dion, 1993; Castles, 1993; Morton, 1993; Alt and Lowry, 1994; Klingemann et al, 1994; Huber and Inglehart, 1995.

[20] For a good analysis of institutional roles see Searing (1991). See Crawford and Ostrom, (1995) for an interesting discussion of institutional terminology.

[21] There has been a significant movement in the attitudes of the British public regarding majoritarian institutions. Owing much to the efforts of Charter 88, a pressure group for constitutional reform, two of the three major parties addressed the issue of proportional representation and devolution at the 1997 election. The current Labour government has already delivered a referendum on devolution and has pledged itself to one on proportional representation. Similarly, within their first month in office, the new Labour government gave the Bank of England an unprecedented degree of independence--a move to reassure markets of Labour's commitment to price stability. Interestingly, this may be part of a wider trend. Institutional change across advanced industrial democracies shows a gradual movement away from power-concentration. Arguably, centralized institutions may be less and less appropriate for mature democracies. See May (1978) for a compelling analysis of the virtues of consensus democracy.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

[22] In a somewhat dubious argument, Neustadt (1965) claimed that the British civil service and the US Congress place equivalent constraints upon their respective executives.

[23] APL's need not be head of government. However, they must be able to exercise significant authority over policy.

[24] While federalism may help leaders implement unwelcome measures, power-sharing increases the risk of policy challenge and reversal. Access points are not only relevant during the pre-enactment period. Veto players are often most effective after the fact--when the consequences of painful measures become clear and when concerned parties have had an opportunity to mobilize. In the case of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, Clinton was promising concessions on the five year lifetime benefit limit *before* the bill was signed. Several states initiated law suits against the federal government immediately following its enactment. In less than a year, Florida had filed a suit claiming that the Welfare Reform Act placed a crippling financial burden upon the state (in excess of $1 billion per annum) owing to its large number of legal immigrants. In short, the opportunities for minority veto associated with consensus democracies are not constrained to the pre-approval period. Unpopular policies might stand a greater chance of being enacted where blame can be diffused, yet they also stand a greater chance of being undermined or dismantled--especially where there is a legal basis for policy challenge (e.g. where judicial review or federalism give rise to a series of constitutionally defined relationships).

[25] The capacity to shift welfare responsibilities to subnational units, of course, is not an opportunity shared by all federal systems. Canada, Germany and Australia, for instance, are constrained by either legal or cultural commitments to national standards in social policy provision (Coleman and Skogstad, 1995; Pierson, 1995). The blame avoidance opportunities deriving from inter-governmental power-sharing largely benefit what Pierson terms "decentralized" federations, such as the United States, where subnational units have the *authority* and *incentives* to behave autonomously (Pierson, 1995; 456-7). Unified market conditions in conjunction with considerable state autonomy over social policy, provides the states with both the incentives and ability to minimize welfare provision (to attract capital and repel welfare claimants). Thus, decentralized federations have a two-pronged effect: a)they facilitate blame avoidance through the transfer of social policy responsibilities to subnational governments, and b)provide subnational governments with incentives to residualize welfare provisions further via the dynamics of market competition.

[26] The use of states as policy laboratories helps reduce the uncertainty associated with major policy reform. In the United States, plans like the forerunner to "Wisconsin Works" were upheld as evidence that welfare could be more effectively addressed at the state level.

[27] From their comparative analysis of left-wing retrenchment in New Zealand and Australia, Castles et al (1996) partially attribute the more incremental pace of Australian reform to its less majoritarian institutions.

[28] The United States is often treated as a mode of coalition government in comparative research. Yet the comparison may only be partially valid as far as the pursuit of unpopular policies is concerned. The public exposure of the American president exceeds that of virtually any other democratically elected leader. Despite the presidency's rather low capacity for policy leadership, public expectations remain immense (Rose, 1988). While the "expectations gap" may have been overstated (Jones, 1991b; Pious, 1996), it does appear that the Chief

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Executive gets the worst of both worlds: like coalition leaders he is in a poor position to act, but unlike power-sharing executives he is in a poor position to hide. As greater policy leadership flows from Congress, electoral blame is becoming increasingly shared between the two institutions--as demonstrated by the public's willingness to hold congressional Republicans culpable for the partial shut-downs of the federal government in the winter of 1995-1996. For a comparison of Western European coalition government and divided government in the United States see Laver and Shepsle (1991).

[29] The problem with the direct link between veto points, veto players and policy inaction is largely due to the fact that virtually all our assumptions about the policy process are predicated on leaders doing more not less.

[30] Note, for example, the impact of US interest groups protesting universal health care compared with those opposing the 1996 Welfare Reform Act. One could equally note the large financial investment in PACs, communications, policy think tanks by US business interests to further the conservative agenda during the 1980s (Ferguson and Rogers, 1986). The welfare state has been targeted by a rightist lobby composed of the Christian right and social and economic conservatives who see the evils of government assistance as ranging from family disintegration to economic stagnation.

[31] The term "crashing through" is usually associated with the post-1984 reform process adopted by the Lange government in New Zealand. The government's combative approach was specifically deployed as a means of eluding opponents (Douglas, 1993; Gregory, 1998).

[32] This type of interactive relationship certainly helps explain why the rhetoric of the right in majoritarian Britain far exceeded their more modest accomplishments. Despite the ardent anti-state agenda, the British state spent approximately 30 per cent more in 1996 than when the Tories came to power in 1979 (inflation adjusted). In the 1978-80 financial year general government expenditure stood at 44 per cent of GDP. Seventeen years later it was just two and a half per cent lower. One commentator summarized Conservative achievements in the weeks leading up to the 1997 general election, "in terms of the three simplest measures of fiscal policy--spending, revenues and borrowing--the Tories have left Britain almost unchanged.....after nearly two decades of anti-statism, the state's activities range about as broadly as ever" (The Economist, Election Briefing, 1997; 37).

[33] The impact of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act is staggering. It affects close to all the 12.8 million in receipt of welfare benefits (and 27 million qualifying for food stamps). The largest government welfare assistance program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) has been abolished--with estimated casualties in excess of one million children and, of course, many more adults. Welfare recipients have two years to find employment. No individual can receive more than five years of benefits in a lifetime (and states may reduce that level further).

[34] This is not to deny the importance of non-institutional explanations for a weak leftist presence in the United States. There are a large number of historical, cultural and institutional accounts for the state of the American left. Institutions, however, are certainly part of this explanatory set.

[35] The 1996 Welfare Reform Act contained a number of means of dividing supporters from opponents as well as opponents from each other. The measure lumps together those who can

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

garner little public sympathy (immigrants) with those who generate most concern (children). While the food stamp program survived the 1996 attack, billions of dollars in cuts were made by terminating payments to illegal aliens and legal non-immigrants. Eligibility rules have been tightened by refusing most non-citizens in receipt of Supplemental Security Income and food stamps any future benefits. The reforms are being implemented via a phase-in scheme. The consequences for all the 13 million affected by the act, therefore, are not immediate or simultaneous (thus diluting and staggering opposition).

[36] Note, for example, how post-1996 immigrants to the United States cannot qualify for the vast majority of federal benefits.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

References

Alesina, A. (1988) "Credibility and Policy Convergence in a Two-Party System with Rational Voters", *American Economic Review,* 78, 796-805.

Alt, J.E. and R.C. Lowery (1994) "Divided Government, Fiscal Institutions, and Budget Deficits: Evidence From the States", *American Political Science Review,* 88, 811-28.

Alvarez, R. and Nagler, J. (1995) "Economic Issues and the Perot Candidacy: Voter Choice in the 1992 Presidential Election", *American Journal of Political Science*, 39, 714-44.

Blais, A., D. Blake, and S. Dion (1993) "Do Parties Make A Difference? Parties and the Size of Government in Liberal Democracies", *American Journal of Political Science,* 37, 40-62.

Budge, Ian, David Robertson, and Derek Hearl (eds) (1987) *Ideology, Strategy and Party Change: Spatial Analysis of Post-War Election Programs in Nineteen Democracies,* London, Cambridge University Press.

Burns, James MacGregor (1963) *The Deadlock of Democracy,* Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall.

Burns, James MacGregor (1990) *Cobblestone Leadership: Majority Rule, Minority Power,* Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma Press.

Castles, Francis G. (ed.) (1982) *The Impact of Parties: Politics and Policies in Democratic Capitalist States,* London, Sage Publications.

Castles, Francis G. (ed.) (1993) *Families of Nations: Patterns of Public Policy in Western Democracies,* Aldershot, Dartmouth.

Castles, Francis G. and R.D. McKinley (1979) "Does Politics Matter: An Analysis of the Public Welfare Commitment in Advanced Democratic States", *European Journal of Political Research,* 7, 169-86.

Castles, Francis G. and D. Mitchell (1992) "Identifying Welfare State Regimes: The Links Between Politics, Instruments and Outcomes", *Governance,* 5, 1-26.

Castles, Francis, Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles (1996) *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand,* Australia, Allen and Unwin.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository. © The Author(s). European University Institute.

Castles, Francis, Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles (1996) "Introduction: Setting the Scene for Economic and Political Change" in *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand,* Australia, Allen and Unwin, 1-21.

Castles, Francis, Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles (1996) "Conclusion: The Great Experiment in Perspective", *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand,* Australia, Allen and Unwin, 211-23.

Castles, Francis (1998) *"When Politics Matters: Public Expenditures Development in an Era of Economic and Institutional Constraints"* Paper presented at the European Forum, Centre for Advanced Studies (European University Institute, 26 November).

Coleman, W.D. and Skogstad, G. (1995) "Neo-Liberalism, Policy Networks, and Policy Change: Agricultural Policy Reform in Australia and Canada", *Australian Journal of Political Science,* 30, 242-63.

Crawford, Sue E.S. and Elinor Ostrom (1995) "A Grammar of Institutions", *American Political Science Review,* 89, 582-600.

Crewe, I. (1986) "On the Death and Resurrection of Class Voting: Some Comments on How Britain Votes", *Political Studies,* 34, 620-38.

Dalton, R.J. (1988) *Citizen Politics in Western Democracies,* Chatham, N.J., Chatham House.

Dalton, R.J., S. Flanagan and P. Beck (eds) (1984) *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies,* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Douglas, R.O. (1993) *Unfinished Business,* Auckland, Random House.

Downs, Anthony (1957) *An Economic Theory of Democracy,* New York, Harper.

Druckman, James, N. (1998) *"Source Credibility and Framing Effects"*, Presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, September 3-6, 1998.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Easton, Brian and Rolf Gerritsen (1996) "Economic Reform: Parallels and Divergences" in Castles, Francis, Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles (eds) *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand,* Australia, Allen and Unwin, 22-47.

Elazar, Daniel (1984) *American Federalism: A View from the States*, (3rd ed.) New York, Harper & Row.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1996) "After the Golden Age: Welfare State Dilemmas in a Global Economy" in Esping-Andersen, G. (ed.) *Welfare States in Transition*, London Sage.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1996) "Welfare States Without Work: the Impasse of Labour Shedding and Familialism in Contiental European Social Policy" in Esping-Andersen G. (ed.) *Welfare States in Transition,* London, Sage.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1996) "Positive Sum Solutions in a World of Trade-Offs?" in Esping-Andersen, G (ed.) *Welfare States in Transition,* London, Sage.

Feldman, S. (1982) "Economic Self-Interest and Political Behavior", *American Journal of Political Science,* 26, 446-66.

Ferguson, Thomas and Joel Rogers (1986) *Right Turn: The Decline of the Democrats and the Future of American Politics,* New York, Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Ferrera, Maurizio (1997) "Re-Balancing the Welfare State in Southern Europe", *ECPR* News, 8, 4-5.

Franklin, Mark (1985) *The Decline of Class Voting in Britain,* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Franklin, Mark (1992) "Britain" in Mark N. Franklin et al. (eds) *Electoral Change, Responses to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Free, L. A. and H. Cantrill (1967) *The Political Beliefs of Americans: A Study of Public Opinion,* New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Gamble, Andrew (1994) *The Free Economy and the Strong State,* Second edition, London, Macmillan.

Gerand, J. (1988) "Explaining Government Growth in the United States", *American Political Science Review,* 82, 837-49.

Giddens, A. (1994) *Beyond Left and Right: The future of Radical Politics,* Cambridge, Polity.

Gregory, Robert (1998) *"The Changing Face of the State in New Zealand: Rolling Back the Public Service",* Prepared for the 1998 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, September 3-6, 1998.

Grodzins, M. (1960) "The Federal System" in *Goals for America,* Englewood Cliffs, Prenctice Hall.

Grofman, Bernard, Robert Griffen and Amihai Glazer (1990) "Identical Geography, Different Party: A Natural Experiment on the Magnitude of Partisan Differences in the US Senate, 1960-84" in R.J. Johnston, F.M. Shelly, and P.J. (eds) Taylor *Developments in Electoral Geography*, London, Routledge.

Hall, Peter (1983) "Policy Innovation and the Structure of the State: The Politics-Administration Nexus in France and Britain", *The Annals,* 466, 43-60.

Hall, Peter (1992) "The Movement From Keynesianism to Monetarism: Institutional Analysis and British Economic Policy in the 1970s" in S. Steinmo, K. Thelan and F. Longstreth (eds) *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hibbs, Douglas (1987) *The Political Economy of the Industrial Democracies,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Hibbs, Douglas (1992) "Partisan Theory After Fifteen Years", *European Journal of Political Economy,* 8, 361-373.

Hinich, M and P. Ordershook. (1970) "Plurality Maximizaiton Versus Vote Maximization: A Spacial Anaysis with Variable Participation", *American Political Science Review,* 64, 772-91.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Holliday, Ian (1997) "The Provision of Services: Trouble in Store for Labour?" in Geddes, A. and Tonge, J. (eds) *Labour's Landslide*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 120-132.

Huber, E., and R. Inglehart (1995) "Expert Interpretations of Party Space and Party Locations in 42 Societies", *Party Politics,* 1, 73-111.

Immergut, E. (1992) *Health Politics: Interests and Institutions in Western Europe,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1990) *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society,* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

James, C. (1992) *New Territory,* Wellington, Bridget Williams Books.

Jones, Charles O. (1991a) "The Diffusion of Responsibility: An Alternative Perspective", *Governance,* 4, 150-67.

Jones, Charles O. (1991b) "Meeting Low Expectations: Strategy and Prospects of the Bush Presidency" in Colin Campbell, S.J. and Bert A. Rockman (eds) *The Bush Presidency: First Appraisals*, Chatham, N.J., Chatham House.

Jones, Bryan D. (1995) *Reconceiving Decision-Making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kim. Hee Min (1997) "Explaining Ideological Swing in Western Democracies: A Comparative Analysis, 1952-1989", Paper Presented at the *International Political Science Association*'s XVII World Congress, Seoul, Korea.

Kinder, D. and D.R. Kiewiet (1979) "Economic Discontent and Political Behavior: The Role of Personal Grievances and Collective Economic Judgments in Congressional Voting", *American Journal of Political Science,* 23, 495-52.

King, A. "Why Labour Won--At Last" in King, A. (ed.) *New Labour Triumphs: Britain at the Polls,* Chatham, NJ, Chatham House, 177-208.

King, A. (1997) "The Night Itself" in King, A. (ed.) *New Labour Triumphs: Britain at the Polls,* Chatham, NJ, Chatham House, 1-14.

Kiser, Larry and Elinor Ostrom (1982) "Three Worlds of Action: A Methatheoretical Synthesis of Institutional Approaches" in Elinor Ostrom (ed.) *Strategies of Political Inquirey*, Beverly Hills, Sage.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.
© The Author(s). European University Institute.

Kitschelt, Herbert (1993) "Class Struggle and Social Democratic Party Strategy", *British Journal of Political Science* 23: 299-337.

Kitschelt, Herbert (1994) *The Transformation of European Social Democracy,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, Richard I. Hofferbert, and Ian Budge (1994) *Parties, Policies and Democracy,* Boulder, C.O., Westview Press.

Lau, Richard (1982) "Negativity in Political Perception", *Political Behavior,* 4, 353-77.

Lau, Richard (1985) "Two Explanations for Negativity Effects in Political Behavior", *American Journal of Political Science,* 29, 119-38.

Laver, Michael, and B. Hunt (1992) *Policy and Party Competition,* New York, Routledge.

Laver, Michael and Kenneth A. Shepsle (1990) "Coalitions and Cabinet Government", *American Political Science Review,* 84, 849-73.

Laver, Michael and Kenneth A. Shepsle (1991) '"Divided Government: America is Not Exceptional,' *Governance,* 4, 250-69.

Laver, Michael and Kenneth A. Shepsle (1993) "Agenda Formation and Cabinet Government" in Riker, William H. (ed.) *Agenda Formation,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 169-82.

Le Grand, J (1990) "The State of Welfare" in Hills, J. (ed.) *The State of Welfare: The Welfare State in Britain Since 1974,* London, Oxford University Press, 338-62.

Lewis-Beck, M. (1983) "Economics and the French Voter: A Microanalysis", *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 47, 347-60.

Lewis-Beck, M. and Tom Rice (1985) "Government Growth in the United States", *Journal of Politics,* 47, 2-27.

Light, P. C. (1991) *The President's Agenda,* revised ed., Baltimore, John Hopkins.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Lijphart, Arend (1984) *Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One Countries,* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Lijphart, Arend (1989) "Democratic Political Systems: Types, Cases, Causes and Consequences", *Journal of Theoretical Politics,* 1, 33-48.

Lowi, T. (1972) "Four Systems of Policy, Politics, and Choice", *Public Administration Review,* 32, 298-310.

Lowi, T. J. (1979) *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States,* New York, W.W. Norton.

Magara, Hideko (1997) 'The Dilemma of the Italian Center-Left Government : Parties and Unions in the Politico-Economic Regime Transition', Paper presented at IPSA XVII World Congress, Seoul, Korea, 17-21 August.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics,* New York, Free Press.

May, John D. 1978. "Defining Democracy: A Bid for Coherence and Consensus", *Political Studies* 26:1-14.

McClosky, H. and A. Brill (1983) *Dimensions of Tolerance: What Americans Believe About Civil Liberties,* New York, Basic Books.

Morton, Rebecca B. (1993) "Incomplete Information and Ideological Explanations of Platform Divergence", *American Political Science Review,* 87, 382-92.

Neustadt, Richard (1965) "White House and White Hall" in Anthony Mughan and Samuel C. Patterson (eds) *Political Leadership in Democratic Societies,* Chicago, Ill, Nelson Hall, 243-258.

Olson, Mancur (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups,* Cambridge, Harvard Univeristy Press.

Palfrey, Thomas R. (1984) "Spacial Equilibrium With Entry", *Review of Economic Studies,* 51, 139-56.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.
©The Author(s). European University Institute.

Papadakis, Elim and Stephen Rainbow (1996) "Labour and Green Politics: Contrasting Strategies for Environmental Reform" in Castles, Francis, Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles (eds) *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand,* Australia, Allen and Unwin, 107-128.

Peterson, Paul E. Barry G. Rabe, and Kenneth Wong (1986) *When Federalism Works,* Washington, D.C., Brookings.

Pierson, Paul (1994) *Dismantling the Welfare State? Reagan, Thatcher, and the Politics of Retrenchment,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Pierson, Paul (1995) "Fragmented Welfare States: Federal Institutions and the Development of Social Policy", *Governance,* 8, 449-78.

Pierson, Paul (1996) "The New Politics of the Welfare State", *World Politics,* 48, 143-79.

Pious, Richard M. (1996) *The Presidency,* Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Poole, Keith T. and Howard Rosenthal (1991) "Patterns of Congressional Voting", *American Journal of Political Science,* 35, 228-78.

Powell, G.B. (1989) "Constitutional Design and Citizen Electoral Control", *Journal of Theoretical Politics,* 1, 107-30.

Prothro, J. and C. Grigg (1960) "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement", *Journal of Politics,* 22, 276-94.

Riker, William H. (1993) "Introduction" in Riker, William H (ed.) *Agenda Formation,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1-10.

Robertson, David (1976) *A Theory of Party Competition,* New York, Wiley.

Rose, Richard (1988) *The Post-Modern President,* Chatham, N.J., Chatham House Publishers.

Rose, Richard and I. McAllister (1986) *The Voters Begin to Choose,* Beverly Hills, C.A., Sage.

Saarlvik, Bo and Ivor Crewe (1983) *Decade of Dealignment,* New York, Cambridge University Press.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Scharpf, Fritz (1988) "The Joint Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration", *Public Administration,* 66, 239-78.

Schmidt, Manfred G. (1996) "When Parties Matter: A Review of the Possibilities and Limits of Partisan Influence on Public Policy", *European Journal of Political Research,* 30, 155-83.

Searing, Donald D. (1991) "Roles, Rules and Rationality in the New Institutionalism", *American Political Science Review,* 85, 1239-60.

Stewart, William H. (1984) *Concepts of Federalism,* Lanham, M.D.,University Press of America.

Sullivan, John, James Piereson, and George Marcus (1982) *Political Tolerance and American Democracy,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Sullivan, John, M. Shamir, N. Roberts and P. Walsh (1984) "Political Tolerance and the Structure of Mass Attitudes", *Comparative Political Studies,* 17, 319-44.

Sundquist, James L. (1992) *Constitutional Reform and Effective Government,* revised ed. Washington D.C., Brookings.

Thelen, K. and S. Steinmo (1992) "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics" in S. Steinmo, K. Thelen and F. Longstreth (eds) *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Vowles, Jack and Ian McAllister (1996) "Electoral Foundations and Electoral Consequences: From Convergence to Divergence" in Castles, Francis, Rolf Gerritsen and Jack Vowles (eds) *The Great Experiment: Labour Parties and Public Policy Transformation in Australia and New Zealand,* Australia, Allen and Unwin, 192-210.

Wallis, J. and Dollery, B. (1997) "Autonomous Policy Leadership: Steering a Polic Process in the Direction of a Policy Quest", *Governance: An International Journal Policy and Administration*, 10, 1-22.

Weatherford, M. Stephen and Lorraine M. McDonnell (1996) "Clinton and the Economy: The Paradox of Policy Success and Political Mishap", *Political Science Quarterly,* 111, 403-36.

Weaver, R. Kent (1986) "The Politics of Blame Avoidance", *Journal of Public Policy,* 6, 371-98.

Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository. The author(s). European University Institute.

Weaver, R. Kent and Bert A. Rockman (1993) *Do Institutions Matter? Government Capabilities in the United States and Abroad,* Washington D.C., Brookings.

Wickham-Jones, Mark (1997) *"The Management of the Economy: How the Conservatives Lost the Economic Argument",* Typescript, University of Bristol.

Wildavsky, A. (1986) *Budgeting: A Comparative Theory of the Budgetary Process,* Boston, Little Brown.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

EUI WORKING PAPERS

EUI Working Papers are published and distributed by the
European University Institute, Florence

Copies can be obtained free of charge
– depending on the availability of stocks – from:

The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

Please use order form overleaf

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Publications of the European University Institute

To

The Publications Officer
European University Institute
Badia Fiesolana
I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI) – Italy
Telefax No: +39/55/4685 636
e-mail: publish@datacomm.iue.it
http://www.iue.it

From

Name .....
Address.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

- ❑ Please send me a complete list of EUI Working Papers
- ❑ Please send me a complete list of EUI book publications
- ❑ Please send me the EUI brochure Academic Year 1999/2000

Please send me the following EUI Working Paper(s):

No, Author .....
Title: .....
No, Author .....
Title: .....
No, Author .....
Title: .....
No, Author .....
Title: .....

Date .....

Signature .....

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

Working Papers of the European Forum

EUF No. 95/1
Diemut BUBECK
A Feminist Approach to Citizenship

EUF No. 95/2
Renaud DEHOUSSE/Thomas CHRISTIANSEN (eds)
What Model for the Committee of the Regions? Past Experiences and Future Perspectives

EUF No. 95/3
Jens BONKE
The Concepts of Work and Care - An Economic Perspective Applied to Britain and Denmark

EUF No. 95/4
Jens BONKE
Education, Work and Gender - An International Comparison

EUF No. 95/5
Henriëtte MAASSEN VAN DEN BRINK/Wim GROOT
Household Production and Time Allocation, the End of the Male Chauvinist Model

EUF No. 95/6
Andrés BARRERA-GONZÁLEZ
Language, Collective Identities and Nationalism in Catalonia, and Spain in General

EUF No. 95/7
Diemut BUBECK
Gender, Work and Citizenship: Between Social Realities and Utopian Visions

EUF No. 95/8
Miriam A. GLUCKSMANN
Gendered Economies of Time: Women Workers in North-West England

***

EUF No. 96/1
David PURDY
Jobs, Work and Citizens' Income: Four Strategies and a New Regime

EUF No. 96/2
Barry EICHENGREEN/Andrew ROSE/Charles WYPLOSZ
Contagious Currency Crises

EUF No. 96/3
Yasemin SOYSAL
Boundaries and Identity: Immigrants in Europe

EUF No. 96/4
Yasemin SOYSAL
Changing Parameters of Citizenship and Claims-Making: Organized Islam in European Public Spheres

EUF No. 96/5
Giovanna PROCACCI
Poor Citizens. Social Citizenship and the Crisis of Welfare States

***

EUF No. 98/1
Yuri KAZEPOV
Citizenship and Poverty. The Role of Institutions in the Structuring of Social Exclusion

EUF No. 98/2
Massimo LA TORRE
Citizenship and Social Rights. A European Perspective

EUF No. 98/3
Ewa MORAWSKA
Structuring Migration in a Historical Perspective: The Case of Traveling East Europeans

EUF No. 98/4
Virginie GUIRAUDON
International Human Rights Norms and their Incorporation: The Protection of Aliens in Europe

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

ISTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO EUROPEO
BIBLIOTECA

EUF No. 98/5
Patrick WEIL
The Transformation of Immigration Policies. Immigration Control and Nationality Laws in Europe: A Comparative Approach

EUF No. 98/6
Public Services and Citizenship in European Law
Mark FREEDLAND
Law, Public Services, and Citizenship - New Domains, New Regimes?
Silvana SCIARRA
Labour Law - A Bridge Between Public Services and Citizenship Rights

***

EUF No. 99/1
Virginie GUIRAUDON
The Marshallian Triptych Re-Ordered: The Role of Courts and Bureaucracies in Furthering Migrant Social Rights

EUF No. 99/2
Ewa MORAWSKA
The New-Old Transmigrants, their Transnational Lives, and Ethnicization: A Comparison of 19th/20th and 20th/21st C. Situations

EUF No. 99/3
Ann Shola ORLOFF
Ending the Entitlement of Poor Mothers, Expanding the Claims of Poor Employed Parents: Gender, Race, Class in Contemporary US Social Policy

EUF No. 99/4
Fiona ROSS
"Beyond Left and Right": The New *Partisan* Politics of Welfare

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.

© The Author(s). European University Institute.
Digitised version produced by the EUI Library in 2020. Available Open Access on Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository.