

Representational Forms: Continuity and Change

Der-Yuan Maxwell Wu*

Abstract

This essay mainly deals with the question of the extent to which the mode of representation has changed, as revolving around "old politics" vs "new" debates in contemporary Comparative Politics literature. First, this author analyzes the representation forms highlighted in pluralism, corporatism and Marxism, as subsumed under "old paradigm". Briefly, the main "object" to be represented is "objectively existent interest". Through some institutional channels, such as political parties or interest groups, varied interests can be transmitted from society into the state (pluralism), or intermediated via the state (corporatism). And the socialist party-states can reflect the genuine interests of the proletariat that once were distorted in Capitalist societies. (Marxism) Further, the author highlights some key features of new representations (or "new social movements"). In short, they center on "identity" and pursue mostly community-based rights for universal and equal representations in both the state and civil society. Then, the author compares the "old" and "new" forms in terms of similarities and differences. For example, agents in both forms similarly strive to be included in the process of defining the meanings of politics or in the policy process across time and space. As to the differences, while the "old" appreciates the merit of "modernity", the "new" tends to be more "post-modernist"-oriented in appealing to such causes of "anti-bureaucratization" and "autonomy". Finally, this author suggests that the "change vs continuity" debate probably could be reconciled, if not resolved, by bringing the two apparently

* Der-Yuan Maxwell Wu is Ph.D. candidate in Political Science, Carleton University Canada.

"incompatible" models as endpoints of a newly constructed continuum in which dimensions of each model can be further clarified.

I. Introduction

The conventional division between "state" and "civil society" has been widely accepted in contemporary Comparative Politics literature, despite the challenges posed mainly by Post-modernists. "Representation" is the key mechanism by which the state and civil society are linked with one another. As democracy has become a prevalent way of governing and living in the world, an adequate representation system becomes indispensable. To seek for a fair and comprehensive representation fosters the evolutions of various forms of representation as democratization proceeds. Among them, political parties, interest groups, specialized associations and social movements constitute principal modes of representation.

The weight assigned to each of the mode varies from paradigm to paradigm. In general, liberalists tend to assume the predominant role of political parties, interest groups and specialized associations in policy process, whereas Marxists tend to focus on the role of vanguard parties or trade union-led social movements versus capital organization. For post-Marxists, the role of the conventional players in the "old" politics need to be reevaluated, and particularly the New Social Movements' (NSMs) contribution to defining the meaning of "new" politics is critically appreciated.

The evolution of these forms of representation, nevertheless, brings to the fore some critical questions in the subject: to what extent has the mode of representation been transformed? Is there anything "new" in social movements? In this essay, I will essentially deal with these issues and will end with a critical assessment. To do this, the aforementioned paradigms and their modes of representation will be further generalized into "old paradigms", roughly corresponding to the Liberalist and Marxist paradigms, and "new paradigm", or essentially post-Marxist paradigm.

II. "Old Paradigm"

Broadly subsumed under the liberalist paradigm, pluralism and corporatism assign considerable importance to groups/associations in the process of representation. For the pluralists, "individuals", as the building block of society, are the fundamental units of action whose interests or preferences, latent or manifest, are to be represented in the state institutions. In a similar vein, methodologically, collectivity can be ultimately explained and understood by reference to individuals and their shared interests. The existence of an organized group or interests is often defined in objective terms and treated as given. Similarly, group members are assumed to have a common perception of the interests which can be fairly articulated or aggregated through institutional and collective channels.(Macridis 1990:224) As to the source of the organized interests, pluralists basically assumed either that they are determined by socio-economic conditions or that they are organizable through rational calculation of utilities by self-interested individuals. Only where individual and collective interests converged, which is often taken for granted, would groups be formed. (Berger 1981:6-7) In normal conditions, there should be no representation problem within both intra-group and inter-group settings. Given that power resources are widely dispersed, though not equally distributed among numerous groups and their members, their interactions in a presumably nearly perfect competitive political market place would lead to an equilibrium where a fair representation could be maintained.¹ Projected in a functionalist framework, the pluralist version of ideal representation in the most developed and institutionalized political system entails a stable division of labour between interest groups and political parties: while interest groups articulate and transmit special demands, parties aggregate them into a general program and

¹ In a modified "Neo-pluralist" version, notably highlighted by Charles Lindblom, some groups, especially business ones, are acknowledged to be more powerful than others. Business need not exert pressure on the government to materialize its interests, the government often automatically ensures that business interests are not adversely affected by policies concerned.(Lindblom 1977)

mobilize support for them.(Berger 1981:8-9)

In the "politics matter" pluralist theories, political parties are even regarded as "the central intermediate and intermediary structure between society and the state" (Castles 1982:5) Parties themselves are said to be under transformation in Western Europe: traditional class-mass parties were converted into "catch-all" parties, aiming at winning elections by delicately downplaying their class-specific ideological baggage, securing access to a variety of interest groups and thereby catering to a wider spectrum of constituency.(Kirchheimer 1990: 238-41) In Canada, catch-all parties also operate according to "the laws of the inclusive middle" and seek to occupy a middle ground on a Left-Right continuum.(Galipeau 1989:417) In extreme situations, party elites also act as representatives of diverse segments to the extent that a dominant party system functions like a microcosm of a plural society.(Arian & Barnes 1974)

In a significant break with the pluralists,² the corporatists tend to de-emphasize the role of political parties in interest representation or intermediation. They also envisage an unequal distribution of influence among various groups/associations. Among them, the "peak" organizations of labor and capital are most influential and the balance of power is not necessarily tilted toward capital and against labor unions.(Berger 1981:11-3) Interests in society are organized into a limited number of singular, compulsory, noncompetitive, hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories, and sanctioned by the state.(Schmitter 1979:13) The pluralist version of stable division of labour in interest representation was jettisoned: many of the roles assumed by parties under pluralism, such as political socialization and policy implementation, were taken by groups/associations.(Berger1981:10) As for the source of interest formation, in addition to socioeconomic structure, the corporatists look further in to history and the role of the state.(Berger 1981:13-6) The direction of interest representation thus does not go simply from society to the state as assumed by the pluralists.

² Berger (1981) maintained that corporatism entails a break with the premises of pluralism (p.9), whereas Almond (1990) held that it is an extension of pluralism. Cawson (1986) suggested that both can be treated as the endpoints of a continuum.

The theme of unequal representation is comprehensively treated in Marxists and Neo-Marxists. As the source of power is necessarily unequal, interests in society are naturally organized according to different logics of collective action. For Offe and Wiesenthal, while capital is always united and can be liquidly merged from the beginning, labor is atomized and divided by competition. The optimization problem of the capital with regard to demand aggregation and organizing techniques is much easier to resolve collectively, whereas heterogeneous labor with conflicting needs is hard to organize on the basis of a common denominator. Furthermore, while the capitalists' interests are clearly defined in terms of costs and benefits and their pursuits are legitimized and entrenched in the capitalist institutions and ideology, the proletariat's true interests are vulnerable to distortion and require much greater communicative and organizational efforts so as to be translated into comparable action.(1980:72-99) Thus, for Marxists, in sharp contrast to the corporatists, power distribution in the representational system necessarily favors capital.

Concerning social movements, the pluralists generally espouse individual-based values of freedom and formal equality. All people, regardless of their heterogeneous group background, are entitled to enjoy equal political and civil rights according to a set of universal standards and rules. Social movements under pluralists primarily aim at reforming established political institutions and bringing into the mainstream some of the excluded segments.(Young 1990:156-7) For corporatists, the emergence of social movements is often read as an indication of the ineffectiveness of the existing representational system. For Marxists, labor union-led movements together with the social democratic parties in Western Europe were the key agents to press for concessions from the capital and the state.

Overall, in the "old" paradigm, the main "object" to be represented is "interest" which is basically assumed to be objectively existent "out there". These interests can be transmitted from society into the state (pluralists) or intermediated from state to society and vice versa (corporatists) through institutional channels, such as interest groups/ associations or political parties, or social movements. For some Marxists, the capitalist system distorts or blocks

the translation of these objective interests, whereas the socialist party-states can represent and reflect the genuine interests of the proletariat. Under the "old" paradigm, to a varying degree in the respective perspectives, socioeconomic structure is often assumed to be the key, though not sole, factor determining and shaping interest formation. However, the role of subjective identity in linking socioeconomic condition and interest articulation was virtually absent in pluralist and corporatist analyses.

III. "New Paradigm"

The "old paradigm" was prevalent in analyzing the "old" mode of representational politics in liberal-democratic welfare states in the approximately two decades after World War II. As modernization and democratization proceeded, "ungovernability" caused by overload of demands considerably paralyzed the welfare state system. Within this context, a "new" form of representation, NSMs, emerged. To account for the new phenomena, NSMs theorists started conceptualizing the "new" form of representational politics by contrasting it with the "old" mode of representation. The major distinctions could be summarized as follows: (Dalton et al 1990: 10-4; Klandermans & Tarrow 1988:7-8; Offe 1987:66-73; Phillips 1992:257-63)

First, in terms of issues and ideologies, while the "old" politics emphasized economic growth, productivity, equity and military/social security, "new" politics advocated greater attention paid to quality of life issues covering from environment, human rights, to gender, ethnicity and peace and sought to forge new relationships to work, the opposite sex and the nature. Second, as far as their social base is concerned, the "old" form largely represented particular interests of class-specific supporters, whereas the "new" mode was primarily based on both personal and collective identities or support from the "new middle class", or those essentially in the cultural and social services. Third, as to the key values, "old" politics strove for "modernity" related values of individual freedom, security of private consumption and material progress, whereas the "new" mode aimed at autonomy and identity, which took the form

of a self-reflective critique of instrumental rationality and a suspicion of both state and market institutions, and was opposed to manipulation, dependence and bureaucratization. Fourth, in terms of organizational structure, the "old" form was characterized with formal, centralized, hierarchical and rigid structure. By contrast, the "new" politics emphasized informality, spontaneity and a low degree of vertical and horizontal differentiation. Finally, in terms of political style for action, while the "old" representation was mostly through pluralist, corporatist groups/associations and political party competition, the "new" form of representation was largely non-institutional protests and demonstrations. Also, while "old" representational agents often pursued gradualist, reformist tactics and were willing to negotiate and compromise, the "new" players emphasized the non-negotiable nature of their concerns.

On another front, the "new" politics also transcends earlier social movements' conception of justice and difference in several ways. First, while the "old" politics style of civil rights movement struggled for individual "equality in front of the law", the "new" politics of difference endeavoured to affirm minority groups' specificity and to celebrate their distinct identities, culture or experiences.(Young 1990:158-62) Furthermore, in the "old", assimilation-oriented politics the meaning of difference is often defined in an essentialist, negative, undesirable, rigid, exclusive and dichotomous way and is reflected in objective, physical attributes, whereas in the "new" politics, it tends to be defined in a relational, contextual, positive and desirable sense. In the old model, differences among individuals/groups, if any, are presumed to be accidental and should be kept in the "private" sphere. By contrast, the "new" model envisions the meaning of difference to be a forum for political struggle. Finally, the "old" politics envisioned a distributive aspect of justice, whereas the "new" politics conceived "justice" as full participation by heterogeneous groups.(Young 1990:163-72)

In brief, the "new" politics highlights personal or collective identities as the "object" to be represented and the need to remove "double consciousness" in order to achieve genuine personal autonomy and liberation. Particularly, this identity politics implies that a dual process of representation must take place, as

Jenson suggested: "the representation of interests via state institutions as well as those of civil society and the constitution of the identities of the represented, through political mobilization and policy innovation."³ Besides, at the heart of the "new" politics of representation is a struggle over meaning. It often requires NSM actors to engage in an imaginative process of rethinking basic relationships in respective issues and connecting discrete issues into a coherent discourse. (Phillips: 1994:58)

IV. Continuity and Change

The various forms of representation, in my viewpoint, are the products of incessant struggles over the issue of participation.⁴ That is, actors in the state and particularly civil society seek to, in various time and spaces, be included or to dominate in both conventional policy-making and new politics-defining process. In Robert Dahl's three paths of democratization, that is (1) competition preceding expansion of participation; (2) inclusiveness preceding competition, and (3) simultaneous openness in both dimensions (1971:33-39), participation in terms of "inclusiveness" can be defined broadly to cover both "old" politics and "new" politics. In this sense, I would agree with Alan Scott's portraying contemporary social movements as "acting to challenge the process of social closure so as to open up the political sphere and to politicize issues previously confined to the private realm, as in earlier social movements". (Scott 1990: 155) This fundamental continuity for me has linked various modes of representation together.

³ As quoted from Susan D. Phillips, "New Social Movements and Routes to Representation: Science versus Politics", in Stephen Brooks and Alain-G. Gagnon eds. *The Political Influence of Ideas*. (1994), p.58.

⁴ In fact, in the case of NSMs, some theorists denied the applicability of the terms of "participation" and "representation". For example, Offe (1984) argued that "they (NSMs actors) do not demand representation...but autonomy" (p.189). Nevertheless, I would hold that autonomy can be adequately achieved, or the condition of being able to defend a physical or moral territory, only through participation, or taking collective action to affect both the definition of politics and political decisions/non-decisions.

Furthermore, as Lorna Weir (1993) pointed out, according to historical facts, identity concerns were not completely absent in the old politics.(p.81-6) Likewise, interest concerns were also revealed in "new" mode of representation. As for the distinctive forum in which "old" versus "new" politics are located, I also agree with Weir's critique toward conventional state-vs-society contrast. That is, "old" movements were not exclusively aiming at the state, nor were "new" ones absolutely devoid of demands on the state.(Weir 1993:86-8) Iris Young's politics of difference in fact explicitly envisioned taking actions and seeking for group representations in both the state and civil society institutions. (1990) Also, in terms of mode of action, the "old" politics also witnessed non-conventional demonstrations, whereas in defining or redefining politics, NSMs often need to form a "united front" with the predominant "old" agencies of representation, political parties and associations at some "opportunity structural points". Brodie and Jenson (1988) even explicitly maintained that "political parties, as the organizers of elections, have the greatest influence on the 'definition of politics.'" (p.1) After all, to foster dramatic change of policies and the sphere of "the political", non-institutional as well as institutional channels are required, albeit to a varying extent at specific time and space. Overall, these commonalities and continuities have seamed the "old" with "new" forms of representation.

To be sure, there are also some distinctive transformations distinguishing the "new" from the "old" politics. The predominant concern with "materialist" values in previous representation for me is in sharp contrast to the focus on "post-materialist" liberation. Similarly, the fact that the "new" politics often acted in reaction to bureaucratization and de-humanization appears to be significantly unprecedented. Notwithstanding the difference and changes, I would argue that the problems of "change-vs-continuity" and "similarity-vs-difference", as many of those in Comparative Politics, probably could be reconciled, if not resolved, by bringing the two "opposite" models of politics as endpoints of a continuum in which degree of variety in several dimensions can be further clarified and by distinguishing various levels of abstraction.

Finally, in analyzing the emergence or resurgence of various forms of representation, I tend to agree with Suzanne Berger's synthesizing approaches adopted in *Organizing Interests in Western Europe* (1981): in addition to relying on individual psychological and socioeconomic factors explanations, researchers should further look at the role of the state, history or the contradiction of the representation system. Nevertheless, international factors as another key shaping forces were virtually left out in the book. A more comprehensive analysis, in my point of view, would require particular attention paid to the international influence, especially under the wave of globalization.

Bibliography

- Almond, Gabriel 1990 "Pluralism, Corporatism and Professional Memory" in G. Almond A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science London: Sage, pp.173-88.
- Arian, A. and Barnes, S. 1974 "The Dominant Party Systems: A Comparison of Israel and Italy" *Comparative Politics* 15: 295-327.
- Berger, Suzanne ed. 1981 *Organizing Interests in Western Europe* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brodie, Janine and Jenson, Jane 1988 *Crisis, Challenge and Change Party and Class in Canada Revisited* Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Castles, Francis G. 1982 "Politics and Public Policy" in F. Castles ed. *The Impacts of Parties* London: Sage, pp.1-20.
- Cawson, Alan 1986 *Corporatism and Political Theory* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1971 *Polyarchy* New Haven: Yale University.
- Dalton, Russell J., Kuechler, Manfred and Burklin, Wilhelm eds. 1990 "The Challenge of New Movements" in R.Dalton and M. Kuechler eds. *Challenging the Political Order* New York: Oxford University Press, pp.3-20.
- Galipeau, Claude 1989 "Political Parties, Interest Groups and New Social Movements: Toward New Representation?" in A.G. Gagnon & A.B. Tanguay eds. *Canadian Parties in Transition* Scarborough: Nelson Canada, pp.404-26.
- Kirchheimer, Otto 1990 "The Transformation of the Western European Party Systems" in R.C. Macridis & B.E. Brown eds. *Comparative Politics: Notes and Readings* 7th ed. Pacific Grove,CA: Brooks/Cole, pp.238-47.
- Klandermans, Bert and Tarrow, Sidney 1988 "Mobilization into Social Movements: Synthesizing European and American Perspectives" in B. Klandermans, Kriesi, Hanspeter and Tarrow, Signey eds. *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across*

- Cultures, International Social Movement Research, Vol.1 Greenwich: JAI, pp.1-38.
- Lindblom, Charles 1977 *Politics and Markets: the World's Political Economic Systems* New York: Basic Books
- Macridis, Roy C. 1990 "Groups and Groups Theory" in R.C. Macridis & B.E. Brown eds. *Comparative Politics: Notes And Readings* 7th ed. Pacific Grove,CA: Brooks/Cole, pp.223-26.
- Offe, Claus 1987 "Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics" in Charles Maier ed. *Changing Boundaries of the Political* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,pp.63-102.
- Offe, Claus 1984 *Contradictions of the Welfare State* London: Hutchinson.
- Offe, Claus and Wiesenhal, H. 1980 "Two Logics of Collective Action: Theoretical Notes on Social Class and Organizational Form" in M. Zeitlin ed. *Political Power and Social Theory* Vol.1, Greenwich: JAI Press, pp.67-116.
- Phillips, Susan D. 1992 "New Social Movements and Unequal Representation: The Challenge of Influencing Public Policy" in A.G. Gagnon & A.B. Tanguay eds. *Democracy Without Justice: Essays in Honour of Khayyam Zev. Paltiel* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, pp.255-75.
- Phillips, Susan D. 1994 "New Social Movements and Routes to Representation: Science versus Politics" in Stephen Brooks & Alain-G. Gagnon eds. *The Political Influence of Ideas: Policy Communities and the Social Sciences* Westport: Praeger, pp.57-82.
- Schmitter, Philippe C. 1979 "Still the Century of Corporatism?" in P.C. Schmitter & G. Lehmbruch eds. *Trends Toward Corporatist Intermediation* London: Sage,pp. 7-52.
- Scott, Alan 1990 *Ideology and the New Social Movements* London: Unwin Hyman.
- Weir, Lorna 1993 "Limitations of New Social Movement Analysis" *Studies in Political Economy* No.40 (Spring 1993):73-102.
- Young, Iris M. 1990 *Justice and the Politics of Difference* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

代表型式：持續與轉變

吳得源*

中文摘要

本文旨在探討「比較政治」學門上，有關代表型式「新」、「舊」之爭辯及持續性之問題。首先，作者分析並比較隸屬「舊政治典範」下，由多元主義、統合主義與馬克斯主義主導之代表型式。大致而言，此一典範下代表型式之主要標的係「客觀存在之利益」。透過制度性管道，諸如政黨或利益團體，社會不同利益得以上陳國家機構（多元主義），國家亦可導引此等利益之形成（統合主義），原本在資本主義「被扭曲」之無產階級利益可獲平等反映（馬克斯主義）。其次，作者臚列「新政治典範」下代表型式（即「新社會運動」）之主要特徵。概言之，此一代表型式係以「認同」為訴求主軸，並追求不同團體在國家及民間社會之普遍及公平參與機會。再次，作者論述「新」與「舊」典範下之不同代表型式之持續性與差異性。其中，就前者而言，無論「新」或「舊」型式，行為者均在特定時空之政策制定或政治界定過程中，爭取被接納之參與；就後者而言，相對於「舊」典範之肯定「現代性」之價值，「新社會運動」往往著重「後現代性」之訴求。（例如揭櫫「反官僚化」、「人性化」、「自主性」之價值。）最後，作者建議：學界或可藉由理論之重組，將不同對比之類型置於一新建構「連續光譜」之兩端，並釐清各類型之定義及面向，藉以調和原各該典範之分歧，澄清持續性與轉變性之問題。

*吳得源，現為加拿大卡爾頓大學政治學博士候選人。

but, why do we need to think about changes over time when we already know they exist? Ask questions (who made this? when? why? how? where?) How are the accounts different? How are they similar? Which source do you like better? Why? What are the PROS and CONS for each source? I have a basic form control which subscribed to the valueChanges observable. @Component({ selector: 'my-app', template: ` < input [formControl]="control" /> <.` Another way to make it work without the async operator this mean I have subscribe to value changes before the control value get changes to '2' and I have catch all the changes later. this.control.valueChanges .pipe(map((name) => { . console.log('fired', name).