SUMMARIES

Democracy with Adjectives. Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research

by David Collier e Steven Levitsky

The recent trend toward democratization in countries across the globe has challenged scholars to pursue two potentially contradictory goals: increasing analytic differentiation in order to capture the diverse forms of democracy that have emerged, and avoiding the problem of conceptual stretching that arises when the concept of democracy is applied to cases for which, by relevant scholarly standards, it is not appropriate. This article argues that the pursuit of these two goals has led to the proliferation of conceptual innovations, including numerous subtypes of democracy – that is to say, democracy «with adjectives». The article explores the strenghts and weaknesses of the alternative strategies of conceptual innovation that have emerged and evaluates the trade-offs among them.

Pluralism, Multiculturalism and Outsiders

by Giovanni Sartori

The term «pluralism» is often misused. A reconsideration of its historical origin and development is therefore neċessary in order to avoid the problems of conceptual stretching and impoverishment. This is the very goal this article adresses. The author explores the relationship between both pluralism and tolerance and pluralism and multiculturalism. He criticizes the common practice whereby all these concepts are treated as synonyms and argues in favour of their distinctiveness. Among the concluding remarks, it is stressed that pluralism is strongly related to reciprocity and therefore that «to be pluralistic» doesn't imply accepting every difference.

Differentiated Citizenship and Political integration in Multi-cultural Societies

by Matteo Gianni

One of the most controversial question liberal democracies are facing today concerns the way they politically integrate groups (ethnic, national, or social) which claim the political recognition of their cultural identity. According to the liberal model, the attribution of individual citizenship's rights is the best way to realize political integration. In opposition to this view, this paper argues that the notion of differentiated citinzenship can open up some interesting insights for approaching and resolving this problem. Multicultural societies face deep conflicts of recognition between actors advocating different (and often conflictual) loyalties. These dynamics call into question the liberal ideal of citizenship as the neutral attribution of a common and legal status. In this perspective, the recognition of formal equality of all citizens is the mean to promote self-respect and self-esteem among all citizens. This view is partially misleading. In some cases, it is not through the reaffirmation of equal recognition that it is possible to re-integrate marginalized cultural groups. Sometimes, political recognition (namely some forms of cultural rights) of differences among citizens represents an important step to improve the self respect of members of such groups. Respect and self-respect are crucial preconditions to realize a fair citizenship. And only a fair citizenship can support a genuine and legitimate representative democracy in culturally divided societies.

Political Institutions and Economic Performance in Seventeen Advanced Democracies

by Adriano Pappalardo

The main topic is how Lijphart's majoritarian and consensus models of democracy have coped with the 1975-1995 economic crisis. Building upon the body of the available literature, the Author discusses several methodological and technical problems involved, proposes a new classification of the countries concerned, and tests it against an extensive battery (six indicators) of macroeconomic data. Contrary to previous findings, the results show that majoritarian regimes score better than the competing model on all relevant variables, including those typically associated with the (socialdemocratic) consensus democracies (i.e., unemployment).

Italian Law Making in the First Republic: Consociationalism or Polarization?

by Francesco Zucchini

The article explores the problem of the «consociational» nature of Italian democracy during the First Republic. The Author focuses on the oversized legislative coalitions that supported «particularistic» bills during this period. Two alternative approaches to explain the pattern of behavior in the Italian Parliament are discussed. The first approach emphasizes the polarized nature of Italian politics and denies the existence of real «consociationalism» in Italy. Large legislative coalitions would have passed only residual and minor laws since the main Italian parties were mutually mistrustful to agree on big issues. In contrast, the second approach explains the bulk of legislative behavior as «consociational», that is, a consistent pattern of party consensus on distributive and particularistic policies. An interpretation of law-making in the Italian Parliament is advanced, using rational choice models. The Author suggests that a nested games – approach can illuminate how rules work and help to understand the effects of institutional changes in the law-making process.