Chapter 1

A 'New' Challenge to Party Politics?
Analysing Green Party Development and Change

What makes Green parties so distinctive and why should the fact that they are changing represent a challenge to our understanding and perception of them? This chapter examines the development of Green party research in order to provide answers to these questions. In doing so, it will argue that while the ideological roots of the Green parties have played a significant role in our identification of them as a 'new' form of party politics, they have also influenced the parameters through which analysts have assessed their development. This can clearly be identified within attempts to classify the distinctiveness of Green parties and in theoretical attempts to explain their rapid emergence. However, more recent changes and conflicts within the Greens have forced us to re-evaluate our understanding of these parties. In so doing, our previous frames of reference only provide partial explanations, such as those provided by 'realo-funds'-style factional divisions. Hence, it is argued that while there exists an accurate assessment of the emergence and classification of Green parties, analysis must be expanded further in order to understand the patterns of change witnessed throughout the 1990s, and the implications for future Green party development.

IDENTIFYING THE IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF THE EUROPEAN GREEN PARTIES

The Green parties' distinctiveness is clearly reflected in their ideological roots. These can be traced predominantly to two key processes.

The first is the emergence of the new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s and the 'unconventional' style of activism that surrounded these protests. The second is the expansion of eco-philosophy and the emergence of a new wave of green political thought. By briefly examining these two dimensions, one can identify key analytical themes and debates from within these spheres that have been influential in shaping the perception and interpretation of Green parties and Green party activity as a form of 'new politics'.

The New Social Movements

The new social movement activism of the 1960s and 1970s represented a radical and distinctive break from previous forms of political activism, and provided an initial home for many of the instigators of Green party development during the 1980s. Many of the distinguishing features of Green parties are thought to reflect a commitment to the ideals and principles that emerged from within the new social movements. Theoretical explanations for the development and distinctiveness of these movements, therefore, provide an influential starting point in tracing analytical models of Green party formation and activity.

In the US, research into the social movement activism surrounding the civil rights campaigns and, later, the student and environmental movements of the 1960s and 1970s, focused upon the 'efficiency' of movement organizations. The basis of social movement activism, it was argued, lay not with the emergence of new conflicts and interests in society but with the ability of movement organizations to mobilize resources. Social movements could influence policy through the mobilization of a broader range of resources than those available to conventional political bodies, enabling them to pursue their goals through informal and unconventional methods, as well as through more traditional routes (Gladwin, 1994, p6). A movement's success, it was argued, reflected how well resources were utilized and the extent to which established institutions were aware of the importance of the movement's aims.

Critics of resource mobilization, however, argued that too much emphasis was placed upon the movement's organization, with little insight into why individuals sought to join or why these groups had suddenly risen to prominence. Gladwin, for example, criticizes resource mobilization approaches for:

...normalizing the anti-institutional and anti-systemic aspects of social movements and under-theorizing those goals which relate to thoroughgoing social and cultural transformation (Gladwin, 1994, p65).
The rationality of the resource mobilization approach is also identified as a contradiction to the specific and distinctive anti-systemic character of the social movements. Cohen (1985) argues that through its emphasis on the 'rational actor' it neglects other influences that are significant to the creation of these new movements:

*It is necessary to analyse those aspects of experience that shape the interpretation of interests individual and collective, and affect the very capacity of actors to form groups and mobilize* (Cohen, 1985, p688).

A more European approach to new social movements, by contrast, focused upon the dimensions neglected within resource mobilization. Marcuse (1969), for example, identified a style of activism within these movements which, he claimed, entails something other than strategic or instrumental rationality (Cohen, 1985, p691). Inglehart (1990) linked the development of new social movements to value priorities and socio-economic change, claiming that an adherence to 'post-materialist values' lay at the heart of these new movements (Inglehart, 1990, p45).

In particular, he identified a shift away from the traditional concern with class conflict and material wealth and towards a greater concern for 'belonging, esteem and the realization of one's intellectual and aesthetic potential' (Inglehart, 1979, p308). New values and new goals, he claimed, resulted in the adoption of different styles of political action.

Touraine (1985) links the development of new social movements to the search for alternative forms of social and cultural life, arguing that recent changes represent a reorganization of the relationship between society, state and the economy, with new movements the potential bearers of new social interests. Emphasizing the importance of their spontaneity of action and their anti-institutional characteristics, Touraine is sceptical of the value of movement organizations, fearing that they can destroy the creativity and vitality of a movement. Habermas also highlights a new focus for conflict based around issues such as cultural reproduction, social integration and socialization. He argues that it is no longer possible for these conflicts to be channeled through traditional parties and organizations as they are ill suited and often unprepared to tackle such issues. New social movements, therefore, provide an outlet for these conflicts and a defence against the encroachment of state and economy on society (Habermas, 1981, p35). In maintaining this position, Habermas argues, it is vital that the movements remain committed to the ideals of grassroots, horizontal control and the restriction of organizational growth.

Building upon these concepts, Melucci describes the movements as displaying a multidimensional character incorporating a 'plurality of perspectives, meanings and relationships' (Melucci, 1989, p25). They function within a new 'political space' between state and society, from which they can:

*...make society hear their messages and translate these messages into political decision-making while the movements maintain their autonomy* (Melucci, 1985, p815).

This aspect is identified as an important element of what exactly is 'new' about these groups. New social movements seek to reveal fundamental problems within a given area. As such, the social movements have an indirect effect, seeking influence over the central issues and concerns of modern society. They develop grassroots, informal and 'hidden' forms of organization, and their strength lies in their ability to stimulate radical questions about the ends of personal and social life. Through their unique style of activism, Melucci argues, they are able to 'announce to society that something else is possible' (Melucci, 1985, p812).

From this brief summary it is possible to identify some of the key features that distinguish this 'new' form of social movement activism from its more traditional predecessors: features that are reflected within Green party analysis. Firstly, new social movements are seen to represent a new social paradigm, contrasting with the dominant goal structure of modern industrial society (Kuechler and Dalton, 1990, p10). Emphasis is placed upon 'quality-of-life' issues rather than personal wealth and material well-being, leading to a focus upon social and collective values surrounding, among other things, issues such as the environment and women's rights. While it is true to say that feminist, ecological and peace movements all have a long history of activism before the 1960s, what has changed is the value that society places on these issues and the manner in which this has been channeled through the new social movements.

Organizational structure represents another defining characteristic - in particular, the notion that form is as vital an element as substance. Significant emphasis is placed upon moving away from traditional structures in favour of more decentralized, open democratic organizations. A final key distinction is the identification of the role of conflict. Whether viewed in terms of class conflict, 'old' versus 'new' values or conflict between state intervention and society, new social movements challenge the expansion of the modern state and highlight the contradictions that state interventions generate. This conflict helps to explain the apotlitical nature and non-institutional character of the social movements.
The Influence of 'Ecologism'

The distinctiveness of Green parties, however, does not rest purely upon their representation of the new social movements. Green parties, by definition, represent a new political challenge that places issues of environmental protection at the top of the political agenda. The parties are, therefore, identified not only as vehicles for new social movement protest, but also as a voice for the newly emerging issues and debates surrounding both 'environmentalism' and 'ecologism'. This combination provides Green parties with an ideological basis that is clearly distinct from other political parties.

Although many of the ideas and concepts of ecologism, arguably, have quite a lengthy history, its ideological development is usually recognized as a relatively recent phenomenon. Dobson identifies it as:

...the accidental conjunction of circumstances, individuals and events in the 1970s which has provided a dynamic refocus for the ecological vocabulary (Dobson, 1990, p215).

This recent wave of development is reflected in a surge of literature during the 1960s and 1970s concerning the nature of human development and its impact upon the environment. At the heart of ecologism lies a critique of the nature and processes of modern industrial society. The cornerstone of this critique are the claims that modern society must reassess many of its core values and recognize the natural limits that exist to both economic and population growth. The continual emphasis upon growth within modern industrial society leads to the neglect of this limited capacity to the detriment of the environment.

The inability of modern society to recognize and react to this imbalance results from attitudes instilled within modern industrialism, which seeks to justify humans' present role as controlling and dominating nature. Continued emphasis upon the free market, it is argued, instills within society a strong commitment to the principles of competitiveness and individualism, while modern technological developments support the process of domination over nature. Green theory identifies significant dangers in accepting this paradigm of modern industrial society:

Growth-orientated economies cannot go on using finite resources. Technological innovations cannot solve the problems indefinitely, although appropriate small-scale technologies are seen as one aspect of the solution. Technological advances can only postpone the problems (Vincent, 1992, p232).

The roots of ecologism, therefore, lie in a reaction against mechanistic science and what is seen as human attempts to dominate nature through technological development. It seeks a new relationship with nature based more upon cooperation and consideration, rather than domination. Achieving this new relationship necessarily entails a radical overhaul of modern industrial society and the ideologies and politics upon which this system is currently based.

One approach to this problem has been the concept of the 'sustainable society'. This model directly challenges the problems of continuous economic growth and provides for wider and more profound forms of fulfilment than those offered by modern society's focus upon the consumption of material objects (Dobson, 1990, p18). Sustainable living requires a re-education of society based upon consuming less and producing for basic needs on a self-sufficiency basis. Ecological models also place great emphasis upon the importance of local organization, active participation and the development of self-governing communities - all of which, it is claimed, help to strengthen relationships and remove society's current emphasis on competitiveness and individualism. In addition, greater local autonomy arguably increases the likelihood of individuals becoming responsible agents within the social sphere.

While the discussion thus far implies a common core to Green political thought, these ideas represent key features of a very disparate literature, within which there are significant conflicts and debates. These debates primarily surround the identification of a central binary division between 'deep' ecology, centred upon the concept of ecocentrism, and a 'shallow' anthropocentric approach. The impact of this dichotomy has had far-reaching implications, not only for the development of Green political thought but also for the subsequent analysis of development and change within Green parties.

'Shallow' ecology questions the assumption that places human welfare above that of all other species. Its focus is predominantly ecocentric, endowing all species of life on Earth with intrinsic value. The principle of biospheric equality sees humans as being on an equal level with all other things, rather than being their masters. Naess (1973), for example, argues that humans' capacity for freedom depends upon this process of identification with external forces - in particular, the natural world. Merchant similarly argues that people must realize that they have a duty to maintain the integrity of the biosphere (Merchant, 1992, p87). Humans, therefore, represent merely one part of the wider biosphere, dependent upon a balanced relationship with the rest of nature for continued survival.

In contrast, an alternative form of 'social' ecology can also be identified, based upon a 'light' or 'shallow' Green anthropocentrism...
The distinction between ecocentrism and anthropocentrism is seen as less influential in this case. Humans' relationship with nature is identified as one where:

**Humans may play the role of managers of natural processes as long as they act only to enable the natural and diverse evolution of organisms within the biospherical community** (Kenny, 1994, p240).

From this perspective, it is argued, there is a greater tendency to believe that the natural world only has value because humans themselves place a value upon it. This does not necessarily imply a lessening of the importance of nature. Rather, it highlights why preservation is so important for society. Vincent suggests that:

**Nature can be an early warning system for us in terms of impending ecological disaster; it supports and nourishes us; we can do valuable experiments on it which can prolong and improve the quality of our lives; we can exercise, admire, relax in . . . and be aesthetically moved by its beauty** (Vincent, 1993, p255).

The identification of nature in terms of human values enables people to understand the significance that its maintenance holds for human society. While not extending the concept of 'value' as far as deep ecology, the recognition of the relationship between humans and nature clearly places this approach beyond more traditional anthropocentric perspectives that focus largely upon exploiting nature for human ends.

These distinctions are also evident among theorists who seek to provide a precise classification of what it means to be 'Green'. Hence, a similar dichotomy can be identified in theoretical distinctions between what is perceived to be a 'true' deep Green approach to environmental issues, in contrast to a weaker 'light' Green compromise. Dobson, for example, distinguishes between 'ecologism' and 'environmentalism', arguing that this distinction is necessary to provide a clearer understanding of Green political theory:

*If we confuse Green politics (capital G) with either conservationism or environmentalism (the latter being green with a small g) then we severely distort and misunderstand the nature of the Green challenge* (Dobson, 1990, p4).

'Environmentalism' is thus identified as a managerial approach to environmental issues, whereas 'ecologism' seeks to radically alter the nature of our relationship with the natural world. Similar classifications and divisions are also evident in alternative dichotomous terminology such as 'dark' and 'light', 'deep' and 'shallow'. At the heart of all these classifications, however, lies what Young described as 'the great divide' (Young, 1992, p14). The basis of this 'divide' rests with the assumption that authentic or 'true' Green politics is understood as 'deep' and must be based upon ecocentric motivations. All other Green activity, by definition, is classed as 'shallow' (Barry, 1994, p370).

**GREEN PARTIES AS A 'NEW' FORM OF POLITICAL CHALLENGE**

The ideological roots of the European Green parties have thus been closely related to both the actions and development of a new form of social movement protest since the 1960s, and the emergence of an ecological critique of modern industrial society, which highlights the environmental dangers posed by continuous growth. Both dimensions are part of a process resulting in a 'new' form of political activism. Social movement literature highlights a challenge to traditional, established political channels which involves not only the emergence of new issues and issue priorities, but also encompasses a new style of social protest based upon greater participation and alternative forms of organization and action. Ecologism, too, represents a radical challenge to the established principles and priorities of modern industrial society: one in which the need to change our relationship with nature results in a significant alteration in societal values and concerns.

Green parties have been identified as an emerging party political vehicle for many of these ideals and concepts. As such, analytical approaches to the study of Green parties have looked to both Green political theory and new social movement research for analytical tools. It is no surprise, therefore, to find that many of the ideas and concepts highlighted above are reflected in this analysis - both in terms of the central ideological commitments of these parties and the nature and style of party activism and organization.

**Explaining the Formation and Development of Green Parties**

Several theoretical approaches have attempted to examine and explain the process of Green party formation and the subsequent success of
failure of Green parties as political organizations. A common thread throughout is the claim that Green parties mark the rise of a 'new' political cleavage. Kitschelt, for example, suggests that a combination of underlying structural change and 'favourable political opportunity structures' have resulted in the emergence of a new style of 'left-libertarian' political party (Kitschelt, 1988a, p197). Such parties are most evident in countries with advanced welfare states, strong labour corporatism and regular participation of left-wing parties in government. New 'post-industrial' demands are constrained through established political channels, requiring the development of 'new political vehicles' to pursue these aims (Kitschelt, 1988a, p234). In addition to these conditions, their emergence also requires the presence of rational actors in order to respond to the possibilities offered for the development of a new political party.

Kitschelt claims that the motivating forces behind 'left-libertarian' parties reflect new social movement commitments and ideals. The parties are thus critical of modern societal development and 'the institutions that underlie the post-war compromise between capital and labour in industrial societies' (Kitschelt, 1988a, p195). An ecological dimension is also evident, as 'left-libertarian' parties are seen to oppose the prioritization of economic growth over non-materialist concerns and attack patterns of policy-making that restrict democratic participation to 'elite bargaining among centralized interest groups and party leaders' (Kitschelt, 1988a, p195).

Müller-Rommel similarly identifies the 'perceived lack of responsiveness' from political institutions to the issues raised by new social movements as a major factor in the emergence of a new breed of political party (Müller-Rommel, 1990, p211). He also identifies 'new politics' parties as the political representatives of new social movements, but disagrees with Kitschelt that this signifies a change in the central political cleavage. Rather, the parties are 're-patterning' the traditional established party systems by 'adding a "new" conflict dimension to the "old" party system cleavage structure' (Müller-Rommel, 1990, p229).

Rüdig's (1990) research focuses more heavily upon the ecological dimension to Green party analysis. He again focuses upon changing cleavage structures as an explanation for Green party formation and development, but highlights an imbalance in other approaches:

**Why is it that most social scientists analysing Green parties regard the "ecological" identity of these parties as irrelevant, unimportant or, at best, as marginal? There seems to be a consensus that somehow they cannot be what they appear to be, that their appearance as ecological parties

has to be a manifestation of some other social force which is totally unconnected to the material content of their demands (Rüdig, 1990, p16).**

While Rüdig accepts the connections between Green party formation, the development of new social movements and the failure of established political channels to incorporate new concerns, he argues that these concepts do not fully explain why the new parties should define their identity in terms of ecological problems (Rüdig, 1990, p29). Although value change and social structure act as 'facilitators' for the development of new parties, Rüdig claims that the primary explanation for their development has been the emergence of a specific 'ecological cleavage'. Thus the 'emergence and politicization of environmental problems' represents the key factor in accounting for the emergence of these new parties (Rüdig, 1990, p31). Despite these differences, however, explanations for the emergence of the Green parties clearly have their roots located in the literature outlined earlier.

**Green Party Classification**

As with party formation, certain key characteristics have been attributed to Green parties, distinguishing them from their more traditional counterparts. Kitschelt (1990, p185) identifies three such features:

- weak commitment mechanisms binding the activists to the parties, reflected in both limited levels of party membership and activism;
- a rejection of traditional, bureaucratic party organization in favour of a decentralized and horizontally coordinated mobilization of activists; and
- an emphasis upon collective decision-making and greater participation.

Kitschelt also found that left-libertarian party activists display similar social backgrounds – predominantly young intellectuals and professionals holding salaried positions in education, health care and cultural services, or those being educated to fill jobs in these areas (Kitschelt, 1990, p186).

Müller-Rommel also recognizes the importance of decentralization and participatory organizational structures within his classification. He identifies a common ideology based around concerns for equal rights, strong ecological thinking, solidarity with the developing world and demands for unilateral disarmament. He suggests that the parties share a similar electorate with 'characteristics which differ from those of established parties' (Müller-Rommel, 1990, p218). Again, this
electorate is identified as primarily young, highly educated, middle class, with white-collar occupations.

Poguntke's classification provides a more detailed picture, but again focuses upon three central dimensions. He cites sets of characteristics reflective of the two studies above. This includes a distinctive, unconventional political style emphasizing participation and grassroots democracy and a distinctive electoral profile (Poguntke, 1989, p185).\textsuperscript{18} Reflecting Rudig's arguments, however, he also identifies programmatic features that display a 'new politics' orientation based around ecology, individualism, leftism, the developing world, unilateral disarmament and participatory, direct democracy extended to all areas of society (Poguntke, 1989, p180).

Poguntke's approach is important here, as he utilizes this classification to distinguish between true 'new politics' parties and those that merely appear to incorporate new politics issues.\textsuperscript{19} In particular, he draws a line between conservative 'conservation groups' and the more radical progressive parties, including the majority of Green parties, for whom 'ecologism inspired by the new politics can be seen as part of a wider phenomenon which implies a new design of society' (Poguntke, 1987, p86). This distinction is the first example in which we can identify the divisions between 'dark' and 'light' forms of Green politics mentioned earlier, utilized within analyses of the Green parties. He develops this distinction further when examining the conflicts and changes within the Green parties as they have grown and evolved.

**A Changing Picture: Green Party Evolution as a Challenge to 'New Politics' Classifications**

While the 'new politics' characteristics identified above have clearly been a key aspect in explaining both the impetus for the development of the Green parties and their initial distinctive structure and political style, more recent developments force us to re-evaluate our existing perceptions of the Greens and Green party analysis. Since the wave of Green political activity of the late 1980s, many Green parties have changed both organizationally and in their strategic outlook. Within a number of parties, this process of re-evaluation has been accompanied by crippling internal division and conflict.

Have these more recent developments resulted in a radical change within the European Greens? If so, what implications does this have for our perception of Green parties as a distinctive and 'new' form of political challenge? How can one explain both the changes that have been witnessed in recent years and the internal conflicts and debates that have often surrounded them? These questions have been at the heart of Green party research in recent years. In attempting to tackle these questions, analysis has again returned to the Greens' ideological and theoretical roots to help understand what has been happening to the 'new politics' parties, and to explain the divisions that have emerged.

Poguntke's analysis identifies two subgroups within the Greens: moderates and fundamentalists (Poguntke, 1989, p191). While they share common goals, he argues that they differ strongly over strategy. In particular:

*Whereas the Moderates believe in the eventual success of piecemeal reform, the Fundamentalists fear the pacifying and demobilizing effects of this strategy* (Poguntke, 1989, p191).

Poguntke suggests that parties who have emerged from within new social movements often reflect 'a deeply rooted suspicion of the state and an erosion of trust in formalized political procedures', which clearly inclines the party to a more fundamentalist stance (Poguntke, 1989, p192). He also suggests that the chance of electoral success and the existence of 'Left-Socialist' or 'Communist' parties within the political system may also influence their stance. While Poguntke only provides the distinction between moderates and fundamentalists as a tentative theoretical model to differentiate between competing factions, similar distinctions form the basis for many of the explanations for Green party conflict and change.

Kitschelt takes these divisions a stage further in his analysis of the Belgian and German Green parties, distinguishing between three groups of party activists who have been central in shaping the parties' strategic direction. He classifies these activists as ideologues, lobbyists and pragmatists. The first and third of these categorizations form the principal divisions within the parties (Kitschelt, 1988b, p134).\textsuperscript{20} Ideologues are defined as:

*Activists who have a broad and radical vision of party objectives... They derive great satisfaction from a party organization which anticipates the participatory reforms they would like to implement in society* (Kitschelt, 1988b, p131).

Ideologues often have a history of political activism within other left-libertarian organizations, such as new social movement groups, before
joining Green parties. In contrast, pragmatists have a much less radical view of the party's goals:

_They are also concerned with comprehensive programmes for social change and selective policy gains but conceive of them more as guidelines for an incremental change of society. They put little emphasis on the party's peculiar organizational form and are more concerned with its electoral performance_ (Kitschelt, 1988b, p131).

Kitschelt argues that left-libertarian parties face numerous difficulties in attempting to function within modern party political systems. Many of these reflect the problems of introducing a new type of political party, based around alternative styles and objectives, into a system rooted in tradition and structure. Parties such as the Greens, who place great emphasis on participation and decentralization, face significant constraints in coping with the traditional patterns of electoral competition. Unlike new social movements, parties express substantive political demands but must also accumulate a power resource in votes, competing with others in a unique competitive setting. Kitschelt argues that to have any sort of future, the new parties must find a method of rendering the ideology and aspirations of their core supporters compatible with gaining sufficient electoral support to influence policy-making (Kitschelt, 1990, p181).

Kitschelt defines this dilemma as a problem of combining a 'logic of constituency representation' with a 'logic of party competition' (Kitschelt, 1988b, p131). Tackling this dilemma draws the two subgroups of 'ideologues' and 'pragmatists' into debate and conflict. Party strategy and development are therefore influenced by the internal balance of power between these two groups. Where ideologues are able to control the party's leadership and direction, it will largely follow a 'logic of constituency representation'. By contrast, when pragmatists gain the upper hand, the party is more likely to look towards a 'logic of party competition' (Kitschelt, 1988b, pp131).

Kitschelt's analysis identifies a division within these parties that is influential in determining their strategic direction. Although his comparative empirical analysis may face criticism concerning the restricted nature of the study, his identification of competing groups within these parties and the focus of their conflict has proved to be an influential insight. Again, one can identify clear links with the 'deep' and 'shallow' scenario highlighted earlier. Furthermore, one can distinguish a primary role for the dual dimensions of commitments to both new social movement forms and the emergent themes of ecologism. For Kitschelt, conflict is focused around two different approaches to party development. One path involves maintaining a commitment to new social movement principles of decentralization and openness by following a 'logic of constituency representation'. The other involves a level of acceptance regarding the need to function effectively within traditional European party systems, which requires an alternative course, based upon following a 'logic of party competition'.

'REALOS AND FUNDIS': THE GERMAN GREENS AS A MODEL FOR UNDERSTANDING PARTY DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE

The groundbreaking success of the Green breakthrough in Germany has resulted in the German Green party *Die Grünen* (later Bundnis 90/Die Grünen, following German unification) becoming the focal point for a large proportion of the analytical research into Green parties. The party experienced an initial period of development and success, followed by a period of internal debates and conflict caused by, and reflected in, a series of disappointing electoral performances. It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that much of our current understanding of Green party division and change has emerged from the analysis of the experiences within *Die Grünen* during the 1980s and early 1990s.

Central to the German case, and later transposed onto other Green parties, has been the identification of an internal factional conflict between two groups, reflecting the divisions highlighted by Kitschelt, which became known as 'realos' and 'fundis'. The conflicts within *Die Grünen* encompassed many important facets of Green party ideology and identity. In particular, conflict centred around how the party should move forward, or, as Markovits describes it, 'defining *Die Grünen*'s optimal strategy' (Markovits and Gorski, 1993, p119). How was social change to be achieved? What role did parliament play in this and what relationship should exist between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary activity? Also, what relationship, if any, should exist between *Die Grünen* and the Social Democrats (SPD)? (Hulsberg, 1988, p141). It is around these issues that the clearest picture of 'realos' and 'fundis' stances are presented.

Realos advocated a move away from a mass-movement focus and towards parliamentary politics, emphasizing the role of alliance and compromise within Green party policy. Coalition, it was argued, represented the only practical way to challenge the German right, as well as providing a pragmatic way to introduce Green policies into the political arena (Hulsberg, 1988, p146). For the realos, therefore, the
role of the party can be identified as one of parliamentary mediator for minority social movements. Achieving these objectives, however, implied major changes to the nature and style of Die Grünen's organization, as Frankland highlights:

*The realos rejected the 'warehouse catalogue' of demands approach to programmatic development; political priorities must be set and 'conscious compromise' must be a foundation for Green politics* (Frankland, 1992, p140).

The realos aimed for a parliamentary focus within the party, advocating the restructuring and 'professionalizing' of the party for a 'reform-politik' that could be supported by a wider social base (Frankland, 1992, p114).

By contrast, fundis rejected any form of tactical orientation merely for the purposes of electoral gain. Any revision of style and objectives was viewed as betraying the original principles from which the party developed. The ideological objectives of Die Grünen, fundamentalists claimed, should not be open to compromise. As Greens no longer viewed left-right political distinctions as capable of solving the problems of modern industrial society, funds argued that the party would not benefit from the development of left-wing coalitions. Parliamentary power could be utilized to greatest effect through tactical and logistical support of the social movements, such as public relations work, and financial and organizational support (Markovits and Gorski, 1993, p122). The stance of the fundis reflected a 'deep' Green conviction that only radical social change would provide lasting environmental solutions, reflected in Petra Kelly's claim that:

*In certain questions, the Greens cannot enter into any compromises. There is not just a little bit of death, a little bit of annihilation, a little bit of cancer, a little bit of war or violence* (cited in Markovits and Gorski, 1993, p123).

The realos faction, as later chapters discuss, eventually gained the upper hand and instigated significant reforms within the party. However, the significance of these changes, and the eventual outcome, had important implications beyond merely organizational structures within the German Green party. Frankland identifies it as a defining moment in the development of Green party politics, during which:

*...the anti-organizational allergies of the movement activists. ... collided with the pragmatic realos, who accepted the inevitabilities of parliamentarization, professionalization, and the role of the promises as political leaders* (Frankland, 1992, p217).

Markovits and Gorski similarly identify the debates as reflecting a desire within the two groups for completely different types of political party, rather than merely an internal party struggle. Fundamentalists, they argue, sought the development of a radical, leftist, Socialist ecology party, reflecting the ideological and activist commitments of the new social movements. The realos, in contrast, wanted to create a reformist party that would appeal to moderate middle-class voters and would provide a pragmatic approach to parliamentary electoral politics, developing an 'ecologically and socially informed restructuring of industrial society' (Markovits and Gorski, 1993, p216).

The nature of the conflict, therefore, appears to represent more than just an internal party struggle. To some it demonstrated that the principles of grassroots democracy were incompatible with the need for efficient political performance under the conditions of parliamentary democracy (Poguntke, 1993, p380). Others saw it as reproducing the structural tensions that had already existed between the new social movements and the newly formed party, although now at a higher political level (Markovits and Gorski, 1993, p216). The conflicts within Die Grünen clearly raised important question marks over the ability of the Green parties to maintain a commitment to new social movement principles, while also aiming to develop a solid and effective party platform from which to represent ecological concerns.

Issues and divisions such as those surrounding the 'realo-fundis' debates within the German Greens have also been transposed onto the patterns of development, change and conflict witnessed within other European Green parties. Here, again, analysis has focused upon the difficulties of marrying the parties' commitment to achieving ecological change with their commitments to the ideals and organizational style of the new social movements. The application of these themes to the European context has enabled Green party researchers to distinguish between 'light' and 'dark', 'electoralist' and 'decentralist', and 'realist' and 'fundamentalist' tendencies within Green parties, and to view change as the attempted resolution of factional disputes along these dimensions. However, closer inspection begins to suggest that the experiences of these parties are actually far from homogeneous.

Within the British Green party, for example, Robinson identifies a 'realo-fundis' split between:

*...those who resolutely seek to defend the purity of their 'Green' principles, and those who are willing selectively...*
to forsake some of these in the interests of pragmatism
(Robinson, 1992, p.211).

He identifies the fundamentalists as refusing to ‘sell out’ to the big power game of politics, while realists seek some level of political influence in the hope of achieving small, but tangible, environmental concessions (Robinson, 1992, p.211). Although both groups are seen to share similar ideological beliefs, realists, it is claimed, are more prepared to compromise to achieve some level of political participation. Bennie et al’s (1995) study, however, questions the case with which we can utilize this dichotomy in the British case. Rather, they identify a far more complex pattern in which party activists were identified as ‘realists’ within particular spheres, such as party policy and strategy, but at an ideological level still viewed themselves as ‘fundamentalists’. The study therefore raises questions regarding whether activist identification with such categorizations are largely issue specific rather than evidence of a completely distinctive ideological stance.

Realo–fundis classifications have also been utilized to examine changes and conflicts within the French Green party, Les Verts, and the Italian Lista Verde. In France, debates over possible alliances with other parties have produced significant levels of internal factionalism and conflict within the party. These debates have been portrayed within the context of realo–fundis divisions, with Antoine Waechter’s strategy of party autonomy being identified as a ‘fundis’ stance in contrast to Dominique Voynet’s ‘realo’ position of favouring alliances with the left.24 In a slightly different context, Rhodes’s analysis of the Italian Lista Verde identifies a split between those activists which he defines as ‘pure Greens’ and those activists within the organization who hold a new left commitment. Again, however, a primary factor in this division appears to be a strategic distinction between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary activity. He suggests that:

This split tends to mirror that between the supporters of demonstrations and grassroots activism (the piazza) and the advocates of national lobbying and parliamentary politics (the palazzo) (Rhodes, 1995, p.186).

Doherty (1992) extends the comparative application of the realo–fundis typology by examining the extent to which realo–fundis conflicts and divisions can be identified as a common factor within Western European Green parties. In doing so, he attempts to address the issue of whether these conflicts are necessarily an inherent result of the Greens’ radical ideology and decentralized organization (Doherty, 1992, p.95). His definition of the realo–fundis division again emphasizes the centrality of the two primary theoretical dimensions highlighted throughout this chapter. He describes fundamentalists as:

Those who are, in principle, critical of coalitions with other parties, opposed to centralization of the party organization and sceptical about achieving radical change by parliamentary means (Doherty, 1992, p.97).

By contrast, he claims that realists emphasize the importance of a solid parliamentary strategy, while not completely rejecting the importance of extra-parliamentary action. They seek changes to a number of the initial organizational principles of the parties, claiming that experience has demonstrated the weaknesses of these organizational structures when placed within the competitive system in which they seek representation and influence.

Doherty’s analysis therefore focuses primarily upon the ambiguity in Green party ideas concerning political strategy. Within this context, the foundation for conflict and division rests with the balance struck between extra-parliamentary and parliamentary activity – in particular, between politics pursued outside existing channels of interest intermediation and ‘a politics that accepts certain forms of institutionalization as inevitable’ (Doherty, 1992, p.97). He argues that these debates reflect many of the issues raised when the parties originally decided to move away from social movement activism and into the party political sphere. In attempting to remain true to their social movement origins, Green parties sought to create an organization and structure reflecting the ideals of these movements. It was only as these parties began to achieve electoral successes, and faced the organizational complexities of parliamentary representation at varying levels, that the original blueprint of party organization began to display cracks and deficiencies. Whereas diversity and debate regarding such issues represented a positive point for the social movements, it has proved more damaging to the Green parties as they attempt to represent many different opinions under a single coherent strategy.

Doherty’s analysis suggests a common pattern of ambiguities within the European Green parties concerning the structure of the Green party and the parliamentary or extra-parliamentary focus for its activities, reflected within some form of realo–fundis dispute. Importantly, he also identifies a relationship between the specificities of internal conflict within Green parties, and the social and institutional conditions within which they function. Hence, controversy and conflict over strategy is often sparked by a relatively strong or weak competitive position. Either situation, Doherty argues, has the effect...
of polarizing the party between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary strategies (Doherty, 1992, p116).

To summarize, then, more recent Green party analysis has devoted significant attention to a conflicting division between realist and fundamentalist factions in Western Green parties that is largely reflective of the realo-fundis debates within Die Grünen. The factional division, as Doherty identifies, appears to focus upon ambiguities concerning Green party strategies towards parliamentary versus extra-parliamentary activism. The style of these conflicts, however, may also reflect specific national circumstances. The balance between realist and fundamentalist factions must therefore be viewed in relation to the party structure, the available political opportunities and the way in which Green party members respond to their own national and traditional contexts (Doherty, 1992, p117). Underlying this process we can clearly identify the continued ideological distinction between a ‘true’ or ‘dark’ Green perspective, focusing upon radical ecological commitments, and an alternative ‘shallow’ or ‘light’ Green perspective, which is more reactive to competitive party pressures and is prepared to compromise on key ideals and commitments. These splits are identified as being at the heart of the process of change witnessed within the European Green parties in recent years.

**BEYOND REALOS AND FUNDIS: THE NEED FOR A BROADER UNDERSTANDING OF GREEN PARTY CHANGE**

Binary distinctions such as those between ‘realos’ and ‘fundis’ represent an effective analytical tool for examining strategic positioning and change among the European Green parties. However, the breadth of change experienced within these parties demonstrates that strategic change is not the only focus for reform. Indeed, a brief inspection of recent developments within a number of European Green parties highlights the difficulties associated with adopting these approaches to Green party change, both structural and strategic. In particular, party change does not always result from the existence, and attempted resolution, of factional disputes within the parties based upon such dichotomous distinctions.

The Green parties in both Sweden and Austria experienced significant structural changes that cannot be fully understood purely in terms of internal realo-fundis divisions among activists. The Swedish Green party, Miljöpartiet de Gröna, as will be seen in later chapters, embarked upon a significant period of organizational change during 1991-1992, which was remarkably free of internal ideological division and conflict. The implementation of structural change within the Austrian Green party, Die Grüne Alternative, during the same period, is also difficult to explain in terms of bitter intra-party squabbling along realo-fundis lines. Indeed, as Frankland points out, moves towards a more professionalized, pragmatic Green party ‘did not lead to incriminations, resignations and splinters’ (Frankland, 1996, p212).

An examination of strategic change within both the British and French Green parties also suggests that such change cannot be identified solely as the result of internal party feuding. Despite the deep divisions witnessed within the British Greens during the early 1990s, subsequent Green Party strategy has been shaped by both an ‘anti-partyist’ and ‘pragmatic’ stance. Similarly, Les Verts have been embroiled in numerous strategic upheavals which, closer analysis suggests, have had more to do with the state of political competition than with internal ideological commitments and concerns.

Cases such as these begin to raise questions concerning the nature of Green party development that cannot be fully understood via factional conflicts over party strategy. For example, why should the Green party in Sweden be able to successfully restructure the party organization with relatively little sign of a strategic realo-fundis style conflict, especially when its roots can be traced clearly to the style of new social movement activism at the heart of fundamental Green party commitments? A similar question can be raised in the case of Austria. In contrast, why should the Green party in the UK be ravaged by internal party conflict over issues of party organizational structure, when the changes suggested were markedly less dramatic than those in the Swedish case? In addition, how can one explain the fact that although the party is now dominated by what would be identified as ‘fundamentalists’, it has maintained the organizational structures that were designed as a more pragmatic approach to party politics? Clearly, certain issues have proved more controversial in some Green parties than in others. All appear to have undergone a process of transformation, but have experienced this process in markedly different ways. Green party development and change thus appear more far-reaching than the previous picture of strategic division can identify.

One of the key difficulties within Green party analysis is the apparent gap between Green political theory and the practical experiences of the Green parties themselves. Bennie et al acknowledge this problem, claiming that:

> There is . . . quite a substantial gap between ‘green political theory’ as developed and discussed in academic circles, and the ideas and beliefs of ‘actual’ Greens involved in practising ‘green politics’ (Bennie et al, 1995, p218).
Not only does this apparent 'gap' between theory and practice create problems in analysing Green party development, it has also been identified as having a direct effect on the parties themselves. Kenny, for example, suggests that the conflicts experienced within the European Green parties could be understood as resulting from a lack of ideological guidance due to 'the absence of a cogent and clear Green political theory' (Kenny, 1994, p222). Ecologism, as highlighted, offers a strong critique of modern industrial society and identifies the need for a change in humans' relationship with nature. However, the divergence within Green political thought and eco-philosophy leaves Green parties and environmental movements without a clear picture of the practical measures through which this change should be achieved. The nature and style of Green political theory, one might argue, does not adequately tackle the political realities facing the movements who are seeking to actively implement Green ideas.

Barry (1994) argues that it is important to attempt some level of integration between the philosophical aspect of Green political theory and the practical activism of the various Green movements, of which Green parties represent a case in point. He claims that the problems have arisen due to the separation of Green political theory into two distinct camps – namely, the shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement, at the heart of which is 'an eco-philosophical dispute between anthropocentrism and eco-centrism' (Barry, 1994, p370). The emphasis currently placed upon deep Green philosophy has created a common perception whereby only ecocentrically motivated political action is identified as truly 'Green'. It is this distinction, Barry claims, that has resulted in inappropriate classifications of Green political activity. To gain a more accurate perception of Green political action, we must therefore move away from this focus upon 'deep' and 'shallow' Green politics. In practice, this involves questioning what is actually at the core of Green political thought and Green ideology. Barry's approach is to argue that:

*The reconciliation of Green philosophy and politics depends on seeing that the normative basis of Green politics includes a concern with the human social world and its organisation, as much as a moral concern with the non-human world* (Barry, 1994, p369).

The ecocentric standpoint, therefore, from which 'deep-shallow' dichotomies are produced, neglects a central aspect of Green party activism – namely, that at the heart of this activism is an inevitable concern with the human social world. By neglecting this factor and drawing a distinct line between 'dark' and 'light' Green, theorists are actually moving further away from providing an accurate picture of Green activism and widening the gap between thought and practice.

This theoretical 'gap' would appear to be central to the problems involved in providing an effective explanation of Green party development, change and conflict. In this case, analysis has focused predominantly upon the theoretical roots of the Green parties, emphasizing both the 'newness' of the political challenge and identifying what it means to be 'Green', along both ideological and philosophical dimensions. However, Green party research has yet to devote similar levels of attention to issues surrounding what it means to be a small, new political party struggling for recognition and attempting to represent and implement a distinctive and broad-ranging 'Green' ideology within established party systems. This may be one reason why, as Bennie et al note, one can identify a significant difference between the style and content of Green political theory and philosophy, on the one hand, and the empirical evidence that emerges from studies of Green party politics and activism, on the other (Bennie et al, 1995, p218).

The development of classifications, such as those between 'realsos' and 'fundis', serve to provide an initial link between theory and practice within Green party analysis. However, closer inspection raises concerns that these approaches may tend to obscure more than they actually clarify. The strategic debates and changes that these classifications identify are often translated as a process of ideological dilution through a strategic shift away from broader ideological objectives. Hence, strategic change is connected with the pragmatic relaxing of party commitments to values identified as being at the heart of the ecological–new social movement framework. The identification of realo-fundis-style conflict has therefore taken on much broader ramifications regarding the 'professionalization' of the Green parties and, with it, the implication that recent developments have witnessed the increasing institutionalization of the 'new politics'.

**UNDERSTANDING EUROPEAN GREEN PARTIES: A SUMMARY**

This chapter has highlighted the importance of two central themes within Green party research: on one hand, the relationship of the parties to the ideology of ecologism and the perception of these parties as a vehicle for these values and ideals; and on the other, their relationship to the organizational structures of the new social movements. While these methodological foundations have proved insightful for initial investigations into both the formation and classification of the
European Green parties, in the context of Green party development and change, a broader framework is required.

The binary distinctions and conflicts identified within eco-philosophy and Green political thought have clearly influenced analytical attempts to interpret Green party conflict and change. However, they are likely to produce only a partial picture if, as Dobson claims, 'The politics of ecology does not follow the same ground rules as its philosophy' (Dobson, 1990, p69).

Typologies such as those outlined in this chapter, while providing a useful insight into strategic patterns within Green parties, cannot necessarily explain the complex relationships between conflicting groups within parties. Neither do they necessarily help to explain the relationship between ideology and political action. Kenny suggests that we view the present stage in the development of ecologism as:

...a slow process of convergence in which disparate ideas, diffuse philosophical perspectives and various political preferences are gradually coalescing around a shared ideological agenda (Kenny, 1994, p245).

The next stage of this process, he argues, is the development of a coherent body of political ideas - an aspect within which the evolution of the European Green parties plays a significant part. Within this context, a broader and more in-depth picture of Green party development and change represents a vital dimension in our understanding of the evolution of Green politics. Given this position, the issue that confronts any attempts to provide a comparative analysis of Green party change is how one can integrate the ideas and analytical concepts within Green theory, with the practical experiences of Green party activism.

It was suggested earlier that, although previous theoretical models provide a strong picture of what it means to be 'Green', along both ideological and philosophical dimensions, less detailed analytical attention has surrounded the Greens' role as political parties. While most analysts discussed here have undoubtedly recognized the influence of external political pressures upon Green parties, the primary focus has been upon their 'new politics' characteristics rather than the pressures and barriers facing a new form of political party struggling to gain recognition within long-established, traditional competitive party systems. This is a fundamental dilemma that Green parties themselves have been forced to face head on. The following chapter demonstrates how a more detailed emphasis upon the Greens' role as small political parties helps to provide a clearer framework for understanding their patterns of development and change.

Chapter 2
Placing Green Politics in a 'Party' Environment

While Green parties may represent an alternative approach to party politics, they nevertheless face many of the same pressures and constraints that have confronted the more established political parties across Western Europe. As such, invaluable insights into the processes of party evolution and change, and the implications of these changes, can be gained by examining broader research into the activities of political parties. In particular, highlighting the 'party' dimension within Green party research enhances the perception of the Greens as political actors who are integrated within the confines of competitive European party systems.

By examining development and change within political parties across different systemic contexts, this chapter highlights the important role accredited to the 'external political environment'. It demonstrates the importance of both 'internal' and 'external' pressures as factors influencing change and argues that an accurate understanding of party development must reflect this balance. These arguments provide the impetus for developing a theoretical framework for analysing Green party development and change, which recognizes the distinctive characteristics that have helped shape the Green parties. It also acknowledges the more general pressures that face a small party active within a competitive European party setting.