

# Political Science and Sociology\*

ERIK ALLARDT  
University of Helsinki

A hybrid normally called political sociology is found on the boundary between political science and sociology. It is from many points of view an irritating term. Political sociology sounds like a mistake or at least a misnomer. The primary goal of political sociology is to analyze politics, not to set up a political program of action. Political sociology is in this sense no more political than other branches of sociology. Why, we may ask, not use the term 'the sociology of politics', which moreover corresponds better to the general terminology for special branches of sociology? However, there are certain reasons for maintaining a distinction between political sociology and the sociology of politics. It is a matter of two different lines of development.

Maurice Duverger maintains in his influential *Sociologie Politique* that political science and political sociology are synonyms and have the same basic problems.<sup>1</sup> On the whole, he is inclined to regard laws that apply to politics as sociological laws. Many people are perhaps unhappy over the growing specialization within science and try to remedy it by tying different fields together. Perhaps professors of political science are often inclined to regard political sociology as a part of political science and perhaps professors of sociology sometimes consider their discipline as the general social science in which the study of politics is included as a branch. They speak then primarily as administrators. However, no administrative arrangements, such as the existence of the areas as academic subjects, for example, can conceal the fact that political sociology represents a research tradition that differs in certain interesting respects from political science and also from sociology. When I speak here of political sociology and the sociology of politics as distinct from political science, it is not my intention to propagandize for any definite arrangement of academic studies or for definite teaching positions. The expressions political sociology and the sociology of politics, which can be readily exchanged for other terms as far as I am concerned, aim at describing certain research traditions and lines of development that are important in the scientific study of politics.

\* Paper presented at the Second Scandinavian Conference of Political Science, Finland 19–22nd August 1968. In writing this paper the author was influenced by Giovanni Sartori's discussion of the subject at the Third International Conference of Comparative Sociology in Berlin, January, 1968.

## The Differences do not Concern the Method

Before I go into the different research traditions it is important to forestall the idea that the difference between political science and sociology lies in some way in the methods that are used. There was a time when one readily spoke of sociological methods. By this was meant both methods for the collection of data like interviews, questionnaires, etc., and methods for analysis like multidimensional scaling, multivariate analysis, etc. I feel that it can be calmly said that there are not any special sociological methods. The methods that were previously described as sociological methods are used today in most social science. It is reasonable to say that methods of investigation are dependent upon the sort of information that is available for the relevant units of analysis and upon the problems involved. It is probably correct to state that the sociologists, at least in comparison with political scientists until the middle of the 1950's were methodological innovators. Under no circumstance can the same assertion be made about the present decade. It is even possible that more methodological innovations have come in recent years from political science than from sociology. At least, many political scientists have stood in the foreground as far as methodological innovations are concerned in comparative analysis, content analysis, programming of data analysis, planning of data archives, etc. Approximately ten years ago there was a quarrel within political science over whether political science was a behavioral science or not. What was then called the behavioral revolution consisted primarily of demands for methodological innovation in the same direction as sociology and psychology had undergone earlier. In spite of the fact that pockets of rather irrational opposition against behavioral points of view can certainly still be found, we can say that the behavioral revolution has by and large been carried out. Modern field research and analytical methods now exist side by side with more traditional methods within political science. By 1961 Robert Dahl in a famous article on the behavioral approach could propose an epitaph for a monument to a successful protest.<sup>2</sup> The traditional methods within political science have been conceptual analysis and historical description. During the more recent period it has been possible to see an increased interest in historical methodology within sociology. Sociology's great classic writers, Durkheim, Marx and Max Weber, to mention the most going names, also worked primarily with concept analysis and historical method. Nonetheless, I do not believe that any interesting or essential differences between political science and sociology can be found on the methodological level.

## The Explanatory Variables are Different

When describing differences between branches of science it is normally most practical to try to state how explanatory or independent variables are chosen in each field. Sociology investigates everything between heaven and earth – art, literature, religion, sexual behavior, buying habits, power conditions, narcotics misuse, politics etc. The

common element is that sociology attempts to explain these manifestations with factors that are connected with the social system or, perhaps even more restricted, the social structure. A faithful sociologist tries to reduce everything to sociology pure and simple. For him, politics is an epiphenomenon, a manifestation that can be explained on the basis of existing social and economic groups, but which does not itself offer or contain explanatory factors. It is for this approach that I wish to reserve the term the sociology of politics. Politics is then one among innumerable social phenomena that can be explained by factors in the social structure.

Scientific areas can not only be characterized by their explanatory variables but also by the variables that one assumes or tries to hold constant during the analysis. Within the social sciences it is often the case that it is assumed that the phenomena which are investigated by near-by disciplines are by and large constant or in any case need not be studied during the actual analysis. Thus within the sociology of politics it is assumed that the very stuff of politics, decisions, compromises, planning etc. are self-evident and constant while variations are to be explained exclusively on the basis of the social structure, i.e., the different interests of social and economic groups. This may irritate many others, but within sociology it is considered fairly legitimate to act in this manner. What is more astonishing is that many political scientists have entirely swallowed this sociological approach. During the last few decades there have been many political scientists who have more or less gone in exclusively for analyses of the social background of political phenomena, whether it is a matter of voter behavior, elite-recruitment or the causes of political conflicts. It is here of little consequence whether the explanatory variables have been sociological or psychological. It has presumably been fairly fruitful that some political scientists have in this way appeared as representatives of the sociology of politics, but if this tendency increases it will mean, as far as I see it, that political science will lose its identity. It cannot reasonably be the task of political science to reduce all politics to sociology.

It can be said with a certain degree of correctness that political science takes up where sociology leaves off. Political science has traditionally worked with political actions, political decisions, intrigues, political plans, political ideas and ideologies, the influence of constitutions on politics, party structure, etc. It seems reasonable to state that these manifestations are still central to political science. Politics can of course be interpreted as a circular sequence of events. The rulers take measures or use authority and the citizens react in turn and can influence the rulers. In any case, the point of departure is that someone first uses, manipulates or expresses rules for power and authority. Previously, political science worked perhaps rather one-sidedly with the reciprocal relations of political actions, in other words with how certain political factors affected other political factors. Contact with sociology has been beneficial to the extent that political scientists have more and more become interested in how certain actions affect not only politics but the entire social structure and culture. However, the essential thing, both now and earlier, has been that it is assumed that politics can be an explanatory factor, that certain changes cannot be reduced to or explained by factors that measure people's social, economic and psychological roles. Certain areas of political science appear from this point of view to be especially

central. Perhaps this applies especially to the research that deals with administration, management and political organization. Here the central task of explaining how politics can be an explanatory factor, that certain changes can not be reduced to or it is difficult in political science to go along with a sociological reduction of politics. Nor it is possible to go along with a reduction of politics to psychology. Politics is consequently *sui generis* something of importance, and it has quite independently a strong influence on a great deal of what people do or abstain from doing.

### The Stratification Aspect

Perhaps the most typical approach among sociologists interested in the analysis of politics can be summed up by the term the stratification aspect. This approach originally derives from Karl Marx and his endeavor to explain all conflicts and changes in society as originating in the class division of society. In modern sociology social class is used in a considerably broader sense than by Marx and it can also be said that the essential element in the Marxian tradition in modern sociology has not been his economic determinism but his striving to seek explanations in the social structure of society.<sup>3</sup> The stratification aspect represents a rather natural approach in sociology. When a representative of the sociology of politics is confronted with political values and ideologies it is natural for him to ask in the first instance whose interests are being articulated through them. On the other hand, it is also assumed that group interests are related to all possible groups and not only to groups defined on the basis of who owns and who does not own the means of production. To assume that politics and political behavior can be explained by reference to group interests is in agreement with the tradition from Marx. Researchers like Johan Galtung or the Stanford sociologists Bo Andersson, Joe Berger and Morris Zelditch, who in their analysis have explained aggression and political action as effects of low status crystallization or as man's attempt to produce a balance between his status position in different rank hierarchies, also apply a sort of stratification perspective.<sup>4</sup> The explanations are made with reference to the social structure. If I also here speak of approaches that are typical of sociology and not political science, there is indeed not any water-tight bulkhead between the two areas. As is wellknown, political science has also had representatives who have strongly pushed the idea that everything ought to be explained in terms of the interests of groups that can be localized in the social structure. Perhaps the most typical interest group theoretician in political science was Arthur Bentley, who formed a school and was once considered, but is hardly done so now, as a founder of a special school of political science.<sup>5</sup>

One of the most prominent sociologists in the study of political phenomena during the last few decades has been Seymour Martin Lipset. Many are acquainted with his books but nonetheless have perhaps neglected to note that he has gone through a rather striking, and, what I believe to be symptomatic, development. In his earlier works he was a typical representative of what I have called the sociology of politics (I have not yet made it entirely clear how this differs from political sociology). In

Lipset's *Political Man*, which in a way was a summary of his production up to 1959, he systematically and thoroughly adopts the stratification aspect. He says among other things that in every democracy conflicts between social groups are expressed through the party system, which at the core represents a democratic transformation of the class struggle. True, he points out that the gulf between social classes is not the only cleavage that is expressed through the political parties, but nevertheless it can be said that the main thread in his book deals with the question of how political behavior can be explained on the basis of social class. He says that the struggle between parties is a struggle between social classes more than anything else. He points out how in all developed states the low income groups tend to vote with the left and the high income groups with the right. The exceptions to this rule are also seen in the light of a stratification aspect. Lipset cites the aphorism: "Each country has its South," and thereby hints that exceptions to the tie between social class and political behavior only occur in underdeveloped areas that have not yet been modernized.<sup>6</sup>

In an important programmatic statement from 1957 Reinhard Bendix and Lipset say that the primary incentive for the studies of voter behavior has been an interest group theory that can in the final analysis be traced back to Karl Marx' theory of class consciousness.<sup>7</sup> It is a fact that Marx is by no means the only classical writer whose influence can be traced in Lipset's *Political Man*. The heritage from Alexis de Tocqueville is as strong. However it is remarkable how Marx and de Tocqueville clearly deal with the same problems, even if they reach opposite conclusions on practically all points. De Tocqueville is the great classic writer on pluralism and is continuously concerned about the fact that the social basis for conflicts will disappear in the modern mass society. Therefore, only the existence of strong and independent social groups and the cleavages between them can guarantee a necessary community of values for the society – a consensus. De Tocqueville, however, constantly seeks the conditions for stability and consensus in the social structure and also uses in this sense a stratification aspect.<sup>8</sup>

It can hardly be denied that often in the study of politics it has been possible to reach fruitful results by making use of a stratification aspect. It is also natural for a sociologist to ask whether the party structure actually corresponds to solidary social groups that can be identified on the basis of other criteria besides political ones. For example, it seems fairly natural to point out that while the party structure in many countries is to a rather large extent the same today as in the 1920's, the social structure has undergone very large changes and consequently new cleavages that have not been expressed in the present party structure can be expected. By comparing the party structure with the social structure, sociologists have often been able to point out and predict future conflicts. Sociologists who write about politics also speak quite often about the future and not about what exists at the present. It could be said that they often speak of *emerging* instead of *existing* cleavages.<sup>9</sup> However it is important to observe that in any case it is nearly always a matter of guessing. It is by no means always emerging conflicts or assumed latent antagonisms between social groups that express themselves politically or lead to manifest

conflicts. The stratification aspect is often fruitful, but obviously it is also rather incomplete. On the whole the question of when a party can be said to represent a definite social group is a very central and difficult question, undoubtedly much more difficult than what the sociologists have often imagined. It is also fairly easy to find examples of political cleavages that can not be explained on the basis of social class or from any aspect of the social structure. In Finland, as in many other countries, three leftist parties are competing for the favor of the voters. Although according to many criteria the People's Democrats (Communists) in Finland have on the average a somewhat lower social position than the Social Democrats, it is apparent that the differences between the voter support of these two left parties can not be effectively explained on the basis of the class division of the society. A Marxist can of course say that the lack of unity depends on the fact that the working class has not yet obtained complete political maturity, but it becomes a bit tiring to have to wait for historical necessities to come about. In order to obtain a satisfactory explanation, we must resort to political traditions that are deeply imbedded in the existing political organizations themselves. Philip Converse has pointed out that when one wants to predict in France how a person will vote, his attitude towards religion is a considerably safer criterion than all known and accessible criteria of social class.<sup>10</sup> Thus there are also in developed countries other cleavages that are often as important as social class. It can perhaps be said that religion belongs to the superstructure that reflects the society's class divisions, but this explanation is unnecessarily complicated and does not fulfil reasonable demands for parsimony when an explanation can in any case be reached in simpler ways. Many political scientists as well as many sociologists have studied the British Tory working-class voter and in this case the research results point definitely to how political organizations have independent effects, so to speak, on political behavior. Whether or not the British worker has contacts with the trade union movement seems to be decisive for his political preferences.<sup>11</sup> Two American researchers, Denton Morrison and Keith Warner, have recently been able to show in an analysis of militant farmers in Michigan and Wisconsin how factors that are connected with political organization explain the militancy of the farmers considerably more effectively than all available indicators of economic status.<sup>12</sup> Hence there exists a whole raft of studies that show how political organization and political traditions that are passed on by political organizations have independent effects on political behavior. To be sure, it is a circumstance we all are aware of but this point of view has often, in any case, been missing in the analyses that I have considered typical of the sociology of politics. Students of political behavior do not only strive to present well-documented results but they are also oriented toward building paradigms, theories and frames of reference. The effects of political organization have of course been well known, but at the same time they have often been left outside of the paradigms and theories that have been used as points of departure when voter's preferences are explained. Be that as it may, in the study of political behavior the so-called stratification aspect is both fruitful and important, but it is also highly incomplete and must be supplemented with data about the effects of political institutions.

## The Institutional Aspect

When one moves from explanations that have their origin in social groups towards explanations that stress the effects of political action itself, one also moves from sociology towards political science. I have already pointed out that the core of political science consists of investigating quite simply the effects of political actions and political institutions. Of course this is no small task. Politics cannot be regarded as only another item in the long row of institutional areas of society. Politics is, among other things, the institutional area where most great decisions about society are shaped. We can place the institutional aspect in contrast to the stratification aspect. It consists of the assumption that social and political institutions themselves can generate and shape changes. Often the political institutions are then seen as organs with the help of which the society adjusts to tensions and conflicts. In any case it seems reasonable to say that if the stratification aspect is typical of sociology the institutional aspect is typical of political science. Once again we can say that, thank goodness, there are no water-tight bulkheads between the disciplines. There have also been – and are – important theoreticians in sociology who stress the institutional aspect. The most important one at the present is Talcott Parsons, who has strongly stressed in his analysis of social change how different institutional areas have been increasingly, differentiated from each other and how the political institutions have been increasingly separated from economic and cultural institutions. In Parsons' neo-evolutionist perspective the political institutions have become increasingly more independent as agents, so to speak, of social change and social influence in general.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly the institutional perspective is also important in sociology. But it has been particularly used within political science and the sociologists have much to learn here from political science. One can hardly avoid wondering over the fact that satisfactory theories do not exist in sociology and social science on the whole for social planning, or shall we say, social policy planning. This depends perhaps at least partly upon the fact that sociologists have been too imprisoned in a stratification perspective and hold the premise that changes as a rule spring from latent interests among groups in the social structure. Consequently, contact with political science, particularly in the area of macro-sociology, is very important for sociology. Most of the great classical writers and theoreticians of sociology like Marx, Max Weber, Pareto, Simmel and Durkheim have had comprehensive knowledge of political conditions and in certain cases they can quite correctly be classified as classic writers within political science as well. However, I am not certain that sociologists in the Scandinavian countries have been aware of the need for contact with political science in the realm of macro-sociological theory-building.

Lipset's *Political Man* has here been held up as an example of a consistent application of the stratification aspect. We have also mentioned the possibility of tracing an interesting development in Lipset's writings, but the description of this development has so far been omitted. Let us say that a noticeable feature of Lipset's later production is an increased interest in the institutional aspect. Among other things it is a striking characteristic of his recently published *Revolution and Counterrevolu-*



tion. *Change and Persistence in Social Structures*, which can also be said to be a sort of summary of his work during the past ten years.<sup>14</sup> Here, as in other books, we can trace an increased number of references to classical writers who have represented an institutional aspect like Max Weber and Mozei Ostrogorski, and an increased curiosity for the fact that many political institutions nevertheless are astonishingly stable and survive both war and the people who have acted within them. This tendency has been theoretically more stringently expressed in Lipset's and Stein Rokkan's brilliant introduction to *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*.<sup>15</sup> In this work it is no longer asked whether the party system corresponds to the social structure but rather how, under what conditions and by what political processes cleavages and interest antagonisms in the social structure are transformed into the party system and how the party system in turn influences integration and the allocation of resources in the society.

### Political Sociology as a Hybrid and Border Area

Lipset's new book as well as the interesting essay by him and Stein Rokkan are not isolated events but rather symptomatic of the development that has taken place within political sociology. Note that I am now speaking of political sociology and not about the sociology of politics. Among political sociologists the view has been stressed more and more that political sociology is the name for the area of research that endeavors to unite the stratification and the institutional aspects. The stratification aspect is by no means absent in Lipset's new books or in the introduction by him and Rokkan, but it is now combined with the institutional aspect. The sociology of politics on the other hand is in conventional terms a special area of sociology that regards politics as an epiphenomenon and is occupied with a sociological reduction of politics. Nor are we dealing with a completely new development within political sociology. Scholars like Max Weber and Robert Michels combined the stratification and the institutional aspects.

This means that political sociology stands considerably nearer to political science than does the sociology of politics. It also means that political sociology is not actually a special area but in fact a hybrid and a genuine border area. I repeat that if the terms political sociology and the sociology of politics are not liked by some people they can exchange them for others. The fact remains that the tendencies that have been described do exist.

It can appear presumptuous of the representatives of political sociology to regard their area as something special and independent to a certain degree from both sociology and political science. It is also true that political sociology enlists recruits among both political scientists and sociologists. The Italian political scientist Giovanni Sartori has been particularly keen in stressing the distinction presented in this paper between political sociology and the sociology of politics.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps the division has also been institutionalized to a degree. The International Sociological



Association has for a long time had a special committee for political sociology. The committee's conferences have normally been attended by approximately an equal number of political scientists and sociologists. The latest development is a search for new working forms for the committee in co-operation with both the ISA and International Political Science Association.

It is of course a cheap trick to refer to an already existing institutionalization. However it can also be stated that a direct need exists for a special border area between sociology and political science. Certain problems, both theoretical and methodological, are so difficult that they can hardly be solved if we do not have a group of persons who concentrate on the border area without needing at the same time to submerge themselves in a mass of problems that may be important in political science and sociology respectively, but are peripheral from the point of view of political sociology.

### Conflict and Consensus in Political Sociology

A central problem in political sociology is the question of the conditions for conflict and consensus in society, and the connection between conflict and consensus. In political sociology it has been common in the 1960's to make a distinction between conflict and consensus theoreticians. This distinction has also been made within sociology and it is also apparent that a solution of problems related to this distinction needs help and impulses from political science.

When we speak of conflict theoreticians as opposed to consensus theoreticians, we do not mean all sociologists and political scientists who attempt to formulate theories of the origin and consequences of conflict. A large part of what at present goes under the name of conflict research falls outside of this. The term conflict theoreticians designates primarily researchers and thinkers who proceed from the view that conflict relations are crucial in the structure of society, or that at least the most productive way of describing a society is to indicate which groups are in conflict and which are allied with other groups. The basic assumptions among conflict theoreticians are by and large the following:

- (1) Society consists of groups that have different interests;
- (2) Societies hold together and can exist as stable structures owing to the fact that a certain group or certain groups in coalition with each other can persuade other groups by means of power and force to serve their interests; and
- (3) Societies are changed when the division of power in the society is changed.

Power and force are thus central terms among conflict theoreticians. A society is by no means so simple that it can be described satisfactorily by simply stating who are the victors, the subdued and the allies. The conflict theoreticians need many aids and corollaries for their basic hypotheses. One of the most important supplementary hypotheses is that there are groups that are unaware of their interests owing to the fact that no one has articulated them yet.

If the conflict theoreticians stress force as the binding factor in society, then the consensus theoreticians tend to assert the importance of institutionalizing rules that make possible a certain community of values. We can try to summarize the premises of the consensus theoreticians in the following statements:

(1) In all societies there are patterns of behavior that have been institutionalized, i.e., that are guided by fairly generally accepted norms and that are repeated over an extended period of time;

(2) Societies hold together and can exist as stable structures because certain values and norms are generally accepted;

(3) Certain social institutions are universal or at least occur in practically all cultures.<sup>17</sup>

Intuitively, it seems reasonable to say that conflicts and institutionalization, force and value consensus, all are central phenomena in society and that no differentiated society can be described satisfactorily without reference to all of them. Nor is it the case that the two types of theoreticians have denied the existence of any of these manifestations. It is primarily a question of differences of emphasis and of opinion of what is the best theoretical strategy.

The difference between conflict- and consensus theoreticians corresponds by and large to the distinction that has been made earlier in this paper between the stratification and the institutional aspects. In general, the conflict theoreticians have been considered to represent a radical perspective, while the consensus theoreticians have often been described as conservative. The first conflict theoretician who can be considered as belonging to the living tradition of social science is Karl Marx. The distinction between the two types of theories has considerable relevance in political theory and goes back to the old question of the state contra society. The predecessors of the modern conflict theoreticians either did not wish to regard the state as more sovereign than other social institutions or even argued for the dissolution of the state as a social institution.

Consequently we are dealing with two rather powerful social science traditions. Some prominent researchers have felt that the two traditions are in effect alternatives that cannot be combined within the same theory. Among these is the German sociologist Ralf Dahrendorf. He says in an aphoristic statement that society is a Janus-head with its two faces turned towards different aspects of reality. On the other hand it can be shown that both conflict and consensus theories contain truths that all scholars must take into account. It is also a fact that conflict and consensus theoreticians often treat the same problem with somewhat different terminologies; certain controversies depend upon confusion of empirical statements and methodological rules and upon how the possibilities for a synthesis are dependent on the formal structure of the theories. It is at least a tremendous incentive for political sociology to try to find a synthesis between the two types of theories. I say explicitly political sociology, since analysis and solution of the problem undoubtedly demand insights in both political science and sociology. The problems connected with conflict and consensus presuppose a strong border area between political science and sociology.

A plea for political sociology ought not to be interpreted as an attempt to bring

about a separation. Rather, a strong political sociology strengthens integration within the social sciences and draws political science and sociology closer to one another. The solution of certain central problems quite simply presupposes impulses from both political science and sociology.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Maurice Duverger, *Sociologie Politique* (2nd ed., Paris, 1967).
- <sup>2</sup> Robert Dahl, "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest," *American Political Science Review*, 55 (1961), pp. 763-772.
- <sup>3</sup> Morris Janowitz, "Political Sociology," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. XII, p. 300.
- <sup>4</sup> See the articles in J. Berger, M. Zelditch, Jr. & B. Anderson, *Sociological Theories in Progress* (Boston, 1966).
- <sup>5</sup> For example, Arthur F. Bentley, *The Process of Government* (Evanston, 1935).
- <sup>6</sup> Seymour Martin Lipset, *Political Man* (Garden City, 1960) chap. 7.
- <sup>7</sup> Reinhard Bendix & Seymour Martin Lipset, "The Field of Political Sociology," recently reprinted in Lewis A. Coser (ed.), *Political Sociology* (New York, Evanston and London, 1966) pp. 9-47.
- <sup>8</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (N.Y., 1945).
- <sup>9</sup> Erik Allardt, "Past and Emerging Political Cleavages," in O. Stammer (ed.), *Party Systems, Party Organizations and the Politics of New Masses* (Berlin, 1968), pp. 66-74.
- <sup>10</sup> Philip E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief System in Mass Publics," in D. E. Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent* (Glencoe, 1964), pp. 248-249.
- <sup>11</sup> Jean Blondel, *Voters, Parties and Leaders - The Social Fabrics of British Politics* (London, 1963).
- <sup>12</sup> Denton E. Morrison & Keith Warner, "Organization of Economic Men? Factors associated with U.S. Farmers' Attitudes Toward Government Agricultural Involvement," Paper presented at the Second World Congress of Rural Sociology, Enschede, Holland, August 1968.
- <sup>13</sup> Talcott Parsons, *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), pp. 21-29.
- <sup>14</sup> Seymour Martin Lipset, *Revolution and Counterrevolution. Change and Persistence in Social Structures* (New York, 1968).
- <sup>15</sup> Seymour Martin Lipset & Stein Rokkan, "Cleavages, Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments, An Introduction," in S. M. Lipset & Stein Rokkan (eds.) *Party Systems and Voter Alignments* (New York, 1967) pp. 1-64.
- <sup>16</sup> Giovanni Sartori, "The Sociology of Parties. A Critical Review," in O. Stammer (ed.), *Party Systems, Party Organizations and the Politics of New Masses* (Berlin, 1968) pp. 1-25.
- <sup>17</sup> Modern descriptions of the distinction are found, among other places, in Ralf Dahrendorf, *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society* (Stanford, 1959), pp. 157-165, and Pieter L. van Berghe, "Dialectic and Functionalism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis," in N. J. Demerath & R. A. Peterson (eds.), *System, Change and Conflict*, (New York and London, 1967) pp. 293-305.