The Making of the Democratic Party. The Emergence of the Party Organizations of the German Social Democratic Workers' Party, the British National Liberal Federation and the Dutch Anti-Revolutionary Party, 1860s-1880s

Heyer, A.

Citation

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Author: Heyer, A.
Title: The Making of the Democratic Party
Issue Date: 2019-01-09

Introduction

1. Political Parties and Representative Democracy

The current discussions about political parties appear to suggest that we have reached the end of the democratic membership party. This trend seems to be so obvious that reports about what the Germans call the end of the *Volkspartei* feature prominently in the mass media.[1] Several Western countries, if not all of them, have been affected by this trend. Take Britain, where the once so powerful parties of Labour and Conservatives have lost a considerable share of members and voters, and British Prime Ministers have been forced to rely on smaller parties as coalition partners.[2] In the Netherlands, where coalition governments are the rule rather than the exception, public concerns about the "the future of political parties" are growing.[3] Here, the *volkspartij* of the Labour Party (Partij van de Arbeid), whose electoral results used to claim 53 seats, is now at a historical low with 9 out of the 150 seats of the Dutch parliament in the 2017 election.[4] In the scholarly literature the discussion about party decline has been ongoing for three decades. Most scholars agree that it is difficult to assess the consequences of this development, but there is a general concern that the crisis of the party might point towards a larger crisis of democracy.[5] Declining membership numbers, in particular, are seen as an

---

[1] For instance, Hans-Jürgen Schlamp, "Das Ende der Demokratie, wie wir sie kennen.," *Spiegel Online*, June 22, 2016, http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/europa-den-parteien-laufen-die-mitglieder-weg-a-1078084.html.

[2] While Labour had to rely on the support of the Liberal Democrats for its 2010 government, Conservative Prime Minister Theresa May depended on the Democratic Unionist Party in 2017. For a general discussion of the decline of party membership in the UK see e.g. Paul Whiteley, "Where Have All the Members Gone? The Dynamics of Party Membership in Britain," *Parliamentary Affairs* 62, no. 2 (January 4, 2009): 242–57.

[3] Quote is the title of a lecture series of the Dutch think tank Pro Demos – House of Democracy in the fall of 2015. "Collegereeks 'Hebben politieke partijen de toekomst?,'" *ProDemos* (blog), accessed January 10, 2017, https://www.prodemos.nl/leer/debatten-lezingen-colleges/collegereeks-politieke-partijen-toekomst/.

[4] The PvdA won 53 seats in 1977. "Zetelverdeling Tweede Kamer 1946-Heden," https://www.parlement.com/id/vh8lnhronvx6/zetelverdeling_tweede_kamer_1946_heden, Parlement & Politiek, n.d., accessed May 3, 2018. The 2017 figure is from Kiesraad, "Officiële uitslag Tweede Kamerverkiezing 15 maart 2017," nieuwsbericht, March 21, 2017, https://www.kiesraad.nl/actueel/nieuws/2017/03/20/officiele-uitslag-tweede-kamerverkiezing-15-maart-2017.

[5] Colin Crouch, *Post-Democracy* (Oxford: Polity Press, 2004); Klaus von Beyme, *Die politische Klasse im Parteienstaat* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993). Recently, political theorists even suggested new democratic institutions that contribute to or even replace existing representative ones. Pierre Rosanvallon, *Counter-Democracy: Politics in an Age of Distrust*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); David Van Reybrouck, *Tegen Verkiezingen*, 8th ed. (Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 2015); Tom van der Meer, *Niet de Kiezer is Gek* (Houten: Spectrum, 2017).

indicator of a growing distance between ordinary citizens and the political elite.[6] Scholars fear that if former mass parties lose more members, their democratic function might be jeopardized, because their organizations no longer represent ordinary citizens.[7]

Under closer scrutiny, however, it is not obvious that decreasing party membership poses a threat to representative democracy.[8] For one thing, not only parties, but also other non-political organizations like trade unions and churches have lost membership support.[9] This might not be a crisis of parties, but a general social trend where it has become increasingly difficult to convince potential members of the benefits of permanent membership. Moreover, party members have become increasingly similar to the socio-economic composition of the general electorate. In this sense, their representative function has been strengthened rather than diminished.[10] Third, there is a certain arbitrary element in the way we conceptualize the causal relationship between party membership and representative democracy. Although the quantity is often seen as an empirical indicator for the representative function of parties, we have no understanding about the exact scale of mass membership that is needed to enable a well-functioning system of democratic representation. Differences in national experiences

---

[6]   van Biezen, Mair, and Poguntke, "Going, Going, . . . Gone?"; Susan E. Scarrow, "Parties without Members? Party Organizations in a Changing Electoral Environment," in *Parties Without Partisans Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, ed. Russel J. Dalton, Russell J and Martin P. Wattenberg, 1st paperback, vol. 5, Comparative Politics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 79–101; Philippe C. Schmitter, "Parties Are Not What They Once Were," in *Political Parties and Democracy*, ed. Larry Jay Diamond and Richard Gunther (JHU Press, 2001), 67–89; Ulrich von Alemann and Tim Spier, "Parteimitglieder nach dem 'Ende der Mitgliederpartei' : ein Überblick über Forschungsergebnisse für Westeuropa seit 1990," *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, 2008, 29–44.

[7]   This is a simplified account of the much discussed cartel-party thesis of Katz and Mair. "Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy," *Party Politics* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 1995): 5–28; "The Cartel Party Thesis: A Restatement," *Perspectives on Politics* 7, no. 04 (2009): 753–66. A critique of the cartel-party thesis has been offered by Herbert Kitschelt, "Citizens, Politicians, and Party Cartellization: Political Representation and State Failure in Post-Industrial Democracies," *European Journal of Political Research* 37, no. 2 (March 1, 2000): 149–79. Other contributions to this debate can be found in Ingrid van Biezen, "Political Parties as Public Utilities," *Party Politics* 10, no. 6 (January 11, 2004): 701–22; Pepijn Corduwener, "Institutionalizing the Democratic Party-State: Political Parties as 'Public Utilities' in Italy and West Germany, 1945–75," *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire*, April 13, 2017, 1–20; Russell J. Dalton and Steven A. Weldon, "Public Images of Political Parties: A Necessary Evil?," *West European Politics* 28, no. 5 (November 2005): 931–51.

[8]   In general, the discussion about the consequences of membership decline has several focal points. While Dalton and Weldon relate decreasing trust in parties to low voting turnout, others like Scarrow and Gezgor have compared the socio-economic background of party members and the general electorate. They conclude that sinking membership numbers are not a problem for representation, because party members share more socio-economic characteristics with their voters. Dalton and Weldon, "Public Images of Political Parties"; Susan E. Scarrow and Burcu Gezgor, "Declining Memberships, Changing Members? European Political Party Members in a New Era," *Party Politics* 16, no. 6 (November 2010): 823–43.

[9]   Ingrid van Biezen and Thomas Poguntke, "The Decline of Membership-Based Politics," *Party Politics* 20, no. 2 (March 1, 2014): 205–16.

[10] Scarrow and Gezgor, "Declining Memberships, Changing Members?"

show that the proportion of party members in the general population varies from as high as 17.27% in Austria to as low as 1.21% in Britain.[11] Fourthly, recent research on long-term developments has questioned the assumption of declining membership numbers and suggested that in most countries their peak might be a historical exception, rather than a rule.[12] Finally, political theorists have argued that representation is essentially constructed in a process where claim-making is more important than actual procedures.[13] In this sense, the representative function of political parties has always depended on the ability of party leaders to make credible arguments about legitimately speaking for specific constituencies.[14]

These points raise the question why scholars and journalists describe the decline of mass membership of parties through the lenses of representative democracy? To answer this question, the historical roots of the relationship between party organizations and democracy need to be better understood. Originally, the term "party" had a broader, primarily negative, meaning, referring to groups holding opposing opinions.[15] For instance, in the Netherlands, "partijen" were considered to be a threat to a harmonious public order, worth criticizing and preventing.[16] Only in the first half of the twentieth century parties did become increasingly conceptualized as essential to democracy. The most important feature of these new parties was their ability to represent the people through a broad membership organization. Remarkably, the early scholarly judgment on the representative function of parties was not always a positive one. Robert Michels' Iron Law of Oligarchy stated that parties were inevitably doomed to be controlled by an internal elite, disregarding the interests of ordinary members.[17] In the case of

---

[11] Figures are from 2008, van Biezen, Mair, and Poguntke, "Going, Going, . . . Gone?," 28.

[12] Scarrow, "Parties without Members? Party Organizations in a Changing Electoral Environment."

[13] Michael Saward, *The Representative Claim* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).

[14] See especially Enroth's argument that the problem with cartel parties is not their failure to represent their constituencies, but rather that it is difficult to empirically determine whether they are representative or not. "Cartelization versus Representation? On a Misconception in Contemporary Party Theory," *Party Politics* 23, no. 2 (March 1, 2017): 124–34.

[15] An exception to the negative perception of partisanship can be found in the writings of the eighteenth-century British Conservative Edmund Burke who described partisanship as beneficial to the common good. Terence Ball, "Party," in *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, ed. James Farr, Russell L. Hanson, and Terence Ball, Ideas in Context (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 155–76; Jonathan White, *Meaning of Partisanship.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 14–21. In the German-speaking context, there was a similar developments where "Partei" was largely considered to be a community in principle (Gesinnungsgemeinschaft). Klaus von Beyme, "Partei," ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck, *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978).

[16] Adriaan van Veldhuizen, "De Partij: over het politieke leven in de vroege S.D.A.P." (Leiden University, 2015), 18–19.

[17] Robert Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie: Untersuchungen über die oligarchischen Tendenzen des Gruppenlebens* (Leipzig: Klinkhardt, 1911), http://www.archive.org/stream/zursoziologiede00michgoog#page/n8/mode/2up. See also for an analysis of Michels' theoretical work Lawrence A. Scaff, "Max Weber and Robert Michels," *The American Journal of Sociology* 86, no. 6

Britain, Mosei Ostrogorski criticized party organizations for what he considered improper interference in the electoral process and the disruption of individual citizens' proper representation in parliament.[18] But there were also more optimistic evaluations, like those of Abbott Lawrence Lowell and Hans Kelsen, who praised parties for channeling diffuse public opinion into clear policy choices.[19] Max Weber even saw party organizations as instrumental for a democratic state to organize democracy in an orderly way.[20]

This growing scholarly interest in the democratic nature of parties was the result of an earlier modification of their institutional form. In the 1860s and 1870s the traditionally loose alliances of parliamentary representatives were merged with the extra-parliamentary membership organizations. Parties started to become permanent organizations with a formalized political agenda.[21] For most political commentators and later scholars this was a crucial moment and remarkable process, which was viewed with apprehension. The founders of the new party organizations further strengthened these concerns by using language that was provocative for their contemporaries. They proudly announced that their organizations would finally enable the participation of ordinary people in political institutions. In a period where democracy was a highly contested term, they called their party "democratic" and praised the "popular basis" of their organizational structure.[22] This allowed the self-styled "democrats" to

(May 1, 1981): 1269–86; Andrew G. Bonnell, "Oligarchy in Miniature? Robert Michels and the Marburg Branch of the German Social Democratic Party," *German History* 29, no. 1 (March 1, 2011): 23–35; Philip J. Cook, "Robert Michels's Political Parties in Perspective," *The Journal of Politics* 33, no. 3 (1971): 773–96.

[18] Mosei Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, vol. 1 (New York: Macmillan, 1902), http://archive.org/details/democracyandtheo031734mbp.Mosei Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, vol. 1 (New York: Macmillan, 1902), http://archive.org/details/democracyandtheo031734mbp. For a historical analysis of Ostrogorski's position on parties, see Paolo Pombeni, "Starting in Reason, Ending in Passion. Bryce, Lowell, Ostrogorski and the Problem of Democracy," *The Historical Journal* 37, no. 02 (1994): 319–41.

[19] Pombeni, "Starting in Reason, Ending in Passion. Bryce, Lowell, Ostrogorski and the Problem of Democracy"; Sandrine Baume, *Hans Kelsen and the Case for Democracy* (Colchester: ECPR Press, 2012).

[20] For an analysis of Weber's position on parties, see Henk te Velde, "The Domestication of a Machine. The Debate about Political Parties around 1900," in *Organizing Democracy Reflections on the Rise of Political Organizations in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Henk te Velde and Maartje Janse (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 255–75.

[21] Henk te Velde and Maartje Janse, eds., *Organizing Democracy: Reflections on the Rise of Political Organizations in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017). See chapter one for a more detailed discussion of associational culture in Europe.

[22] "sozial-demokratisch" "Protokoll über die Verhandlungen des Allgemeinen Deutschen sozial-demokratischen Arbeiterkongresses zu Eisenach am 7. , 8. und 9. August 1869," in *Protokolle der sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei*, vol. 1 (Glashütten im Taunus: Verlag Detlev Auvermann KG, 1971), 55; "Proceedings Attending the Formation of the National Federation of Liberal Associations with Report of Conference Held in Birmingham" (The "Journal" Printing Offices, 1877), 7, Manuscript Papers Relating to Francis Schnadhorst and the Organisation of the Liberal Party, Special Collections, University of Bristol. For a discussion of the term democracy in nineteenth-century Europe, see Robert Saunders, *Democracy and the Vote in British Politics, 1848-1867: The Making of the Second Reform Act* (Aldershot: Ashgate,

position themselves as the representatives of the masses against the "aristocrats" and "dictatorship" of their political opponents.[23] Meanwhile, the nineteenth-century critics of party organization pointed to the gap between the announced mass membership and the actual size of the party. For them, the promise of hundreds of thousands of members was a crude exaggeration of the reality of a few thousand followers.[24]

These historical discussions about the democratic character of party organization serve as a starting point for my dissertation. Instead of analyzing the current state of membership parties, I study the founding years of the relationship between party organization and democracy. This allows me to approach party formation from a different angle. Many scholars have described parties as crucial institutions for democratic representation in present political systems.[25] They have, however, given little attention to the fact that this relationship might also have a reversed effect. Parties not only were contested organizations in processes of democratization, democratic ideas and practices also were a decisive factor in the emergence of the first party organizations. My study bridges this gap in the literature by comparing three early party organizations with different ideological orientations and national circumstances. The main research question is: why and how did the first party organizations emerge?

To answer this question, the dissertation analyzes the nineteenth-century discourse and practices of early party founders. Their organizations operated on two levels that enabled the development of a new organizational model that would decisively determine political history for the coming decades. The representative capability of the new parties' membership was both a contested rhetoric and an actual experience.[26] On the one hand, there was the

---

2011); Joanna Innes and Mark Philp, *Re-Imagining Democracy in the Age of Revolutions: America, France, Britain, Ireland 1750-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Henk te Velde, 'De domesticatie van democratie in Nederland. Democratie als strijdbegrip van de negentiende eeuw tot 1945', *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 127, no. 2 (25 June 2012): 3–27.Robert Saunders, *Democracy and the Vote in British Politics, 1848-1867: The Making of the Second Reform Act* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011); Joanna Innes and Mark Philp, *Re-Imagining Democracy in the Age of Revolutions: America, France, Britain, Ireland 1750-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Henk te Velde, 'De domesticatie van democratie in Nederland. Democratie als strijdbegrip van de negentiende eeuw tot 1945', *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 127, no. 2 (25 June 2012): 3–27.

[23] Rienk Janssens, *De opbouw van de Antirevolutionaire Partij 1850-1888* (Verloren, 2001), 156–58; Velde, "De domesticatie van democratie," 14. "Protokoll," 11.

[24] This point is further elaborated in chapter four and five of this dissertation. See also Susan E. Scarrow, *Beyond Party Members: Changing Approaches to Partisan Mobilization*, Comparative Politics (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), chap. three.

[25] For instance, Larry Jay Diamond and Richard Gunther, *Political Parties and Democracy* (JHU Press, 2001). The most recent contribution to this discussion is probably Giovanni Capoccia and Daniel Ziblatt, "The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies: A New Research Agenda for Europe and Beyond," *Comparative Political Studies* 43, no. 8–9 (2010): 931–68.

[26] This approach is inspired by a recent study of political scientist Susan Scarrow, who has argued that historical membership numbers of parties have to be studied with caution, because they were both "organizational rhetoric and (…) organizational practices." Scarrow, *Beyond Party Members*, 67.

powerful promise of mass politics that would allow for a better system of democratic representation. Party founders told their followers that their organizations were the only tool to achieve democratic reform and the political participation of ordinary people.[27] This was, of course, an exaggeration of organizational routine where a small group controlled the course of the comparably low number of party members. Still we should not underestimate the importance of the appeal of the narrative of the quantitatively membership organization. Ideas, narratives or scripts have the power to create new political realities.[28] Early party founders' claims about their ability to enable the political participation of ordinary people in- and outside their organizations might look exaggerated given our understanding of modern democracy, but they functioned as a self-fulfilling prophecy that enabled democratization, especially in a period when political rights were limited to a small fraction of the population.

Based on these initial considerations, the dissertation's objective is to contribute to the historiography of party formation. Because it does not rely on a single case study, but rather analyzes several party organizations, this study shows why and how organizing as a party became a possible and logical course of action in a nineteenth-century setting. In conversation with more conventional narratives of political history, I derive new explanatory factors for party emergence and show how they shaped the first years of organizational consolidation in a transnational framework.[29] Through this broader angle I finally hope to inspire a different perspective on the current discussions about party decline. Studying the first moment when the relationship between democracy and party organization was fostered, the dissertation intends to offer a historical contribution on the crisis of membership parties.

2. Historical Comparison

The study is based on an interdisciplinary research design. Although historians as well as political scientists have studied early party organizations, there is surprisingly little exchange between party scholars of the two disciplines. One of the main reasons for this continued separation are different objectives and epistemologies. For most social scientists, early party organizations are not the primary research object, but rather serve as a starting point to explain

---

[27] Rosanvallon has referred to the ambigious nature of democracy writing that "democracy is always at one and the same time the apparent solution to the modern problem of the constitution of social order as well as a question for ever left unanswered." Pierre Rosanvallon, 'Towards a Philosophical History of the Political', in *The History of Political Thought in National Context*, ed. Dario Castiglione and Iain Hampsher-Menk, Ideas in Context (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 196.

[28] See e.g. Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein, *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015); Gordon S. Wood, *The Idea of America: Reflections on the Birth of the United States* (London: Penguin Books, 2011), chap. 1.

[29] See, for instance, Dimiter Toshkov, *Political Analysis: Research Design in Political Science* (New York: Palgrave, 2016).Dimiter Toshkov, *Political Analysis: Research Design in Political Science* (New York: Palgrave, 2016).

current political developments. Social scientists who venture into the still largely unchartered territory of the history of the first party organizations rely on comparison to develop multiple sorts of categorization, for instance, by suggesting Weberian-style ideal types.[30] Based on a large sample of cases, the relationship between parties and democratization has been explored in numerous studies.[31] Concentrating on a number of well-known historical cases in the first part of their books, party scholars like Duverger and Satori decisively shaped our understanding of the broad phenomenon of party emergence.[32] Their systematic studies demonstrate the relevance of studying early parties in a more general research design, even though their broad focus limits both the depth of their empirical research and exchange with recent scholarly work of political historians. An exception to this is the work of Susan Scarrow, who has relied on primary sources and historiography to place parties' membership numbers in their historical context. Her work on the difference between the myth and realities of membership numbers has inspired this dissertation to study in more detail what the ideas and practices of democratic mass organization meant for the formation of the first party organizations.[33]

The dissertation also stands in the tradition of the often more detailed and specialized research of history. While most social scientists compare several parties, historians usually chose to study a single case study of party emergence.[34] Instead of generalized conclusions, the party historiography is full of detailed analyses of primary sources that are carefully interpreted in their specific historical context. The few party historians who have used historical comparison for party research studied a small number of cases to minimize methodological problems like

---

[30] See Angelo Panebianco, *Political Parties: Organization and Power* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 17; Ingrid van Biezen, "Building Party Organisations and the Relevance of Past Models: The Communist and Socialist Parties in Spain and Portugal," *West European Politics* 21, no. 2 (April 1, 1998): 32–62.

[31] For instance, Joseph G. LaPalombara and Myron Weiner, 'The Origin and Development of Political Parties', in *Political Parties and Political Development*, ed. Joseph G. LaPalombara and Myron Weiner, 6 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 3–42; Hans Daalder, 'Parties, Elites, and Political Developments in Western Europe', in *Political Parties and Political Development*, ed. Joseph La Palombra and Myron Weiner, Studies in Political Development 6 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 43–77.

[32] See the classic work of Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, trans. D. W. Brogan, Third edition (London: Barnes and Noble, 1967); Giovanni Sartori, *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis* (ECPR Press, 2005).

[33] Scarrow, *Beyond Party Members*.

[34] Of special importance for this dissertation are John P. Rossi, *The Transformation of the British Liberal Party: A Study of the Tactics of the Liberal Opposition, 1874-1880* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1978); John Russell Vincent, *The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-1868* (London: Constable, 1966); Janssens, *opbouw*; Shlomo Na'aman, *Die Konstituierung der Deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1862/63* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975); Thomas Welskopp, *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit: die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vom Vormärz bis zum Sozialistengesetz* (Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz, 2000).

different languages and historiographies.[35] For instance, specializing in a single ideological orientation, Åberg compared the Liberal Party in Germany and its counterpart in Sweden.[36] Another possibility is the comparison within a single national context like Mittmann's comprehensive study between the Social Democrats and the Centre Party in Germany.[37] Other authors, most prominently the influential historians Nipperdey and Hanham, and recently, de Jong, analysed entire party systems to demonstrate the importance of party competition for the political developments of Germany, Britain or the Netherlands respectively.[38] Tracing the transfer between German and British Socialist parties, Berger has shown how successful models of party organization in two countries influence each other and inspire their further institutionalization.[39] Another notable inspiration is the work of historian Pombeni who has analyzed the history of British, French, German and Italian party systems to engage with early-twentieth-century criticism of party organization.[40] This dissertation is inspired by Pombeni's approach, but will look at three specific cases in more detail, enabling a closer analysis of the emergence of the first party organizations.

Summing up, this dissertation connects the principles of the social sciences and history to provide a new research approach to the phenomenon of early party organization. Sartori has used the metaphor of the "ladder of abstraction" to explain the limits of comparison. Climbing up the ladder, thus creating increasing abstraction, scholars cannot avoid missing some of the details of the case-specific context. Likewise, descending the ladder means that general observations will remain limited.[41] Analyzing three party organizations, I stand somewhere on the middle steps of Sartori's ladder. The study is based on primary sources and the specialized secondary literature of both disciplines to provide in-depth insights into the creation of an

---

[35] Jürgen Kocka, "Comparison and Beyond," *History and Theory* 42, no. 1 (2003): 39–44. On a general level, Baldwin has argued that historians should work more often with comparisons to study causality. Peter Baldwin, "Comparing and Generalizing: Why All History Is Comparative, yet No History Is Sociology.," in *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, ed. Maura O'Connor and Deborah Cohen (New York: Routledge, 2004), 1–22.

[36] For instance, Martin Åberg, *Swedish and German Liberalism from Factions to Parties 1860-1920* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2011). See also Berger's detailed comparison between German and British Labour parties *The British Labour Party and the German Social Democrats, 1900 - 1931* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).

[37] Ursula Mittmann, *Fraktion und Partei* (Droste, 1976).

[38] Thomas Nipperdey, *Die Organisation der deutschen Parteien vor 1918* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1961); Harold John Hanham, *Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone* (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1978); Ron de Jong, *Van standspolitiek naar partijloyaliteit: verkiezingen voor de Tweede Kamer 1848-1887* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1999).

[39] Stefan Berger, "Herbert Morrison's London Labour Party in the Interwar Years and the SPD: Problems of Transferring German Socialist Practices to Britain," *European Review of History: Revue Europeenne d'histoire* 12, no. 2 (2005); Berger, *The British Labour Party*.

[40] Paolo Pombeni, *Introduction à l'histoire des partis politiques* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992).

[41] Giovanni Sartori, "Comparing and Miscomparing," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3, no. 3 (1991): 254.

important political institution. In order to allow for a detailed study of the process of party formation, the dissertation focuses on the years around the decade between 1869 and 1879 in which the three cases were founded. This means that for each case the five years before and after the founding assembly have been studied. Still one should not ignore the fact that, already in their early phase, the ideas and practices of party organizations exceeded the traditional boundaries of the nation state. I, therefore, compare three case studies to venture out of the traditional field of party history that usually relies on historical comparison of two cases. To analyze the broad range of nineteenth-century party formation, the dissertation brings together organizations that are usually not studied together. Moreover, the dissertation incorporates a transnational perspective by studying the three cases as an interrelated phenomenon of political transition.

3. Three Early Party Organizations

In order to bridge the gap between history and the social sciences, I will introduce the three cases in connection to the research approaches of both disciplines. The three cases of this study are: the German Social Democratic Workers' Party (Sozialdemokratische Arbeiter Partei, SDAP), the British National Liberal Federation (NLF) and the Dutch Anti-Revolutionary Party (Anti-Revolutionaire Partij, ARP). Historians are familiar with these three party organizations because they are important cases of national historiographies and generally considered to be the first modern parties of their national political systems.[42] Their founders were among the first to combine organizational structure outside of parliament with parliamentary representation. Still, the specialized historiography mentions organizations that could fit this definition and emerged before these three prominent cases. Depending on their specific research interest, historians have named the German Central March Association (Centralmärzverein) in 1848 and the National Association (Nationalverein) in 1859 and the General German Workers' Associations (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein) in 1863 as the first German party organization.[43] In Britain, the Liberals had already established the Liberal Registration Society

---

[42] For the Dutch ARP, this argument has been made in both general and specialized literature. Herman de Liagre Böhl, "Hoofdlijnen in de politieke ontwikkeling van het moderne Nederland," in *Maatschappij & Nederlandse politiek.*, ed. Uwe Becker (Het Spinhuis, 1998), 213; George Harinck and Arie van Deursen, "Woord vooraf," in *De Antirevolutionaire Partij, 1829-1980*, ed. Roel Kuiper, Peter Bak, and George Harinck (Hilversum: Verloren, 2001), 10; de Jong, *Van standspolitiek naar partijloyaliteit*, 22. For the British NLF, see Francis H. Herrick, "The Origins of the National Liberal Federation," *Journal of Modern History* 17, no. 2 (June 1, 1945): 116–29. For German Social Democracy, see Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie*; David E. Barclay and Eric D. Weitz, *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998).

[43] Dieter Langewiesche, 'Die Anfänge der deutschen Parteien. Partei, Fraktion und Verein in der Revolution von 1848/49', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 4, no. 3 (1 January 1978): 324–61; Andreas Biefang, *Politisches Bürgertum in Deutschland, 1857-1868: nationale Organisationen und Eliten* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1994); Toni Offermann, *Die erste deutsche Arbeiterpartei: Materialien zur Organisation,*

(later Liberal Central Association) to nationally coordinate electoral efforts in 1860.[44] In 1867 the Tories followed this example and founded the British National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations.[45] Finally, in the Netherlands the conservative General Electoral Association (Algemeene Kiesvereniging) emerged in 1868.[46]

The three cases of this study - German SDAP, British NLF and Dutch ARP - differ from these earlier cases of party organization because of their ability to survive the first years of organizational consolidation. As the first permanent party organizations, their organizational structures existed until the twentieth, or even twenty-first, century. Comparing these three party organizations with different political orientations in different national contexts is a challenge and an opportunity. It requires not only the command of three languages, but also a thorough understanding of national historiographies. The prominent position of the three cases in the secondary literature helps in dealing with this challenge. The German SDAP, after being renamed Socialist Workers' Party (Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei) in 1875 and later Social Democratic Party (Sozialdemokratische Partei), became the "model party" of Marxist Socialism.[47] When at the beginning of the twentieth century, Michels described German Social Democracy in his *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der Modernen Demokratie* (On the Sociology of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy)*,* the party became the most cited example of early party organization.[48] For the early phase of Social Democratic history, a significant number of detailed studies have been published that provide a good addition to the more general literature on the party in the later phase of Imperial Germany.[49] The British party

Verbreitung und Sozialstruktur von ADAV und LADAV, 1863-1871 (Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz, 2002).Dieter Langewiesche, 'Die Anfänge der deutschen Parteien. Partei, Fraktion und Verein in der Revolution von 1848/49', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 4, no. 3 (1 January 1978): 324–61; Andreas Biefang, *Politisches Bürgertum in Deutschland, 1857-1868: nationale Organisationen und Eliten* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1994); Toni Offermann, *Die erste deutsche Arbeiterpartei: Materialien zur Organisation, Verbreitung und Sozialstruktur von ADAV und LADAV, 1863-1871* (Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz, 2002).

[44] Vincent, *The Formation of the Liberal Party*, 84–85.

[45] Robert Blake, *The Conservative Party from Peel to Churchill* (London: Fontana, 1972), 114; Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, 1978, 93, 349–68; Archie Hunter, *A Life of Sir John Eldon Gorst: Disraeli's Awkward Disciple* (London: Frank Cass, 2001).Robert Blake, *The Conservative Party from Peel to Churchill* (London: Fontana, 1972), 114; Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, 1978, 93, 349–68; Archie Hunter, *A Life of Sir John Eldon Gorst: Disraeli's Awkward Disciple* (London: Frank Cass, 2001).

[46] Ron de Jong, 'De Algemeene Kiesvereeniging, 1868-1875. De eerste politieke partij van Nederland', in *Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen 1999*, ed. Gerrit Voerman and Anthonie Lucardie, Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen (Groningen: DNPP, 2000), 240–50.

[47] Barclay and Weitz, *Between Reform and Revolution*, 2.

[48] Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie*. For a more recent application of Michel's theoretical framework, see Charlie Jeffery, *Social Democracy in the Austrian Provinces, 1918-1934: Beyond Red Vienna* (London: Leicester University Press, 1995).

[49] Most recently and influential for this study is Welskopp, *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit*. See also Na'aman, *Die Konstituierung*; Ilse Fischer, *August Bebel und der Verband Deutscher Arbeitervereine 1867/68: Brieftagebuch und Dokumente*, Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, Beiheft 14 (Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz

organization of the National Liberal Federation is known as the "source of modern popular party organization" in the party historiography.[50] The early party scholar Mosei Ostrogroski wrote about it in his influential *Democracy and Organization* after the turn of the century.[51] Despite the large international impact of Ostrogorski's study, research on the early years of the NLF has been confined to a number of articles and book chapters that are accompanied by more general studies of the parliamentary Liberal Party.[52] As the first "modern" party organization of the

---

Nachf., 1994); Ursula Herrmann, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Geraer Vereinstags 1867: Eine Dokumentation," *Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* 27, no. 2 (1991): 182–208; Ernst Schraepler, "Der Zwölfer-Ausschuss des Vereinstages Deutscher Arbeitervereine und die Ereignisse von 1866," *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 16–17 (1968): 210–53; Offermann, *Die erste deutsche Arbeiterpartei*. In addition, there are numerous studies on the local and regional levels that have influenced this dissertation, for instance, Georg Eckert, *Aus den Anfängen der Braunschweiger Arbeiterbewegung: unveröffentlichte Bracke-Briefe* (Braunschweig: Limbach, 1955); Georg Eckert, "Aus der Korrespondenz des Braunschweiger Ausschusses der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiter-Partei.," in *Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch*, 45 (Wolfenbüttel: Waisenhaus-Buchdruckerei und Verlag, 1664), 107–49; Stephan Resch and Karl Borromäus Murr, *Lassalles "südliche Avantgarde": Protokollbuch des Allgemeinen Deutschen Arbeitervereins der Gemeinde Augsburg* (Bonn: Dietz, J H, 2013); Gerlinde Runge, *Die Volkspartei in Württemberg von 1864 bis 1871: Die Erben der 48er Revolution im Kampf gegen die preussisch-klein-deutsche Lösung der nationalen Frage*, vol. 62, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, B (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1970); Torsten Kupfer, "Die organisatorische Entwicklung der Sozialdemokratie in Preußen nach dem Sozialistengesetz 1889 - 1898," *Moving the Social* 18 (1997): 61–82; Toni Offermann, "Die regionale Ausbreitung der frühen deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1848/49-1860/64," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 13, no. 4 (1987): 419–47. See also the edited volumes of Hans Mommsen, ed., *Sozialdemokratie zwischen Klassenbewegung und Volkspartei: Verhandungen der Sektion Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung des Deutschen Historikertages in Regensburg, Okt. 1972* (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1974); Gerhard Ritter, *Arbeiterbewegung, Parteien und Parlamentarismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976); Gerhard Ritter, *Der Aufstieg der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung: Sozialdemokratie und freie Gewerkschaften im Parteiensystem und Sozialmilieu des Kaiserreiches* (München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1990). An excellent English-language overview is provided by Stefan Berger, *Social Democracy and the Working Class in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Germany*, Themes in Modern German History Series (Harlow: Longman, 2000). Older English-language contributions are Douglas A. Chalmers, *The Social Democratic Party of Germany, from Working-Class Movement to Modern Political Party* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964); Roger Pearce Morgan, *The German Social Democrats and the First International, 1864-1872* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); Vernon L. Lidtke, *Outlawed Party: Social Democracy in Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966); Richard W. Reichard, *Crippled from Birth: German Social Democracy, 1844-1870* (Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1969); Barclay and Weitz, *Between Reform and Revolution*.

[50] Herrick, 'The Origins', 116.Herrick, 'The Origins', 116.

[51] Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization*.Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization*. See also Watson's early description of NLF history. *The National Liberal Federation from Its Commencement to the General Election of 1906* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907).

[52] Herrick, "The Origins"; Trygve R. Tholfsen, "The Origins of the Birmingham Caucus," *The Historical Journal* 2, no. 2 (January 1, 1959): 161–84; Griffiths, P. C, "The Origins and Development of the National Liberal Federation to 1886" (Oxford, 1973); P. C Griffiths, "The Caucus and the Liberal Party in 1886," *History* 61, no. 202 (June 1, 1976): 183–97; Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, 1978; Patricia

Netherlands, the Anti-Revolutionary Party adds a case to the study that is less known to an international audience. Still in the Dutch historiography, the party has gained renewed attention, both as an interesting case of its own and as an important example of nineteenth-century political history.[53] Although mentioned in some comparative studies, its presence in the social science literature has given an incorrect impression of its process of emergence. This party organization did not emerge out of "the Churches and religious sects" outside of parliament, as party scholar Maurice Duverger suggested, but had important roots in the parliamentary faction around the aristocratic MP Groen van Prinsterer.[54] In addition, a number

---

Auspos, "Radicalism, Pressure Groups, and Party Politics: From the National Education League to the National Liberal Federation," *Journal of British Studies* 20, no. 1 (October 1, 1980): 184–204; Eugenio F. Biagini, *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism, 1876-1906* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), chap. four; James Owen, *Labour and the Caucus: Working-Class Radicalism and Organised Liberalism in England, 1868-1888* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014). For the parliamentary Liberal Party, see for instance Vincent, *The Formation of the Liberal Party*; Rossi, *The Transformation of the British Liberal Party*; Jonathan Parry, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993); Terence Andrew Jenkins, *The Liberal Ascendancy, 1830-1886* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994).

[53] See especially Janssens, *opbouw*. But also Roel Kuiper, *Herenmuiterij: vernieuwing en sociaal conflict in de antirevolutionaire beweging, 1871-1894* (Leiden: Groen, 1994); Arie van Deursen, 'Van antirevolutionaire richting naar antirevolutionaire partij 1829-1871', in *De Antirevolutionaire Partij, 1829-1980*, ed. George Harinck, Roel Kuiper, and Peter Bak (Hilversum: Verloren, 2001), 11–52; Ron de Jong, 'Antirevolutionaire partijvorming, 1848-1879: een afwijkende visie', in *Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen 2001*, ed. Gerrit Voerman, Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen (Groningen: DNPP, 2003), 213–26, http://pub.dnpp.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/root/ DNPPjaarboeken/2001/Antirevolupartijvo/; Ron de Jong, 'Het antirevolutionaire volk achter de kiezers. De mythe van een leuze. De electorale aanhang van de ARP rond 1885 en in 1918', *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 123, no. 2 (1 January 2008): 185–96. For an overview on the recent historiography see, D.F.J. Bosscher, "Een partij die niet ophoudt te fascineren: nieuwe literatuur over de Antirevolutionaire Partij," in *Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen 2001*, Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen (Groningen: DNPP, 2003), 227–36, http://pub.dnpp.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/root/DNPPjaarboeken/ 2001/Eenpartijdienietop/. The relationship of the ARP to earlier forms of political protest has been discussed by Annemarie Houkes, *Christelijke vaderlanders: godsdienst, burgerschap en de nederlandse natie (1850-1900)* (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2009); Maartje Janse, *De Afschaffers: Publieke Opinie, Organisatie en Politiek in Nederland 1840-1880* (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2007). For recent references to the ARP's general position in Dutch political history, see, for instance, Henk te Velde, *Stijlen van leiderschap: persoon en politiek van Thorbecke tot Den Uyl* (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2002); Ido de Haan, *Het beginsel van leven en wasdom: de constitutie van de Nederlandse politiek in de negentiende eeuw*, De natiestaat (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2003); de Jong, *Van standspolitiek naar partijloyaliteit*.

[54] Duverger, *Political Parties*, xxxi. For Groen van Prinsterer, see, among many other titles, Jan Willem Kirpestein, "Groen van Prinsterer als belijder van kerk en staat in de negentiende eeuw" (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1993).

of well-researched political biographies have described the life of leading party activists of the three party organizations by critically engaging with their contemporary image.[55]

Because this study is inspired by the scholarly discussions about the current decline of party organization, the dissertation has followed additional analytical criteria, based on the social science literature. I do not claim to have employed the rigid framework of political science, but rather use their reasoning as a starting point for a historical analysis. Comparative scholars distinguish between most different research design and most similar research design.[56] The most different research design is best suited to offer new explanatory factors of party emergence. For this study, I use an exploratory approach that is not based on hypotheses. In this sense, the dissertation follows the approach of historians that build their analysis inductively by first going to the archive before identifying general mechanisms. Still, the dissertation starts with noting that the outcome remains constant: the three cases followed a similar organizational model in the same period. Differences occur in what one could call two possible independent variables 1) national circumstances and 2) ideological orientation. Concerning the first independent variable, the national circumstances of Germany, Britain and the Netherlands differed in regard to their nineteenth-century transformations in a) political institutions and b) socio-economic structure.[57] The German Social Democratic Workers' Party was founded two years before German unification in 1869. While the Reichstag had only limited influence, universal male suffrage had been established in the states of the North German Confederation in 1867.[58] The second case, the British National Liberal Federation emerged in

---

[55] Biographies of Joseph Chamberlain provide a particularly valuable addition to the literature on his party organization. See, for instance, Peter T. Marsh, *Joseph Chamberlain: Entrepreneur in Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); Michael Balfour, *Britain and Joseph Chamberlain* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985); Denis Judd, *Radical Joe: A Life of Joseph Chamberlain* (London: Hamilton, 1977); Duncan Watts, *Joseph Chamberlain and the Challenge of Radicalism* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1992); James Louis Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan, 1932). For Abraham Kuyper this dissertation has primarily relied on the recent study of Jeroen Koch who provided an extensive account in connection with recent innovations in political culture Jeroen Koch, *Abraham Kuyper: een biografie* (Utrecht: Boom, 2007). See also C. Augustijn, J. H. Prins, and H.E.S. Woldring, eds., *Abraham Kuyper: zijn volksdeel, zijn invloed* (Delft: Meinema, 1987); James D. Bratt, *Abraham Kuyper: Modern Calvinist, Christian Democrat*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013). For the German Social Democrats, I relied on more recent studies as well as more historical biographies. Francis Ludwig Carsten, *August Bebel und die Organisation der Massen* (Berlin: Siedler, 1991); Raymond H. Dominick, *Wilhelm Liebknecht and the Founding of the German Social Democratic Party* (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1982); Kurt Eisner, *Wilhelm Liebknecht: Sein Leben und Wirken*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Vorwärts, 1906), https://archive.org/details/wilhelmliebknec00eisngoog.

[56] B. Guy Peters, *Comparative Politics: Theory and Methods* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 1998).

[57] A more thorough discussion of structural and institutional explanations of party emergence is provided in Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

[58] Margaret Lavinia Anderson, *Practicing Democracy: Elections and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Marcus Kreuzer, "Parliamentarization and the Question of German Exceptionalism: 1867–1918," *Central European History* 36, no. 3 (2003): 327–57.

1877. In contrast to Germany, voting rights in Britain were limited, but a powerful House of Commons enabled a much more liberal political landscape.[59] In regard to socio-economic development, Britain experienced industrialization first, while Germany was a relative latecomer.[60] When Abraham Kuyper founded the Anti-Revolutionary Party in 1879, the Netherlands lagged behind in industrialization and focused on other areas of economic development such as agriculture and services.[61] On a political level, the small Dutch constitutional monarchy experienced gradual parliamentarization and comparatively late suffrage rights extension.[62]

Table 1: Most different system design[63]

Variable / Party organization	SDAP (1869)	NFL (1877)	ARP (1879)
1) **National circumstances**			
a) Suffrage rights	High	Middle	Low
b) Industrialization	Middle	Early	Late
2) **Ideology**	Social Democratic	Radical Liberal	Orthodox Protestant
3) **Explanatory variable**	?	?	?
Outcome	Early Party Organization	Early Party Organization	Early Party Organization

In relation to the geographical circumstances of the case studies, a disclaimer might be necessary for specialists in the political history of the three countries. In the comparative framework of this study, a certain degree of simplification cannot be avoided. In particular with regard to the three states, the general labels Germany, Britain and the Netherlands will be used.

---

[59] Patrick Joyce, *The State of Freedom: A Social History of the British State Since 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[60] Patrick Joyce, *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, C.1848-1914* (Cambridge University Press, 1993); Friedrich Lenger, *Industrielle Revolution und Nationalstaatsgründung (1849-1870er Jahre)*, ed. Jürgen Kocka, Gebhardt, Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte 15 (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2003).

[61] Michael Jansen, *De industriële ontwikkeling in Nederland 1800-1850*, Reconstruction national accounts of the Netherlands (Amsterdam: NEHA, 1999).

[62] Henk te Velde, 'Van grondwet tot grondwet. Oefenen met parlament, partij en schaalvergroting, 1848-1917', in *Land van kleine gebaren: een politieke geschiedenis van Nederland 1780-1990*, ed. Remieg Aerts et al. (Nijmegen: SUN, 1999), 99–175.

[63] Table design is taken from Toshkov, *Political Analysis*, 268.

Although changing political entities played an important role in national histories, the details of this process are of limited relevance for the general phenomenon of party formation. This is especially the case for Germany where states like Saxony or Prussia formed nearly independent governments until their unification in the Second Empire in 1871.[64] For reasons of simplicity, most sections in this dissertation refer to the broad term "Germany." Only when content makes it necessary have I applied more specific terminology. The use of the term "Britain" should be interpreted in a similar vein. Although the party organization of the NLF extended its organizational structure from its North English heartland to Wales and Scotland, the dissertation generally speaks about "British" politics.[65] The same applies to the Netherlands, where most Anti-Revolutionary activities occurred in the provinces of North and South Holland, but regions like Friesland also hosted influential party chapters.[66]

Inspired by the framework of the most different research design of the social sciences, the three cases have, secondly, been selected for their variance in ideology, an independent variable that is often mentioned in studies on party formation. For early generations of party scholars, both in history and the social sciences, it seemed logical to attribute early party organizations to Socialist parties whose ideology contained the most obvious affinity with mobilizing ordinary people.[67] However, the British perspective shows that bourgeoisie-dominated Radical Liberals also adhered to the mass character of early party organization.[68] Unlike the Social Democratic and Liberal cases, the Dutch ARP had a religious political orientation. Founded by Orthodox Protestant minister Abraham Kuyper, the party opposed the individualistic values of the French Revolution. Nevertheless, despite his hostility towards the values of Liberalism and Social Democracy, Kuyper based his political mission on the promise to improve the parliamentary representation of ordinary people.[69]

---

[64] Hartmut Zwahr, "Die deutsche Arbeiterbewegung im Länder- und Territorienvergleich 1875," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 13, no. 4 (January 1, 1987): 448–507; Ritter, *Der Aufstieg*.

[65] For an example of NLF campaign activities in Scotland, see e.g. Ewen A. Cameron, "'A Far Cry to London': Joseph Chamberlain in Inverness, September 1885," *Innes Review* 57, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 36–53.

[66] Janssens, *opbouw*.

[67] Most famously and influentially is Duverger, *Political Parties*, 1. Otto Kirchheimer, "Der Wandel des Westeuropäischen Parteisystems," *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 6, no. 1 (1965): 25.

[68] Most well-known is Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization*.Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization*.

[69] J. H. Prins, "Kuyper als Partijleider," in *Abraham Kuyper: zijn volksdeel, zijn invloed*, ed. C. Augustijn, J. H. Prins, and H.E.S. Woldring (Delft: Meinema, 1987), 95–122; Roel Kuiper, "De Weg van het volk. Mobilisering en activiering van de Antirevolutionaire beweging, 1878-1888," in *De eenheid & de delen: zuilvorming, onderwijs en natievorming in Nederland, 1850-1900*, ed. Henk te Velde and Hans Verhage (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1996), 99–119; Henk te Velde, "Ervaring en zingeving in de politiek: het politieke charisma in de tijd van Abraham Kuyper," *Theoretische Geschiedenis* 23, no. 4 (1996): 519–38; Henk te Velde, "Kappeyne tegen Kuyper of de principes van het politieke spel," in *De eenheid & de delen: zuilvorming, onderwijs en natievorming in Nederland, 1850-1900*, ed. Henk te Velde and Hans Verhage

4. Sources

In addition to the secondary literature, the dissertation relies on a range of primary and secondary sources. Most sources that were used in this dissertation were composed in the decade around the emergence of each party. These formative years provide a detailed insight into the interplay between democratic ideas and practices, before the democratic mass membership party became a widely accepted phenomenon. For this extensive body of material, ideological complexities and national identities were less important than the ideas and practices that were shared by the party founders of the three organizations. Of special importance for the study of this period were primary sources that gave insights into the motives of party founders and their organizational choices. Following a similar organizational model, party founders were occupied with the same sort of activities to mobilize and discipline their geographically separated followers. Perhaps most surprising, the types of sources also share similarities. In particular, I analyzed letters, autobiographies, political brochures and other publications that were composed by party leaders, their members and critics. Also reports of party congresses and newspaper articles provide insights into how party members and critics justified their behavior and contributed to the emergence of party organization.

The source analysis started with the German SDAP whose comprehensive archives have been made accessible in well-sorted collections and numerous reprinted publications. But also the British and Dutch cases have left an impressive, though less extensive, amount of printed and unpublished material. Most material has not yet been re-published, thus requiring me to spend additional time in the archive. An increasing number of digital sources are available online, but I primarily had to rely on national, university and party archives. For the German case study I used the Bundesarchiv in Berlin, Archiv der Sozialen Demokratie in Bonn, International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam and the private collection of Wilhelm Bracke in the Stadtbibliothek Braunschweig. For Britain, I relied on the archives of the Special Collection of Bristol University and the Cadbury Research Library of Birmingham University. The Historische Documentatie Centrum voor het Nederlandse Protestantisme of the Free University in Amsterdam gave me access to the primary material on the Dutch ARP.

5. Dissertation Structure

The following five chapters explore the emergence of party organization in chronological order by comparing the three cases in each chapter. The first chapter introduces the theoretical argument of the dissertation by combining the literature of social movements, party organizations and the cultural turn in political history. On the basis of a transnational analysis,

---

(Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1996), 121–33; Velde, *Stijlen van leiderschap*, chap. 2; Hanneke Hoekstra, "De kracht van het gesproken woord: politieke mobilisatie en natievorming bij Kuyper en Gladstone," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 4 (2003): 494–511; Arko van Helden, "De 'kleine luyden' van Abraham Kuyper – een vorm van populistische retoriek?," *Negentiende Eeuw* 35, no. 3 (2011): 139–53.

new explanatory factors of party organization are identified. The conventional secondary literature of party organizations often maintained the boundaries of the nation state and refers to structural developments like industrialization and suffrage-rights extension to explain party emergence. Yet for early party founders, these broad developments created very different national circumstances. The leaders of the three parties participated in a European intellectual sphere in which organization was seen as a powerful tool to overcome social and political problems. In particular, the example of the Anti-Corn Law League impressed party activists of different political orientations. Already as young men, party founders like August Bebel, Abraham Kuyper and Joseph Chamberlain joined local and national associations in which they soon experienced the emancipatory effect of their own and their peers' lives.

The second chapter uses comparison to identify common explanatory factors in the period before party formation. It was no coincidence that education was an important topic in all three cases. Party founders built on previous national organizations in the field of education to demonstrate the existence of a national community of disadvantaged followers. But their calls for further politicization and institutionalization were confronted with considerable opposition by other activists. In order to overcome their skepticism, the founders of the German SDAP, British NLF and Dutch ARP used the frame of education as a tool of empowerment to convince their followers that they could improve their own and their families' lives. When party founders argued that this political mission required an advanced model of political organization, the narrative of the mass party as an organization of democratic representation was conceived. This discourse had to be implemented in the organizational practices of early party organization. To study this process, the third chapter provides a close empirical analysis of three founding assemblies to show how party founders implemented their promise of democratization by developing representative structures. While delegates considered practical arguments, their main concern was to create an organization that enabled the democratic representation of ordinary followers. This was an experience that shaped the birth of not only the membership organization of the German Social Democrats, but also the British Liberals and even the Dutch Anti-Revolutionaries.

Chapter four shows how parties' democratic mission remained important after the founding assemblies. The chapter starts with analyzing party leaders' commitment to democracy by exploring different options of implementing representative structures. While the Dutch ARP relied primarily on a charismatic model of representation, the German SDAP focused on a procedural model. The case of the British NLF is an example of how these two models could be combined. The fifth chapter brings together the main argument of the dissertation by critically engaging with the idea that the young party organizations were primarily electoral organizations. For early party founders, parliamentary representation was not an easy strategy to achieve political change. Depending on their specific political context, they developed alternative conceptualizations of the performance of their organization in elections. For all three of them, elections were not only a means to gain political influence, but more importantly

in this early phase, they were also an instrument of organizational consolidation and legitimation of this organization. Finally, in the conclusion the narrative and experiences of party founders are summarized to comment on the current discussions about party decline. The nineteenth-century contested ideas and practice of democratic representation were an essential, yet often overlooked, factor in the foundation process of first party organization.